

TRIBAL SUPREME COURT PROJECT

MEMORANDUM

MAY 21, 2015

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).

The October Term 2014 has been and continues to be relatively quiet in relation to cert petitions and cases involving questions of federal Indian law. Oral arguments have concluded without a single Indian law case argued on the merits this Term. As expected, the U.S. Solicitor General filed his brief in *Dollar General Corporation v. Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians* on May 12, 2015, and the Court has scheduled the petition for conference on June 04, 2015. Although the United States recommended that the Court deny cert in the *Dollar General* case, since the question involves a challenge to tribal court jurisdiction—specifically, jurisdiction over a tort committed by a non-Indian corporation—there is a high probability that four Justices may vote to grant review.

PETITIONS GRANTED

KNIGHT V THOMPSON (NO. 13-955) – On January 26, 2015, the Court issued a “GVR” (petition granted, judgment vacated and case remanded) for further consideration in light of its unanimous decision in *Holt v. Hobbs*. In *Holt*, the Court held that Arkansas violated the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA) where its grooming policy did not allow beards and it refused to grant a religious exemption to an inmate whose Muslim religion required him to wear a beard. Shortly before the Court granted review in *Holt*, a group of Native American inmates filed a petition in *Knight v. Thompson*, asking the Court to review a decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit which held in favor of prison officials in Alabama who refused to grant a religious exemption from their restrictive grooming policy to allow Native Americans to wear long hair consistent with their Native religious beliefs. The Native American Rights Fund, representing the National Congress of American Indians and Huy filed “friend of the Court” briefs supporting the prisoners in both *Holt* and *Knight*.

Like Mr. Holt, the Native American prisoners in *Knight* are seeking relief under RLUIPA, which requires that a substantial burden on an inmate’s religious exercise be the least restrictive means of furthering a compelling government interest. This standard, referred to as “strict scrutiny,” is the most stringent legal standard applied to laws and government rules. A lack of consistent application of this rigorous standard by the lower federal courts has allowed some state prison systems to unduly restrict religious practices of Native American inmates. Nearly 80% of U.S. prison systems allow Native Americans to wear long hair, either through blanket policies or special religious exemptions. By and large, prison officials have found ways to mitigate the minimal risks associated with these practices and have observed numerous benefits

to Native inmate behavior and rehabilitation as a result. However, a handful of state prison systems stubbornly refuse to accommodate certain facets of Native religion, such as long hair at issue in *Knight*. Those prison officials have hidden behind safety, security and hygiene concerns to frustrate sincere religious beliefs and practices. Yet, these same prison officials openly admit that they did not investigate, or even consider, the successful accommodation measures taken by the 80% of prison systems allowing long hair, or exemptions for Native American inmates. Rather than apply RLUIPA's strict scrutiny to the state's arguments and ask, "Why not Alabama?" the lower courts in *Knight* deemed the policies of other jurisdictions simply irrelevant to the operation of Alabama prisons and accorded "due deference" to the uninformed opinions and unsubstantiated claims of prison officials.

The *Holt* opinion, and the *Knight* case on remand, should change a fundamental aspect of how certain prison systems deal with Native Americans and their religious practices. For those Natives who reside in the darkest corners of U.S. penal systems, it is no longer the rule that they cannot engage in their traditional religious practices merely because their jailors say so. Courts will demand more, just as Congress intended when it enacted RLUIPA.

PETITIONS FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI PENDING

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

STOP THE CASINO 101 v. BROWN (NO-14-1236) – On April 9, 2015, Stop the Casino 101 Coalition, an unincorporated citizen group, filed a petition seeking review of a decision by the Court of Appeal of California which held that the gaming compact between California and the Graton Tribe was "in accordance with federal law" and consistent with the provisions of the California Constitution. On April 24, 2015, the State of California filed a waiver of its right to respond, and the petition has been scheduled for conference on May 21, 2015.

