

TRIBAL SUPREME COURT PROJECT

MEMORANDUM

MARCH 25, 2011

UPDATE OF RECENT CASES

The Tribal Supreme Court Project is part of the Tribal Sovereignty Protection Initiative and is staffed by the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) and the Native American Rights Fund (NARF). The Project was formed in 2001 in response to a series of U.S. Supreme Court cases that negatively affected tribal sovereignty. The purpose of the Project is to promote greater coordination and to improve strategy on litigation that may affect the rights of all Indian tribes. We encourage Indian tribes and their attorneys to contact the Project in our effort to coordinate resources, develop strategy and prepare briefs, especially at the time of the petition for a writ of certiorari, prior to the Supreme Court accepting a case for review. You can find copies of briefs and opinions on the major cases we track on the NARF website (www.narf.org/sct/index.html).

At present, two important Indian trust cases are pending on the merits before the Court. First, the Tribal Supreme Court Project is finalizing the preparation of amicus briefs in support of the Tribe in *United States v. Jicarilla Apache Nation* which will be argued before the Court on April 20, 2011. In this case, the United States is challenging the Federal Circuit's ruling that the federal government "cannot deny an Indian tribe's request to discover communications between the United States and its attorneys based on the attorney-client privilege when those communications concern the management of an Indian trust." Second, the Project continues to wait for the Court to issue its decision in *United States v. Tohono O'odham Nation* which was argued on November 1, 2010. The delay in issuing an opinion may indicate a lack of consensus on the Court regarding the broad rule requested by the United States which would preclude any Indian tribe from bringing money damages claims in the Court of Federal Claims if they have filed a "related" tribal trust mismanagement case in another court even though it seeks different (*e.g.* equitable and injunctive) relief.

As reported last month, the Court has called for the views of the Solicitor General in three other Indian law cases: *Osage Nation v. Irby* (reservation disestablishment); *Brown (formerly Schwarzenegger) v. Rincon Band* (IGRA "revenue" sharing); and *Miccosukee Tribe v. Kraus-Anderson* (enforcement of tribal court judgments). More than likely, the Solicitor General will not file his briefs until after the Court's April 2011 oral argument session, but the petitions will likely be considered in conference before the Court adjourns for its summer recess at the end of June 2011.

You can find copies of briefs and opinions on the major cases we track on the Project's website (www.narf.org/sct/index.html).

CASES RECENTLY DECIDED BY THE SUPREME COURT

MADISON COUNTY V. ONEIDA NATION OF NEW YORK (NO. 10-72) – On January 10, 2011, the Court issued an order vacating and remanding the case to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. In a per curiam opinion, the Court stated:

We granted certiorari on the questions “whether tribal sovereign immunity from suit, to the extent it should continue to be recognized, bars taxing authorities from foreclosing to collect lawfully imposed property taxes” and “whether the ancient Oneida reservation in New York was disestablished or diminished.” Counsel for respondent Oneida Indian Nation advised the Court through a letter on November 30, 2010, that the Nation had, on November 29, 2010, passed a tribal declaration and ordinance waiving “its sovereign immunity to enforcement of real property taxation through foreclosure by state, county and local governments within and throughout the United States.” Petitioners Madison and Oneida Counties responded in a December 1, 2010 letter, questioning the validity, scope, and permanence of that waiver; the Nation addressed those concerns in a December 2, 2010 letter.

We vacate the judgment and remand the case to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. That court should address, in the first instance, whether to revisit its ruling on sovereign immunity in light of this new factual development, and—if necessary—proceed to address other questions in the case consistent with its sovereign immunity ruling. [Citations omitted].

This ruling is a victory for the Oneida Indian Nation and for all of Indian country. In *Madison County*, the Second Circuit had held that the Oneida Indian Nation is immune from suit, but in a terse concurring opinion written by Judge Cabranes, two of the three judges on the panel made clear that although they were bound by Supreme Court precedent upholding tribal sovereign immunity, the decision “defies common sense” and “is so anomalous that it calls out for the Supreme Court to revisit *Kiowa* and *Potawatomi*.” For the present, the Court will not be revisiting its well-settled precedent.

