

**CASE DIGEST:** *NATCA*, 71 FLRA 424 (2019)

This case concerned whether the Agency violated the parties' agreement by not paying certain employees premium pay when they worked alone and a supervisor was unavailable. The Arbitrator denied the Union's grievance, finding that the employees did not supervise an "area" as required by the parties' agreement and therefore they had no contractual right to receive premium pay. The Union filed a nonfact exception alleging that the Arbitrator based his award on an erroneous assumption. The Authority denied the exception because the Union did not establish that the Arbitrator's assumption was clearly erroneous and the Union's argument did not challenge a central fact underlying the award.

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.