165 Hôtel de Ville, Hull, Quebec, K1A 0J2 - Fax: (819) 953-3326

Canada Labour Code Part II Occupational Health and Safety

John Ingles applicant

and

Canadian National Railways employer

Decision No.: 04-011 March 16, 2004

This case was decided by Douglas Malanka, appeals officer.

- On April 14, 2002, Mr. Charles (John) Ingles, a Conductor/Yard Foreman with Canadian National Railway (CNR) refused to work. According to the evidence, Mr. Ingles suffered an ongoing chronic gastrointestinal tract illness for the past 2 years which he suspected resulted from his use of a BELTPACK, a radio wave control device that remotely controlled locomotive functions in yard switching using electromagnetic waves. Mr. Ingles had been engaged in this work for about 6 years prior to his refusal to work.
- [2] Health and safety officer Thorton investigated into Mr. Ingles' refusal to work on April 14, 2002. Following his investigation, he decided that the use of the BELTPACK did not constitute a danger for Mr. Ingles. According to his decision report, health and safety officer Thorton concluded that the evidence and statements submitted by doctors treating Mr. Ingles and by CNR did not establish that the use of the BELTPACT medically affected Mr. Ingles or otherwise constituted a danger for him.
- M. Ingles appeal the decision of health and safety officer Thorton to an appeals officer pursuant to subsection 129.(7) of the Canada Labour Code, Part II on April 23, 2002. However, the United Transportation Union representing Mr. Ingles subsequently wrote on August 29, 2003 to request leave to withdraw the appeal without prejudice. Their letter indicated that CNR concurred with the request.

[4] As the Appeals Officer seiz that the file is closed.	zed of this appeal, I confirm t	hat the appeal is withdrawn and
	 Douglas Malanka	_
	Appeals Officer	

Summary of Decision

Decision No.: 04-011

Applicant: John Ingles

Employer: Canadian National Railway

Key Words: Decision, refusal to work, illness

Provisions:

Code: 129(7)

Regulations:

Summary:

The applicant appealed a decision of no danger issued by a health and safety officer, following a refusal to work. The applicant further withdrew its appeal and the appeals officer closed the file.