

Airport Litigation

Practice Areas

Airports
Construction
Environmental
Insurance
Litigation
Public Law
Real Estate
Telecommunications
Unmanned Aircraft
Systems/Drones

Attorneys

Melissa Cook Allison
Scott P. Lewis
David S. Mackey

The leaders of Anderson & Kreiger's airport practice are trial lawyers who have tried bench and jury trials and won precedent-setting rulings for airport clients in state and federal courts throughout the country.

We have briefed and often argued appeals for airport clients in the U.S. Courts of Appeals for the First, Third, Sixth, Ninth, Eleventh and D.C. Circuits; and the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court and Appeals Court. We have filed *amicus* briefs for airport clients in the U.S. Supreme Court. We have argued for airport clients in U.S. District Courts in Massachusetts, Ohio, Oklahoma and Pennsylvania.

Below are some examples of our recent litigation experience:

- We represented the City of Los Angeles in a lawsuit pending in state court in California, where the City of Ontario is attempting to regain ownership of Ontario International Airport and is claiming damages of hundreds of millions of dollars.
- We represented both AAAE and ACI, as well as 18 individual airports, in a petition for review of a TSA rule that would have placed the burden of staffing exit lanes on airports. Our work included filing a petition for review in the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, briefing a motion to stay and supporting AAAE and ACI's successful lobbying effort to obtain a legislative solution.
- For the City of Philadelphia, we won the first case establishing the preemptive effect of the "Vision 100 Act" on local laws that might interfere with capacity enhancement projects at congested airports.
- For ACI-NA, we won an important appeal in the D.C. Circuit, with the Court of Appeals ruling that the Airline Deregulation Act does not bar local airport proprietors from implementing congestion pricing.
- We convinced the First Circuit to affirm a judgment dismissing a federal lawsuit that sought to maintain claims under RICO and the Sherman Act against

individual airport commissioners arising from alleged violations of AIP grant assurances.