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“Charge what you will, but prove what you charge.”

This is an excellent cite to add to a grievance where management has “thrown spaghetti at the wall” to see what sticks. Throwing the book at a carrier requires that the Service prove EVERYTHING that it charges. The level of discipline - or the issuance of discipline at all – cannot be ascertained when some of the charges simply cannot be proven. Did the Service charge the grievant with being absent on 5 occasions but there were only 3 recorded absences? How do we know 3 absences would still qualify for the same punishment? Did they charge the carrier with “abandoning the mail” when he returned mail to the office because he was going home sick from work? You can’t “abandon” something if you brought it back to the post office and transferred responsibility of its disposition to management. Did the carrier get charged with ELM 665 for among other things being dishonest, immoral, etc for a simple infraction? All of these scenarios represent deficiencies if they are included in the charges against a carrier. The following arbitration is a regional decision, but use it to support your argument that other arbitrators have agreed that all charged misconduct must meet the test of just cause.