

**ACTIONS AND JUDGMENTS**

*14 C.F.R. Section 204.3 (l) & (m) – List of all outstanding actions for more than \$5,000 against any relevant corporation or key personnel. and number of actions for less than \$5,000 against any relevant corporation or key personnel*

There are no actions or judgments in any amount above or below \$5,000 against Republic Airline Inc. or RAH, nor are there any such actions or judgments against any of the identified personnel of Republic Airline Inc. or RAH. However, there are pending cases against Chautauqua that have arisen in the course of its commercial airline operations which are typical of the litigation commenced against air carriers, which have no bearing on the fitness of either Chautauqua or Republic.

A description of each action is set forth below:

**Chautauqua Airlines Pending Litigation**

Hollis v. CA : Civil No. 1:02-CV-263 (Filed August 14, 2002). Hollis worked as part of a janitorial staff cleaning airplanes in Fort Wayne. She claims sexual harassment, retaliation, constructive discharge, and breach of settlement agreement. Ms. Hollis recently hired an attorney after initiating the complaint *pro se*. On December 9, the Court granted a Motion to Dismiss as to Bryan Bedford, and Chautauqua is now the lone defendant. The case is in discovery. Ms. Hollis's current settlement demand is \$50,000. CA has rejected this demand, believes her case lacks merit, and is planning to vigorously defend the case.

Willis-McFarlin v. CA: IP 02-0707-CM/S (Filed: May 6, 2002). Ms. Willis-McFarlin claims sex and race discrimination arising from her failure to pass her recurrent examination required of all flight attendants. Ms. Willis-McFarlin also pursued a grievance against CA, and this was arbitrated in November. No ruling has yet been issued. CA believes her claim is without merit, and will vigorously defend this claim.

Snover v. CA: IP 02-1168 CM/F (Filed July 29, 2002). A former pilot has sued CA and his Union for his termination from employment, and his loss in arbitration. He was terminated for an inappropriate take off. CA and the Union have filed a motion to dismiss and this is pending. CA believes Snover's claim is without merit, and will vigorously defend this claim, as does will Union.

Franklin v. CA: IP 02-1047-CT/K (Filed: July 3, 2002). Ms. Franklin is a management employee who had worked for less than a year, she was laid off for poor performance. Shortly after filing this lawsuit, Ms. Franklin's attorney withdrew from representing her. She is claiming age and sex discrimination, and is proceeding *pro se*. CA believes her claim is without merit, and it intends to defend this case vigorously. The case is in the early stages of discovery in federal court in Indianapolis. Ms. Franklin has been unable to find an attorney to represent her to date.