

THE FACTS ABOUT THE CASE OF SAM BRIDGES

The hospital and university administration has repeatedly insisted that Sam Bridges, a black hospital employee, was fired for incompetence. But even a superficial investigation of the facts behind the dismissal shows that the administration is more interested in eliminating a political organizer than in rendering justice to a black employee in particular or black people in general.

THE CHARGES

Sam was dismissed by his supervisors without a hearing of any kind because he allegedly slept on the job, used abusive language to other employees, and was seen during working hours in the general campus area. On Monday, April 5 the Black Advisory Committee began a preliminary investigation and on Wednesday, April 7 issued a statement supporting the administration action. The investigation was conducted without Sam present and involved only the testimony of Sam's superiors, one co-worker and a security guard. On Friday morning, the second day of the occupation, the Black Advisory Committee reopened its hearing and reversed its position.
WHY?

THE EVIDENCE

- 1.) Sam's supervisor testified that he was told by another employee that Sam was found sleeping in the brown bag room. The Black Advisory Committee questioned the co-employee and found that he had never seen Sam sleeping on the job and that he had never spoken to the supervisor of such matters. When the supervisor was confronted with these facts he couldn't remember who he had heard the story from.
- 2.) Sam had allegedly used abusive language to one co-worker and a security guard. The co-worker admitted having had words with Sam but felt that the matter was between them and Sam had not used abusive language. The security guard admitted that all Sam had said to him was "hey, old man, come back here". When the security guard took this incident to his supervisor, the superior called Warren Thorpe who asked him to come to the office. The supervisor went back to the security guard and told him not to worry about it because Sam was being terminated anyway. This was on March 9. Sam was not terminated until March 16.
- 3.) When questioned about Sam's being in the general campus area, his supervisor admitted that Sam's break and lunch periods were flexible and that Sam could easily have been seen on the campus during one of these periods.

Based on this new testimony and evidence the BAC reversed its position and demanded Sam be rehired. But these hearings and the BAC reversal have been suppressed both by the administration and the media.

THEN WHY DIDN'T SAM USE THE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE?

Sam's foreman, Warren Thorpe, informed Sam that since he had not served a six month probationary period he had no right to a grievance procedure. It was not until a week after the hospital occupation that Sam received a letter informing him that he did, after all, have a right to a hearing. But until that time, even though no concrete evidence was presented, Sam will be deprived of his right to work.