

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES WASHINGTON, D.C. 2011

31013

B-178156

June 5, 1973

The Honorable Earl L. Butz The Secretary of Agriculture

Dear lir. Secretary:

Reference is made to letter dated Harch 2, 1973, from Hr. J. W. Dainema, Acting Chief, Forest Service, requesting our decision as to whether the Forest Service has the authority to effect geretroscuive temporary proHotion for an employed Hr. William D. Green, for the period July 26, 1971, through August 19, 1972.

The circumstances surrounding this request we set forth in the shove-cited letter as follows:

On July 2, 1971, a position of Chief, Employee Relations Branch (Supervisory Labor Management Relations Specialist GS-230-13), was astablished in the Division of Personnel Management, Pocific Northwest Region, Forest Service, U. S. Dapartment of Agriculture.

On July 26, 1971 that office requested the Washington Office, Forcet Service, Washington, D. C., for a certificate of condidates to fill this position. That request also asked that Mr. William D. Green be included on the requested cortificate. Mr. Green mot the criteria for filling the position.

Mr. Green won at this time assigned as a Personnel Management Specialist, GS-201-12, Employment and Employee Relations Branch, Division of Personnel Management, Pacific Morthwest Region.

Pending receipt of the certificate of candidates to fill the CS-13 position, Mr. Green was assigned to that position on a temporary Acting basis.

Concurrent with this activity the Regional Personnel Officer was reassigned (July 11, 1971) and his successor did not report for duty until after November 1, 1971. In addition, the President's freeze on hiring and promotions was effected on August 5, 1971, and the Department of Agriculture and the

PUBLISHED DECISION
52 Comp. Gon.

720082 0915 (3

Forest Rervice from all promotions shortly thereafter. As a result of these events no nation was taken to formally fill the GS-13 position, not was Mr. Gracu's detail to that position formally recognized through a detail documented by a personnel action or a temporary promotion.

On Narch 16, 1972, the Region ogain requested a certificate of condidates in order to fill the Raployee Relations Breach Chief position previously catablished on July 2, 1971. The Washington Office replied on March 22, 1972, that the position should be filled by lateral reassignment and this was done, effective August 20, 1972. Hr. Breen was not selected to fill the position but continued to perform the duties of Employee Relations Branch Chief from July 1971 through August 1972.

It is further stated in the letter that as a result of his non-selection for the grade CB-13 position Mr. Green filed a formal grievance. One of his allegations was that he was unfairly treated by being detailed to a higher grade position without appropriate compensation or recognition. The Mashington Office of the Powert Service concluded that "Hr. Green did function as Chief, Employee Helations Branch, for a period of time without being officially detailed or compensated." It was also found that "the Region was in violation of the spirit if not the intent of the Poderal Reviewall Manual, Chapter 300, Section 6-3."

Consequently, it is reported that the Grievance Examiner concluded that there was a parious breach by the Porest Service of the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Agriculture's policies and regulations concerning details, which resulted in unfair trestuent to lir. Green. Based on the above facts, the Examiner found that the Forest Service "was obligated to give ir. Green a temporary promotion and/or baye the position filled, through appropriate means, as seen as sirculateness permitted." The Examiner accordingly recommended that Mr. Green's records he documented, so as to be given recognition for the entire period that he was ditailed to the higher grade position. Units recognizing that the regulations do not make any provisions for a retroactive temporary presection and that such premotions may not be rade, the Examiner Surther recommended that the Forest Foreign present the circumstances of Mr. Green's grievance to the Civil Bervice Commission and/or the Comptroller General for a ruling as to whether or not Mr. Green may

receive a retroactive temperary projection for the period of time he performed higher grade duties.

It is urged in the letter that the finding that Hr. Order yes, in fact, action as an irreshant of the new grade 60-13 pasition supports a conclusion that the fallows to process a temporary production was an additionality exact. Also, it is contended that the provisions of 5 Crit 553.831(b), providing for the payment of backeny then the amployee is found to have unlessed on a fastified or newermented personnel action, and the retionals applied in our desinion 46 Comp. Gen. 258 (1956), lend to the conclusion that a retrovetive temporary promotion is in order.

An a general rule a personnel action may not be effected rereectively so as to increase the right of an amployed to companyation. See
40 Coap. See. 207 (1960). Novever, exceptions to this rule have been
made where through administrative or elevical error a personnel action
was not effected an originally intended, where an administrative error
has deprived the employed of a right swanted by statute or regulation,
or there pophiceetionary administrative regulations or policies have
not been excited out. See B-170077, April 7, 1971; B-165125, October 28,
1966, copies enclosed.

To be a from the record before us that the circustances ourrounding the from a working assignment from the period July 26, 1971,
through August 19, 1972, do not fall within any of the show exceptions
no as to justify a temporary proportion retronatively. Even though he
may have been eligible for proportion to grade G5-13 during this period,
lin. Grant had no vested right to such a proportion at any this, by atsente,
regulation, on a derivice. In this repart, thile we recognize that the
notions of the Forest Service in the present case may not have been
within the intent of Cubchapter 6-6, Chapter 335 of the Federal Pernomes Hannal (i.e., that except when the service is for a brief period,
a temperary proportion abould by effected where the temperary survice of
An employed in higher-grade position is required), there are no modetory provirious contained therein directing that an agency propote the
employed under such circumstances.

Our decision in 48 Comp. Gen. 258, supra, is clearly dictinguishable from the present case. In that case when an employee's position was reclassified from grade GS-9 to grade GS-11, the agency delayed in promoting the exployee to grade GS-11 for approximately 9 months after the Givil Survice Commission waived the position's qualification

4 . · ·

 \mathcal{J}

1

requirements. No held that since the applicable regulation directed that personnel action he taken within opecified time limits when a classification action had hepp offected, and the agency falled to take such action within the time appealfied, corrective action pan in order. Thus, the decision clearly fell within the above-cited exception that a nondineretionary administrative regulation had not been enabled out.

In addition to the above, it is excited in the letter of lievel 2, 1973, that the Linel decision as to whether ir. Green would be promoted to grade CS-13 prated within the discretionary suthority of the Vashington Office of the Torcet Service. The letter indicates in this connection that it is doubtful that the Vashington Office would have approved his selection, in place, to grade CS-13, in view of the management philosophy that interent americance is important for the betterment of the organizetion and the development of employees, and that this view norms to be substemblated by the fact that a grade Gi-13 employee from enother Porent Beryite unit was selected for the new unit. Since it appears that Hr. Green would not have been temporarily promoted in any event, it is difficult to find a basia on which to justify a retroactive temporary pronotion for the period involved, other than the fact that he had performed higher grade duties for which he received no additional companation. With respect to this latter fact, you are advised that Federal caplayees are entitled only to the scienies of the positions to which they are appointed regardless of the duties they naturally parform. See Diamigh v. United Staten, 163 C. Cls. 702 (1966); Colerum v. United States, 100 C. Cls. 41 (1943); B-175372, April 13, 1972, copy englowed.

Accordingly, we find no basis on which the Porcot Service may effect a retreactive temperary promotion for in. Gree. for the period involved.

Cincerely yours.

Paul G. Dembling

For the Comptroller General of the United States