
This is the fifth case between the same parties involving the application of the same telework provision in the parties’ agreement. The Authority, once again, concluded that the remedy—limiting the Agency’s ability to premise telework approval on the scheduling of a minimum number of hearings per month—excessively interfered with management’s right to direct employees and assign work.

Member DuBester dissented, finding that the remedy was 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.