

# **EXHIBIT D**

1 **PATRICK J. SZYMANSKI** (*pro hac vice*)  
2 **PATRICK J. SZYMANSKI, PLLC**  
3 1900 L Street, NW, Ste 900  
4 Washington, DC 20036  
5 Telephone: (202) 721-6035  
6 [szymanski@msn.com](mailto:szymanski@msn.com)

7 **BRIAN J. O'DWYER** (*pro hac vice*)  
8 **GARY SILVERMAN** (*pro hac vice*)  
9 **JOY K. MELE** (*pro hac vice*)  
10 **O'DWYER & BERNSTIEN, LLP**  
11 52 Duane Street, 5th Floor  
12 New York, NY 10007  
13 Telephone: (212) 571-7100  
14 [bodwyer@odblaw.com](mailto:bodwyer@odblaw.com)  
15 [gsilverman@odblaw.com](mailto:gsilverman@odblaw.com)  
16 [jmele@odblaw.com](mailto:jmele@odblaw.com)

17 Attorneys for US Airline Pilots Association

18 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
19 **DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

20 Don Addington, *et. al.*,  
21 *Plaintiffs,*  
22 v.  
23 US Airline Pilots Association, *et. al.*,  
24 *Defendants.*

25 Case No.: CV-13-00471-PHX-ROS  
26 **US Airline Pilots Association's**  
27 **Reply Memorandum in Support of**  
28 **Motion for Summary Judgment**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Page

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES.....1

ARGUMENT

I. The Transition Agreement does not limit the rights of USAPA and US Airways to enter into the MOU.....2

II. Plaintiffs mischaracterize ¶10.h of the MOU and ignore that both East and West pilots were fully and accurately informed that the MOU was neutral on the subject of seniority.....5

III. In entering into the MOU, USAPA obtained benefits for all US Airways Pilots.....7

CONCLUSION.....10

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

| <u>Cases</u>   | <u>Page(s)</u> |
|--|----------------|
| <i>Addington v. US Airline Pilots Ass’n</i> ,<br>606 F.3d 1174 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010).....                                      | 5, 8           |
| <i>Baker v. Newspaper &amp; Graphic Commc’ns Union, Local 6</i> ,<br>628 F.2d 156 (D.C. Cir. 1980).....                              | 7              |
| <i>Barthelemy v. Air Line Pilots Ass’n</i> ,<br>897 F.2d 999 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990).....  | 9              |
| <i>Barton Brands, Ltd. v. NLRB</i> ,<br>529 F.2d 793 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1976).....  | 7              |
| <i>Beck v. United Food &amp; Commercial Workers Union, Local 99</i> ,<br>506 F.3d 874 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007).....               | 9              |
| <i>Consol. Rail Corp. v. Ry. Labor Executes’ Ass’n</i> ,<br>491 U.S. 299 (1989).....   | 4              |
| <i>Ford Motor Co. v. Huffman</i> ,<br>345 U.S. 330 (1953).....   | 2, 10          |
| <i>Gullickson v. Southwest Airlines Pilots’ Ass’n</i> ,<br>87 F.3d 1176 (10 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996).....                            | 8              |
| <i>Humphrey v. Moore</i> ,<br>375 U.S. 335 (1964).....   | 3              |
| <i>Intl. Ass’n of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, AFL-CIO v. Aloha Airlines</i> ,<br>776 F.2d 812 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985)..... | 4              |
| <i>Papcin v. Dichello Distributors, Inc.</i> ,<br>697 F. Supp. 73 (D.Conn. 1988).....  | 8              |
| <i>Rakestraw v. United airlines, Inc</i> ,<br>981 F.2d 1524 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992).....   | 7, 8           |
| <i>Simo v. Union of Needletrades, Indus. &amp; Textile Employees</i> ,   |                |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

322 F.3d 602 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003).....9

*Szaley v. Pia Cnty.*,  
371 F. App'x 734 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010).....2

Statutes

McCaskill-Bond Amendment, Federal Aviation Act  
42 U.S.C. § 42112.....*passim*

Railway Labor Act  
45 U.S.C. § 184 .....4

Rules

Fed.R.Civ. P. 56.....2

LR Civ. 56.1.....2

1 seniority regime” that triggers USAPA’s duty of fair representation, not USAPA and US  
2 Airways’ decision to amend the TA.<sup>5</sup> *Id.* As this Court has already ruled, any dispute  
3 concerning the TA, including what it requires, is a “minor dispute” within the exclusive  
4 jurisdiction of the System Board of Adjustment.<sup>6</sup> *See* Doc. 122, at 6-7.

