

Teen With Autism, Family Booted From United Airlines Flight

By [Kelly House, The Oregonian/TNS](#)

May 11, 2015



A United Airlines flight bound for Portland, Ore. made an emergency landing in Salt Lake City amid crew concerns about the behavior of a passenger with autism. (Thinkstock)

A mom plans to sue after her family, including a daughter with autism, was kicked off a United Airlines flight to Portland, Ore. for being “disruptive.”

Donna Beegle, a public speaker who focuses on poverty, told [KATU](#) news her family was traveling home from Disney World last Tuesday when they were escorted off the plane after she challenged a flight attendant’s refusal to let her buy a hot meal for her daughter.

She said her 15-year-old daughter, Juliette, is high functioning but doesn’t speak. Beegle knew Juliette was getting hungry, but Juliette wouldn’t eat the snacks the family had on hand. Juliette is a picky eater, Beegle said, a common trait of children who have autism.

Beegle thought hot food might appeal to her daughter. She asked a flight attendant if she could buy a hot meal from first class, but the flight attendant denied the request after a 25-minute debate with Beegle.

At that point, Beegle told KATU, she told the attendant, ““You know what? Maybe after she has a meltdown and she’s crying and trying to scratch, then you’ll help us,” Beegle said.

Juliette eventually got the hot meal and began to calm down, Beegle said. About 30 minutes later, the flight crew announced plans to make an emergency landing in Salt Lake City. Once the plane touched down, police came to escort the Beegle family off.

A spokeswoman for United released a statement claiming the flight crew worked to accommodate the family, but ultimately “made the best decision for the safety and comfort of all of our customers and elected to divert to Salt Lake City after the situation became disruptive.”

United spokeswoman Karen May said she could provide no further details about the incident.

Witnesses to the in-flight incident differed in their views on whether the crew was justified in calling the police. In interviews with KOIN 6 news, [one witness](#) said the crew overreacted, while another said Juliette’s “howling” made other passengers feel unsafe.

United Airlines touts its efforts to accommodate people with autism by offering simulated flights to prepare them for their time flying. Beegle doesn’t believe that’s enough.

“They need training,” she told KGW.

© 2015 *The Oregonian*
Distributed by Tribune Content



She wasn’t put off plane because of autism’

The incident happened aboard United Flight 1535 from Houston to Portland

By Jennifer Dowling and KOIN 6 News Staff Published: May 9, 2015, 5:17 pm

Updated: May 10, 2015, 6:21 am

‘Fear of autism’ forces Tigard family off plane’

PORTLAND, Ore. (KOIN) — Other passengers on United Flight 1535 from Houston to Portland had differing views on the removal of a Tigard family during an emergency landing ostensibly because their teenage daughter with autism was disruptive.

[Donna Beegle told KOIN 6 News on Friday](#) about the incident that happened May 5. The Beegles were flying back from DisneyWorld, and took a flight from Orlando to Houston with a connecting flight from Houston to Portland.



Donna Beegle, May 8, 2015 (KOIN)

Beegle noticed a telltale sign from her daughter. She needed a hot meal, and Beegle offered to buy one from First Class.

She told KOIN 6 News she explained that if her daughter didn't get a hot meal, she would "get to the meltdown point" and maybe scratch someone. Juliette soon got a first-class meal.

The plane made an emergency landing in Salt Lake City, and police forced the Beegles — Donna, her husband, Juliette and their son — off. United made a connection for them and they flew to Portland on a Delta flight.



KOIN 6 Chris Hall was a passenger on United

Flight 1535 that made an emergency landing and removed a Tigard family. He took cell phone video of the incident, May 9, 2015 (KOIN)

Before leaving the plane, Beegle said she made police take statements from the other passengers. She said one officer told her, "You have a lot of people on your side saying this was not an issue."

One passenger, Chris Hall, provided KOIN 6 News with video he shot inside the plane as the Beegles were removed. The video seems to support their claim Juliette was not disruptive. Hall can be heard saying, "This is ridiculous," and agreeing with someone who said a lawsuit was likely to follow.

"The child would make noise every now and then, no louder than, say, a baby crying," Hall told KOIN 6 News. "I don't think they should have landed a plane for her being fussy."

But another passenger had a different view, and told KOIN 6 News the flight crew was right to land in Salt Lake City and make the Beegle family get off.