PETITIONS FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI GRANTED

Currently, a writ of certiorari has been granted in two Indian law cases:

UNITED STATES V. JICARILLA APACHE NATION (NO. 10-382) – On January 7, 2011, the Court granted review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit which held that the federal government “cannot deny an Indian tribe’s request to discover communications between the United States and its attorneys based on the attorney-client privilege when those communications concern the management of an Indian trust and the United States has not claimed that the government or its attorneys considered a specific competing interest in those communications.” The Federal Circuit adopted the fiduciary exception to the attorney-client privilege in tribal trust cases which permits a beneficiary to discover information relating to fiduciary matters (including trust management). The United States opening brief is due on February 22, 2011. The Tribe’s brief in response is due on March 24, 2011. Oral argument has been scheduled for April 20, 2011.

UNITED STATES V. TOHONO O’ODHAM NATION (NO. 09-846) – On November 1, 2010, the U.S. Supreme Court heard oral argument in *United States v. Tohono O’odham Nation*, a case in which the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit found that 28 U.S.C. § 1500 does not preclude jurisdiction in the Court of Federal Claims when a Indian tribe has also filed an action in Federal District Court seeking different relief (*e.g.* money damages versus historical accounting). The question presented for the Court’s review is:

Whether 28 U.S.C. 1500 deprives the CFC of jurisdiction over a claim seeking monetary relief for the government’s alleged violation of fiduciary obligations if the plaintiff has another suit pending in federal district court based on substantially the same operative facts, especially when the plaintiff seeks monetary relief or other overlapping relief in the two suits.

During oral argument, the Justices appeared to struggle with the positions of both parties and the practical implications resulting from a ruling for either side. In particular, the Court appeared hesitant to adopt the broad rule sought by the United States—a rule precluding jurisdiction in the Court of Federal Claims in which a “related” case is pending in another court even if it seeks different relief. A number of Indian tribes have filed identical claims for breach of fiduciary duties in both the Court of Federal Claims and the Federal District Court seeking separate relief. Unlike prior Indian law cases, the Justices did not appear as hostile to the tribal position. Four amicus briefs in support of the Tohono O’odham Nation were filed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Home Builders, the Colorado River Indian Tribes and National Congress of American Indians, and the Osage Nation. Justice Kagan is recused in this case.

PETITIONS FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI PENDING

Currently, several petitions for a writ of certiorari have been filed and are pending before the Court in the following Indian law and Indian law-related cases:

ROSALES V. UNITED STATES (NO. 10-1103) – On March 7, 2011, a petition was filed seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit which affirmed the decision of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims granting the United States’ motion to dismiss claims which stem from a 15-year-old tribal election and membership dispute. The claims involve ownership of two parcels of land held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Jamul Indian Village. The petitioners claim that the beneficial owners of the trust lands are the individual Indian families, not the Tribe. Based on the Court’s 2009 decision in *Carciari v. Salazar*, the petitioners contend that the Tribe was a “created tribe,” not a “historical tribe,” and not under federal jurisdiction in 1934. However, the Federal Circuit rejected their arguments stating, *Carciari* “has nothing to do with this case.” The United States brief in opposition is due on April 8, 2011.

YANKTON SIOUX TRIBE V. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS (NO. 10-1059) – On February 22, 2011, the Yankton Sioux Tribe filed a petition seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit which held that certain land transfers by the United States to the State of South Dakota were lawful since the lands were not within the “external boundaries” of the Yankton Sioux Reservation. The Tribe filed this “hold” petition in light of the petitions filed by the State of South Dakota, Charles Mix County and the Southern Missouri Recycling and Waste Management District in *South Dakota v. Yankton Sioux Tribe* (see below). The briefs in opposition are due on April 27, 2011.

WINNEMUCCA COLONY COUNCIL V. WASSON (NO. 10-1011) – On February 7, 2011 a petition was filed seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which held that the parties to this intra-tribal factional dispute over tribal funds have been afforded due process, have exhausted their tribal court remedies, and then affirmed the Nevada Inter-tribal Court of Appeals dismissal of the case for lack of jurisdiction. The brief in opposition was filed on March 11, 2011, and the petition has been scheduled for conference on April 15, 2011.

NAVAJO NATION V. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION (NOS. 10-981, 10-986 AND 10-1080) – On January 28, 2011, the Navajo Nation filed a petition seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which involves “complex compulsory party joinder issues” in longstanding litigation brought by the EEOC over the application of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act to Navajo preference for employment provisions in leases between Peabody Coal and the Navajo Nation as approved by the Secretary of the Interior. (Peabody Coal has filed a separate petition seeking review in No. 10-986.) On March 3, 2011, the United States filed a conditional cross-petition (No. 10-1080) on the question of whether the Secretary of the Interior is a “required party” under Rule 19(a)(1). The United States brief in opposition is due on May 4, 2011.

