

TEAMSTERS UNITED PARCEL SERVICE
NATIONAL GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

DOCKET

June 2 - 5, 2014

3:00 P.M.

THE BOSTON PARK PLAZA HOTEL & TOWERS
50 PARK PLAZA AT ARLINGTON STREET
BOSTON, MA 02116

CASES CARRIED OVER:

- N-07-176: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA
On behalf of **Keith Barros**, Union alleges the Company is violating **Articles 1 and 7**, by subcontracting freight.
- N-07-230: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA
On behalf of **all affected NorCal Locals**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 1, 26 and 32**, claiming the Company is subcontracting UPS Mail Innovations work.
- N-08-104: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32**, claiming that the Company is subcontracting UPS Package work to SCS (RC 3-07-148).
- N-09-17: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 22** by refusing to maintain Article 22 jobs created in the Local's jurisdiction.
- N-09-153: Local 542 v. UPS, San Diego, CA
On behalf of **Larry Crothers**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32**, claiming the Company is subcontracting. Union requests that the Company return the work to UPS Feeder Drivers (4/18/08 and ongoing) **REDOCKETED**.
- N-09-218: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees within NorCal**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22 and all others that apply**, claiming that the Company is not replacing Article 22.3 jobs.
- N-09-223: Local 278 v. UPS, San Francisco, CA
On behalf of **Encarnilo Mauricio**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 3**, claiming that the Company is failing to post and bid permanently vacated full-time Article 22.3 positions.

- N-10-06: Local 519 v. UPS, Knoxville, TN
On behalf of **Becky Cole**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 6, Section 4**. The Company implemented EDS and IDS machines and cut 50% of the revenue recovery work force as a direct result, without notification or negotiation.
- N-10-205: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 22.3 and all others that apply**, by neglecting to post for bid vacated 22.3 combination jobs, pursuant to the CBA.
- N-10-272: Local 964 v. UPS, Brook Park, OH
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 34, Section 1**. Part-time employees who don't reach the 750 hours of work do not receive any pro-rata pension as defined in Article 34, Section 1. The Union requests that the Company make contributions for all Part-Time employees who have worked at least 375 hours in any year, in accordance with the Contract.
- N-10-275: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 1 and 32**, claiming the Company is utilizing non-bargaining unit employees to process post cards.
- N-10-282: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC
On behalf of **Martin Klapac**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming that the Company improperly used employees of another Local Union's jurisdiction to perform work that should have been performed by Local 639 bargaining unit employees (11/29/09).
- N-10-283: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC
On behalf of **Martin Klapac**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming that the Company improperly used members of another Local Union's jurisdiction to perform work that should have been performed by Local 639 bargaining unit members (12/6/09).

- N-11-09: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC
On behalf of **William Cooper**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17, Section 1, Article 29, and all others that apply**, and requests that grievant be paid funeral leave and penalty pay.
- N-11-12: Local 355 v. UPS, Baltimore, MD
On behalf of **Barry Freeburger, et al.**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 22 and all others that apply**, and is requesting that all shifting work remain in the Feeder classification.
- N-11-33: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 1, 2 and 32**, claiming the Company has subcontracted work assigned to the collective bargaining unit in violation of the CBA, specifically the work of post card room clerks (Ongoing since 7/22/10).
- N-11-81: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Wayne Scragg**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 36**. Center Manager Jeff Bossert has subjected grievant to discrimination by refusing to give him a low step truck. Bossert has given a reasonable accommodation to another driver however refuses to provide the same accommodation for grievant (Grievance #52906).
- N-11-166: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 1 and 32**, claiming the Company is subcontracting UPS/U.S. Post Office work (formerly N-173-07).
- N-11-176: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA
On behalf of **Stan Seelert**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 22 and all others that apply**, claiming Feeder Drivers worked out of classification (10/5/09).
- N-11-177: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 1, 26 and 32**, claiming that the Company utilized subcontractors while qualified Feeder Drivers were sent back to their respective package centers (11/15/10).

- N-11-203: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 1, Section 2, Article 2, Section 1 and Article 32**. The Company has subcontracted work assigned to the bargaining unit in violation of the CBA; specifically, inside work - loading and unloading, and address correction.
- N-12-01: Local 577 v. UPS, Amarillo, TX
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company is not replacing Article 22, Section 3 jobs.
- N-12-04: Local 516 v. UPS, Muskogee, OK
On behalf of **Jessie Smith**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32**, claiming the Company is subcontracting Feeder loads that should be done by the bargaining unit (6/10/11 and ongoing).
- N-12-70: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC
On behalf of **James Hoover, et al.**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 3** claiming the Company has failed to post/bid/award vacated Article 22.3 jobs.
- N-12-71: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Laura Proano**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 36**, claiming grievant feels discriminated against for physical disability and age (8/24/11).
- N-12-645: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 1, 32 and all others that apply**, claiming that the Company is diverting work out of UPS to other UPS companies.
- N-12-652: Local 2785 v. UPS, San Francisco, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37**, claiming the Company does not have a right to post all Preloaders' names with misloads for all Preloaders to see.

- N-12-656: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ
On behalf of **Bartels, Wendler and Katis**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-050.
- N-12-657: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ
On behalf of **Bartels, Wendler and Katis**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-051.
- N-12-658: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ
On behalf of **Bartels, Wendler and Katis**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-052.
- N-12-659: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ
On behalf of **Bartels, Wendler and Katis**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-053.
- N-12-660: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ
On behalf of **Bartels, Wendler and Katis**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-055.
- N-12-661: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ
On behalf of **Bartels, Wendler and Katis**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-056.
- N-12-662: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ
On behalf of **M. Nelson**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32, 43 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-10-11-089.
- N-12-663: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ
On behalf of **Thompson and Hasoskinson**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-048.
- N-12-664: Local 104 v. UPS, Phoenix, AZ
On behalf of **Thompson and Hasoskinson**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting RC-07-11-049.