Marilyn Hedlund was aboard United Flight 1535 from Houston to Portland when a family was removed because their daughter was disruptive. Hedlund said she agrees with the decision the airline made, May 9, 2015 (KOIN)

Marilyn Hedlund said Juliette had been “howling” before the incident and the flight attendants had been working quietly with the family for nearly an hour before the pilot made the decision to make an emergency landing.

“There was a lot of howling, and we thought well, what’s going on? And it never stopped,” Hedlund said.

“She wasn’t put off the plane because she had autism, she was put off the plane because she was maybe proposing some kind of a threat, to (about) 170 other people at 36,000 feet, which doesn’t make anyone feel safe,” Hedlund said. “What if she got crazy and got up and opened an exit door at 36,000 feet?”

In a statement to KOIN 6 News, United Airlines spokeswoman Jennifer Dohm said, “After working to accommodate Dr. Beegle and her daughter during the flight, the crew made the best decision for the safety and comfort of all of our customers and elected to divert to Salt Lake City after the situation became disruptive. We rebooked the customers on a different carrier and the flight continued to Portland.”

The Beegles boarded a Delta flight from Salt Lake City to Portland.

“We have to define disruption,” Beegle told KOIN 6 News on Saturday. “Is her getting agitated and making sounds a threat?”

She added her daughter could not have opened an exit door. “She would have had to go through her Dad. He had the middle seat. She’s a 15-year-old girl.”

“I think the airline did everything they possibly could,” Hedlund said.

Hall disagrees. “The whole thing is ridiculous. They shouldn’t have done that.”

Donna Beegle has contacted an attorney and will likely file a lawsuit. She said it’s not about the money, it’s about providing training for people and dispelling fear about autism

Teen with autism, family kicked off Portland-bound plane



[Play Video](#) Dr. Donna

Beegle described the incident as traumatic. "I'm still shaken by this. (It was) so upsetting," she said.

A Tigard mom claims employees of a major airline kicked her family off a Portland-bound flight because of her daughter with autism. The incident happened Tuesday after the pilot made an emergency landing in Salt Lake City.

Dr. Donna Beegle and her family, including her 15-year-old daughter with autism, Juliette, were coming back from Disney World and on a connected flight from Houston to PDX at the time of the emergency landing. Beegle, a public speaker, says Juliette has flown most of her life as she often brings her along on her speaking engagements. Until Tuesday, she says, there had never been any issues.

Before boarding, Beegle says Juliette had refused the food they bought. In an attempt to prevent a meltdown, Beegle asked a flight attendant if they had any hot food. She also would not eat the snacks they brought on board. Juliette, like many people with autism, is clinically picky about the food she eats. Juliette is high-functioning but has extreme difficulty verbally communicating.

After a 25-minute back-and-forth with a first class flight attendant, Beegle says she was

told the crew could not accommodate her daughter because the family was sitting in economy.

And that was when I just kind of said, 'You know what? Maybe after she has a meltdown and she's crying and trying to scratch, then you'll help us,'" Beegle said.

The flight attendant eventually complied and then about 30 minutes later, a member of the flight crew announced the plane would be making an emergency landing because of a passenger behavior issue.

"Then the police said, 'Well, you know, we're going to have to ask you to leave the plane.' And I said, 'I don't understand why? There's no issue. What is the problem?' And he said, 'Well, the captain doesn't feel comfortable flying to Portland with your daughter on the plane,'" Beegle continued.

In a statement to KATU News, a United Airlines spokesperson wrote, "After working to accommodate Dr. Beegle and her daughter during the flight, the crew made the best decision for the safety and comfort of all of our customers and elected to divert to Salt Lake City after the situation became disruptive. We rebooked the customers on a different carrier and the flight continued to Portland."

Beegle is in the process of filing a lawsuit. She says the purpose of the legal action is to encourage the carrier to better train their employees in understanding the needs of autistic children.

Notably, United Airlines has partnerships with a handful of organizations aimed at helping children with autism.

Beegle has filed claims with both United Airlines and the Federal Aviation Administration. An area FAA spokesperson, in an email, said he was checking into the incident.



Reduced Mobility Rights

Advocating access to aviation since 2011

Mom starts petition to make flying safer for people with Autism

• Tuesday, 12 May 2015 15:06

• Written by [Roberto Castiglioni](#)



Beth Joy's petition to amend the ACAA and make flying safer for people with Autism is boosted by the removal of a 15-year-old from a United flight.

Dr. Donna Beegle was flying back to Portland after a family vacation to Disney World. During the flight, her daughter Juliette became agitated because she was hungry.