SOUTH DAKOTA V. YANKTON SIOUX TRIBE (NOS. 10-929, 10-931, 10-932 AND 10-1058) – On January 18, 2011, the State of South Dakota, Charles Mix County and the Southern Missouri Recycling and Waste Management District each filed a petition seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit which held that the Yankton Sioux Reservation was not disestablished by the Act of 1894. The state parties argue that the Eighth Circuit decision is in direct conflict with the decision of the South Dakota Supreme Court decision in *Bruguier v. Class* which held that the reservation had been disestablished by Congress. On February 22, 2011, the Yankton Sioux Tribe filed a conditional cross-petition seeking review on the separate question of incremental diminishment of the reservation. The United States and the Tribe’s briefs in opposition are due on April 25, 2011.

NATIVE WHOLESALE SUPPLY V. OKLAHOMA (NO. 10-754) – On December 3, 2010, Native Wholesale Supply, a cigarette importer and distributor chartered under the laws of the Sac & Fox Tribe of Oklahoma, filed a petition seeking review of a decision by the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma which held that the state courts have personal jurisdiction over a nonresident corporation for an alleged violation of state law, and that tribal sovereign immunity does not bar state enforcement of the Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement Complementary Act against an individually-owned Indian business. On December 8, 2010, the state filed a waiver of its right to respond. The petition was scheduled for conference on January 21, 2011. However, the Court has requested a response which the state filed on March 21, 2011.

MICCOSUKEE TRIBE V. KRAUS-ANDERSON CONSTRUCTION COMPANY (NO. 10-717) – On November 29, 2010, the Miccosukee Tribe filed a petition seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit which held that federal courts do not have subject matter jurisdiction over an action filed by the Tribe seeking enforcement of a tribal court judgment against a non-Indian. The Eleventh Circuit found that “a suit to domesticate a tribal judgment does not state a claim under federal law, whether statutory, or common law.” Kraus-Anderson filed its response brief on December 21, 2010, in support of granting the petition. On January 24, 2011, the Court invited the Solicitor General to submit a brief to provide the views of the United States on whether to grant review.

OSAGE NATION V. IRBY (OKLAHOMA TAX COMMISSION) (NO. 10-537) – On October 22, 2010, the Osage Nation filed a petition seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit which held that the Osage Reservation has been disestablished by Congress. The Osage Nation

sued the State of Oklahoma seeking declaratory and injunctive relief: a declaration that the Osage Reservation was “Indian country” within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1151; and an order enjoining state agents from imposing or collecting taxes on members of the tribe who lived within the reservation. Although the Tenth Circuit found that the Osage Allotment Act did not have any specific language indicating Congress’s intent to disestablish the reservation, the panel held that such intent is manifested by subsequent events (*e.g.* opening of reservation to non-Indians) and modern demographics (*e.g.* high percentage of non-Indians living within reservation). On November 22, 2010, NCAI filed an amicus brief in support of the petition for writ of certiorari and on January 11, 2011, the State of Oklahoma filed its brief in opposition. On February 22, 2011, the Court invited the Solicitor General to submit a brief to provide the views of the United States on whether to grant review.

BROWN (FORMERLY SCHWARZENEGGER) V. RINCON BAND OF LUISENO INDIANS (NO. 10-330) – On September 3, 2010, the State of California filed a petition seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which affirmed the district court’s holding that the State of California negotiated in bad faith based on its finding that the State’s repeated demands that the Tribe pay a portion of its net revenues to the State’s general fund was an attempt to impose a tax on the Tribe in violation of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. The Tribe filed its brief in opposition on November 11, 2010, and on December 13, 2010, the Court invited the Acting Solicitor General to file a brief expressing the views of the United States.

UNITED STATES V. EASTERN SHAWNEE TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA (NO. 09-1521) – On June 15, 2010, the United States filed a petition seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit which held that, based its recent decision in *Tohono O’odham*, 28 U.S.C. § 1500 is not a bar to the Tribe in seeking relief in the Court of Federal Claims where it seeks different relief and the relief sought could not be awarded in the Federal District Court. Although the Tribe filed a waiver of its response, the Court has requested and the Tribe filed its response on September 15, 2010. The petition was scheduled for the conference on October 15, 2010, and is likely being held pending the Court’s decision in *United States v. Tohono O’odham Nation*.

