### AFA Chicago/Rosemont: McDonald v. UAL Case Records

55 linear feet 1959-1992 (bulk 1965-1984)

Walter P. Reuther Library, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI Finding aid written by Kathy Makas on January 25, 2013.

**Accession Number:** LR002386

**Creator**: Association of Flight Attendants

**Acquisition:** Materials received from AFA Chicago/Rosemont office, 1990-2-

12, 1990-2-20, and 1997-5-28.

**Language:** Material entirely in English.

**Access:** Collection is open for research.

**Use:** Refer to the Walter P. Reuther Library *Rules for Use of Archival* 

Materials. Restrictions: Researchers may encounter records of a sensitive nature – personnel files, case records and those involving investigations, legal and other private matters.

Privacy laws and restrictions imposed by the Library prohibit the use of names and other personal information which might identify an individual, except with written permission from the

Director and/or the donor.

Parts of this collection contain further restrictions, users must sign

a Restricted Use Form to access certain records.

**Notes:** Citation style: "AFA: McDonald v. UAL Case Records,

Chicago/Rosemont, Box [#], Folder [#], Archives of Labor and

Urban Affairs, Wayne State University"

**Related Material:** 

#### Abstract

McDonald v. UAL was part of a series of legal cases involving United Air Lines (UAL), their former flight attendants, and the Association of Flight Attendants (AFA). The cases centered around flight attendants who lost their job due to UAL's no-marriage policy of the 1950s and 1960s in which the company insisted that their female flight attendants remain unmarried. Upon hiring a woman as a stewardess, UAL made them sign a form which stated they could only work as a flight attendant if they remained unmarried. If a flight attendant married they had to transfer to a ground job, were forced to resign, or were fired. For years flight attendants had no legal basis to protest this employment clause, but in 1964 the Civil Rights Act was passed with Title VII prohibiting sex based discrimination. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) was founded that same year, and ALPA's Steward and Stewardess Division (the precursor to the AFA) began fighting UAL's no-marriage policy, which the company finally revoked in 1968. In 1965 the EEOC declared UAL's no-marriage policy in violation of Title VII and opened the legal system to flight attendants seeking reinstatement. The first case in this series was Mary Sprogis v. UAL, 1966. This case led to a class action suit by Carole Romasanta in 1975. The Romasanta case, however, only included stewardesses who had been fired and those who had protested their removal from the flight attendant position. The narrow classification of the Romasanta case left a void, as hundreds of stewardesses had been forced to resign because of the ruling and hadn't protested either because they were unaware of the grievance process or they didn't believe they could win a grievance against a company policy. In 1977, Liane Buix McDonald filed another class action, this one to include all stewardesses who were fired, resigned, or transferred from the flight attendant position due to the no-marriage ruling.

Prior to the McDonald case the AFA backed flight attendants protesting the marriage rule and helped them to regain their jobs, seniority, and back pay. The McDonald case changed the AFA's mind; the sheer number of flight attendants gave the Association pause. The lawyers for the McDonald class estimated between 1100 and 1700 stewardesses lost their positions as flight attendants between 1965, when the EEOC declared UAL's policy in violation of Title VII, and 1968, when UAL revoked this policy and allowed flight attendants to marry. Unlike previous cases where individuals or small classes of plaintiffs were to be reinstated, returning such a large number of flight attendants to the line would put a major stress on the UAL seniority system as it stood. Many of the stewardesses in the class had only worked 1-2 years and, if their original seniority were to be reinstated, would be placed above flight attendants who had been working 13 years or more. Thus, amid protest from its membership, who were worried about losing their seniority and possibly their jobs, the AFA decided to work against the McDonald class.

The case lasted from 1977 to 1989. During that time much effort was spent on entitlement hearings to decide who should belong to the class, and who should be reinstated. The litigation also covered back pay, seniority rights, and how to reintroduce qualifying class members into the seniority list and back on active flight duty. In 1986, the court awarded \$37,972,500 in back pay to be divided equally among the qualifying class members. The court also ruled that those who wished to be reinstated were to retain their original company seniority for compensation and benefits, but their bidding

seniority was based on the time actually worked before they were forced to leave, and a percentage of the time which elapsed between their removal from flight attendant duty and their reinstatement. Reinstated flight attendants were sent to training and returned to the line on an individual basis whenever their case was approved so there was no mass return of flight attendants. Many from the original class did not qualify, and many did not wish to return to flying so only a percentage of the class actually returned as flight attendants. This approach minimized the litigation's impact on the seniority list, while still ensuring reimbursement for the class for their losses due to UAL's unfair employment practice.

The collection includes court documents, UAL marriage grievances from the mid-1960s, lawyer's correspondence, class membership lists, and research. It also includes individual cases to determine class membership. These cases include attorney notes, statements of claimants, questionnaires and answers, AFA and UAL responses, and documents provided by the claimant.