- N-12-894: Local 856 v. UPS, San Bruno, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32**, claiming Company is subcontracting bargaining unit work. Company is not abiding by the decision of Case No. N-11-87.
- N-12-895: Local 886 v. UPS, Oklahoma City, OK
On behalf of **Terry Jones**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32**, claiming Company is subcontracting bargaining unit work. Violation took place 2/10/12 and ongoing.
- N-12-1000: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA
On behalf of **Bret Corbett and April Frates**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 26, 32 and all others that apply**, claiming subcontracting/failure to provide information (RC 4/12/005 and RC 4/12/034) 12/12/11 and 12/30/11.
- N-12-1002: Local 174 v. UPS, Tukwila, WA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 32**, claiming Bargaining unit work is being subcontracted (August 31, 2011 and ongoing)
- N-12-1006: Local 355 v. UPS, Baltimore, MD
On behalf of **Mike Petro, et al.**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 3**, claiming the Company is refusing to fill a permanent vacancy.
- N-12-1008: Local 391 v. UPS, Raleigh, NC
On behalf of **Thomas Sherron**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 17 and all others that apply**. The Company failed to pay grievant five (5) hours of holiday pay for Christmas 2011. The Company owes him five (5) hours of holiday pay and penalty for each week they did not correct his paycheck.
- N-12-1061: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 7**. Employees have not been allowed to remain on the job, without loss of pay unless and until the discharge or suspension is sustained under the grievance procedure (ongoing from 6/28/12).

- N-12-1080: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Jeff Delbrune**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming Supervision failed to correct grievant's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 7/7/12).
- N-13-43: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 3**, claiming the Company has failed to fill vacancies as required by the CBA.
- N-13-264: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Angel Urena**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Company management team failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from week ending 1/29/13). 12/17/12.
- N-13-274: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Jonathan Vargas**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37 and all others that apply**, claiming the Supervisor treated Alternate Shop Steward without dignity and respect and sent him home when addressing a grievance (ongoing but escalated on 1/14/13).
- N-13-364: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Doris Barrett**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Company unreasonably denied the employee long term disability that she was eligible for under SPD. (ongoing from 5/1/13).
- N-13-369: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Phil Martorana**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Manager Mike Rechner failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 10/14/11).
- N-13-371: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Jodi Kipping**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every

reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (ongoing 2012 through 2013).

- N-13-379: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Pete Richards**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company has performed bargaining unit work without exhausting every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient workforce to staff its operations with bargaining unit employees (5/24/12 through 3/4/13).
- N-13-381: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Todd Henris**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 32** (2/11/13).
- N-13-382: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **John Baietto**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 32** (2/11/13).
- N-13-383: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Brian Madden**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 32** Subcontracting issue (2/11/13).
- N-13-413: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Mark Grant**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Manager Kevin Colwell failed to correct the Employee's pay shortage which was the result of an Employer error (ongoing from 5/2/13).
- N-13-416: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Steve Ambrosio**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (6/10/13-ongoing).
- N-13-417: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Eddie Aldridge**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (6/24/13-ongoing).

- N-13-418: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Dan Betancourt**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (5/29/13-ongoing).
- N-13-419: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Vincent Chierchie**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (7/3/13-ongoing).
- N-13-420: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Louis Cintron**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (8/22/13-ongoing).
- N-13-421: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Chris Coleman**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (6/25/13-ongoing).
- N-13-422: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Pat Finnerty**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (7/2/13-ongoing).
- N-13-423: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Mike Focazio**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (5/1/13-ongoing).
- N-13-424: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Bill Keller**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (5/1/13-ongoing).
- N-13-425: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Joe Martino**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (6/26/13-ongoing).

- N-13-426: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Mike Neary**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (7/1/13-ongoing).
- N-13-427: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Steve Noethiger**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (6/27/13-ongoing).
- N-13-428: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Anthony Reynolds**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (7/22/13-ongoing).
- N-13-429: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Chris Robinson**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (7/1/13-ongoing).
- N-13-430: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Jose Suarez**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (8/12/13-ongoing).
- N-13-440: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Danny Villagran**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 7**, claiming the employee had returned to regular duties after sustaining a compensable injury, and was required by the Worker's Compensation doctor to receive additional medical treatment during the employee's regularly scheduled working hours. Manager Santiago Lado refused to work the employee to avoid paying the employee's regular hourly rate of pay for such time. (3/4/13)
- N-13-441: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Vincente Carlo**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Manager Mike Hickey failed to correct the Employee's pay after a grievance settlement (ongoing from 5/2/13).

- N-13-442: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Tim Hargrove**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Manager John Woods has overly supervised the aggrieved employee and treated the employee without dignity and respect (ongoing but escalated on 8/29/13).
- N-13-448: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Rene Duchatellier and all affected members**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37**, claiming the Employer continually fails to allow a minimum of ten percent (10%) of the package car drivers worked in any Center off on a daily basis for the relief of overtime in violation of Article 37 (ongoing from 6/20/13)
- N-13-453: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Scott Damone, Peter DePierro and Dan Marangiello**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**, paid for time. Any grievance settlement not paid within ten (10) working days of the settlement shall entitle the grievant(s) to a penalty payment, as outlined (6/27/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-454: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Larry Marino**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**, paid for time. Any grievance settlement not paid within ten (10) working days of the settlement shall entitle the grievant(s) to a penalty payment, as outlined (6/27/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-455: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Gary Bolk and John Koepfel**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**. Any grievance settlement not paid within ten (10) working days of the settlement shall entitle the grievant(s) to a penalty payment, as outlined (6/27/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-456: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Mark English**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**, paid for time. Grievant worked as a cover clerk on 5/1/13; his timecard was put in as an Optional Holiday. He

still has not received his 8 hours' pay or an Optional Holiday restored (5/1/13 and ongoing).

- N-13-457: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **John Young**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**, paid for time. Any grievance settlement not paid within ten (10) working days of the settlement shall entitle the grievant(s) to a penalty payment, as outlined (4/4/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-466: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Scott Damone**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (4/9/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-467: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Peter DePierro**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (3/12/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-468: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **John Koepfel**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (6/18/13 and ongoing).
- N-13-469: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Larry Marino**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (7/9/13).
- N-13-470: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Larry Loverde**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (7/8, 7/9, 7/10 and 7/11/13).
- N-13-471: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Gary Bolk**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (7/11/13).