PETITIONS FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI DENIED/DISMISSED

The Court has denied or dismissed the following petitions for writ of certiorari:

HENZLER V. SALAZAR (NO. 10-942) – On March 21, 2011, the Court denied review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which affirmed the district court’s grant of summary judgment to the Department of the Interior in relation to a due process challenge to a 1930 denial of an allotment application filed pursuant to the Alaska Native Allotment Act of 1906.

YELLOWBEAR V. WYOMING (NO. 10-7881) – On February 22, 2011, the Court denied review of a petition filed by Andrew John Yellowbear, Jr., a member of the Northern Arapaho Tribe, seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit which affirmed the district court’s denial of his writ for habeas corpus in relation to his state court conviction for murder. The Tenth Circuit rejected Mr. Yellowbear’s attempt to have the federal courts review *de novo* whether the scene of his crime was within an Indian reservation. The Wyoming Supreme Court had held that a 1905 Act of Congress diminished the Wind River Reservation and the scene of the crime was outside the current boundaries of the Reservation.

DAY V. APOLIANA (OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS) (NO. 10-811) – On February 22, 2011, the Court denied review of a petition filed by four “native Hawaiians” seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which rejected petitioners contention that they have a federal right, enforceable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, to require that trust funds managed by the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) trustees only be spent “for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians.” Petitioners challenge four projects on which the OHA trustees spent parts of the trust proceeds, including support for the Akaka bill.

EAGLE V. PERINGTON PAIUTE TRIBE (NO. 10-5764) – On January 24, 2011, the Court denied review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which held that defendant’s Indian status, although a requirement of tribal jurisdiction, is not an element of the crime which must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt. Ms. Eagle had argued that she was denied due process when the Tribe failed to allege or prove that she was “Indian.”

ATTORNEY’S PROCESS AND INVESTIGATION SERVICES, INC. V. SAC & FOX TRIBE OF MISSISSIPPI IN IOWA (NO. 10-613) – On January 18, 2011, the Court denied review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit which held that the Sac & Fox Tribal Court had jurisdiction over a non-Indian corporation which provides security and consulting services to casino operators. Attorney’s Process and Investigation Services, Inc. (API) had filed a petition seeking review of the lower court’s holding that the tribal court had jurisdiction over API and the tort claims brought against API under the second exception to the *Montana* test (the conduct of the non-Indian threatens the political integrity, economic security, health and welfare of the tribe).

THUNDERHORSE V. PIERCE (NO. 09-1353) – On January 10, 2011, the Court denied review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit which held that the prison’s enforcement of its grooming rules, including the prohibition of long hair on men with no exception for Native American religious practitioners, does not violate the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Person’s Act. The U.S. Solicitor General had recommended that the petition be denied, or in the alternative, “be granted and the decision below summarily reversed and remanded for application of the correct legal standard.”

GLACIER ELECTRIC COOP V. ESTATE OF SHERBURNE (NO. 10-408) – On November 19, 2010, the Court denied review of an unpublished one-page memorandum decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which held that under the doctrine of issue preclusion Glacier Electric Cooperative, Inc., (“GEC”) could not challenge the subject matter jurisdiction of the Blackfeet Tribal Court. In an earlier stage of this seventeen-year litigation, the Respondents sought enforcement as a matter of comity in the federal courts of a \$2 million money judgment against GEC entered by the tribal court after a jury trial. (Comity requires a finding of jurisdiction and due process.) The federal district court ruled that the tribal court had subject matter jurisdiction, that GEC was accorded due process, and that “the underlying tribal court judgment is entitled to recognition and enforcement in the federal courts.” GEC appealed the district court’s ruling regarding due process to the Ninth Circuit, but did not appeal its ruling regarding tribal court jurisdiction. The Ninth Circuit reversed the district court, finding that GEC had been denied due process based on inflammatory statements made during closing arguments, thus not entitling respondents to enforce the tribal court judgment through the federal courts. Respondents returned to tribal court to seek enforcement of the money judgment against the assets of GEC located within the Reservation, and GEC unsuccessfully challenged the tribal court’s jurisdiction to enforce the judgment.

