

Issue: Compliance - Grievance Procedure (5 Day Rule); Ruling Date: April 29, 2009; Ruling #2009-2286; Agency: Virginia Department of Transportation; Outcome: Grievant Not In Compliance.



**COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA**  
**Department of Employment Dispute Resolution**

**COMPLIANCE RULING OF DIRECTOR**

In the matter of the Department of Transportation  
Ruling No. 2009-2286  
April 29, 2009

The Department of Transportation (the agency) seeks to administratively close the grievant's February 20, 2009 grievance. The agency alleges that the grievant has failed to comply with the time limits set forth in the grievance procedure for advancing or concluding her grievance.

FACTS

The grievant initiated her grievance, dated February 20, 2009, to challenge, among other issues, a Written Notice she received. The first step-respondent provided a written response to the grievance on March 6, 2009. The grievant signed a memo indicating receipt of the first step response on March 13, 2009. Because the grievant had failed to return the grievance package to the agency to advance or conclude the grievance within five workdays of receiving the first step response, the agency mailed the grievant a notice of noncompliance on March 25, 2009, by first class and certified mail. Because more than five workdays have elapsed since the grievant's presumed receipt of the notice of noncompliance letter,<sup>1</sup> and the grievant has not yet cured the noncompliance, the agency seeks a compliance ruling.

DISCUSSION

The grievance procedure requires both parties to address procedural noncompliance through a specific process.<sup>2</sup> That process assures that the parties first communicate with each other about the noncompliance, and resolve any compliance problems voluntarily, without this Department's (EDR's) involvement. Specifically, the party claiming noncompliance must notify the other party in writing and allow five workdays for the opposing party to correct any noncompliance.<sup>3</sup> If the opposing party

---

<sup>1</sup> The mailing of correspondence, properly addressed and stamped, raises a presumption of receipt of the correspondence by the addressee. *E.g.*, *Washington v. Anderson*, 236 Va. 316, 322, 373 S.E.2d 712, 715 (1988).

<sup>2</sup> *Grievance Procedure Manual* § 6.3.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

fails to correct the noncompliance within this five-day period, the party claiming noncompliance may seek a compliance ruling from the EDR Director, who may in turn order the party to correct the noncompliance or, in cases of substantial noncompliance, render a decision against the noncomplying party on any qualifiable issue. When an EDR ruling finds that either party to a grievance is in noncompliance, the ruling will (i) order the noncomplying party to correct its noncompliance within a specified time period, and (ii) provide that if the noncompliance is not timely corrected, a decision in favor of the other party will be rendered on any qualifiable issue, unless the noncomplying party can show just cause for the delay in conforming to EDR's order.<sup>4</sup>

In this case, the grievant appears to have failed to advance or conclude her grievance within five workdays of receiving the first resolution step response. Moreover, the agency appears to have notified the grievant of the noncompliance, but the grievant has not yet cured the issue.

As the grievant has apparently failed to advance or conclude her grievance in a timely manner, she has failed to comply with the grievance procedure.<sup>5</sup> This Department therefore orders the grievant to correct this noncompliance **within ten workdays of the date of this ruling** by notifying her agency human resources office in writing that she wishes to either conclude the grievance or continue to the second step of the grievance process. If the grievant does not do so, the agency may administratively close the grievance without any further action on its part. The grievance may be reopened only upon a timely showing by the grievant of just cause for the delay (for example, a serious illness, or other circumstances beyond the grievant's control).

This Department's rulings on matters of compliance are final and nonappealable.<sup>6</sup>

---

Claudia T. Farr  
Director

---

<sup>4</sup> While in cases of substantial noncompliance with procedural rules the grievance statutes grant the EDR Director the authority to render a decision on a qualifiable issue against a noncompliant party, this Department favors having grievances decided on the merits rather than procedural violations. Thus, the EDR Director will *typically* order noncompliance corrected before rendering a decision against a noncompliant party. However, where a party's noncompliance appears driven by bad faith or a gross disregard of the grievance procedure, this Department will exercise its authority to rule against the party without first ordering the noncompliance to be corrected.

<sup>5</sup> See *Grievance Procedure Manual* § 3.1.

<sup>6</sup> See Va. Code §§ 2.2-1001(5), 2.2-3003(G).