

STATE OF WISCONSIN

BEFORE THE WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

HARTFORD POLICE EMPLOYEES UNION
LOCAL 1432-A, AFSCME, AFL-CIO,

Complainant,

vs.

CITY OF HARTFORD,

Respondent.

Case 47
No. 53728 MP-3122
Decision No. 28713-A

HARTFORD CITY EMPLOYEES UNION
LOCAL 1432-B, AFSCME, AFL-CIO,

Complainant,

vs.

CITY OF HARTFORD,

Respondent.

Case 48
No. 53729 MP-3123
Decision No. 28714-A

HARTFORD MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES
UNION LOCAL 1432, AFSCME, AFL-CIO,

Complainant,

vs.

CITY OF HARTFORD,

Respondent.

Case 49
No. 53730 MP-3124
Decision No. 28715-A

ORDER DENYING RESPONDENT'S MOTION
THAT PROCEEDING BE HELD IN ABEYANCE

No. 28713-A
No. 28714-A

Amedeo Greco, Hearing Examiner: I conducted a hearing in these matters on July 1, 1996, and September 20, 1996, in Hartford, Wisconsin. Thereafter, the City of Hartford ("City") filed a brief and reply brief and Locals 1432, 1432-A and 1432-B, ("Union"), filed a brief, all of which were received by December 2, 1996.

The City's December 2, 1996 Reply Brief, at pp. 3-4, moved that "this proceeding be held in abeyance until all the 1996 benefit payments have been made and that an additional hearing be scheduled after that date so that all the benefit payments can be submitted in evidence to allow the Examiner to make his determination." The City claims that "a comparison of all the benefits to all the employees in each bargaining unit must be made before the Examiner here can make a determination whether or not the benefits as described in the listed Plan were provided to the employees" in order to "balance any greater benefits under Tier I and II against any lesser benefits under Tier III." (Emphasis in original).

The Union opposes the motion on the grounds that the City had an opportunity to introduce such evidence into the record at the September 20, 1996, hearing and that, "Better than nine months of experience would have given them [i.e., the City] a solid foundation of experience from which to extrapolate."

The Union is correct. The City here has been accorded all the time it needs to present whatever evidence it deems material to these proceedings. As a result, no further delay or evidence is either necessary or warranted.

In light of the above, I therefore issue the following

ORDER

The City's motion to hold this proceeding in abeyance is hereby denied.

Dated at Madison, Wisconsin, this 18th day of December, 1996.

WISCONSIN EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

By Amedeo Greco /s/
Amedeo Greco, Examiner