OKLAHOMA v. HOBIA (NO. 14-1177) – On March 23, 2015, the State of Oklahoma filed a petition seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit which held that, in light of *Bay Mills*, the State has failed to state a valid claim for relief against the Kialegee Tribal Town under IGRA and a state-tribal gaming compact. The question presented is: "Does *Michigan v. Bay Mills*, 134 S.Ct. 2024 (2014), require dismissal of a State's suit to prevent tribal officers from conducting gaming that would be unlawful under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act and a state-tribal gaming compact when (1) the suit for declaratory and injunctive relief has been brought against tribal officials - not the tribe; (2) the gaming will occur in Indian country on the land of another tribe; and (3) the state-tribal compact's arbitration provision does not require arbitration before filing suit?" On April 24, 2015, the Tribe filed a waiver of its right to respond and the petition was scheduled for conference on May 21, 2015. However, on May 11, 2015, the Court requested a response from the Tribe which is due June 10, 2015.

MENOMINEE INDIAN TRIBE OF WISCONSIN v. UNITED STATES (NO 14-510) – On November 3, 2014, the Menominee Indian Tribe filed a petition seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia which held that the Tribe did not establish the necessary grounds for obtaining equitable tolling of the statute of limitations for filing claims against the Indian Health Service for unpaid contract support costs. The Tribe maintains that this decision is in direct conflict with the Federal Circuit's 2012 decision in *Arctic Slope Native Ass'n Ltd. v. Sebelius*. The response of the United States is due on May 26, 2015.

DOLLAR GENERAL CORPORATION V. MISSISSIPPI BAND OF CHOCTAW INDIANS (NO. 13-1496) – On May 12, 2015, the Solicitor General filed a brief on behalf of the United States recommending that the Court deny the petition filed by the Dollar General Corporation which seeks review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit upholding tribal court jurisdiction over non-Indians. The Fifth Circuit held that the Tribal Court has jurisdiction over tort claims brought by a tribal member based on the consensual relationship between the store owned by Dollar General and the Tribe. The store is located on tribal trust land leased to the non-Indian corporation and the store agreed to participate in a youth job training program operated by the Tribe. A tribal member who participated in the program brought an action in Tribal Court alleging that he was assaulted by the store manager. The petition has been scheduled for conference on June 4, 2015.

PETITIONS FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI DENIED/DISMISSED

The Court has denied or dismissed the following petitions for writ of certiorari in Indian law cases:

WESTERN SKY FINANCIAL V. JACKSON (NO. 14-991) – On April 27, 2015, the Court denied review of a petition filed by Western Sky Financial, an on-line lending company owned by an enrolled member of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and operates on Cheyenne River Indian Reservation in South Dakota, seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit which held that the “arbitration provision contained in the loan agreements (prepared by Western Sky) is unreasonable and substantively and procedurally unconscionable under federal, state, and tribal law.” The Seventh Circuit had also held that the Tribal Court did not have subject matter jurisdiction over the claims, and no colorable claim of tribal jurisdiction was raised to invoke the rule of tribal exhaustion.

STATE OF WISCONSIN V. LAC COURTE OREILLES BAND OF LAKE SUPERIOR CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF WISCONSIN, ET AL. (NO. 14-792) – On April 20, 2015, the Court denied review of a petition filed by the State of Wisconsin seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit which held that the Tribes met their burden of proof (*e.g.*, circumstances have changed so much that night hunting of deer with lights is no longer a substantial safety hazard) to reopen the court’s 1991 judgment under FRCP Rule 60(b). The Seventh Circuit remanded the case to the district court, stating that the “burden of production should be placed on the state, for as the record stands the evidence presented by the tribes that night hunting for deer in the ceded territory is unlikely to create a serious safety problem provides a compelling reason for vacating the 1991 judgment that prohibited Indians from hunting deer at night in that territory.”

CONFEDERATED TRIBES AND BANDS OF THE YAKAMA INDIAN NATION V. MCKENNA (NO. 14-947) – On March 9, 2015, the Court denied review of a petition filed by the Yakama Indian Nation seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which held that the plain text of the Yakama Treaty of 1855 did not preclude enforcement of the State of Washington’s escrow statute, which requires tobacco companies to reimburse the State for health care costs related to the use of tobacco products.

STOCKBRIDGE MUNSEE COMMUNITY V. NEW YORK (NO. 14-538) – On March 2, 2014, the Court denied a petition filed by the Stockbridge-Munsee Community seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit which held that its Indian land claims are barred by the *City of Sherrill* equitable defenses. The Second Circuit had distinguished the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Petrella v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc.* which held that courts may not override the judgment of Congress and apply equitable defenses to summarily dispose of claims at law filed within the established statute of limitations.

