

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE 475 L'Enfant Plaze, SW Washington, DC 20260

SEP 2 5 1994

Mr. Jim Lingberg National Representative-at-Large Maintenance Craft Division American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO 817 14th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005-3399.

> Re: S. Rogers Providence, RI 02940 HlC-1E-C 28103

Dear Mr. Lingberg:

On September 7, 1984, we met to discuss the above-captioned grievance at the fourth step of our contractual grievance procedure.

The question raised in this case is whether the grievant was improperly required to begin a new 6 year period in a work status in order to achieve protected status on returning to duty after an absence of more than one year.

The union contends that Article 6.A.3. did not intend to include time on maternity leave as time not worked for purposes of retaining protected status.

During our discussion, we agreed to resolve this case based on our having no dispute relative to the meaning and intent of Article 6.A.3.(a)(3).

Please sign and return the attached copy of this decision as your acknowledgment of agreement to resolve this case.

Sincerely,

Margaret H. Oliver Labor Relations Department

National Representative-at-Large Maintenance Division American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO

) AS OF 8-15-WINALC HAS A COSE PONDING NATIONAL ARB, ON THIS ISSUE