

1 US Airways, Inc.  
KAREN GILLEN, State Bar No. 018008  
2 karen.gillen@usairways.com  
111 West Rio Salado Parkway  
3 Tempe, AZ 85281  
Telephone: (480) 693-0800  
4 Facsimile: (480) 693-5932

5 O'Melveny & Myers LLP  
ROBERT A. SIEGEL (*pro hac vice*)  
6 CHRIS A. HOLLINGER (*pro hac vice*)  
rsiegel@omm.com  
7 chollinger@omm.com  
400 South Hope Street  
8 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899  
Telephone: (213) 430-6000  
9 Facsimile: (213) 430-6407

10 Attorneys for Intervenor  
US Airways, Inc.

11 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

13 Don Addington; John Bostic; Mark  
14 Burman; Afshin Iranpour; Roger Velez;  
Steve Wargoeki; Michael J. Soha;  
15 Rodney Albert Brackin; and George  
Maliga, on behalf of themselves and all  
16 similarly situated former America West  
Pilots,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 vs.

19 US Airline Pilots Ass'n, an  
unincorporated association,

20 Defendant.

21 -----

22 US Airways, Inc.

23 Intervenor.

Case No. 2:13-cv-00471-ROS

**INTERVENOR US AIRWAYS, INC.'S  
RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION FOR RULE 25(C) JOINDER  
OF ALLIED PILOTS ASSOCIATION  
(APA) AND FOR ISSUANCE OF  
PERMANENT INJUNCTION**

1 Intervenor US Airways, Inc. (“US Airways”) hereby submits this Response to  
2 Plaintiffs’ Motion to Join the Allied Pilots Association (APA) and for Permanent  
3 Injunction (“Motion for Injunction”) (Doc. No. 317).<sup>1</sup>

#### 4 ARGUMENT

5 After years of litigation, the *Addington* Plaintiffs finally prevailed in their quest to  
6 vindicate the Nicolau seniority-integration arbitration award. But instead of seeking  
7 quickly to conclude the process of integrating the American Airlines and US Airways  
8 pilots seniority lists in a manner consistent with the Nicolau award in the upcoming pilot  
9 seniority list integration arbitration (“SLI Arbitration”), to be conducted pursuant to the  
10 McCaskill-Bond statute, the *Addington* Plaintiffs have sought a needlessly broad  
11 injunction that could delay both the pending SLI Arbitration as well as the Company’s  
12 implementation of the integrated seniority list that is generated through the SLI  
13 Arbitration. While the Company has been, and remains, entirely neutral in regard to how  
14 the pilot seniority lists are to be integrated, it opposes any such delay and disruption to the  
15 seniority-integration process.

16 On June 26, 2015, just three days before the SLI Arbitration was scheduled to  
17 begin, the Ninth Circuit issued its decision, ruling that Defendant US Airline Pilots  
18 Association (“USAPA”) had violated its duty of fair representation to the West pilots by  
19 not requiring use of the Nicolau Award in connection with the merger between  
20 US Airways and American Airlines, and remanding the case to this Court for entry of an  
21 injunction prohibiting USAPA from advocating against use of the Nicolau Award in the  
22 SLI Arbitration. Immediately thereafter, the USAPA Merger Committee withdrew from  
23 the SLI Arbitration on the stated ground that the USAPA Merger Committee – which had  
24 been authorized by the post-merger certified pilots union, the Allied Pilots Association

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> After the filing of the instant lawsuit, US Airways entered into a merger transaction  
27 whereby it became a subsidiary of American Airlines Group Inc. (“AAG”). American  
28 Airlines, Inc. is also a subsidiary of AAG. For labor relations purposes, US Airways and  
American now operate as a “single carrier” sometimes referred to as the “New American  
Airlines.” *See In re Allied Pilots Ass’n*, 41 N.M.B. 289 (2014).

1 (“APA”), to represent the pre-merger US Airways East pilots in the SLI Arbitration –  
2 could no longer adequately represent those pilots.

3         Once the USAPA Merger Committee had withdrawn, only two APA-appointed  
4 merger committees were left to participate in the SLI Arbitration – one for the pre-merger  
5 US Airways West pilots and one for the pre-merger American Airlines pilots. As a result,  
6 the three-arbitrator panel designated to conduct the SLI Arbitration (the “McCaskill-Bond  
7 Arbitration Board”) postponed the start of the hearings until September 29, 2015, and  
8 ruled that the APA should use its best efforts to appoint a new merger committee that  
9 would represent the interests of the pre-merger US Airways East pilots (the “New East  
10 Pilots Merger Committee”). (*See* Motion for Injunction (Doc. No. 317-1) Ex. C.) In so  
11 ruling, the McCaskill-Bond Arbitration Board noted that all of the pilot groups, including  
12 the US Airways East pilots, “are presumptively entitled to have their interests represented  
13 in this SLI Proceeding,” and expressly declined to impose any restrictions on the positions  
14 that could be advocated by the New East Pilots Merger Committee. (*See id.* Ex. C at ECF  
15 pp. 12-13.) Through their instant motion for permanent injunction, however, the  
16 *Addington* Plaintiffs seek to restrict what the New East Pilots Merger Committee is  
17 permitted to argue before the McCaskill-Bond Arbitration Board.

