STATE OF CONNECTICUT LABOR DEPARTMENT CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF LABOR RELATIONS

IN THE MATTER OF

State of Connecticut Judicial Branch

Local 749 of Council 4 AFSCME. AFL-CIO

(RESPONDENT)

-AND-

Judicial Department Employees

(COMPLAINANT)

2ND AMENDED MPP-32,914

RESPONDENT'S ADDRESS:

90 Washington Street Hartford, CT 06106

RESPONDENT'S PHONE:

860-706-3500

PURSUANT TO SECTION 5-274 OF AN ACT CONCERNING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR STATE EMPLOYEES, THE UNDERSIGNED ALLEGES THAT THE ABOVE-NAMED RESPONDENT HAS ENGAGED IN AND IS ENGAGING IN PROHIBITED PRACTICES WITHIN THE MEANING OF SECTION 5-272 OF SAID ACT, IN THAT:

Respondent has interfered with, restrained, and coerced employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 5-271; and refused to bargain collectively in good faith with Complainant Union which has been designated as the exclusive representative of employees employed by Respondent; including but not limited to refusing to discuss grievances with Complainant Union. Said actions constitute a violation of but not limited to section 5-272 (a) (1) and (a) (4) of the Act.

Specifically, the Respondent has engaged in anti-union animus. The employer has restricted the Union President's access to the Union membership. This restriction has made it difficult for the Union to educate and explain the SEBAC agreement to the Union membership. Furthermore, the employer has disciplined the Union President without cause, unilaterally removed the police powers of the Union President and is falsely accusing the Union President of unauthorized leave.

The Judicial Branch has targeted the Union President by eliminating the Supreme Court Police Department. The branch is trying to force the Union President Charles Dellarocco to take a position outside of the bargaining unit which would eliminate his ability to remain President.

Complainant seeks comprehensive statutory remedy including but not limited to an order to cause Respondent to cease and desist; make Union and affected members whole for any and all loses; any additional remedy determined to be appropriate by the board and pay to Complainant all costs borne by Complainant in pursuance of this Complaint and compliance therewith.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS

Judicial Department Employees

Local 749 of Council 4 AFSCME, AFL-CIO

COMPLAINANT

John Devito, Staff Representative

STEPHANIE WISE NOTARY PUBLIC

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES DEC. 31, 2019

444 East Main Street

New Britain CT 06051

(860) 224-4000

SIGNATURE RECEIVED

SEP 1.1 2018

Connecticut State Land of Labor Relations

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

HEREBY CERTIFY THAT, PURSUANT TO SECTION 7-471-20 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL REGULATIONS; A COPY OF THE FOREGOING WAS MAILED TO THE RESPONDENT BY REGISTERED OR CERTIFIED MAIL.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT LABOR DEPARTMENT CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF LABOR RELATIONS

IN THE MATTER OF State of Connecticut Judicial Branch (RESPONDENT) -AND-

Judicial Department Employees

Local 749 of Council 4 AFSCME, AFL-

CIO

(COMPLAINANT)

AMENDED CASE NO. SPP-32914

RESPONDENT'S ADDRESS:

90 Washington Street Hartford, CT 06106

RESPONDENT'S PHONE:

860-706-3500

PURSUANT TO SECTION 5-274 OF AN ACT CONCERNING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR STATE EMPLOYEES, THE UNDERSIGNED ALLEGES THAT THE ABOVE-NAMED RESPONDENT HAS ENGAGED IN AND IS ENGAGING IN PROHIBITED PRACTICES WITHIN THE MEANING OF SECTION 5-272 OF SAID ACT, IN THAT:

Respondent has interfered with, restrained, and coerced employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 5-271; and refused to bargain collectively in good faith with Complainant Union which has been designated as the exclusive representative of employees employed by Respondent; including but not limited to refusing to discuss grievances with Complainant Union. Said actions constitute a violation of but not limited to section 5-272 (a) (1) and (a) (4) of the Act.