### **Important Subjects:**

Airlines—Employees—Labor unions
Association of Flight Attendants (U. S.)—Trials, litigation, etc.
Flight attendants—Labor unions—United States
Sex discrimination—United States
Stewardesses, Airline
United Airlines
Women's rights—United States

### **Important Individuals:**

Bigelow, Mark
Erp, Michael
Herman, Peter
McDonald, Liane Buix
Moldof, Stephen
Moran, James B.
Purogel, Linda
Rhode, Susan
Savelson, Robert
Tschirhart, Paul

# Arrangement

12.

13.

The collection is arranged into 2 series.

# Series I. Legal Files, 1966-92 (Boxes 1-6)

### **Series II. Individual Case Files, 1959-85** (Boxes 6-55)

Series 1	
Box 1	
1.	Appeals, 1983
2.	Attorney's Fees, 1983-84
3.	Back Pay, 1983
4.	Back Pay, 1984
5.	Back Pay, 1984-85
6.	Brief for the Equal Opportunity Commission, Amicus Curiae, 1982-12-20
7.	Burden of Proof, 1983-84
8.	Burden of Proof, 1984-85
9.	Case Notes, 1984-85
10.	Certificate of Interest, 1983-1-25
11.	Claimants, 1986
12.	Claimants, 1987
13-14	Claimants, 1988
15.	Claimants, 1989
16.	Claimant/Class Information, A-H
17.	Claimant/Class Information, I-M
18.	Claimant/Class Information, N-R
19.	Claimant/Class Information, S-Z
20.	Claimant Information
21.	Claimant Information Cards, Set 1, A-D
22.	Claimant Information Cards, Set 1, E-K
23.	Claimant Information Cards, Set 1, L-P
24.	Claimant Information Cards, Set 1, Q-T
Box 2	
1.	Claimant Information Cards, Set 1, U-Z
2.	Claimant Information Cards, Set 2, A-J
3.	Claimant Information Cards, Set 2, K-R
4.	Claimant Information Cards, Set 2, S-Z
5-6	Claimant Lists, 1983-84
7-8	Class Membership, 1983-85
9.	Class Membership, 1985-86
10.	Class Membership Hearing Lists, 1983
11.	Consent Decree

Correspondence; Attorney Robert Savelson, January 1980

Contracts, 1964-65, 1967-69

- 14. Correspondence; Attorney Robert Savelson, February 1980
- 15. Correspondence; Attorney Robert Savelson, February-March 1980
- 16. Correspondence; Attorney Robert Savelson, April-December 1980
- 17. Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, 1981
- 18. Correspondence; Attorney Mark Bigelow, 1983-84
- 19. Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof re: Settlement, 1986-87
- 20. Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, 1986-87
- 21. Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, 1990-92
- 22. Court Documents, n.d.
- 23. Court Documents and Correspondence, January 1982
- 24. Court Documents and Correspondence, February-December 1982
- 25. Court Documents and Correspondence, January-July 1983
- 26. Court Documents and Correspondence, July-December 1983

### Box 3

- 1. Court Documents and Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, January-February, 1983
- 2. Court Document and Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, March, 1983
- 3. Court Documents and Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, April-May 1983
- 4. Court Documents and Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, May 1983
- 5. Court Documents and Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, June-August 1983
- 6. Court Documents and Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, September 1983
- 7. Court Documents and Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, October-December 1983
- 8. Court Documents and Correspondence, 1984
- 9. Court Documents and Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, January-February 1984
- 10. Court Documents and Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, March-April 1984
- 11. Court Documents and Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, August-December 1984
- 12. Court Documents and Correspondence; Attorney Stephen Moldof, 1986-87
- 13. Defendant's First Set of Interrogatories to Plaintiff Class Members
- 14. Deferral Rights, 1983-85
- 15. Domicile Designations
- 16. Domicile Information, 1984-85
- 17. EEOC v. UAL; Consent Decree, 1976-4-30
- 18. Entitlement Hearing Schedules, 1983
- 19. Entitlement Hearing Schedules, 1984
- 20. Entitlement Hearings; Plaintiff's Exhibit List