Juliette eventually calmed down after cabin crew gave her a warm meal, but things were about to turn a totally unexpected twist.

"The next thing we hear is we're doing an emergency landing in Salt Lake City," Beegle told NBC station KGW of Portland, Oregon. "We have a passenger on board with a behavior issue."

Juliette and her family were escorted off the plane by police officers. This event reaffirmed the need for airports and airlines to study ways to best assist people with Autism and their families.

"Airlines are not required to honor special seating requests for autistic passengers", Beth Joy says in her petition. "I think this is wrong. Many autistic passengers require special seating while flying that should be respected."

Last April, during a family trip to Hawaii, Beth and her daughter Vivie had a mixed experience. "Flying, for someone with sensory and auditory processing disorders, can be quite difficult. Her neurologist recommended she sit in the bulkhead and by the window. The seat placement would help ease her symptoms and allow for easier care during the flight. We got a doctor's note requesting the appropriate seating arrangements and called 6 months ahead of time to make sure she would have the accommodations she needed to have a stress free flight."



Despite pre-travel preparations, the airline honored their seating request on the way to Hawaii, but denied it on the way home. According to Beth, the problem is that the Air Carrier Access Act doesn't specifically require airlines to provide special accommodations for people with autism.

“Join me and ask the DOT to do the right thing and help make air travel as comfortable as possible for those on the autism spectrum. Tell them to amend the ACAA,” Beth said.

The petition raised over 6,000 supporters to date. Readers wishing to sign Beth Joy’s petition should visit her page titled “[Make Air Travel Safer For People With Autism And Service Dogs](#)” on Change.org.



In the meantime, airports across the world are stepping up to the challenge. Last March, Los Angeles airport introduces the world’s first self-identification program to ensure people with Autism may enjoy seamless airport journeys.

“By self-identifying, potential incidents with police, airport, and airline personnel can be defused,” Lawrence Rolon, LAWA’s coordinator for disability services, said. “Stickers identify the person

with autism, so that if a behavioural incident occurs, the responding personnel will immediately recognize the behaviour is likely a result of autism.”

In 2014, Ireland’s main airport Dublin set the European benchmark for passengers with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD), helping them make the flying experience a seamless one. Working in cooperation with Irish Autism Action, Dublin Airport created a dedicated page on its website to help parents and carers carefully prepare their journey ahead of getting to the airport.

CBS NEWS May 14, 2015, 7:01 AM

How easily can pigs fly for free?

Some airline passengers take advantage of a law meant to protect the disabled, reports CBS News travel editor Peter Greenberg.

The Air Carrier Access Act states "no carrier can discriminate" against individuals demonstrating "a physical or mental impairment" to board with animals.

CBS News staffer Swainson Gill and his family pet dog, Pharaoh, were volunteers to demonstrate how easily pets can travel for free under those rules.

Pharaoh ported the required vest, but he is not an emotional support animal on official business.

"I have not met a flight attendant who has not had some experience with a pet in the cabin," Association of Professional Flight Attendants national president Laura Glading said. "I don't really want to brush with a broad brush everyone who has an emotional support animal. They can be very, very helpful. I have a dog myself."

Emotional support animals are often mistaken for, but are not service animals, which are trained in specific tasks to assist people with disabilities.

"In a very real sense my safety, my life is in the paws of my dog," The Seeing Eye president and CEO Jim Kutsch said. "The best service animal is the one that isn't noticed. The dog that is very quietly behind the scenes doing its job to mitigate the disability of the human half of the partnership."

Anyone claiming an emotional need, with access to the internet, and a one-time fee of about \$150 can apply for certification. That's about the same most passengers pay to travel -- each way -- with pets not considered an emotional support.

"I think a lot has to do with not having to pay, a way to bring your pet along and it's really gotten out of hand," Glading said.

Swainson logged on to one of the many sites offering counseling services. His reported disability: "a fear of flying," one of the many reasons given, and difficult to challenge.

The questionnaire was complete in less than five minutes. Two weeks later a letter confirming his dog as an emotional support animal arrived along with the official-looking vest.

Within days Swainson and Pharaoh were on their way from New York to Washington, D.C. to take in the sites.

"It's amazing how easy it was," Swainson said.

"It's not really whether they're a service animal, whether they're an emotional support animal or whether they're a pet, it's when the dog themselves are stressed and out of their comfort zone, that are misbehaving -- that's where the problems come up," Kutsch said.

