

No. 00-11223

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

KAUFMAN

Plaintiffs - Appellees

v.

ALLIED PILOTS ASSOCIATION

Defendants - Appellants

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

APPELLANTS' BRIEF

EDGAR N. JAMES
D.C. Bar No. 333013
STEVEN K. HOFFMAN
D.C. Bar No. 384696
KATHY L. KRIEGER
D.C. Bar No. 385877
James & Hoffman, P.C.
1146 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036-3703
(202) 496-0500 phone
(202) 496-0555 fax

Dated: January 25, 2001

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS

No. 00-11223

Kaufman v. Allied Pilots Association

The undersigned counsel of record hereby certifies that the following listed persons have an interest in the outcome of this case. These representations are made in order that the judges of this court may evaluate possible disqualification or recusal.

Persons Interested in the Controversy:

Allied Pilots Association, Richard LaVoy, Brian Mayhew, David Aldrich, Robert Ames, Stanley Bissell, Dennis Breslin, J. S. Ditty, Ernest Dryer, David Duquemin, L. G. Foster, Mark Hunnibel, Jeff Marchand, Norman Patterson, Steve Roach and Randy Trommer (Appellants)

Richard Kaufman, Jack Marut, C. Anthony Wainswright, Jeffrey Krasnoff, Center for Rehabilitative Medicine, Shon Prejean, Steven Carli, Mark Lewis, Joellen Cashion, Jim Cashion, Carolyn Rogers, Rosalie J. Vass, Mary C. Cascino, Ralph A. MacDonald and Nancy Geidel (Appellees)


American Airlines, Inc. (named as a Defendant below) and AMR, Inc. (parent corporation of American Airlines, Inc.)

Law Firms Representing the Parties:

James & Hoffman, Washington, D.C.
Attorneys for Appellants

Malesovas, Martin & Tekell, LLP, Waco, TX
Beatie & Osborn, LLP, New York, NY
Attorneys for Appellees

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Edgar N. James', written over a horizontal line.

Edgar N. James
Counsel of Record for Appellants

STATEMENT REGARDING ORAL ARGUMENT

The issues presented on this appeal are complex and substantial. Appellants seek reversal of a ruling below that seriously undermines uniform federal regulation of labor disputes affecting commerce and conflicts with settled legal authority, including the relevant precedent of the Supreme Court, this Circuit and other federal courts. Appellants therefore believe that oral argument is appropriate in this case.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION	1
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	3
STANDARD OF REVIEW	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
STATEMENT OF FACTS AND PRIOR PROCEEDINGS	6
1. The pilots' work stoppage and the ensuing RLA enforcement proceedings	6
2. The consolidated damages action by American's ticket holders	8
3. The district court's ruling on dispositive motions	10
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	13
ARGUMENT	18
I. FEDERAL LABOR LAW PREEMPTS PLAINTIFFS' TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE CLAIMS SEEKING STATE-LAW REMEDIES FOR A NATIONWIDE WORK STOPPAGE PROHIBITED BY A FEDERAL COURT ORDER ENFORCING THE RLA	18
A. The <u>Garmon</u> preemption doctrine precludes state remedies for conduct prohibited by federal labor statutes and federal court orders enforcing statutory commands	18

B. Application of controlling law compels reversal of the ruling below
subjecting “post-TRO” violations of the RLA to state remedies 25

II. THE AIRLINE DEREGULATION ACT ALSO PREEMPTS AND
BARS PLAINTIFFS’ TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE CLAIMS
SEEKING EXTRA-CONTRACTUAL REMEDIES FOR DENIAL
OF SCHEDULED AIRLINE SERVICES 44

A. The Airline Deregulation Act preempts state claims
“related to”—that is, having a connection or reference
to—airline services 45

B. The “post-TRO” tort claims in this case relate directly to
airline services and are therefore preempted by the ADA 48

CONCLUSION 55

ADDENDUM

