

1 LEE SEHAM, Esq. pro hac vice
STANLEY J. SILVERSTONE, Esq. pro hac vice
2 LUCAS K. MIDDLEBROOK, Esq. pro hac vice
NICHOLAS P. GRANATH, Esq., pro hac vice
3 SEHAM, SEHAM, MELTZ & PETERSEN, LLP
445 Hamilton Avenue, Suite 1204
4 White Plains, NY 10601
Tel: 914 997-1346; Fax: 914 997-7125

5 STANLEY LUBIN, Esq., State Bar No. 003076
6 stan@lubinandenoach.com
LUBIN & ENOCH, PC
7 349 North 4th Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85003-1505
8 Tel: 602 234-0008; Fax: 602 626 3586

9 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

11 Don ADDINGTON; John BOSTIC; Mark
BURMAN; Afshin IRANPOUR; Roger
12 VELEZ; and Steve WARGOCKI,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 vs.

15 US AIRLINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
US AIRWAYS, INC.,
16 Defendants,

Case No. 2:08-cv-1633-PHX-NVW
(Consolidated)

DECLARATION OF
NICHOLAS PAUL GRANATH, ESQ.
IN OPPOSITION TO
MOTION TO TRANSFER

17 Don ADDINGTON; John BOSTIC; Mark
BURMAN; Afshin IRANPOUR; Roger
18 VELEZ; and Steve WARGOCKI,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 vs.

21 Steven H. BRADFORD, Paul J. DIORIO,
Robert., A. FREAR, Mark. W. KING,
22 Douglas L. MOWERY, and John A.
STEPHAN,
23

Defendants.

Case No. 2:08-cv-1728-PHX-NVW

1 I, Nicholas Paul Granath, Esq., declare as follows:

2 1. I am attorney of record for defendant USAPA in this matter as well as for
3 all named defendants in the matter of Addington *et al* v. Bradford *et al*, Case No. 2:08-
4 cv-01728-NVW and for USAPA in US Airways vs. Addington *et al*, Case No. 2:10-cv-
5 01570-ROS. I make this Declaration of my own free will and based on my personal,
6 first-hand knowledge, unless otherwise specifically indicated.

7 2. This Declaration is submitted in opposition to the Addington plaintiffs'
8 motion to transfer and in support of "Defendant USAPA's Memorandum In Opposition
9 To The Addington Plaintiff's Motion To Transfer Case."

10 3. Attached and marked and labeled as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of
11 the July 8, 2010, order of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

12 4. Attached and marked and labeled as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of
13 plaintiffs' motion to stay, to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, dated July 14, 2010.

14 5. Attached and marked and labeled as Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of
15 the August 3, 2010, order of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

16 6. Attached and marked and labeled as Exhibit D is a true and correct copy of
17 the Mandate issued on August 10, 2010, by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

18 Further your Declarant sayeth not.

19 Pursuant to 29 USC § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is
20 true and correct.
21

22 Executed on: August 9, 2010

23 /s/ NICHOLAS PAUL GRANATH

FILED

JUL 08 2010

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Exhibit A

DON ADDINGTON, individual resident of the State of Arizona, formerly employed by America West Airlines, Inc. and presently employed by its successor after merger, US Airways, Inc.; JOHN BOSTIC, individual resident of the State of Arizona formerly employed by America West Airlines, Inc. and presently employed by its successor after merger, US Airways, Inc.; MARK BURMAN, individual resident of the State of Arizona, formerly employed by America West Airlines, Inc. and presently employed by its successor after merger, US Airways, Inc.; AFSHIN IRANPOUR, individual resident of the State of Arizona, formerly employed by America West Airlines, Inc. and presently employed by its successor after merger, US Airways, Inc.; ROGER VELEZ, individual resident of the State of Arizona, formerly employed by America West Airlines, Inc. and presently employed by its successor after merger, US Airways, Inc.; STEVE WARGOCKI, individual resident of the State of Arizona, formerly employed by America West Airlines, Inc. and presently employed by its successor after merger, US Airways, Inc.,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

No. 09-16564

DC No. 2:08-CV-01633 NVW
D. Ariz.

ORDER

v.

US AIRLINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
an unincorporated association representing
the pilots in the employment of US
Airways, Inc., a Delaware corporation,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

US AIRWAYS, INC., a Delaware
corporation; STEPHAN BRADFORD;
ROBERT DAVISON; DOUGLAS L.
MOWERY,

Defendants.

Before: TASHIMA, GRABER and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

The panel voted to deny the petition for clarification and said petition is denied.

Judge Graber votes to deny the petition for rehearing en banc, Judge Bybee votes to grant the petition for rehearing en banc, and Judge Tashima recommends that the petition for rehearing en banc be denied. The full court has been advised of the petition for rehearing en banc and no judge of the court has requested a vote on en banc rehearing. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 35(f).

The petition for rehearing en banc is denied.

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

No. 09-16564

Don ADDINGTON, John BOSTIC, Mark BURMAN,
Afshin IRANPOUR, Roger VELEZ, and Steve
WARGOCKI, individually and representing a class
of persons similarly situated,

Plaintiffs-Appellees

v.

US AIRLINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION, an
unincorporated association representing the
pilots in the employment of US Airways Inc.,

Defendant-Appellant

**MOTION TO STAY THE MANDATE PENDING FILING
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
FRAP RULE 41(d)(2)**

POLSINELLI SHUGHART, P.C.
MARTY HARPER (SBN 003416)
ANDREW S. JACOB (SBN 022516)
3636 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1200
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
Telephone: (602) 650-2008
Facsimile: (602) 264-7033

MOTION

Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 2101(f), and Fed. R. App. P. Rule 41(d)(2)(B), the above-named Appellees respectfully move the Court to enter an order staying issuance of the mandate in the above-entitled appeal. Appellees make this motion with bona fide intention to make proper and timely application to the Supreme Court of the United States for a writ of certiorari.

This Court denies a motion for a stay of the mandate if it “determines that the application for certiorari would be frivolous or is made merely for delay.” Circuit Rule 41-1, adv. committee n. The Court should grant this motion because neither of these concerns applies here.

First, the application for certiorari would not be frivolous. Indeed, ripeness was a close decision here, as evidenced by the fact that two Article III judges were on each side of the issue. Not only was the issue close, but it is reasonably likely to be reviewed by the Supreme Court because any one of three grounds to be raised in the application merit the attention of the Court. These grounds are as follows:

- (1) If allowed to stand, this case will encourage other unions to refuse, in bad faith, to implement an arbitrated seniority

integration following an airline merger. This would allow other majority groups in airline mergers to improperly thwart important federal labor policy—evidenced by the 2007 passage of the McCaskill-Bond Bill.¹

- (2) This case affords an opportunity to properly distinguish bad faith representation from arbitrary representation. The latter, by definition, requires a final product of bargaining to prove breach of DFR. *ALPA v. O’Neill*, 499 U.S. 65, 78 (1991). The former does not. *Amalgamated Motor Coach Emp. v. Lockridge*, 403 U.S. 274, 301 (1974).
- (3) This decision must be reversed or reconciled with a number of decisions from other circuits. *E.g.*, *Ramey v. Dist. 141, Int’l Ass’n of Machinists & Aerospace Workers*, 378 F.3d 269, 279 (2d Cir. 2004) (“The duty of fair representation owed by a union to its members is similar to a contractual duty, and the union’s announcement of its intent to advocate against its members’ interests may be compared to a party’s anticipatory repudiation of a contractual duty. In some anticipatory repudiation cases the aggrieved party may sue immediately after the repudiation is

¹ McCaskill-Bond Bill provides that when an airline “merger affects the seniority rights of the carriers employees, . . . provisions shall be made for the integration of seniority lists in a fair and equitable manner” and, if needed, referred to arbitration where “[t]he decision of the arbitrator shall be final and binding on the parties.” 121 Stat. 2383, Div. K, Title I, § 117 (Dec. 26, 2007).

announced. However, the statute of limitations ordinarily does not begin to run, and the cause of action does not accrue, until the date of the actual breach; that is, until the date on which performance is due.”); *Air Wisconsin v. Sanderson*, 909 F.2d 213, 217 (7th 1990) (“[A]n attempt by a majority of the employees in a collective bargaining unit to gang up against a minority of employees in the fashion apparently envisaged by the plaintiffs could itself be thought a violation of the duty of fair representation by the union that the majority used as its tool.”); *Santos v. Dist. Council of New York City & Vicinity of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of Am., AFL-CIO*, 619 F.2d 963, 970-71 (2d Cir. 1980) (holding that a union breached its duty of fair representation, and a DFR claim began to accrue, at the time “appellants were aware that the [union] was not proceeding in good faith to seek enforcement of [an arbitration] award”).