While Pharaoh's behavior would earn him his wings, not every pet or passenger is as comfortable at 30,000 feet.

"We had 50 documented reports where there was a return to the gate, or somebody was bitten or there was non-compliance," Glading said.

Currently there are no rules at the Department of Transportation as to what constitutes an emotional support animal. There's not even a rule as to how many animals can fly on any one flight.

CBS News found a pig at Ross Mill Farm in Pennsylvania and paid a fee to take the 4-month-old pot belly named Valley on an adventure with Swainson. He followed up with a counseling center in Colorado to obtain a letter prescribing the pig as the "primary treatment" for his "psychological disability" at no extra charge.

"Pigs are becoming a very popular pet again and people find they get tremendous emotional support from their pig," Glading said.

Valley the pig was treated like a celebrity at the Charlotte terminal.

Aside from acting a little like a pig during meal service, he flew without incident. Not only was it easy to get Valley on a flight, his new found popularity made it difficult to leave.

Valley proved to be a clean and respectable passenger, and while some animals are so disruptive they're removed before takeoff, anything goes once you're up in the air. And that's what really concerns those working in the cabin.

© 2015 CBS Interactive Inc. All Rights Reserved.



Service animals or just companions?

Every so often, it comes up as a contentious and emotion-laden topic: owners who falsely claim “service dog” status to get privileges, usually in the form of access to places from which their pets otherwise would be banned, such as stores, libraries, restaurants, museums and public transportation.

Confusion abounds, even regarding definitions. Yet few issues evoke greater animus from the general public and ordinary pet owners than this form of cheating.

The Americans with Disabilities Act officially recognizes “service animals” and confers many benefits under the law. They can accompany their humans virtually anywhere, must be allowed in housing where otherwise excluded, and can even be claimed as a tax-deductible medical expense. Service animals must have special training to provide specific kinds of assistance to people with disabilities, and be certified by an accredited agency.

In addition, “emotional support animals” have special rights under various legal auspices. Under the Fair Housing Act, they may live in housing that excludes pets, and the Air Carrier Access Act permits them to fly with their humans at no extra cost. These animals are not required to possess special training or skills; rather, it is the human who must obtain a letter from a health professional explaining that the emotional support animal is part of his treatment.

Seldom does anyone cry “unfair” about a seeing-eye dog seated by his blind person in a restaurant. Is this because the blind person’s disability is both apparent and untainted by moral stigma (unlike mental or emotional illness)? Or because the dog is, if not actively guiding, then behaving like a “device” rather than a dog, inertly awaiting the next command? An emotional support animal, merely by being identified as such, invokes a skepticism about the claim that includes inchoate judgments about the legitimacy of mental and emotional illness. Is it simply a claim of convenience, an excuse to cheat other pet owners when traveling or renting an apartment? Everyone who loves a dog or cat readily admits that their emotional support can sometimes be life-saving. If you don’t medicalize your depression by going to a doctor for a

prescription for animal companionship, shouldn't you still be able to take your pet with you when her presence would be a solace and comfort?

To pet owners who have not gotten their animals certified as "emotional supports," it looks like cheating when another pet, with no special training, can ride on the bus or go into a restaurant just because his owner bought a little green vest online. To yet others, the offense is that when "illegitimate" support animals misbehave, they put the tolerance given to "real" support animals at risk of revocation.

Today, there is clear consensus that pets provide indisputable health (and mental health) benefits. No one denies that dogs and other animals can be trained to assist people with all kinds of disabilities; yet most of the firsthand reports about the value of their physical services emphasize that their emotional support is even more important. I venture to guess that most of us would acknowledge that the comforting presence of a beloved pet has been crucial to getting us through some hard times in our lives. Yet, in spite of all this common knowledge, we exclude dogs and other animals from virtually all public venues and activities. Tolerance is the best we now offer in the narrow cases where the need, or the performed service, can be objectively identified and defended.

I loved the world of James Herriot, the early 20th century Yorkshire vet, in which animals were everywhere, accepted as fellow beings and given scope for both their individual and their species' traits. While there's no going back, I do see a few hopeful signs that we may yet work through our current incoherent and schizophrenic attitudes to better integrated ones, at least toward the animals that most intimately share our lives. The University of Denver, for example, offers degrees through its Institute for Human-Animal Connection. Maybe a serious academic study will help us educate ourselves and our animal companions for a world in which our relationships will be neither strictly utilitarian nor merely indulgent, but will embody a new kind of solidarity. We need it.