MICCOUSUKEE TRIBE V. SOUTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (NO. 10-252) – On November 29, 2010, the Court denied review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh

Circuit which upheld the Environmental Protection Agency's regulation adopting the "unitary waters" theory. The Miccosukee Tribe had argued that the "unitary waters" regulation is contrary to the unambiguous language of the Clean Water Act which prohibits the transfer or discharge of a pollutant from one meaningfully distinct body of water to another without a NPDES permit.

TRUCKEE-CARSON IRRIGATION DISTRICT V. UNITED STATES AND PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE (NO. 10-396) – On November 29, 2010, the Court denied review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which held that, under the provisions of the Fallon Paiute Shoshone Indian Tribes Water Rights Settlement Act of 1990, the United States can pursue all claims against the Irrigation District for past excess diversions of water in favor of farmers.

COTTIER V. CITY OF MARTIN (NO. 10-335) – On November 15, 2010, the Court denied review of an en banc decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit which upheld Ordinance 122, which established boundaries for three voting wards within the City. The American Civil Liberties Union filed a petition on behalf of Native voters who alleged that Ordinance 122 was enacted with a racially discriminatory purpose and dilutes the votes of Indians in each ward in violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, and in violation of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution.

MORRIS V. U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION (NO. 10-368) – On November 15, 2010, the Court denied review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit which upheld the license issued by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to Hydro Resources, Inc. (HRI). The New Mexico Environmental Center had filed a petition on behalf of Eastern Diné Against Uranium Mining seeking review of a license which will allow HRI to conduct *in situ* leech mining for uranium on four sites in northwestern New Mexico impacting a number of Navajo families.

SUQUAMISH INDIAN TRIBE V. UPPER SKAGIT INDIAN TRIBE, ET AL. (NO. 10-33) – On October 18, 2010, the Court denied review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which held that the Suquamish Indian Tribe's usual and accustomed fishing grounds ("U&A") do not include Saratoga Passage and Skagit Bay on the eastern side of Whidbey Island. This case is a sub-proceeding of *U.S. v. Washington*, a case decided in 1974 where Judge Boldt determined the U&A grounds for the Puget Sound Indian tribes.

GOULD V. CAYUGA INDIAN NATION (NO. 10-206) – On October 4, 2010, the Court denied review of a decision by the Court of Appeals of New York which held that the Tribe's convenience stores are located on a "qualified reservation" (as defined under state tax law) and are thus exempt from the collection of state cigarette sales taxes.

FORT PECK HOUSING AUTHORITY V. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (NO. 10-195) – On October 4, 2010, the Court denied review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit which held that the regulation adopted by HUD implementing the block grant funding formula does not violate the provisions of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996.

HOFFMAN V. SANDIA RESORT AND CASINO (NO. 10-4) – On October 4, 2010, the Court denied review of a decision by the Court of Appeals of New Mexico which held that the doctrine of tribal sovereign immunity barred a non-Indian's claims related to a \$1.5 million jackpot payout from a slot machine that "malfunctioned." The Court of Appeals held that the limited waiver of immunity within the tribal-state gaming compact for physical injury to persons or property did not apply to his claims.

METLAKATLA INDIAN COMMUNITY V. SEBELIUS (NO. 09-1466) – On October 4, 2010, the Court denied review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit which held that the filing of a class action against the government does not toll the statute of limitations for asserted class members to exhaust their administrative remedies. The underlying class action lawsuit was filed in 2001 against the Indian Health Service for failure to pay contract support costs to tribal contractors.

MAYBEE V. STATE OF IDAHO (NO. 09-1471) – On October 4, 2010, the Court denied review of a decision by the Idaho Supreme Court which held that an enrolled tribal member's on-line sale of unstamped cigarettes, shipped from his business located on the Seneca Reservation to consumers in Idaho, was in violation of state law as adopted pursuant to the Master Settlement Agreement with the four largest tobacco manufacturers in the United States.

SCHAGHTICOKE TRIBAL NATION V. KEMPTHORNE (NO. 09-1433) – On October 4, 2010, the Court denied review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit which rejected the Tribe's argument that the Reconsidered Final Determination, denying federal acknowledgement, resulted from undue (and improper) political influence and was issued by an unauthorized decision-maker in violation of the Vacancies Reform Act.

HOGAN V. KALTAG TRIBAL COUNCIL (NO. 09-960) – On October 4, 2010, the Court denied review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which upheld the authority of the Kaltag Tribal Court over a tribal member-child placement proceeding. The Ninth Circuit held that under ICWA, the State is required to extend full faith and credit to the Tribal Court's adoption judgment.