- N-13-472: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Paul Marino**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 3, Section 7**, claiming Supervisors performed bargaining unit work (7/16/13).
- N-13-480: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY
On behalf of **Jason Grosjean**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 4**. The Company continues to violate the Part-time employees preferred job language and has not honored grievant's request regarding his preferred job, ongoing for a 2-year period (2012-2013).
- N-13-481: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY
On behalf of **Frank Celeste**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 22, Section 4**. The Company continues to violate the Part-time employees preferred job language and has not honored grievant's request regarding his preferred job, ongoing for a 2-year period (2012-2013).
- N-13-482: Local 769 v. UPS, Miami, FL
On behalf of **Thomas Burris**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 17**, claiming the Company has not paid the employee for all time in service 9/21/12, 9/24-26/12.
- N-13-486: Local 79 v. UPS, Tampa, FL
On behalf of **Tisha Richardson**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 17**. The Company is paying employees option days in advance of employees actually taking the days off, in violation of clear Supplemental language, and then taxing them at a higher rate of 25% (1/3/13).
- N-13-222: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA
On behalf of **Sergio DeLaLuz**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 1 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company utilized subcontractors while qualified feeder drivers were sent back to their respective package centers (11/13/12).
- N-13-223: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 41**, claiming the Company reconfigured existing 22.3 combination jobs from

inside/outside to inside/inside creating a shortage of pay for affected employee's (October/November 2012).

- N-13-585: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA
On behalf of **Robert Duncan**, Union alleges the Company violated **Articles 26 and 32 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company is violating contractual rights by subcontracting feeder work - no notification (1/3/13).
- N-13-586: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA
On behalf of **Robert Duncan**, Union alleges the Company violated **Articles 26 and 32 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company is violating contractual rights by subcontracting feeder work - no notification (5/21/13 and 5/30/13).
- N-13-587: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA
On behalf of **Bret Corbett**, Union alleges the Company violated **Articles 26 and 32 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company is violating contractual rights by subcontracting feeder work - no notification (6/8/11).
- N-13-588: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA
On behalf of **Jerry McCoy**, Union alleges the Company violated **Articles 26 and 32 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company is violating contractual rights by subcontracting feeder work - no notification (11/21/12).
- N-14-01: Local 767 v. UPS, Forest Hill, TX
On behalf of **Craig Curtis**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**. The Union claims the Company brought in an outside contractor and had them start performing automotive bargaining unit work on trailers that up until August of 2013 had always been performed by the bargaining unit (8/19/2013 and ongoing). **REDOCKETED**
- N-14-02: Local 767 v. UPS, Forest Hill, TX
On behalf of **Edward Miller**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**. The Union claims the Company

brought in an outside contractor and had them start performing automotive bargaining unit work on trailers that up until August of 2013 had always been performed by the bargaining unit (8/27/2013).
REDOCKETED

N-14-03: Local 767 v. UPS, Forest Hill, TX
On behalf of **Edward Miller**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**. The Union claims the Company brought in an outside contractor and had them start performing automotive bargaining unit work on trailers that up until August of 2013 had always been performed by the bargaining unit (ongoing since 8/19/2013). **REDOCKETED**

N-14-06: Local 30 v. UPS, Jeanette, PA
On behalf of **Ted Miller**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work without exhausting all means, and also sent people home early throughout the shift (12/18/2011).

N-14-07: Local 326 v. UPS, New Castle, DE
On behalf of **Doug Hite**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims the Company used non bargaining unit personnel including supervisors to perform bargaining unit package car work exhausting all qualified employees in October in order to prevent employees from gaining seniority (Month of October).

N-14-09: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Rayzon Jackson**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 10**. The Union claims the grievant should not be liable for reimbursement or discipline and for lost or stolen packages until grievant procedure is heard (11/27/2013).

N-14-19: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Steve Ambrosio**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3** and all others that apply. The Union claims Supervisors are

continually performing bargaining unit work
(9/24/2013 and ongoing).

- N-14-20: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Todd Henris**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3** and all others that apply. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/30/2013).
- N-14-21: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **William J. Keller**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3** and all others that apply. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/24/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-22: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Robert West**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3** and all others that apply. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/30/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-23: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Robert Dulaney**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3** and all others that apply. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/24/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-24: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Mike Focazio**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/26/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-25: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Dan Betancourt**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (1/6/2014 and ongoing).

- N-14-26: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **William Hill, Vincent Palifka and Matt Beattie**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 14, Section 1**. The Union claims the Employer called Mr. Hill and Mr. Palifka to the Division Manager office and placed on a one day suspension. Mr. Beattie was issued a warning letter for an injury he sustained (10/1/2013).
- N-14-27: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Scott Damone and Peter DePierro**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 17**. The Union claims the Employer has not paid grievances timely within 10 working days of settlement agreement and penalty pay is now owed (7/8/2013 to present).
- N-14-28: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Craig Newman**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisor Ken English, Manager Frank Maffei and Division Manager Pat Sheppard, harassed and overly supervising Craig Newman (1/14/2014).
- N-14-29: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Michelle Smith**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (10/21/2013).
- N-14-30: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **John Young**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/5/2013).
- N-14-31: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Craig Newman**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (10/2/2013 and ongoing).

- N-14-32: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Frank Ruffillo**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (10/4/2013).
- N-14-33: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Aron Hershkowitz**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (7/26/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-34: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Larry Loverde**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/24/2013).
- N-14-35: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Peter DePierro**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (7/17/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-36: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Scott Damone**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (7/16/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-37: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Kendal Laird**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually performing bargaining unit work (9/30/2013).
- N-14-38: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Gary Bolk**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Supervisors are continually

performing bargaining unit work (7/31/2013 and ongoing).

