

**CASE DIGEST:** *SSA, Office of Hearings Operations & IFPTE, Ass'n of Admin. Law Judges*, 71 FLRA 589 (2020) (Member DuBester dissenting in part)

This case involves another alleged violation of the telework provision in the parties' agreement. The Agency denied the grievant's telework request because the grievant did not satisfy the requirement to schedule a reasonably attainable number of cases for hearing per month. The Arbitrator found that the Agency violated the parties' agreement when it denied the grievant's telework request, and ordered the Agency to allow the grievant to telework if he scheduled an average of forty-seven cases for hearing per month and to have a collegial conversation with the grievant before restricting telework in the future. The Authority found that the award is contrary to law, in part, because it excessively interferes with management's rights to direct employees and assign work.

Member DuBester dissented in part. He would find that, under applicable Authority precedent, the award is not contrary to law.

This case digest is a summary of a decision issued by the Federal Labor Relations Authority, with a short description of the issues and facts of the case. Descriptions contained in this case digest are for informational purposes only, do not constitute legal precedent, and are not intended to be a substitute for the opinion of the Authority.