PENDING CASES BEFORE THE U.S. COURTS OF APPEAL AND OTHER COURTS

PATCHAK V. SALAZAR (D.C. CIR. NO. 09-5324) – On March 7, 2011, the United States and the Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Tribe (Gun Lake Tribe) filed their petitions for rehearing and rehearing en banc asking the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit to review its decision that: (1) Mr. Patchak, an individual non-Indian landowner, is within the "zone of interests" protected by the Indian Reorganization Act and thus has standing to bring a *Carcieri* challenge to a land-in-trust acquisition; and (2) Mr. Patchak's *Carcieri* challenge is a claim brought pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act (APA), not a case asserting a claim to title under the Quiet Title Act (QTA), and is therefore not barred by the Indian lands exception to the waiver of immunity under the QTA. The D.C. Circuit acknowledged that its holding is in conflict with the Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Circuits which have all held that the QTA bars all "suits 'seeking to divest the United States of its title to land held for the benefit of an Indian tribe,' whether or not the plaintiff asserts any claim to title in the land."

WATER WHEEL CAMP RECREATIONAL AREA, INC. V. LARANCE (9TH CIR. NOS. 09-17349; 09-17357) – On February 17, 2011, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit heard oral argument on review of a decision by the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona in a case involving non-Indian holdover tenants of tribal lands on the California portion of the Colorado River Indian Reservation who sought a declaration that the Tribal Court had no jurisdiction over an eviction suit filed by the Tribe. The district court judge denied relief to Water Wheel holding that there was a consensual relationship between the Tribe and its corporate tenant sufficient to meet the first exception to the rule in *Montana v. United States*. But the district court held that Tribe did not have jurisdiction over Robert Johnson, the President of Water Wheel under the *Montana* test, and enjoined Judge LaRance from exercising jurisdiction over

Mr. Johnson. The Tribal Court had sanctioned Mr. Johnson, holding him individually liable to any judgment against Water Wheel, for his refusal to comply with discovery requests and tribal court orders compelling compliance with discovery requests. Parts of the judgment were, in effect, sanctions against the defendants for violation of court orders. The Tribal Court of Appeals affirmed the judgment evicting Water Wheel and Johnson, and awarded over \$3 million for unpaid rent, trespass damages, and attorney fees. The Tribal Court has now appealed the federal district court's decision with respect to jurisdiction over Mr. Johnson and Water Wheel has cross-appealed the denial of relief as to it. The Tribal Court filed its opening brief on May 14, 2010. The Project helped develop and coordinate the filing of several amicus briefs in support of the Tribal Court which were filed on May 21, 2010, including a brief on behalf of the Colorado River Indian Tribe; a brief on behalf of the National Congress of American Indian and individual Indian tribes; and a brief on behalf of the National American Indian Court Judges Association.

ONEIDA INDIAN NATION V. ONEIDA COUNTY (2ND CIR. NOS. 07-2430-CV(L); 07-2548-CV(XAP); 07-2550-CV(XAP) – On December 16, 2010, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit denied the petition for rehearing/rehearing en banc filed by the United States and the tribes. The Second Circuit, in a split decision (2-1), had affirmed the district court's dismissal of the possessory land claims (e.g. trespass damages) filed by the Oneida tribes and the United States based on the equitable considerations (i.e. "indisputably disruptive" nature of the claims) discussed in *Cayuga Indian Nation v. Pataki* and the Supreme Court's opinion in *City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation*. The Second Circuit reversed the district court and held that the Oneida tribes are also barred from pursuing their non-possessory claims for fair compensation based on the State's payment to the Oneidas of far less than the true value of the land. Judge Gershon, in dissent, finds that the tribes and the United States are not foreclosed from pursuing their non-possessory claims. In particular, the United States should be allowed to pursue its claim against the State for violation of the Non-intercourse Act based on the State's failure to pay a fair price for the tribes' lands. At present, any petition for writ of certiorari will be due on April 15, 2011.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO SUPREME COURT PROJECT

As always, NCAI and NARF welcome general contributions to the Tribal Supreme Court Project. Please send any general contributions to NCAI, attn: Sharon Ivy, 1516 P Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

Please contact us if you have any questions or if we can be of assistance: John Dossett, NCAI General Counsel, 202-255-7042 (jdossett@ncai.org), or Richard Guest, NARF Senior Staff Attorney, 202-785-4166 (richardg@narf.org).