- N-14-39: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC
On behalf of **Mary D. Shaw**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 32**. The Union claims improper use of subcontractors (4/10/2013).
- N-14-40: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC
On behalf of **Mary D. Shaw**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Union claims improper use of out of center driver(s) (4/3/2013).
- N-14-41: Local 639 v. UPS, Washington, DC
On behalf of **Michael Iannone**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 22**. The Union claims failure of Company to fill Article 22.3 vacancy (current and ongoing).
- N-14-42: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **John Gonzales**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisors perform work without making every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient work force (12/12/2013 and 12/17/2013).
- N-14-43: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Kevin Patterson**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisors perform work without making every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient work force (12/18/2013, 12/23/2013, 12/24/2013 and 12/26/2013).
- N-14-44: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Alex Monaco**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisors perform work without making every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient work force (10/9/2013, 12/16/2013, 12/19/2013, 12/20/2013, 12/23/2013 and 12/24/2013).

- N-14-45: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Pierre Patrick**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisors perform work without making every reasonable effort to maintain a sufficient work force (12/17/2013).
- N-14-49: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Brian Madden, John Baietto and Todd Henris**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 32 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Subcontracting (2/11/2013).
- N-14-50: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Brian Madden**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisors working during free period (12/1/2013 through 12/24/2013).
- N-14-51: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Company used free period hires and expeditors past contractual date (1/1/2014-ongoing).
- N-14-52: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Gustavo Loriano**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37 and all others that apply**. The Union claims harassment (11/7/2013).
- N-14-53: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Ralston Bozwell, Jason Jessup, Mike Costanza and Josh Morgan**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37 and all others that apply**. The Union claims harassment (11/19/2013, 11/20/2013, and prior grievances submitted to the Company from 9/2013-1/31/2014).
- N-14-55: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Keenan Boston**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3 Section 7**. The Union claims the Supervisor is doing bargaining unit work (Grievance #71184).

- N-14-58: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **William Miller**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #68727).
- N-14-59: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **William Miller**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #68748).
- N-14-60: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **William Miller**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #69132).
- N-14-61: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **William Miller**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #69134).
- N-14-62: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor C. McMiller is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72383).
- N-14-63: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor P. Blount is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73053).
- N-14-64: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor P. Blount is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73075).

- N-14-65: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor T. Musto is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73076).
- N-14-66: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor B. Trikur is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73077).
- N-14-67: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor P. Blount is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #70424).
- N-14-68: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor C. McMiller is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73051).
- N-14-69: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor B. Trikur is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73052).
- N-14-70: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor C. McMiller is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #73054).
- N-14-71: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor B. Trikur is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72380).

- N-14-72: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor P. Blount is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72379).
- N-14-73: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor B. Trikur is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72381).
- N-14-74: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor C. McMiller is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72382).
- N-14-75: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Bill Shendlinger**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #68721).
- N-14-76: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Bill Shendlinger**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #69133).
- N-14-77: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Bill Shendlinger**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #71183).
- N-14-78: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #74586).

- N-14-79: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #74330).
- N-14-80: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #74428).
- N-14-81: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Robert Laba**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #68722).
- N-14-82: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Robert Laba**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72061).
- N-14-83: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Robert Laba**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72367).
- N-14-84: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Robert Laba**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #72368).
- N-14-86: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Robert Laba**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #68724).

- N-14-87: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Bill Shendlinger**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 7**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (Grievance #68721).
- N-14-88: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Union claims Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work.
- N-14-90: Local 174 v. UPS, Tukwila, WA
On behalf of **Matt Svarz**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3**. The Union claims the Company is allowing full time Supervisor Rick Aholelei to perform bargaining unit work during the months of November and December 2012 (Peak season 2012).
- N-11-10: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR
On behalf of **Ana Cruz**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 27, Section 7**. The Company assigned the pick up of Medtronics Co. (Juncos) on Saturday to another employee for the last three (3) years, unknown to grievant. Union requests that grievant be paid her salary every Saturday for the last three (3) years.
REDOCKETED

EAST

- N-14-135: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR
On behalf of **Jose A. Rivera-Pagan**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 22 and all others that apply**. The Union alleges the employee was given a warning letter in circumstances out of normal conditions (10/18/13).
- N-14-136: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR
On behalf of **Radford Holder**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union alleges part-time Supervisor Mario Torres worked in the unload and sort operation for three (3) hours (10/21/13).
- N-14-137: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR
On behalf of **Jorge Carrasquilo**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**. The Union alleges management agreed to pay 16 hours penalty for an employer's error and did not pay it (10/8/13).
- N-14-138: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR
On behalf of **Jorge Carrasquilo**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**. The employee alleges the Company did not pay 1 hour and 20 minutes from (10/10/13).
- N-14-139: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR
On behalf of **Ricardo Giraldo and other shop stewards**, Union claims the Company is in violation of **Article 19 and all others that apply**, by tampering with the bulletin board and removed information from it as well as threatened the delegates regarding this matter (11/4/13 and subsequent events).
- N-14-140: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR
On behalf of **Hector Torres**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 3 Section 7**. The Union alleges Supervisor Waldemar Ortiz was doing Union work loading in a Mid Point sort etc. (5/21/13).

- N-14-141: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR
On behalf of **Luis Valderrama**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 3 Section 7**. The Union alleges after telling the employees of the area available to clock out, Supervisor Mario Torres proceeded for one hour to sort, move packages and clean the area (6/12/13).
- N-14-142: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR
On behalf of **Luis Valderrama, Rafael Martinez, Carlos Gonzalez, Luis Cepeda, Luis Arroyo, Hiram Ramos, Efrain Vera and others**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 3 Section 7**. The Union alleges management is ordering union members to clock out and finishing the job with Supervisors (Since or about 6/18/13).
- N-14-143: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR
On behalf of **Luis Valderrama, Rafael Martinez, Carlos Gonzalez, Luis Cepeda, Luis Arroyo, Hector Torres, Edwin Alvarez, Jose Rivera, Juan Diaz, Hiram Ramos and Efrain Vera**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**. The Union alleges the Company is violating the above Articles and is affecting the employees' performance (Since or about 6/18/13).
- N-14-144: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR
On behalf of **Edwin Alvarez**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37 and all others that apply**. The Union claims the Supervisor is placing packages inside the vehicles (6/18/13).
- N-14-145: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 17**. The Union alleges ongoing pay shortage for employees working 6th day (1/10/14).
- N-14-146: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Leroy James**, Union claims the Company is in violation of **Article 10**. The Union alleges the grievant damaged DIAD while working. The grievant should not have to reimburse Company for payment of equipment (3/27/14).

