



**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Issued by the Department of Transportation  
on the 12th day of June, 2026

**Complaint of**

**Bradford Grob**

**v.**

**United Airlines, Inc.**

**Docket DOT-OST-2025-1689**

**Served June 12, 2026**

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

On October 3, 2025, Mr. Bradford Grob filed a formal complaint with the U.S. Department of Transportation (Department or DOT) against United Airlines, Inc. (United) for alleged misconduct during a foreign court proceeding against United. Pursuant to 14 CFR 302.406(a)(2), we dismiss the complaint because the Department lacks statutory enforcement authority in this matter.

**Complaint and Answer**

Mr. Grob states that, on July 27, 2023, he booked a flight on United flight UA85 from Tel Aviv, Israel (TLV) to Chicago, Illinois (ORD), via Newark, New Jersey (EWR) for travel on October 15, 2023. He states that United cancelled this flight, and that he obtained a favorable default judgment for compensation in the State of Israel from the Jerusalem Small Claims Court in January 2025. Mr. Grob states that United attempted to vacate the default judgment by presenting a false affidavit to the Jerusalem Court and that United has engaged in a pattern of wrongdoing by attempting to manipulate or avoid similar default judgments in Israel.

Additionally, on October 14, 2025, Mr. Grob filed an exhibit to the Complaint concerning an unrelated United flight (UA90) from EWR to TLV in September 2024, which was diverted to Canada as a result of a passenger emergency. He asserts that numerous incidents related to this

flight and its diversion reflect a wide range of unfair and deceptive practices, as well as a “disregard for Jewish passengers and Israeli destinations” by United.<sup>1</sup>

In its October 30, 2025 answer,<sup>2</sup> United agrees that it cancelled flight UA85, and that it has fulfilled its obligations to Mr. Grob under U.S. law by issuing a refund. United further argues that the litigation in Israel is still ongoing and urges the Department to observe its jurisdictional limits by declining to interfere in a foreign judicial matter and limiting its adjudication exclusively to applicable U.S. law and DOT regulations.

### **Applicable Law**

Under 49 U.S.C. 41712, air carriers, foreign air carriers, and ticket agents are prohibited from engaging in unfair or deceptive practices in air transportation or the sale of air transportation. Section 41712 authorizes the Department to investigate and decide whether a carrier or ticket agent is engaging in an unfair or deceptive practice in air transportation or the sale of air transportation.

In addition, U.S. and foreign air carriers operating at least one aircraft having a seating capacity of 30 or more seats must acknowledge in writing receipt of each complaint regarding its scheduled service to the complainant within 30 days of receiving it and shall send a substantive written response to each complainant within 60 days of receiving the complaint.<sup>3</sup> A complaint for purpose of this requirement is “a specific written expression of dissatisfaction concerning a difficulty or problem which *the person experienced* when using or attempting to use an airline’s services” (emphasis added).<sup>4</sup>

### **DOT Findings and Conclusion**

After carefully reviewing the information presented in the Complaint, the Answer, and Mr. Grob’s exhibit, we have determined that further action is not warranted. This matter is beyond the statutory enforcement authority of the Department. Alleged misconduct that may have occurred during litigation in a foreign judicial proceeding does not constitute “air transportation or the sale of air transportation.” Furthermore, we do not consider Mr. Grob’s Exhibit concerning UA90 in September 2024 to be a “complaint” within the meaning of section 259.7(c). The record does not indicate that Mr. Grob was a passenger on that flight, nor does it establish that he otherwise experienced problems with respect to it. Finally, it is undisputed that United complied with its obligations under U.S. law by providing Mr. Grob with a refund for the canceled flight.

---

<sup>1</sup> Exhibit, ¶7.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Grob filed an unauthorized reply, which we declined to consider pursuant to 14 CFR 302.6(b).

<sup>3</sup> 14 CFR 259.7(c).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*

ACCORDINGLY, I dismiss the complaint filed in Docket DOT-OST-2025-1689 under the authority in 14 CFR 302.406(a)(2) delegated to me by the Assistant General Counsel of DOT's Office of Aviation Consumer Protection. Pursuant to 14 CFR 302.406(b), the order becomes effective as the Department's final action 30 days after service.

**BY:**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kyle Joseph". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**KYLE-ETIENNE JOSEPH**

**Senior Attorney**

**for the Office of Aviation Consumer Protection**

*An electronic version of this document is available at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov).*