5  
6 As to Plaintiffs’ continued claim that the MOU is the “single agreement”  
7 referenced in the TA (Doc. 267, at 7), Plaintiffs submit no evidence to rebut USAPA and  
8 US Airways’ agreement that it is not. The MOU is a four-party agreement between US  
9 Airways, American, USAPA, and the APA which is applicable to the merged operations  
10 of US Airways and American, not the merged operations of America West and US  
11 Airways. USAPA 56.1 Stmt., ¶44. Further, in MOU ¶4, the parties explicitly agreed to  
12 modify and displace all provisions of the TA and agreed that the procedures in ¶10  
13 provide the exclusive means for integrating seniority, including the provision that the  
14 *status quo* of separate seniority lists shall continue. USAPA 56.1 Stmt., ¶49. Consistent  
15 with that provision, by letter dated February 28, 2013, US Airways denied the David

16  
17 <sup>5</sup> This Court noted in its October 11, 2012 Order in the Declaratory Judgment Action that  
18 “there is no claim that the Transition Agreement itself is limiting USAPA’s authority  
19 during the negotiation of a new collective bargaining agreement.” 2:10-cv-01570-ROS,  
20 Doc. 193, at 6, n. 2.

21 <sup>6</sup> It is well established that under the Railway Labor Act, disputes growing out of the  
22 interpretation or application of agreements concerning rates of pay, rules, or working  
23 conditions are subject to mandatory arbitration before the System Board of Adjustment.  
24 45 U.S.C. §184; *Consol. Rail. Corp. v. Ry. Labor Executives’ Ass’n*, 491 U.S. 299, 303,  
25 109 S.Ct. 2477, 2480 (1989); *International Ass’n of Machinists and Aerospace Workers,*  
26 *AFL-CIO v. Aloha Airlines*, 776 F.2d 812, 815 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985). In fact, Section X of the  
27 TA establishes such a system board to hear disputes concerning the interpretation or  
28 application of the TA. Doc. 213-4 Tab 6, p. 12. Plaintiffs’ claim that USAPA is bound  
by the TA, that the TA is the contract “status quo”, that the TA requires implementation  
of the Nicolau Award, and that the MOU is the “single agreement” referenced in the TA,  
concern the interpretation or application of the TA, and therefore is within the exclusive  
jurisdiction of the System Board of Adjustment. Just as this Court ruled that Plaintiffs’  
claim against US Airways “is a basic claim about the interpretation or application of a  
collective bargaining agreement” that “must be submitted to arbitration”, so too must this  
new iteration of Plaintiffs’ DFR claim against USAPA be submitted to arbitration. Doc.  
122, at 6-7.

1 Braid grievance in part because “[a]t this point in time, we have neither a combined  
2 contract nor a combined seniority list.” Doc. 213-10 Tab 43, p. 8.

3 As discussed in USAPA’s initial memorandum in support of its motion (Doc. 211,  
4 pp. 7-10), USAPA acted properly, reasonably and well within its DFR to all the pilots it  
5 represents when it agreed to the MOU which, at the request of the airline parties,  
6 contained ¶4 which provided that the MOU (and the MTA) replaced not only the TA but  
7 also any preexisting *status quo* within.  
8

9 **II. Plaintiffs mischaracterize ¶10.h of the MOU and ignore that**  
10 **both East and West Pilots were fully and accurately informed**  
11 **that the MOU was neutral on the subject of seniority.**

12 Plaintiffs claim “USAPA put ¶ 10.h into the MOU with the intention of  
13 abandoning the existing obligation to use the Nicolau Award.” Doc. 267, at 11. They are  
14 wrong.

15 As an initial matter, both the Ninth Circuit and this Court recognize that consistent  
16 with its DFR, USAPA is not under any obligation to use the Nicolau Award. *Addington*  
17 *v. US Airline Pilots Ass’n*, 606 F.3d 1174, 1181 n. 3 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010) (“We note . . . that  
18 USAPA is at least as free to abandon the Nicolau Award as was its predecessor,  
19 ALPA.”); 2:10-cv-01570-ROS, Doc. 193, at 7 (“[I]f USAPA wishes to abandon the  
20 Nicolau Award and accept the consequences of this course of action, it is free to do so.”).

21 Second, USAPA has never been secretive about its dissatisfaction with the  
22 Nicolau Award, and its opposition to the unmodified Nicolau Award.

23 Third, all ¶10.h says is that the MOU is seniority neutral. That the MOU is  
24 seniority neutral was repeatedly communicated to the membership prior to the MOU  
25 ratification vote and was understood by Plaintiffs as demonstrated in their emails and the  
26 Leonidas updates. USAPA 56.1 Stmt., ¶¶82, 89, 90; Doc. 213-9 Tabs 18, 19, 22; West  
27 Pilots Email Chain, annexed as Ex. A to the Declaration of Joy K. Mele. In this respect,  
28 the idea that there was some secret or nefarious purpose behind ¶10.h is a notion