- N-14-147: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union claims the Company is in violation of **Article 4**. The Union alleges the Company has not provided information requested by the Union, in writing, on numerous occasions for grievance #60437, 60447, 72083, 68943 and 66302 (ongoing).
- N-14-148: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Tom Gilbert**, Union claims the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 4 and 7**. The Union alleges the Supervisor Torey Hull performed bargaining unit work Grievance #79336 (11/15/13).
- N-14-149: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Mike Stanford**, Union claims the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 4 and 7**. The Union alleges the Supervisor Jamar Palmer performed bargaining unit work Grievance #72748 (12/27/12).
- N-14-150: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Rich Bowe, Tom Gilbert and Mike Stanford**, Union claims the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 4 and 7**. The Union alleges Supervisors Torey Hull, Mikel Irkliewskij, Scott Coddington and Diana Rhamel performed bargaining unit work Grievance #'s 72737, 72738, 72739 and 72741 (12/11/12).
- N-14-151: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Mike Stanford and Mike Drake**, Union claims the Company is in violation of **Article 3, Section 4 and 7**. The Union alleges Supervisors Torey Hull, Diana Rhamel, Jamar Palmer and Steve Callagy performed bargaining unit work Grievance #'s 72742, 72743, 72744 and 72745 (12/12/12).
- N-14-152: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 18**. The Union alleges Supervisor Rich Fairless violated the collective bargaining agreement Grievance #68896 (5/22/12).

- N-14-153: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Victor Palumbo**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 18 and all others that apply**. The Union alleges Supervisor Mike Bach is in violation of the collective bargaining agreement Grievance # 82160 (4/10/14).
- N-14-154: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 18**. The Union alleges Supervisor Ashley Chesney is in violation of the collective bargaining agreement Grievance # 82162 (4/10/14).
- N-14-155: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 18**. The Union alleges Supervisor Alex Maldonado is in violation of the collective bargaining agreement Grievance # 82161 (4/10/14).
- N-14-156: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Keith Stouch**, Union claims that the Company is in violation of **Article 20**. The Union alleges the Company is not allowing Keith to work Grievance #'s 87668 and 66500 (5/5/14).
- N-14-157: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY
On behalf of **Chris Swift, Jr.**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3 Section 7**. The Union claims the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (12/3/13 and 12/9/13).
- N-14-158: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY
On behalf of **John Woodrich**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3 Section 7**. The Union claims the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (12/2/13, 12/20/13 and 1/3/14).
- N-14-159: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY
On behalf of **Karen Wiltsie**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3 Section 7**. The Union claims the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (11/6/13 and 11/27/13).

- N-14-160: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY
On behalf of **Michael Mach**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 3 Section 7**. The Union claims the Supervisor is performing bargaining unit work (11/20/13, 11/27/13, 12/3/13 and 1/3/14).
- N-14-161: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY
On behalf of **Christopher Clark**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 22 and all others that apply**. The Union claims the grievant was not paid in accordance with terms and provisions of the contract (90 calendar days of start date).
- N-14-162: Local 317 v. UPS, Syracuse, NY
On behalf of **Michele Hunt**, Union claims the Company is in violation of **Article 10**. Management claims the clerk accepted a personal check instead of a cashier's check or money order and the clerk disagrees (1/8/14).
- N-14-163: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **leslie**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is sorting High Volume PD 4 (10/2/13).
- N-14-164: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Virgil Blanding**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is sorting High Volume PD 6 and loading truck (9/26/13).
- N-14-165: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Virgil Blanding**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is sorting High Volume PD 6 and loading truck (10/1-2/2013).
- N-14-166: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Mark Johns**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is working (4/2/13).
- N-14-167: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Dave Loobie**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is working (8/28/13, 9/17/13 and

9/30/13).

- N-14-168: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Jodi Kipping**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming Supervisors working in Laurelton and Foster buildings (May 1, 2013 through May 1, 2014).
- N-14-169: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Robert Monahan**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company is using non-clerks to do clerk work (10/1/13, 10/4/13, 10/8/13, 10/10/13, 10/28/13 and 10/29/13).
- N-14-170: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Miguel Cifuentes**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming Supervisors working (5/1/13 through 5/1/14).
- N-14-171: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Angel Gomez**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming Supervisors working (1/6/14, 1/13/14, 1/14/14, 2/4/14 and 2/5/14).
- N-14-172: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Steven Williams**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming Supervisors working (9/27/13 and 9/30/13).
- N-14-173: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Mark Cohen**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Company Supervisors shuttling ground work to drivers and supervisors working in Foster building (1/1/14 to 5/1/14).
- N-14-174: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Pete Richards**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Company Supervisors shuttling ground work to drivers (04/2013 through 04/2014).

- N-14-175: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Thauddues Palmer**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming Supervisors were doing union work (October 2013 through April 2014).
- N-14-176: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Lennox James**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisors are doing union work (1/21-24/14 and 1/27/14).
- N-14-177: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Andre Prime**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisors are doing union work (6/24/13, 6/26/13, 7/1/13, 7/2/13 and 7/5/13).
- N-14-178: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Bankole Thomas**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisors are doing union work (3/28/14, 4/10/14 and 4/11/14).
- N-14-179: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Joseph D'Angelo**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisors are doing union work (12/16-20/13).
- N-14-180: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Edwin Reves**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisors are doing union work (10/1/13).
- N-14-181: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Louis Gonzalez**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisors are shuttling work to drivers (6/12/13).
- N-14-182: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Joe Chacon**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisors are doing union work from 3 hours (9/9/13).