Second, this motion is not made to delay; it is made to protect the West Pilots from needless hardship. A stay of the mandate would leave the injunction in place and protect West Pilot interests without causing cognizable hardship to USAPA. Hardship analysis should focus on the first 90 days of a stay because, as a general rule, once a stay is in place, it continues after a petition is filed until the Supreme Court’s final disposition. *See* Fed. R. App. P. Rule 41(d)(2)(B). Hardship should not be a

problem over the next 90 days because USAPA can freely negotiate a new CBA while the injunction stays in effect, leaving the seniority provision for later. If, by some chance, USAPA completes all other negotiations while the stay of the mandate is in effect, it can move the district court to stay the injunction.

In contrast, if the mandate is not stayed and the injunction is vacated, USAPA will be completely unconstrained. It might put a date of hire seniority list in place before the Supreme Court can address certiorari. That would be difficult to undo if the Supreme Court were to reverse this Court on ripeness. Surely, it would be much harder to protect West Pilots interests in that situation than it would be to protect USAPA's interests if the mandate were stayed.

Wherefore, Appellees respectfully move the Court for an order staying the issuance of the mandate pending their filing a petition for writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court of the United States.

DATED this 14th day of July, 2010.

POLSINELLI SHUGHART, P.C.

By: s/ Andrew S. Jacob
Marty Harper
Andrew S. Jacob
Attorneys for Appellees

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

U.S. Court of Appeals Docket No. 06-16417

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system on July 14, 2010.

Participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the appellate CM/ECF system. Participants who are not registered as shown on the Service List will be served by U.S. Mail.

/s/

Andrew S. Jacob

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I certify that pursuant to Circuit Rule 35-4 or 40-1, the attached petition for panel rehearing/petition for rehearing en banc/answer is: (check applicable option)

X Proportionately spaced, has a typeface of 14 points or more and contains 875 words (petitions and answers must not exceed 4,200 words).

or

_____ Monospaced, has 10.5 or fewer characters per inch and contains _____ words or _____ lines of text (petitions and answers must not exceed 4,200 words or 390 lines of text).

or

_____ In compliance with Fed. R. App. 32(c) and does not exceed 15 pages.

/s/

Andrew S. Jacob

AUG 03 2010

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Exhibit C

DON ADDINGTON, individual resident of the State of Arizona formerly employed by America West Airlines, Inc. and presently employed by its successor after merger, US Airways, Inc.; et al.,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

v.

US AIRLINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION, an unincorporated association representing the pilots in the employment of US Airways Inc., a Delaware corporation,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

US AIRWAYS, INC., a Delaware corporation; et al.,

Defendants.

No. 09-16564

DC No. 2:08 cv-1633 NVW
D. Ariz., Phoenix

ORDER

Before: TASHIMA, GRABER, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Plaintiffs-appellees' motion to stay issuance of the mandate pending the filing of a petition for a writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court is denied.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

AUG 10 2010

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

Exhibit D

DON ADDINGTON, individual resident
of the State of Arizona, formerly
employed by America West Airlines, Inc.
and presently employed by its successor
after merger, US Airways, Inc.; et al.,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

v.

US AIRLINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
an unincorporated association
representing the pilots in the employment
of US Airways, Inc., a Delaware
corporation,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

US AIRWAYS, INC., a Delaware
corporation; et al.,

Defendants.

No. 09-16564

D.C. No. 2:08-cv-01633-NVW
U.S. District Court for Arizona,
Phoenix

MANDATE

The judgment of this Court, entered June 04, 2010, takes effect this date.

This constitutes the formal mandate of this Court issued pursuant to Rule
41(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

FOR THE COURT:

Molly C. Dwyer
Clerk of Court

Gabriela Van Allen
Deputy Clerk