

vehicle) and was armed, he might engage in a carjacking. Officer A further testified of his oath to protect the public and his belief that the public was in danger from the suspect. Officer A also testified that his emergency lights and siren were not in operation while he followed the suspect, and he never attempted to close the gap on the suspect's automobile; thus, he was not in pursuit.

The city argued that Officer A had failed to obey the orders of two sergeants to terminate a pursuit and should be disciplined for his failure to obey their orders.

Source: Adapted from *City of San Antonio*, 95 ARB 5066.

#### QUESTIONS

1. Was Officer A in pursuit of the suspect's vehicle?
2. As an arbitrator, would you uphold or deny the grievance?
3. Would you change the punishment of Officer A from a one-day suspension to that of a written warning?
4. What is the value to the police command in disciplining Officer A?

START

Print

#### Case Study 11-2 Sleeping On the Job

The grievant has been employed by the Company as a truck driver of an all-wheel drive, articulating dump truck which he operated in conjunction with other pieces of equipment. While sitting in a loading area at the preparation plant he was being loaded by a long-armed loader; he was observed by a supervisor leaning back with his head against the box behind the seat with his eyes closed and his mouth open. The truck was running, and it was out of gear with the safety brake on, as prescribed by the safety procedures. He was suspended in compliance with the labor agreement—a 24–48-hour meeting was properly held, and he was terminated on March 11, 2009, for sleeping on the job.

The Company contended that this was the third such incident involving the grievant. In the previous summer, the supervisor found the grievant asleep while sitting in his truck as it was being loaded. The motor was running, it was out of gear, and the safety brake was on. The supervisor had the loader bump the truck, and when the startled grievant eyeballed the supervisor, the supervisor shook his finger at him and shook his head to let him know he was caught sleeping and that it was not permitted.

On September 17, 2008, the grievant was observed sleeping for an extended period of time while being loaded by a backhoe. In this instance the supervisor physically mounted the truck and opened the cab door to a very startled awakened employee. Again, the motor was running, it was out of gear, and the safety brake was on. A written safety observation card which stated "EMPLOYEE WAS ASLEEP" was issued to the grievant. In addition, a counseling session was held with the grievant and his Union Steward. The Company and the Union Stewart informed the grievant that if he were caught asleep again, he would be discharged. The Company informed him if he had physical problems, he should get a doctor's excuse and he stated he had no problems.

A third occurrence of the grievant being found sleeping on the job was evidenced on March 3, 2009, as the supervisor was walking past the grievant's truck while it was being loaded. The supervisor had walked completely around the truck and was not seen or noticed by the sleeping grievant. The cab of the truck has a clear 180-degree open view through its windows. The supervisor and the backhoe operator observed the grievant asleep for several minutes. The Supervisor reported the incident to Management, and the grievant was discharged for sleeping on the job.

The Company argued that a third sleeping on the job violation, while in the cab of a running piece of heavy equipment, is more than just cause for termination. This is a work area where there is high foot traffic and is frequented with numerous smaller vehicles and other equipment that is constantly on the move. Sleeping on the job is a very dangerous act.