

D.U.P. NO. 80-27

STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION  
BEFORE THE DIRECTOR OF UNFAIR PRACTICES

In the Matter of  
JERSEY CITY MEDICAL CENTER,

Respondent,

-and-

DOCKET NO. CI-80-32

CHARLES PARISI, JR.,

Charging Party.

SYNOPSIS

The Director of Unfair Practices declines to issue a complaint with respect to an Unfair Practice Charge since the Charging Party did not assert that any of the claimed unfair practices occurred within six months of the filing of the Unfair Practice Charge. Further, the Charging Party failed to designate those portions of the Act claimed to be violated by the Respondent.

D.U.P. NO. 80-27

STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION  
BEFORE THE DIRECTOR OF UNFAIR PRACTICES

In the Matter of

JERSEY CITY MEDICAL CENTER,

Respondent,

-and-

DOCKET NO. CI-80-32

CHARLES PARISI, JR.,

Charging Party.

REFUSAL TO ISSUE COMPLAINT

An Unfair Practice Charge was filed with the Public Employment Relations Commission (the "Commission") on March 10, 1980, by Charles Parisi, Jr. (the "Charging Party") against the Jersey City Medical Center (the "Respondent") alleging that the Respondent was engaging in unfair practices within the meaning of the New Jersey Employer-Employee Relations Act, N.J.S.A. 34:13A-1 et seq. (the "Act").

N.J.S.A. 34:13A-5.4(c) sets forth in pertinent part that the Commission shall have the power to prevent anyone from engaging in any unfair practice, and that it has the authority

to issue a complaint stating the unfair practice charge. <sup>1/</sup>  
The Commission has delegated its authority to issue complaints to the undersigned and has established a standard upon which an unfair practice complaint may be issued. This standard provides that a complaint shall issue if it appears that the allegations of the charging party, if true, may constitute an unfair practice within the meaning of the Act. <sup>2/</sup> The Commission's rules provide that the undersigned may decline to issue a complaint. <sup>3/</sup>

For the reasons stated below the undersigned has determined that the Commission's complaint issuance standards have not been met.

Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 34:13A-5.4(c) the Commission is precluded from issuing a complaint where the unfair practice charge has not been filed within six months of the occurrence of the alleged unfair practice. More specifically, N.J.S.A. 34:13A-5.4(c) provides " ... provided that no complaint shall

<sup>1/</sup> N.J.S.A. 34:13A-5.4(c) provides: "The commission shall have exclusive power as hereinafter provided to prevent anyone from engaging in any unfair practice ... Whenever it is charged that anyone has engaged or is engaging in any such unfair practice, the commission, or any designated agent thereof, shall have authority to issue and cause to be served upon such party a complaint stating the specific unfair practice and including a notice of hearing containing the date and place of hearing before the commission or any designated agent thereof ... "

<sup>2/</sup> N.J.A.C. 19:14-2.1

<sup>3/</sup> N.J.A.C. 19:14-2.3

issue based upon any unfair practice occurring more than 6 months prior to the filing of the charge unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge in which event the 6 months period shall be computed from the day he was no longer so prevented."

Further, the Commission's rules state that an unfair practice charge shall contain inter alia:

A clear and concise statement of the facts constituting the alleged unfair practice, including, where known, the time and place of occurrence of the particular acts alleged and the names of respondent's agents or other representatives by whom committed and a statement of the portion or portions of the Act alleged to have been violated.  
(Emphasis added) 4/

Accordingly, it is incumbent upon the Charging Party to allege the occurrence of unfair practices within the six month limitation requirement and to allege the specific subsection(s) of N.J.S.A. 34:13A-5.4(a) and/or (b) which form the basis of the alleged statutory violation. The undersigned has determined that in the absence of such allegations, a complaint may not issue. 5/


4/ N.J.A.C. 19:14-1.3

5/ See In re Newark Housing Authority, D.U.P. No. 80-16, 6 NJPER 139 (¶ 11069 1980); In re Union Cty. Welfare Bd. D.U.P. No. 80-8, 5 NJPER 473 (¶ 10238 1979); and In re North Warren Reg. Bd. of Ed., D.U.P. No. 78-7, 4 NJPER 55 (¶ 4026 1977).

Subsequent to the filing of the instant Unfair Practice Charge, by letter dated March 17, 1980, the undersigned informed the Charging Party that the Charge could not be processed further unless it was amended, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 19:14-1.5, to include the specific subsection(s) alleged and the time and place of occurrence of the particular acts alleged to constitute the unfair practice. The undersigned directed the Charging Party's attention to the relevant six month limitation provision of N.J.S.A. 34:13A-5.4(c) and advised that a complaint would not issue if the Charging Party failed to allege the occurrence of an unfair practice within the prescribed six month limitation period. The undersigned has not received a reply to the March 17, 1980 letter, nor has the Charge been amended, as requested.

Accordingly, as the Charging Party has not included in the Charge the specific subsections alleged and the time of occurrence of the conduct alleged to constitute the unfair practice within the six month statutory limitation period, the undersigned declines to issue a complaint.

BY ORDER OF THE DIRECTOR  
OF UNFAIR PRACTICES

  
Carl Kurtzman, Director

DATED: May 20, 1980  
Trenton, New Jersey