#### Furlough, 1971-80 21.

Box 4	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form.
1.	Grievances, 1966
2-3	Grievances, 1967
4-6	Grievances, 1968
7.	Grievances, 1969
8.	Hearing Schedules
9-11	Information and Research
12.	McLean v. UAL. 1990
13.	Motion to Reconsider and Consolidated Appeals, 1983-84
14.	Motions, 1983-84
15.	Objections, etc., 1983-85
16-17	· ·
18.	Opening Brief of Plaintiff-Appellant and Class Representative Liane Buix
10.	McDonald, 1982-83
19.	Opening Brief on Behalf of Cross-Appellant UAL, February 1983
20.	Out-of-Service Listings, 1983
21.	Pension, 1988-89
22.	Plaintiff's Post Trial Memorandum Regarding Reinstatement with
	Seniority. 1981-9-10
23.	Post Trial Brief of AFA, 1981-7-21
24.	Post Trial Brief of AFA on Back Pay Issues, 1983-3-11
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Box 5	
1.	Rehearing, 1984
2-3	Reinstatement and Placement of Class Members, 1986-87
4.	Reinstatement Appeal, 1983-5-27
5-7	Reinstatement Decisions, 1986-88
8.	Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion of AFA to Intervene
9-10	Research
11.	Responsive Statements of AFA to Statement of Claimants, 1983-10-13
12-13	Return to Service, 1986-87
14.	Returnee Data
15.	Seniority, 1983-84
16.	Settlements, 1971-83
17.	Settlement and Reinstatement, 1986
18.	Special Administrative Master's (SAM) Orders, 1983-84
19.	Summaries
20-22	Summaries, 1983-84
Box 6	Contains consitive meterials researchers must sign Destricted Use Form
1.	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Summary List of Court Documents Filed, 1970-84
2.	Training, 1986
3.	Transcripts, n.d.
3. 4.	Transcripts, 1982-9-16
᠇.	11ansempts, 1702-7-10

# B

- 2.3.
- 4.

5.	Transfer Motions, 1983
6.	Transfers, 1983
7-9	Transfers, 1984
10.	Transfers, 1985
11.	Updates from Cohen, Weiss and Simon, 1983-85
12.	Vacation for Class Members Reinstated, 1984-85
13-14	Witnesses
15.	Witness Reports, Unconfirmed
16-17	Worksheets and Research
Camina II	
Series II	Latini had Care Files A Al
18-33	Individual Case Files, A-AL
Box 7	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form
1-30	Individual Case Files, AL-AR
1 00	marradar case r nes, riz rinc
Box 8	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form
1-33	Individual Case Files, AR-BA
Box 9	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form
1-29	Individual Case Files, BA-BE
Box 10	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form
1-27	Individual Case Files, BE-BO
D 11	
Box 11	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form
1-27	Individual Case Files, BO-BR
Box 12	Contains sansitive metapiels researchers must sign Destricted Use Form
1-29	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form Individual Case Files, BR-BU
1-29	ilidividual Case Piles, DR-DO
Box 13	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form
1-30	Individual Case Files, BU-CA
1 50	maryidadi Case i nes, Be Cri
Box 14	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form
1-33	Individual Case Files, CA-CH
<b>Box 15</b>	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form
1-33	Individual Case Files, CH-CO
<b>Box 16</b>	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form
1-33	Individual Case Files, CO-CU
D 17	
Box 17	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form
1-32	Individual Case Files, CU-DE

Box 18 1-32	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form Individual Case Files, DE-DU
Box 19 1-32	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, DR-EN
Box 20 1-31	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, EP-FI
Box 21 1-28	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Forma Individual Case Files, FI-FO
Box 22 1-29	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, FO-GE
Box 23 1-34	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, GE-GR
Box 24 1-30	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, GR-HA
Box 25 1-33	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, HA-HE
Box 26 1-28	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, HE-HO
Box 27 1-31	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, HO-HU
Box 28 1-33	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, HU-JO
Box 29 1-34	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, JO-KE
Box 30 1-31	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, KE-KO
<b>Box 31</b> 1-33	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, KO-LE
Box 32	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form.  Individual Case Files, LE-LO

Box 33 1-35	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, LO-MA
<b>Box 34</b> 1-33	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, MA-MA
Box 35 1-32	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, MA-MO
<b>Box 36</b> 1-35	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, MO-Mc
<b>Box 37</b> 1-36	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, Mc-Mc
Box 38 1-32	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, Mc-NO
<b>Box 39</b> 1-32	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, NO-OS
Box 40 1-38	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, OT-PE
<b>Box 41</b> 1-30	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, PE-PR
<b>Box 42</b> 1-37	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, PR-RE
Box 43 1-35	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, RE-RO
Box 44 1-32	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, RO-SA
Box 45 1-37	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, SA-SC
<b>Box 46</b> 1-34	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, SC-SH
<b>Box 47</b> 1-35	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, SH-SO

<b>Box 48</b> 1-38	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, SO-SU
Box 49 1-32	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, SU-TE
<b>Box 50</b> 1-33	· ·
Box 51 1-34	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, TR-VO
Box 52 1-37	· ·
Box 53 1-34	8
Box 54 1-33	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, WI-YO
<b>Box 55</b> 1-15	Contains sensitive materials – researchers must sign Restricted Use Form. Individual Case Files, YU-ZU