Specifically, the Respondent has engaged in anti-union animus by targeting the President of Local 749. The employer has restricted the Union President's access to the Union membership. This restriction made it very difficult for the Union to educate and explain the SEBAC agreement to the Union membership. Furthermore, the employer has disciplined the Union President without cause, unilaterally removed the police powers of the Union President and is falsely accusing the Union President of unauthorized leave.

Complainant seeks comprehensive statutory remedy including but not limited to an order to cause Respondent to cease and desist; make all those impacted whole; any other remedy the Board deems appropriate; and pay to Complainant all costs borne by Complainant in pursuance of this Complaint and compliance therewith.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS

STEPHANIE WISE

NOTARY PUBLIC

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES DEC. 31, 201

Judicial Department Employees

Local 749 of Council 4 AFSCME, AFL-CIO

COMPLAINANT

Wayne Marshall, Field Representative

444 East Main Street

New Britain CT 06051

(860) 224-4000

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT, PURSUANT TO SECTION 7-471-20 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL REGULATIONS, A COPY OF THE FOREGOING WAS MAILED TO THE RESPONDENT BY REGISTERED OR CERTIFIED MAIL.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT LABOR DEPARTMENT CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF LABOR RELATIONS

IN THE MATTER OF

State of Connecticut Judicial Branch

(RESPONDENT)

Judicial Department Employees

(COMPLAINANT)

Local 749 of Council 4 AFSCME, AFL-CIO

RESPONDENT'S

90 Washington Street

ADDRESS:

Hartford, CT 06106

RESPONDENT'S PHONE:

860-706-3500

PURSUANT TO SECTION 5-274 OF AN ACT CONCERNING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR STATE EMPLOYEES, THE UNDERSIGNED ALLEGES THAT THE ABOVE-NAMED RESPONDENT HAS ENGAGED IN AND IS ENGAGING IN PROHIBITED PRACTICES WITHIN THE MEANING OF SECTION 5-272 OF SAID ACT, IN THAT:

Respondent has dominated or interfered with the formation, existence or administration of Complaint Union; refused to bargain collectively in good faith with Complaint Union which has been designated as the exclusive representative of employees employed by Respondent; including but not limited to refusing to discuss grievances with Complaint Union. Said actions constitutes a violation of but not limited to section 5-272 (a) (2) (4) of the Act.

Specifically, Respondent has unilaterally changed the working conditions of the Supreme Court police department. The judicial branch has stripped the police officers of their certification and has taken away all duty equipment.

Complainant seeks comprehensive statutory remedy including but not limited to an order to cause Respondent to Cease and Desist; Make Union and affected members whole for any and all loses; Any additional remedy determined to be appropriate by the Board; and pay to Complainant all costs borne by Complainant in pursuance of this Complaint and compliance therewith.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME

Judicial Department Employees

Local 749 of Council 4 AFSCME, AFL-CIO

COMPLAINANT

John DeVito, Staff Representative

SIGNATURE

STEPHANIE WISE

NOTARY PUBLIC

444 East Main Street New Britain CT 06051

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES DEC. 31, 2019 (860) 224-4000

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT, PURSUANT TO SECTION 7-471-20 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL REGULATIONS, A COPY OF THE FOREGOING WAS MAILED TO THE RESPONDENT BY REGISTERED OR CERTIFIED MAIL.



