

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

Riki O’Hailpin; Nina Arizumi; Robert Espinosa; Erwin Young;
Puanani Badiang; Sabrina Franks; Ronald Lum; Dan Saiki; Brandee
Aukai v. Hawaiian Airlines, Inc.; Hawaiian Holdings, Inc.

O’Hailpin · No. Civ. No. 22-00532 HG-WRP · Decided December 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Hawaii denied Plaintiffs’ motions for leave to file supplemental responses to Defendants’ motions to dismiss for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction under the Railway Labor Act. The court held that Plaintiffs had not shown good cause because the proposed deposition evidence and publicly available travel-restriction materials were not new or previously unavailable and were not material to the jurisdictional analysis. The court also denied Defendants’ motions to strike Plaintiffs’ unauthorized replies, while instructing that reply briefing is permitted only when specifically ordered.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Hawaii
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Hawaii
DECIDED	December 4, 2025
DOCKET	Civ. No. 22-00532 HG-WRP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved for leave to file supplemental responses to defendants’ pending motions to dismiss for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction under the Railway Labor Act. Defendants moved to strike plaintiffs’ unauthorized reply briefs. The district court denied both sets of motions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Good cause is required to modify a court-ordered briefing schedule under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1) and 16(b)(4), with the inquiry focused primarily on the diligence of the party seeking modification.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Riki O’Hailpin, Nina Arizumi, Robert Espinosa, Erwin Young, Puanani Badiang, Sabrina Franks, Ronald Lum, Dan Saiki, Brandee

TOPICS

[motions to dismiss](#) [subject matter jurisdiction](#) [civil procedure](#) [title vii](#) [religious discrimination](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[civil procedure](#) [employment law](#) [civil rights](#) [labor law](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiffs established good cause to modify the court’s briefing schedule and file supplemental responses to defendants’ Railway Labor Act-based motions to dismiss.
2. Whether the deposition testimony and publicly available foreign travel-restriction materials plaintiffs sought to submit were new, previously unavailable, diligent, and material to the pending jurisdictional motions.
3. Whether defendants’ motions to strike plaintiffs’ unauthorized reply briefs should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiffs failed to establish good cause to modify the court’s briefing schedule because they did not demonstrate diligence, newly unavailable information, or a material basis for supplemental briefing.
2. The proposed supplemental evidence and arguments would not materially assist the court in deciding whether interpretation of the applicable collective bargaining agreements was required to adjudicate plaintiffs’ accommodation claims and defendants’ undue-hardship defenses.
3. The court declined to strike plaintiffs’ unauthorized reply briefs, but directed the parties that reply briefing is permitted only when specifically ordered by the court.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Good cause primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking amendment.” (6)

“The analysis hinges on whether the trier of fact would arguably need to resolve disagreements about the terms of the collective bargaining agreement to evaluate a plaintiff’s failure-to-accommodate claim or a defendant’s undue hardship defense.” (14)

“The task of the Court is merely to determine if interpretation of the applicable Collective Bargaining Agreement is required to adjudicate a plaintiff’s claim or whether a provision in a CBA arguably disposes of a plaintiff’s claim.” (17)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hawaiian Airlines and Hawaiian Holdings announced a mandatory COVID-19 vaccination policy for U.S.-based employees in August 2021. Four plaintiffs—two pilots and two flight attendants—requested religious exemptions, which the defendants denied, and asserted Title VII failure-to-accommodate claims. Defendants

argued that the claims and related undue-hardship defenses required interpretation of the plaintiffs' collective bargaining agreements and therefore fell within the Railway Labor Act's jurisdictional limitations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendants filed two motions to dismiss asserting that the Railway Labor Act deprived the court of subject-matter jurisdiction because adjudication of plaintiffs' Title VII religious-accommodation claims would require interpretation of applicable collective bargaining agreements. After briefing closed, plaintiffs sought leave to submit supplemental responses based on depositions taken in a related case and publicly available foreign travel-restriction materials. Plaintiffs also filed replies without leave, prompting defendants' motions to strike. The court denied leave to supplement because plaintiffs failed to show good cause, diligence, newly unavailable information, or materiality, and denied the motions to strike while directing that future replies be filed only when specifically authorized.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Nelson, et al. v. Hawaiian Airlines, Inc., et al., Civ. No. 23-00603 HG-WRP
- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 608-609 (9th Cir. 1992)
- GP Asset Holdings, LLC v. Rosslaw, PLLC, 2024 WL 5479142, *1 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2024)
- Zivkovic v. Southern California Edison Co., 302 F.3d 1080, 1087 (9th Cir. 2002)
- In re Western States Wholesale Natural Gas Antitrust Litigation, 715 F.3d 716, 737 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc., 624 F.3d 1253, 1259-1261 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Ironwood Homes, Inc. v. Bowen, 719 F. Supp. 2d 1277, 1286 (D. Or. 2010)
- Kirola v. City & County of San Francisco, 2014 WL 2737686, *2 (N.D. Cal. June 11, 2014)
- Eckert Cold Storage, Inc. v. Behl, 943 F. Supp. 1230, 1233 (E.D. Cal. 1996)
- ACLU of Southern California v. U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement, 347 F.R.D. 518, 527 (C.D. Cal. 2024)
- Albanes v. ITT Aerospace Controls, LLC, 2019 WL 13256798, *3 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2019)
- Maluf v. Bergelectric Corp., 2025 WL 2312043, *1 n.1 (D. Nev. July 29, 2025)
- Kona Enterprises, Inc. v. Estate of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Odell v. Kalitta Air, LLC, 107 F.4th 523, 532 (6th Cir. 2024)
- Alaska Airlines, Inc. v. Schurke, 898 F.3d 904, 919, 924 (9th Cir. 2018) (en banc)
- Petersen v. Snohomish Regional Fire & Rescue, 150 F.4th 1211, 1220 (9th Cir. 2025)