

STATE OF HAWAII
HAWAII LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

In the Matter of)
TUI ISAIA,)
Complainant,)
and)
UNITED PUBLIC WORKERS, AFSCME,)
LOCAL 646, AFL-CIO; EDWIN SIAOSI,)
Business Agent, United Public Workers,)
AFSCME, Local 646, AFL-CIO; MEL)
RODRIGUES, Business Agent, United Public)
Workers, Local 646, AFL-CIO; PETER)
TRASK, Administrator, United Public Workers,)
AFSCME, Local 646, AFL-CIO; GARY)
RODRIGUES, Former State Director, United)
Public Workers, AFSCME, Local 646,)
AFL-CIO; SAU GOGO, Correctional Officer,)
Oahu Community Correctional Center, Depart-)
ment of Public Safety, State of Hawaii;)
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY, State)
of Hawaii; TED SAKAI, Former Director,)
Department of Public Safety, State of Hawaii;)
MARIAN TSUJI, Former Deputy Director,)
Department of Public Safety, State of Hawaii;)
and EDWIN SHIMODA, Administrator,)
Institution Division, Department of Public)
Safety, State of Hawaii,)
Respondents.)

CASE NOS.: CU-10-219
CE-10-529
ORDER NO. 2187
ORDER DENYING RESPONDENT
UNION'S MOTION FOR PARTICU-
LARIZATION

ORDER DENYING RESPONDENT
UNION'S MOTION FOR PARTICULARIZATION

On May 1, 2003, Respondents UNITED PUBLIC WORKERS, AFSCME, LOCAL 646, AFL-CIO; EDWIN SIAOSI, Business Agent, United Public Workers, AFSCME, Local 646, AFL-CIO; MEL RODRIGUES, Business Agent, United Public Workers, AFSCME, Local 646, AFL-CIO; PETER TRASK, Administrator, United Public Workers, AFSCME, Local 646, AFL-CIO, and GARY RODRIGUES, former State Director, United Public Workers, AFSCME, Local 646, AFL-CIO (collectively UPW or Union), by and through their counsel, filed a Motion for Particularization with the Hawaii Labor Relations Board (Board). UPW's counsel states, in an affidavit attached to the motion, that the instant complaint is so vague that the Union is unable to frame an answer thereto. UPW's counsel states that Complainant fails

to state the applicable sections of the collective bargaining agreement; the provisions of Chapter 89 which were violated; how, when, and in what specific manner the Union committed prohibited practices; the grievances which have been previously filed, if any, and when Complainant brought his concerns to the Union.

Based upon a review of the complaint and consideration of the arguments presented, the Board finds that the complaint is clear in alleging, inter alia, that Complainant feels he has been discriminated in his pay because of his race and origin. The Board therefore concludes that the charge is not vague and hereby denies the UPW's motion for particularization. Accordingly, the Board also directs the Union to file its answer to the instant complaint within five days.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, May 13, 2003.

HAWAII LABOR RELATIONS BOARD



BRIAN K. NAKAMURA, Chair



CHESTER C. KUNITAKE, Member



KATHLEEN RACUYA-MARKRICH, Member

Copies sent to:

Herbert R. Takahashi, Esq.
Tui Isaia
Ryan W. Roylo, Deputy Attorney General
Joyce Najita, IRC