- N-14-183: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Todd Henris**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 30 and all others that apply**, claiming out of district drivers are performing cpu work on Sunday (4/6/14 and ongoing).
- N-14-184: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisors are working relief breaks throughout the building as subterfuge for supervisors performing bargaining unit work (week ending 3/1/14, 3/8/14, 3/15/14, 3/22/14, 3/29/14, 4/5/14, 4/12/14, 4/19/14, 4/26/14, 5/3/14, 5/10/14 and ongoing).
- N-14-185: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Local 804 Business Agent**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 32**, claiming the Company is not using Local 804 Union porters at the Laurelton Building to do porter work Sunday through Saturday, day and night (ongoing).
- N-14-186: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Mike Haring**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming Supervisor Randall was doing bargaining unit work on the sort aisle (3/26/13).
- N-14-187: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Virgil Blanding**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming several Supervisors were doing bargaining unit work by loading truck (10/2/13).
- N-14-188: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Virgil Blanding**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the Supervisor is unloading bargaining unit work from boxline 4 (10/28/13).
- N-14-189: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Virgil Blanding**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming Supervisor Anthony Payne was doing bargaining unit

work on the metro boxlines (10/15/13, 10/16/13 and 10/18/13).

- N-14-190: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Ebony Lewis**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming full time Supervisor Sandy Brown and Christain Agostini were doing bargaining unit work in small sort (4/30/14).
- N-14-191: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Amari Harris**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the part-time Supervisor Jackie Eason was doing bargaining unit work in small sort (1/27/14).
- N-14-192: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Montre Travis**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 16**, claiming the driver lost his license and UPS will only offer driver 8 hours on 2 different shifts and not 8 continuous hours (April 2014).
- N-14-193: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Leslie Williams**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the part time Supervisor Derrick were doing bargaining unit work in small sort (1/24/14).
- N-14-194: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Reanna Brown**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Company is in violation of Article 17 (3/21/13).
- N-14-195: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 17**, claiming the Company is in violation of Article 17 (8/5/13).
- N-14-196: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Justin Tyrell Williams**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3 Section 7**, claiming the part time Supervisor is doing bargaining union work (4/21/14, 4/22/14 and 4/24/14).

N-14-197: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Leslie Williams and Dwayne DeMercado**,
Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 3**
Section 7, claiming part time Supervisor Jackie
Eason were doing bargaining union work in small sort
(2/17-20/2014).

CENTRAL

N-14-198: Local 89 v. UPS, Louisville, KY
On behalf of **John Schoenlaub**, Union claims the
Company is in violation of **Article 26 and Article 32**.
The Union alleges Zappos bus moved UPS equipment,
including loaded trailer between their facilities on
public road (8/7/13 and 8/13/13).

WEST

- N-14-199: Local 162 v. UPS, Portland, OR
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 23 and all others that apply**. It is the well-established practice in Joint Council 37 that Local Union 162 has processed and filed grievances on behalf of Joint Council 37 for at least the last 25 years. Company point of order needs to be denied and the case needs to be referred back to the NY 5 States Grievance Committee to be heard on its merits (1/1/14 through 1/17/14 and ongoing).
- N-14-200: Locals 70 and 315 v. UPS, Oakland and Martinez, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 38**. The Union claims the Company is violating contractual rights by not compensating part time employees for travel during a temporary change in operations (3/1/14).

SAFETY AND HEALTH COMMITTEE

- N-10-124: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Articles 18, 47 and all others that apply**, with respect to health, safety and climate conditions as a result of the thermostat set points at 45 degrees Fahrenheit for occupied and 40 degrees Fahrenheit for unoccupied areas.
- N-10-129: Local 519 v. UPS, Knoxville, TN
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 18, Section 6 and all others that apply**, claiming a change of practice by the Company to lower building temperature from 54 degrees Fahrenheit to 40 degrees Fahrenheit.
- N-11-90: Local 651 v. UPS, Lexington, KY
On behalf of **Blake Jenkins, William Scott Clary and Richard Haun**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 18, Section 6**, claiming conditions are too cold, requesting that the heat be turned on or up.
- N-11-91: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR
On behalf of **William Rivera**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 35, Sections 4 and 10**. Grievant was terminated after failing a drug test. He went to rehab, was reinstated to his position and then failed an alcohol test by .5.
- N-11-97: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 18**, claiming the Company created an unsafe work area in Edison Small Sort.
- N-11-118: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Wayne Scragg**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 14**. Grievant reported for work, refused work by Center Manager Jeff Bossert. Bossert stated "he is not going to make reasonable accommodations to him by giving him a low step truck." (Grievance #52904)

- N-11-124: Local 344 v. UPS, Milwaukee, WI
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 18**, that claiming low backed seats in tractors are serious safety concern and a violation of the Safety and Health Preamble.
- N-11-288: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Laura Proano**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 14**, claiming that the Company is not acting in a timely manner to provide grievant an accommodation.
- N-12-690: Local 480 v. UPS, Nashville, TN
On behalf of **Paul Murray**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 18, 6 and all others that apply**, claiming building heat (December 2009).
- N-12-691: Local 480 v. UPS, Nashville, TN
On behalf of **Steve Odom**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 18, 6 and all others that apply**, claiming building heat (ongoing).
- N-12-692: Local 480 v. UPS, Nashville, TN
On behalf of **Tracy Wallace**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 18, 6 and all others that apply**, claiming building heat (ongoing).
- N-12-998: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Keith Thomas**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 18**. Company has a new policy to remove package car driver after having accidents from routes for not knowing D.O.K questions (week ending 3/22/12).
- N-12-1108: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Jose Rivera**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 14, Section 3**, claiming the Company didn't provide grievant a reasonable accommodation (7/27/12).
- N-11-289: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 18**. The Company is causing an unsafe work environment by asking and allowing part-time employees to push empty air cans into trailers

where there are no rollers on the trailer floor (3/29/11) **REDOCKETED**.