Laurie Raymond owns High Tails Dog & Cat Outfitters in Glenwood Springs. Sextiped Valley appears on the third Saturday of the month.

<http://www.postindependent.com/news/16353134-113/service-animals-or-just-companions>



ADA regulations pertaining to service dogs

May 14, 2015 8:07 pm

Service animals are defined as dogs that are individually trained to do work or perform tasks for people with disabilities. Examples of such work or tasks include guiding people who are blind, alerting people who are deaf, pulling a wheelchair, alerting and protecting a person who is having a seizure, reminding a person with mental illness to take prescribed medications, calming a person with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) during an anxiety attack, or performing other duties. Service animals are working animals, not pets. The work or task a dog has been trained to provide must be directly related to the person's disability. Dogs whose sole function is to provide comfort or emotional support do not qualify as service animals under the ADA.

This definition does not affect or limit the broader definition of "assistance animal" under the Fair Housing Act or the broader definition of "service animal" under the Air Carrier Access Act.

Some State and local laws also define service animal more broadly than the ADA does. Information about such laws can be obtained from the State attorney general's office.

Under the ADA, State and local governments, businesses, and nonprofit organizations that serve the public generally must allow service animals to accompany people with disabilities in all areas of the facility where the public is normally allowed to go. For example, in a hospital it would be inappropriate to exclude a service animal from areas such as patient rooms, clinics, cafeterias, or examination rooms. However, it may be appropriate to exclude a service animal from operating rooms or burn units where the animal's presence may compromise a sterile environment.

Under the ADA, service animals must be harnessed, leashed, or tethered, unless these devices interfere with the service animal's work or the individual's disability prevents using these devices. In that case, the individual must maintain control of the animal through voice, signal, or other effective controls.

- When it is not obvious what service an animal provides, only limited inquiries are allowed. Staff may ask two questions: (1) is the dog a service animal required because of a disability, and (2) what work or task has the dog been trained to perform. Staff cannot ask about the person's disability, require medical documentation, require a special identification card or training documentation for the dog, or ask that the dog demonstrate its ability to perform the work or task.
- Allergies and fear of dogs are not valid reasons for denying access or refusing service to people using service animals. When a person who is allergic to dog dander and a person who uses a service animal must spend time in the same room or facility, for example, in a school classroom or at a homeless shelter, they both should be accommodated by assigning them, if possible, to different locations within the room or different rooms in the facility.
- A person with a disability cannot be asked to remove his service animal from the premises unless: (1) the dog is out of control and the handler does not take effective action to control it or (2) the dog is not housebroken. When there is a legitimate reason to ask that a service animal be removed, staff must offer the person with the disability the opportunity to obtain goods or services without the animal's presence.
- Establishments that sell or prepare food must allow service animals in public areas even if state or local health codes prohibit animals on the premises.

- People with disabilities who use service animals cannot be isolated from other patrons, treated less favorably than other patrons, or charged fees that are not charged to other patrons without animals. In addition, if a business requires a deposit or fee to be paid by patrons with pets, it must waive the charge for service animals.

- If a business such as a hotel normally charges guests for damage that they cause, a customer with a disability may also be charged for damage caused by himself or his service animal.

Staff are not required to provide care or food for a service animal.

http://helenair.com/ada-regulations-pertaining-to-service-dogs/article_ae3f6d12-43fe-5e9c-ae37-c28cdb076eb5.html



As Uber battles 13 lawsuits, cabbies & state agencies are out for blood (update)



Image Credit: Uber, Harrison Weber/VentureBeat

May 8, 2014 8:54 AM

Harrison Weber

Updated May 8 10:20 a.m. Pacific to reflect the total number of state insurance agency warnings.

If cab companies and state officials get their way, they'll regulate ride-sharing service Uber to death.

Ambitious transportation startup Uber now faces at least 13 active lawsuits in the U.S. and is under fire from 11 state insurance agencies over its insurance practices.

You'd think the firm would be busily working the phones for damage control, but it's not — Uber's spokesperson and head of corporate communications, Andrew Noyes, has left the company. The former Facebook public policy manager originally joined Uber less than 12 months ago.

Since Noyes' unexplained departure, Uber has nearly gone dark; only the unresponsive company's expansion plans are clear. Not long after it announced its 100-city milestone, VentureBeat discovered a series of job listings revealing Uber's next batch of cities. Future offerings, including the Family service, reflect Uber's continued plans to disrupt the traditional ground transportation industry.

And disrupted they are.

