

§ 1977.16

Secretary to decline to entertain complaints which have become stale. Accordingly, complaints not filed within 30 days of an alleged violation will ordinarily be presumed to be untimely.

(3) However, there may be circumstances which would justify tolling of the 30-day period on recognized equitable principles or because of strongly extenuating circumstances, e.g., where the employer has concealed, or misled the employee regarding the grounds for discharge or other adverse action; or where the discrimination is in the nature of a continuing violation. The pendency of grievance-arbitration proceedings or filing with another agency, among others, are circumstances which do not justify tolling the 30-day period. In the absence of circumstances justifying a tolling of the 30-day period, untimely complaints will not be processed.

[38 FR 2681, Jan. 29, 1973, as amended at 50 FR 32846, Aug. 15, 1985]

§ 1977.16 Notification of Secretary of Labor's determination.

Section 11(c)(3) provides that the Secretary is to notify a complainant within 90 days of the complaint of his determination whether prohibited discrimination has occurred. This 90-day provision is considered directory in nature. While every effort will be made to notify complainants of the Secretary's determination within 90 days, there may be instances when it is not possible to meet the directory period set forth in section 11(c)(3).

§ 1977.17 Withdrawal of complaint.

Enforcement of the provisions of section 11(c) is not only a matter of protecting rights of individual employees, but also of public interest. Attempts by an employee to withdraw a previously filed complaint will not necessarily result in termination of the Secretary's investigation. The Secretary's jurisdiction cannot be foreclosed as a matter of law by unilateral action of the employee. However, a voluntary and uncoerced request from a complainant to withdraw his complaint will be given careful consideration and substantial weight as a matter of policy and sound enforcement procedure.

29 CFR Ch. XVII (7-1-04 Edition)

§ 1977.18 Arbitration or other agency proceedings.

(a) *General.* (1) An employee who files a complaint under section 11(c) of the Act may also pursue remedies under grievance arbitration proceedings in collective bargaining agreements. In addition, the complainant may concurrently resort to other agencies for relief, such as the National Labor Relations Board. The Secretary's jurisdiction to entertain section 11(c) complaints, to investigate, and to determine whether discrimination has occurred, is independent of the jurisdiction of other agencies or bodies. The Secretary may file action in U.S. district court regardless of the pendency of other proceedings.

(2) However, the Secretary also recognizes the national policy favoring voluntary resolution of disputes under procedures in collective bargaining agreements. See, e.g., *Boy's Markets, Inc. v. Retail Clerks*, 398 U.S. 235 (1970); *Republic Steel Corp. v. Maddox*, 379 U.S. 650 (1965); *Carey v. Westinghouse Electric Co.*, 375 U.S. 261 (1964); *Collier Insulated Wire*, 192 NLRB No. 150 (1971). By the same token, due deference should be paid to the jurisdiction of other forums established to resolve disputes which may also be related to section 11(c) complaints.

(3) Where a complainant is in fact pursuing remedies other than those provided by section 11(c), postponement of the Secretary's determination and deferral to the results of such proceedings may be in order. See, *Burlington Truck Lines, Inc., v. U.S.*, 371 U.S. 156 (1962).

(b) *Postponement of determination.* Postponement of determination would be justified where the rights asserted in other proceedings are substantially the same as rights under section 11(c) and those proceedings are not likely to violate the rights guaranteed by section 11(c). The factual issues in such proceedings must be substantially the same as those raised by section 11(c) complaint, and the forum hearing the matter must have the power to determine the ultimate issue of discrimination. See *Rios v. Reynolds Metals Co.*, F.2d (5th Cir., 1972), 41 U.S.L.W. 1049 (Oct. 10, 1972); *Newman v. Avco Corp.*, 451 F.2d 743 (6th Cir., 1971).

(c) *Deferral to outcome of other proceedings.* A determination to defer to the outcome of other proceedings initiated by a complainant must necessarily be made on a case-to-case basis, after careful scrutiny of all available information. Before deferring to the results of other proceedings, it must be clear that those proceedings dealt adequately with all factual issues, that the proceedings were fair, regular, and free of procedural infirmities, and that the outcome of the proceedings was not repugnant to the purpose and policy of the Act. In this regard, if such other actions initiated by a complainant are dismissed without adjudicatory hearing thereof, such dismissal will not ordinarily be regarded as determinative of the section 11(c) complaint.

SOME SPECIFIC SUBJECTS

§ 1977.22 Employee refusal to comply with safety rules.

Employees who refuse to comply with occupational safety and health standards or valid safety rules implemented by the employer in furtherance of the Act are not exercising any rights afforded by the Act. Disciplinary measures taken by employers solely in response to employee refusal to comply with appropriate safety rules and regulations, will not ordinarily be regarded as discriminatory action prohibited by section 11(c). This situation should be distinguished from refusals to work, as discussed in § 1977.12.

§ 1977.23 State plans.

A State which is implementing its own occupational safety and health enforcement program pursuant to section 18 of the Act and parts 1902 and 1952 of this chapter must have provisions as effective as those of section 11(c) to protect employees from discharge or discrimination. Such provisions do not divest either the Secretary of Labor or Federal district courts of jurisdiction over employee complaints of discrimination. However, the Secretary of Labor may refer complaints of employees adequately protected by State Plans' provisions to the appropriate state agency. The basic principles outlined in § 1977.18, *supra* will be observed

as to deferrals to findings of state agencies.

PART 1978—RULES FOR IMPLEMENTING SECTION 405 OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1982 (STAA)

Subpart A—Interpretive Rules [Reserved]

Subpart B—Rules of Procedure

COMPLAINTS, INVESTIGATIONS, FINDINGS AND PRELIMINARY ORDERS

Sec.

- 1978.100 Purpose and scope.
- 1978.101 Definitions.
- 1978.102 Filing of discrimination complaint.
- 1978.103 Investigation.
- 1978.104 Issuance of findings and preliminary orders.
- 1978.105 Objections to the findings and the preliminary order.

LITIGATION

- 1978.106 Scope of rules; applicability of other rules; notice of hearing.
- 1978.107 Parties.
- 1978.108 Captions, titles of cases.
- 1978.109 Decision and orders.
- 1978.110 Judicial review.
- 1978.111 Withdrawal of section 405 complaints, objections, and findings; settlement.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- 1978.112 Arbitration or other proceedings.
- 1978.113 Judicial enforcement.
- 1978.114 Statutory time periods.
- 1978.115 Special circumstances; waiver of rules.

AUTHORITY: 29 U.S.C. 657(g)(2); 29 U.S.C. 660(c)(2); 49 U.S.C. 31101 and 31105; Secretary of Labor's Order No. 1-90, 55 FR 9033.

SOURCE: 53 FR 47681, Nov. 25, 1988, unless otherwise noted.

Subpart A—Interpretive Rules [Reserved]

Subpart B—Rules of Procedure

COMPLAINTS, INVESTIGATIONS, FINDINGS AND PRELIMINARY ORDERS

§ 1978.100 Purpose and scope.

(a) This subpart implements the procedural aspects of section 405 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982, 49 U.S.C. 2305, which provides