- N-13-150: Local 992 v. UPS, Hagerstown, MD
On behalf of **Gary Stanfield**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 16, Section 3.3**. After properly notifying the Company of his DUI citation that occurred on 11/3/12, the Company did not allow grievant to work inside pending completion of the SAP assessment and return to work call (11/9-16/12).
- N-13-151: Local 992 v. UPS, Hagerstown, MD
On behalf of **Gary Stanfield**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 16, Section 3.3**. After properly notifying the Company of his DUI citation that occurred on 11/3/12, the Company did not allow grievant to work inside pending completion of the SAP assessment and return to work call (11/19/12).
- N-13-491: Local 519 v. UPS, Knoxville, TN
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a Company violated **Article 16 and all others that apply**, by arbitrarily deviating from the written SAP recommendations for an employee.
- N-13-492: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 18**. Union Steward John Woodrich has filed multiple grievances regarding safety violations - boxes falling, high from the P-D's, and the stacking of irregulars blocking egress and ingress (3/25/13 - 3/29/13).
- N-13-584: Local 222 v. UPS, Salt Lake City, UT
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 14**, claiming the Company is in violation of Article 14 of the JC #3 Feeder, Package, Mechanics & Combination Employees Rider and all other applicable articles (beginning 7/1/13 and ongoing).
- N-14-92: Local 63 v. UPS, Rialto, CA
On behalf of **Scott Barnes and all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 18**. The Union claims the

Company is forcing the San Bernardino hub drivers to drive vehicles that are not safe (5/16/2013).

- N-14-93: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 18**. The Union claims the Company is placing employees' safety and health in jeopardy (multiple violations up to final discussion on 1/17/2014).
- N-14-96: Local 317 v. UPS, Syracuse, NY
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 18**. The Union claims the Company implemented a mandatory stretching program for employees without notifying the Local Union or Safety Committee (1/15/2014).
- N-14-97: Local 317 v. UPS, Syracuse, NY
On behalf of **Todd Brinley**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 16**. The Union claims the grievant was denied a leave of absence for rehabilitation purposes and discharged. (12/13/2013).
- N-14-98: Local 63 v. UPS, Rialto, CA
On behalf of **Myra Martinez**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 16 Section 4**. The Union claims the Company denied reasonable accommodation request (1/18/2013).
- N-14-99: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Joe Belcaro**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 14**. The Union claims the Employee was injured at work and Company did not pay subsequent medical bills incurred from injury (ongoing).

NEW CASES:

- N-14-201: Local 773 v. UPS, Allentown, PA
On behalf of **Stephen Bentham IV**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 18**. The Union claims the automotive shop is not designated as a separate walled-in area (ongoing).
- N-14-202: Local 901 v. UPS, San Juan, PR
On behalf of **Raquel Perez**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. The Union claims the Supervisor gave private information of an employee to another employee (in or around 5/20/13).
- N-14-203: Local 449 v. UPS, Buffalo, NY
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 18 Section 6**. The Union claims the Company has not satisfactorily addressed the issue about the lack of heat in the Niagara Falls building (beginning of January 2014 through the entire winter of 2014).
- N-14-204: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Pete Richards**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 17 and all others that apply**, claiming the Company did not allow driver to work while waiting for his ADA accommodation (8/19/13 to 12/23/13 Monday through Saturday).

PREMIUM SERVICES COMMITTEE

- N-09-258: Local 992 v. UPS, Hagerstown, MD
On behalf of **Brett Golden**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 43 and 32**. On or about 9/29/08, UPS began using the "New Covenant" trucking company to perform bargaining unit Feeder Work that had been performed by the UPS Feeder Drivers dispatched out of the Hagerstown, MD UPS building. Specifically, UPS is allowing the non-union New Covenant trucking Company to move loads from the Home Depot Distribution Center located in Hagerstown, MD to Chicago, IL and Salt Lake City, UT.
- N-11-153: Local 396 v. UPS, Covina, CA
On behalf of **Larry Berru**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 43 and all others that apply**, when it moved hourly work, which was being satisfied by hourly drivers, to facilitate a mileage run.
- N-12-10: Local 891 v. UPS, Jackson, MS
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 17 and 43**, and requests Jackson mileage Feeder Drivers be paid all additional monetary conditions payment established from Memphis Feeder Operation and surrounding areas.
- N-13-163: Local 767 v. UPS, Ft. Worth, TX
On behalf of **Steve Griffin**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Articles 17 and 43**, claiming a Sleeper Team was forced to do extra work (extra leg) which extended their week and they were not compensated at the proper rate **05339UP12**.
- N-13-493: Local 355 v. UPS, Baltimore, MD
On behalf of **Charles Wilder**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 43**, over a pay dispute. The sleeper team was re-routed and pulled regular ground work and grievant was not paid correctly (12/16/12).

NEW CASES:

- N-14-205: Local 384 v. UPS, Norristown, PA
On behalf of **Steve Lang**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 43**, over pay rate (ongoing).
- N-14-206: Local 767 v. UPS, Forest Hill, TX
On behalf of **Jimmy Lyon**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 43 and all others that apply**. The Union Claims the Company added a leg to Team WR75109 and did not offer the extra work in seniority order (9/23/13 and 9/30/13).
- N-14-207: Local 767 v. UPS, Forest Hill, TX
On behalf of **John Benton**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 43 and all others that apply**. The Union Claims the Company added a leg to Team WR75109 and did not pay the affected drivers for the sixth and/or seventh punch rate for this extra work (9/23/13 and 9/30/13).

9.5

- N-11-405: Local 657 v. UPS, San Antonio, TX
On behalf of **Joe Armstrong**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37**, claiming excessive hours and requests triple-time rate of pay (Week Ending 3/26/11).
- N-11-407: Local 657 v. UPS, San Antonio, TX
On behalf of **Leonard Gaitan**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37**, claiming excessive hours on a regular basis (Week Ending 6/11/11).
- N-11-408: Local 657 v. UPS, San Antonio, TX
On behalf of **Albert Rodriguez**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37**, claiming excessive hours and requests triple-time rate of pay (Week Ending 6/4/11).
- N-12-736: Local 767 v. UPS, Forest Hill, TX
On behalf of **Coby Cowling**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37**, when grievant, already on 9.5 list, was worked over 9.5 four days of workweek (Tues-Fri). Three days (T, W, T) over 9.5 was on same route, fourth day (F) was on different route 09219UP11.
- N-12-919: Local 886 v. UPS, Oklahoma City, OK
On behalf of **Philip Garver**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37**. The Company pulls grievant off his bid route and forces him into the unassigned pool, causing him to go over 9.5 hours (6/14, 6/16, 6/17, of 2011).
- N-12-920: Local 886 v. UPS, Oklahoma City, OK
On behalf of **Philip Garver**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37**. Company pulled grievant off his bid route and forced him to the unassigned pool, causing him to run over 9.5 hours (2/27, 2/28, 2/29 3/01, 3/02, of 2012).