STATE OF CONNECTICUT LABOR DEPARTMENT CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF LABOR RELATIONS

IN THE MATTER OF

State of Connecticut Judicial Branch

(RESPONDENT)

-AND

Judicial Department Employees

(COMPLAINANT)

Local 749 of Council 4 AFSCME, AFL-CIO

90 Washington Street

RESPONDENT'S ADDRESS:

Hartford, CT 06106

RESPONDENT'S PHONE:

860-706-3500

PURSUANT TO SECTION 5-274 OF AN ACT CONCERNING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR STATE EMPLOYEES, THE UNDERSIGNED ALLEGES THAT THE ABOVE-NAMED RESPONDENT HAS ENGAGED IN AND IS ENGAGING IN PROHIBITED PRACTICES WITHIN THE MEANING OF SECTION 5-272 OF SAID ACT, IN THAT:

Respondent has dominated or interfered with the formation, existence or administration of Complainant Union; refused to bargain collectively in good faith with Complainant Union which has been designated as the exclusive representative of employees employed by Respondent; including but not limited to refusing to discuss grievances with Complainant Union. Said action constitutes a violation of but not limited to section 5-272 (a) (2) (4) of the Act.

Specifically, Respondent has the judicial branch is targeting the president of local 749. The judicial branch is conducting investigations and sustaining charges on the president without merit.

Complainant seeks comprehensive statutory remedy including but not limited to an order to cause Respondent to Cease and Desist; Make Union and affected members whole for any and all loses; Any additional remedy determined to be appropriate by the Board; and pay to Complainant all costs borne by Complainant in pursuance of this Complaint and compliance therewith.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS

Judicial Department Employees

Local 749 of Council 4 AFSCME, AFL-CIO

COMPLAINANT

John DeVito, Staff Representative

STEPHANIE WISE NOTARY PUBLIC MY COMMISSION EXPIRES DEC. 31, 2019

444 East Main Street New Britain CT 06051

(860) 224-4000

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

THEREBY CERTIFY THAT, PURSUANT TO SECTION 7-471-20 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL REGULATIONS, A COPY OF THE FOREGOING WAS MAILED TO THE RESPONDENT BY REGISTERED OR CERTIFIED MAIL.

OCT 2 2017

SIGNATURE

STATE OF CONNECTICUT LABOR DEPARTMENT CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF LABOR RELATIONS

		_	_			
F	М	Α	T	ΓE	R	OF

cate of Connecticut Judicial Branch

(RESPONDENT)

-AND-

Judicial Department Employees

(COMPLAINANT)

Local 749 of Council 4 AFSCME, AFL-CIO

CASE NO. SPP-32869

RESPONDENT'S ADDRESS:

90 Washington Street Hartford, CT 06106

RESPONDENT'S PHONE:

860-706-3500

PURSUANT TO SECTION 5-274 OF AN ACT CONCERNING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FOR STATE EMPLOYEES, THE UNDERSIGNED ALLEGES THAT THE ABOVE-NAMED RESPONDENT HAS ENGAGED IN AND IS ENGAGING IN PROHIBITED PRACTICES WITHIN THE MEANING OF SECTION 5-272 OF SAID ACT, IN THAT:

Respondent has refused to bargain collectively in good faith with Complainant Union which has been designated as the exclusive representative of employees employed by Respondent; including but not limited to refusing to discuss grievances with Complainant Union. Said action constitutes a violation of but not limited to section 5-272 (a) (4) of the Act.

Specifically, Respondent has unilaterally changed working conditions at the Police Department of the Supreme Court by reducing staffing levels. As a result, the employer has created an unsafe working environment.

Complainant seeks comprehensive statutory remedy including but not limited to an order to cause Respondent to cease and desist; bargain in good faith; make whole all those employees who are impacted; any additional remedy determined to be appropriate by the Labor Board; and pay to Complainant all costs borne by Complainant in pursuance of this Complaint and compliance therewith.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS

Judicial Department Employees

Local 749 of Council 4 AFSCME, AFL-CIO

COMPLAINANT

State of Connecticut My Commission Expires

July 31, 2021

Wayne Marshall, Field Representative

444 East Main Street New Britain CT 06051

(860) 224-4000

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT, PURSUANT TO SECTION 7-471-20 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL REGULATIONS, A COPY OF THE FOREGOING WAS

MAILED TO THE RESPONDENT BY REGISTERED OR CERTIFIED MAIL.