18         Although, as the *Addington* Plaintiffs correctly note, the Ninth Circuit stated that  
19 the pre-merger US Airways East pilots should not benefit from Defendant USAPA’s  
20 breach of the duty of fair representation, the court expressly declined to order the sort of  
21 broad injunction against non-parties that the Plaintiffs now seek. The court specifically  
22 rejected Plaintiffs’ request that the injunction provide that “an unmodified Nicolau Award  
23 must be used...in the pending McCaskill-Bond process.” *See Addington v. US Airline*  
24 *Pilots Ass’n*, 791 F.3d 967, 991 n.12 (2015). Imposing an injunction limiting the  
25 authority of the McCaskill-Bond Arbitration Board to construct an integrated seniority list  
26 is, in any event, unnecessary; the McCaskill-Bond Arbitration Board is fully able, and is  
27 certain, to create an integrated seniority list consistent with the Ninth Circuit’s decision  
28 without an injunction mandating that result.

1 Likewise, there is no need to extend the permanent injunction that is to be issued  
2 against USAPA to cover what the New East Pilots Merger Committee is allowed to argue  
3 to the McCaskill-Bond Arbitration Board. Each pilot merger committee should be free to  
4 present any position it wishes in the SLI Arbitration. If the New East Pilots Merger  
5 Committee chooses to advocate against use of the Nicolau Award, the West Pilots Merger  
6 Committee will certainly have a full and fair opportunity to argue that the New East Pilots  
7 Merger Committee's position must be rejected as inconsistent with the Ninth Circuit's  
8 decision that the Nicolau Award should have been implemented by USAPA. All interests  
9 will thereby be protected, the McCaskill-Bond Arbitration Board will be able to render a  
10 final and binding award consistent with the Ninth Circuit's decision, and no party will  
11 have any sound legal ground to challenge the result of the SLI Arbitration.

12 Conversely, the broad injunction sought by the *Addington* Plaintiffs against entities  
13 such as the APA, which had no role in USAPA's breach of the duty of fair representation  
14 and which by any objective measure has been scrupulously fair in its dealings with the  
15 various merger committees, is certain to spawn still more litigation, either before the SLI  
16 Arbitration can be completed or after an integrated pilot seniority list has been issued.  
17 Implementation of the new integrated seniority list would be delayed, uncertainty over the  
18 finality of the arbitration award would result, and the New American Airlines would be  
19 unable to enjoy the full benefits of a merger just as US Airways was never able to fully  
20 integrate operations following its merger with America West Airlines.

21 In seeking to intervene in this case after its dismissal, US Airways explained that  
22 its purpose was to advocate for a prompt and final resolution of the seniority dispute  
23 between the East Pilots and the West Pilots, in order to "avoid[] any delay or disruption to  
24 the process of integrating US Airways and American pilots following the merger – a  
25 process that is central to the airline's realization of the operational and financial benefits  
26 from a combined pilot workforce." (*See* Doc. No. 197 at ¶ 15.) And in granting  
27 US Airways' Motion to Intervene, this Court agreed, finding that "US Airways has a  
28 'significant protectable interest' in the timely resolution of the seniority dispute[,] [and

1 that] the failure to resolve the seniority dispute in a timely manner may ‘impair or impede’  
2 that interest by frustrating the expected realization of ‘the operational and financial  
3 benefits from the combined pilot workforce.’” (See Doc. No. 194 at 4.) The injunction  
4 requested by the *Addington* Plaintiffs would undermine US Airways’ “significant  
5 protectable interest” in a timely resolution of the seniority-integration process. Not only  
6 would US Airways and American Airlines be hamstrung as prolonged litigation over the  
7 fairness of the SLI Arbitration process dragged on, but all of the affected pilots would be  
8 deprived of seniority-related opportunities to transfer to other bases, to fly different  
9 aircraft and to enjoy promotional opportunities.

10 The purpose of the 2007 McCaskill-Bond Amendment, 49 U.S.C. § 42112, note  
11 § 117(b)(3), was to ensure that final and binding integrated seniority lists would be  
12 created and implemented promptly following any airline merger. The broad injunction  
13 sought by the *Addington* Plaintiffs here would frustrate Congressional intent by virtually  
14 ensuring still more years of litigation. Accordingly, US Airways respectfully requests that  
15 the injunction entered by the Court apply only to USAPA, the party which actually  
16 engaged in the conduct violative of the duty of fair representation owed to the Plaintiffs.

17 Respectfully submitted,

18  
19 Dated: September 14, 2015

O’Melveny & Myers LLP

20  
21 By:           /s/Robert A. Siegel            
22 Robert A. Siegel (*pro hac vice*)  
23 Chris A. Hollinger (*pro hac vice*)  
400 South Hope Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899

24 US Airways, Inc.  
25 Karen Gillen, State Bar No. 018008  
111 West Rio Salado Parkway  
Tempe, AZ 85281

26 Attorneys for Intervenor US Airways, Inc.  
27  
28