- N-12-1131: Local 385 v. UPS, Orlando, FL
On behalf of **Kyle Harrison**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company is working grievant over 9.5 hours more than three (3) days in a work week (March 14, 2012).
- N-12-1220: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Michael Aspinall**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Supervisor Lawrence Maher has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise aggrieved employee in the performance of his duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 1/19/12, but escalated 6/27/12 and is continuous).
- N-12-1239: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **David Torres**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37**. Manager Supervision has continued to intimidate, harass, coerce overly supervise the aggrieved employee in the performance of her duties. They have also continually tried to keep the employee to a standard that is higher than a fair day's work for a fair day's pay (ongoing from 5/14/12).
- N-12-1263: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Cesar Garcia**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1(c)** and the 9.5 Committee Guidelines. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company also continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (W/E 7/21/12 and ongoing).
- N-12-1269: Local 70 v. UPS, Oakland, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 3 and all others that apply**, claiming supervisors are working (RC 4-12-031), 10/6/11 ongoing.

- N-13-193: Local 728 v. UPS, Atlanta, GA
On behalf of **Kendall Greeson**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. Grievant is on the 9.5 list for the Acworth, GA center, filed a grievance for W/E 5/28/11; meets Article 37 requirements, and should be paid penalty pay (originally filed as Case N-12-754).
- N-13-194: Local 728 v. UPS, Atlanta, GA
On behalf of **Ryan Gentry**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. Grievant is on the 9.5 list for the Acworth, GA center, filed a grievance for W/E 5/28/11; meets Article 37 requirements, and should be paid penalty pay (originally docketed as Case N-12-1205).
- N-13-546: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Milton Torres**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Company failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce grievant's workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt In." The Company has continually failed to grant grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (ongoing from 2/4/13 up to and including 7/19/13).
- N-14-105: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Kevin Devereux**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1b**. The Union claims the Employer failed to cooperate with package car driver Kevin Devereux who desired to be relieved of overtime (7/26/2013).
- N-14-106: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Jon Koepfel**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1b**. The Union claims the Employer failed to cooperate with package car driver Jon Koepfel who desired to be relieved of overtime (7/26/2013).
- N-14-107: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **John Young**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1b**. The Union claims the Employer failed to cooperate with package car driver John Young who desired to be relieved of overtime (9/30/2013).

- N-14-109: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Michael DelGaudio**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Michael DelGaudio workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 8/31/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-110: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Robert Dulaney**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Robert Dulaney workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 9/14/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-111: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Dennis Kotarski**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Dennis Kotarski workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 9/21/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-112: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Arthur Cowcer**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Arthur Cowcer workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/25/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-113: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Kevin Devereux**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Kevin Devereux workday

below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/27/2013 and ongoing).

- N-14-114: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Mark English**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Mark English workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 8/3/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-115: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Scott Kersch**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Scott Kersch workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/13/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-116: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **John Hoffman**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver John Hoffman workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/27/2013).
- N-14-117: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Jon Koepfel**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Jon Koepfel workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/20/2013).

- N-14-118: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Larry Marino**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Larry Marino workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 8/31/2013).
- N-14-119: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Paul Marino**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Paul Marino workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/20/2013 and ongoing).
- N-14-120: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Tomas Viera**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Tomas Viera workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/20/2013).
- N-14-121: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Joe Waters**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1c**, claiming the Employer failed to make a reasonable effort to reduce package car driver Joe Waters workday below 9.5 hours per day after letting him "Opt in". The Employer also failed to grant the grievant triple time pay for hours worked in excess of 9.5 hours per day (week ending 7/20/2013).
- N-14-123: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Art Harder**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company is violating the grievant's 9.5 rights (ongoing in 2013).

- N-14-124: Local 177 v. UPS, Hillside, NJ
On behalf of **Javier Torres**, Union alleges the Company violated **Article 37, Section 1**, claiming the Company is violating the grievant's 9.5 rights (ongoing in 2013).
- N-14-126: Local 385 v. UPS, Orlando, FL
On behalf of **Randall Tucker**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Union claims the grievant is working over 9.5 hours multiple days in a week (3/30/2013).
- N-14-127: Local 385 v. UPS, Orlando, FL
On behalf of **Randall Tucker**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Union claims the grievant is working over 9.5 hours multiple days in a week (4/6/2013).
- N-14-128: Local 385 v. UPS, Orlando, FL
On behalf of **Randall Tucker**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Union claims the grievant is working over 9.5 hours multiple days in a week (6/29/2013).
- N-14-129: Local 385 v. UPS, Orlando, FL
On behalf of **Randall Tucker**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Union claims the grievant is working over 9.5 hours multiple days in a week (7/6/2013).
- N-14-130: Local 385 v. UPS, Orlando, FL
On behalf of **Randall Tucker**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 37, Section 1**. The Union claims the grievant is working over 9.5 hours multiple days in a week (7/13/2013).

NEW CASES:

N-14-208: Local 533 v. UPS, Reno, NV
On behalf of **Frank Lombardo, Jr.**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 17 and all others that apply**. The Union claims Brother Lombardo is working 12-14 hour days and requesting he be paid time and half for all hours over 9.5, plus sort/load time or adjust his route to keep him under 9.5 plus sort/load time (2/15/2014).

N-14-209: Local 804 v. UPS, Long Island City, NY
On behalf of **Joe Martell**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 37**, claiming the Company is in direct violation of Article 37 Section 1 of the master agreement (week ending 4/12/2014).

CSI

N-14-210: Local 480 v. UPS, Nashville, TN
On behalf of **Kenneth Romanowski**, Union alleges the Company is in violation of **Article 16 and all others that apply**. The Union Claims the Company has failed to provide Long Term Disability for the grievant as outlined in the appropriate NMA and MSRA (on or about 12/19/13).