GATZAROS V. SAULT STE. MARIE TRIBE OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS (NO. 14-665) – On February 23, 2015, the Court denied review of a petition filed by the owners of a substantial interest in Monroe Partners, LLC (an entity that owned fifty percent of Greektown Casino in Detroit), who sought review of an unpublished decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit which affirmed the district court’s dismissal of their suit seeking recovery of approximately \$74 million under a guaranty agreement that was signed by the Tribe.

SEMINOLE TRIBE OF FLORIDA V. STATE OF FLORIDA (NO. 14-351) – On January 12, 2015, the Court denied a petition filed by the Seminole Tribe of Florida seeking review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit which held that state sovereign immunity bars the tribe’s suit for declaratory relief and its effort to enjoin state officials from unlawfully collecting motor fuel excise taxes from the tribe. The State of Florida has established a pre-collection tax regime whereby exempt entities must petition for a refund of motor fuel taxes. According to the Eleventh Circuit, since any relief would necessarily come out of the state treasury, the tribe’s suit falls outside the *Ex Parte Young* doctrine which permits suit against state officials for prospective relief only.

MM&A PRODUCTIONS, LLC V. YAVAPAI APACHE NATION (NO. 14-425) – On December 15, 2014, the Court denied review of a petition filed by an entertainment production consultant which sought review of a decision by the Arizona Court of Appeals which affirmed the trial court’s dismissal of a contract action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction based on the doctrine of tribal sovereign immunity. Specifically, the question presented was “whether the authority of a tribal official who signs a waiver of sovereign immunity may be established under the doctrine of apparent authority.”

FRIENDS OF AMADOR COUNTY V. JEWELL (NO. 14-340) – On December 1, 2014, the Court denied review of a petition filed by Friends of Amador County (FOAC), a community organization opposed to the development of additional casinos in the county, which sought review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which affirmed the district court’s decision that the Buena Vista Rancheria is a required and indispensable party under Rule 19 who cannot be joined under the doctrine of tribal sovereign immunity. In the underlying action, FOAC had filed several claims challenging the Tribe’s gaming compact with California, including: (1) whether certain lands qualify as “Indian lands” under IGRA; and (2) whether the federal government erred in granting the tribe federal recognition.

HICKS V. HUDSON INSURANCE CO. (NO. 14-283) – On October 14, 2014, the Court denied review of a petition filed by a non-Indian employee of a tribal casino who sought review of a decision by the Oklahoma Supreme Court which dismissed her workers compensation claims brought in state court against the insurer for the Muscogee Creek Nation based on the doctrine of tribal sovereign immunity. The question presented was: “Whether an insurance company doing business with a federally recognized American Indian Tribe is entitled to sovereign immunity for the acts and omission it takes in furtherance of the business of insurance.”

YOWELL V. ABBEY (NO. 13-1049) – On October 6, 2014, the Court denied review of a petition filed by Raymond Yowell, an 84-year-old Western Shoshone Indian and cattle rancher, who sought review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which reversed a district court order denying the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Department of Treasury’s motion for summary judgment regarding his civil rights claims against state and federal officials and vacated the injunction issued against BLM. Throughout his life, Mr. Yowell had let his livestock graze on the “historic grazing lands associated with the South Fork Indian Reservation.” In the 1990s, the BLM accused him of trespassing

and in 2002, without a warrant or court order, seized and sold his cattle. The Ninth Circuit held that the district court had abused its discretion in granting the injunction and had erred in denying the motion for summary judgment based on the qualified immunity of the state and federal officials.

MARCUSSEN V. BURWELL (NO. 13-1447) – On October 6, 2014, the Court denied review of a petition filed by Lana Marcussen who sought review of a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which summarily affirmed dismissal of a federal court challenge to pending state court proceedings involving ICWA under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine. Specifically, the questions presented were: (1) Whether the Rooker Feldman doctrine should be overruled for denying all judicial relief by removing the subject matter jurisdiction of the federal courts to hear any civil action brought against federally mandated statutes enforced in the state courts; and (2) Whether Congress has the authority to adopt laws intended to be primarily or exclusively enforced in the state courts.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE TRIBAL 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: Sam Owl, 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).