

Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board

FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE, :  
LODGE NO. 5 :  
 :  
v. : Case No. PF-C-09-18-E  
 :  
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA :

**AMENDED PROPOSED DECISION AND ORDER**

A charge of unfair labor practices was filed with the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board (Board) by the Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge No. 5 (Union) on February 13, 2009, alleging that the City of Philadelphia (City) violated Section 6(1)(a) and (e) of the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Act (PLRA) as read with Act 111.

On February 26, 2009, the Secretary of the Board issued a complaint and notice of hearing wherein a hearing was set for April 17, 2009, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Because of a granted continuance request, the hearing was actually held on April 24, 2009, at which time both parties in interest were afforded a full opportunity to present testimony, cross-examine witnesses and introduce documentary evidence. In lieu of viva voce evidence, the parties entered into a series of factual stipulations. Neither party filed a post-hearing brief.

The Examiner, on the basis of the stipulations and exhibits presented at the hearing and from all other matters and documents of record makes the following:

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The parties stipulated and agreed the Union is a labor organization. (N.T. 5).
2. The parties stipulated and agreed the City is a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. (N.T. 5).
3. The parties stipulated and agreed that Arbitrator Charles D. Long Jr., on January 8, 2009, issued an arbitration award pursuant to a grievance filed by the Union on behalf of Lieutenant Edward Spangler, a suspended employe. That arbitration award ordered, *inter alia*, the City to pay Spangler for the five-day suspension, and make him whole for any lost overtime. (N.T. 5).
4. As of June 19, 2009, the City had paid Spangler for the five-day suspension, but had not paid Spangler for any lost overtime. (N.T. 5: E-mail of April 7, 2009).

**DISCUSSION**

It has long been established that the failure to comply with the terms of a grievance arbitration award occurs only after exhaustion of appellate rights and the expiration of a reasonable or expressly provided time period for compliance. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 8 PPER ¶ 233 (Nisi Decision and Order, 1977). To determine whether a particular lapse of time is a reasonable period for compliance with an arbitration award, the Board will consider such factors as: 1) The nature and complexity of the compliance required under the award, 2) The length of time before compliance occurred, 3) The employer's ability to comply with the award including legitimate obstacles to compliance, 4) Steps taken by the employer toward compliance and 5) The employer's explanation or lack thereof for the delay. City of Philadelphia, 19 PPER ¶ 19069 at 185 (Final Order, 1988); Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Department of Community Affairs), 19 PPER ¶ 19165 (Proposed Decision and Order, 1998); Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Office of Administration), 17 PPER ¶ 17151 (Proposed Decision and Order, 1986).

The arbitration award here was issued on January 8, 2009, and as of the April 24, 2009, hearing, the City had not complied with the overtime portion of the award. Such a delay is unreasonable, given the simple nature of the award. City of Philadelphia, 27 PPER ¶ 27093 (Proposed Decision and Order, 1996), 27 PPER ¶ 27202 (Final Order, 1996)(delay of five months in paying a simple arbitration award is an unfair labor practice)

The City has violated Section (6)(1) (a) and (e) of the PLRA as read with Act 111. By way of remedy, the City is ordered, *inter alia*, to pay Spangler the for the lost overtime as described in the January 8, 2009,, arbitration award plus 6% *per annum* interest on that amount, from the date of the award until the money is tendered to Spangler.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The Hearing Examiner, therefore, after due consideration of the foregoing and the record as a whole, concludes and finds:

1. The City is an employer within the meaning of Section 3(c) of the PLRA.
2. The Union is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 3(f) of the PLRA.
3. The Board has jurisdiction over the parties hereto.
4. The City has committed unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 6(1)(a) and (e) of the PLRA as read with Act 111.

#### ORDER

In view of the foregoing and in order to effectuate the policies of the PLRA and Act 111, the Hearing Examiner

#### HEREBY ORDERS AND DIRECTS

that the City shall:

1. Cease and desist from interfering with, restraining or coercing employes in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in the PLRA and Act 111.
2. Cease and desist from refusing to collectively bargain with the representatives of its employes.
3. Take the following affirmative action:
  - (a) Immediately tender to Spangler pay for the lost overtime as required by the January 8, 2009, arbitration award, plus 6% *per annum* interest on that amount, calculated from January 8, 2009,, until Spangler is actually paid;
  - (b) Post a copy of this decision and order within five (5) days from the effective date hereof in a conspicuous place readily accessible to its employes, and have the same remain so posted for a period of ten (10) consecutive days; and
  - (c) Furnish to the Board within twenty (20) days of the date hereof, satisfactory evidence of compliance with this decision and order by completion and filing of the attached affidavit of compliance.

#### IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED AND DIRECTED

that in the absence of any exceptions filed with the Board pursuant to 34 Pa. Code § 95.98(a) within twenty days of the date hereof, this order shall be final.

SIGNED, DATED AND MAILED at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, this sixteenth day of September, 2009.

PENNSYLVANIA LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

---

Timothy Tietze, Hearing Examiner