Uber v. taxi lobby

State insurance agency officials from 11 states — including California, Ohio, Nebraska, Connecticut, and Minnesota — are lining up to condemn Uber for its insurance “coverage gaps.” While the states in question have issued statements of their own, one organization is drastically amplifying the message: the Taxicab, Limousine & Paratransit Association, a nonprofit that claims to include “1,100 regulated transportation companies.” (Note the use of the term “regulated.”)

For colorful commentary, we called Dave Sutton, the spokesperson for the Taxicab, Limousine & Paratransit Association's “Who's Driving You?” initiative. According to Sutton (emphasis: VentureBeat):

We've been warning about the risks, and now you have insurance experts in all these different states warning people. Insurance is very simple. Private drivers will not be covered by their insurance. ...The ridesharing companies have said, “Well, our policies are supplementary,” but **insurance experts are saying that this is not acceptable**. The only way to provide coverage for driving commercially is commercial coverage.

Our members have a financial interest in this — yes, they do. But **what we are talking about is public safety**.

In the limited cases where Uber responded to our numerous requests for comment, the company called the Taxicab, Limousine & Paratransit Association's campaign “a scare tactic.” (emphasis: VentureBeat)

The 'Who's Driving You?' campaign is **nothing more than the taxi lobby trying to protect an antiquated industry** from competition and consumer choice.

Central to this controversy is Uber's insurance policy, which leaked in March. Uber is under fire from both private- and public-sector institutions due to claimed gaps in insurance coverage. Uber's response to these claims has remained consistent since its 2012 San Francisco lawsuit:

Uber complies with all laws and regulations applicable to its business. Any claim to the contrary is baseless and motivated by those who seek to deprive the public of this safe and convenient transportation option. Uber would rather compete for business on the streets of San Francisco than in the courtroom, but Uber will defend these claims in court and is confident of the outcome.

That 2012 lawsuit was eventually dropped. But for Uber, it was only the tip of the start.

The lawsuits: Regulation, insurance, and death

While Uber battles two insurance-related lawsuits, the company is also under attack from drivers for allegedly withholding tips and for allegedly sidestepping industry regulations. On the most extreme end of the spectrum, Uber is wrestling a wrongful death lawsuit after a purported Uber driver struck and killed a 6-year-old girl this past New Year's Eve in San Francisco.

According to Uber communications team member Lane Kasselmann, these lawsuits are largely frivolous:

Despite often frivolous lawsuits filed by anti-competition taxi interests, the critical fact is that in no us [sic] city has a court decided that Uber can't operate.

Yet Uber drivers are reportedly facing fines from legal authorities in New York and Tampa Bay, Fla. Given the century-old, highly regulated industry in which Uber operates, these roadblocks are unsurprising. However, the company's aggressive growth has shifted the narrative.

Uber's 13 active U.S. lawsuits are listed below, obtained from U.S. court database Pacer.gov. The below lawsuits come from passengers, traditional taxi and limousine companies, and Uber drivers themselves:

1. Wrongful death suit: Ang Jiang Liu et al v. Uber — San Francisco
2. Regulatory complaints: Western Washington Taxicab Operators v. Uber — Seattle
3. Regulatory complaints: Greater Houston Transportation Company v. Uber — Houston
4. Regulatory complaints: Shahriar Noorparvar v. Uber — California Central District

5. Regulatory complaints: Mazaheri v. Doe et al — Oklahoma City
6. Regulatory complaints: Illinois Transportation Industry v. City of Chicago — Chicago
7. Withholding tips: Ehret v. Uber — San Francisco
8. Withholding tips: O'Connor v. Uber — San Francisco
9. Regulatory complaints: Boston Cab Dispatch v. Uber — Boston
10. Regulatory complaints (demand of \$10M): Manzo v. Uber — Chicago
11. Insurance: Landmark Insurance Company v. Uber and Yellow Group — Illinois
12. Insurance (related to #11): Landmark Insurance Company v. Uber and Yellow Group — Illinois
13. Regulatory complaints: Yellow Group v. Uber — Illinois

What we have now is a pile-on. At best it will disincentivise Uber to innovate and bog it down for years in legal limbo. At worst, it will kill off Uber and suffocate its competitors along with it, including Lyft and Sidecar.

According to Silicon Valley legend Marc Andreessen, Uber's software "eats taxis." But for Uber chief Travis Kalanick, these conflicts are just par for the course.

This is what happens when you destroy an antiquated system. Unless that system destroys you first.