1	IGNACIA S. MORENO Assistant Attorney General		
2	Environment and Natural Resources Division		
3	DEVON LEHMAN McCUNE (COBN 33223) United States Department of Justice		
3	United States Department of Justice Environment and Natural Resources Division		
4	Natural Resources Section		
5	1961 Stout St., 8th Floor Denver, CO 80294		
6	Telephone: (303) 844-1487		
6	Facsimile: (303) 844-1350 Devon.McCune@usdoj.gov		
7			
8	CHARLES O'CONNOR (CSBN 56320) U.S. Attorney's Office		
0	450 Golden Ğate Avenue		
9	P.O. Box 36055 San Francisco, CA 94102		
10	Telephone: (415) 436-7200		
11	Charles.OConnor@usdoj.gov		
	Attorneys for Defendants		
12	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
13			
14	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
15	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
13			
16	NISENAN MAIDU TRIBE OF THE) No. 5:10-cv-00270-JW NEVADA CITY RANCHERIA,)		
17	DEFENDANTS' ANSWER		
18	Plaintiff,) TO COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF THE RANCHERIA ACT,		
	v. BREACH OF FIDUCIARY		
19	(KEN SALAZAR, et al.,) OBLIGATION, DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF		
20)		
21	Defendants.)		
	·/		
22	Defendants hareby submit their Answer to the Complaint for Breach of the Borelessia		
23			
24	Act, Breach of Fiduciary Obligation, Declaratory and Injunctive Relief ("Complaint") filed by		
	Plaintiff on January 20, 2010. Defendants specifically deny each and every allegation of the		
25			
26			
27	paragraphs in this Answer correspond to the numbered paragraphs in Plaintiff's Complaint. Any		
	references in this Answer to the Plaintiff as "Tribe" are not an admission that Plaintiff is, in fact,		
28			

a tribe. Instead, "Tribe" is used as a matter of convenience and mirrors the usage in Plaintiff's Complaint.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. This paragraph constitutes Plaintiff's characterization of its action to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.
 - 2. This paragraph constitutes legal conclusions, to which no response is required.
- 3. Defendants deny the first sentence. The second and third sentences constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.
- 4. This paragraph constitutes Plaintiff's characterization of its action to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.
- 5. This paragraph constitutes Plaintiff's characterization of its action to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.

JURISDICTION

6. The first, fourth, and fifth sentences constitute legal conclusions, to which no response is required. The second and third sentences are Plaintiff's characterization of its action, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.

1 VENUE 2 7. 3 4 therein. 5 **PARTIES** 6 7 8. 8 9 9. 10 11 12 13 10. Defendants admit paragraph 10. 14 11. 15 16 12. 17 18 19 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS** 20 Α. 21 22 13. 23 14. 24 25 26

This paragraph constitutes legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained

- Defendants are without information or belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, therefore, the allegations are denied.
- Defendants admit that Ken Salazar is the Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior and is an officer or employee of the United States. The remainder of paragraph 9 constitutes legal conclusions, to which no response is required.
- Defendants are without information or belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, therefore, the allegations are denied.
- Defendants are without information or belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, therefore, the allegations are denied.

Historical Background of the Nevada City Rancheria

27

28

- Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph.
- Defendants are without knowledge or information as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in this paragraph and, therefore, the allegations are denied.
 - 15. Defendants are without knowledge or information as to the truth or falsity of the

allegations contained in this paragraph and, therefore, the allegations are denied.

- 16. Defendants admit the first sentence to the extent President Wilson issued an Executive Order on May 6, 1913 covering the property originally reserved in the 1850's by white settlers. The second sentence quotes the Executive Order. Defendants aver the Executive Order speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
 - 17. Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph.
- 18. Defendants are without knowledge or information as to truth or falsity of the first sentence and, therefore, the allegations are denied. As to the first part of the second sentence, Defendants admit that there were several Indian Service reports of Indians living on the land covered by the Executive Order. Defendants are without knowledge or information as to the truth or falsity of the remainder of the second sentence and, therefore, the allegations are denied.
- 19. This paragraph constitutes Plaintiff's characterization of the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA), 25 U.S.C. § 461 *et seq.*, including section 18 of the IRA, 25 U.S.C. § 478. Defendants aver the IRA speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
 - 20. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 20.
- 21. Defendants deny the allegations in the first sentence. Defendants are without knowledge or information as to the truth or falsity of the factual allegations contained in the second sentence and, therefore, the allegations are denied.

B. Federal Termination Policy and the Rancheria Act

22. As to the first sentence, Defendants admit that the United States pursued a policy of termination in the 1950's, but deny it was in response to pressure from non-Indians.

Defendants admit the second and third sentences. The fourth sentence quotes House Concurrent Resolution 108. Defendants aver the Resolution speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its

contents. As to the fifth sentence, Defendants admit that the United States pursued a termination policy through specific legislative enactments. Defendants are without knowledge or information as to the truth or falsity of the sixth sentence and, therefore, the allegations are denied. Defendants deny any remaining allegations in paragraph 22.

- 23. Defendants admit the first sentence. The second and third sentences characterize the California Rancheria Act. Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 24. This paragraph characterizes the California Rancheria Act. Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 25. This paragraph characterizes the California Rancheria Act. Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 26. This paragraph characterizes the California Rancheria Act. Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 27. This paragraph characterizes the California Rancheria Act. Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 28. This paragraph characterizes the California Rancheria Act. Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 29. This paragraph characterizes and quotes the California Rancheria Act.

 Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 30. Defendants admit the first sentence. The second sentence quotes the amendments to the California Rancheria Act. Defendants aver the amendments speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their contents.

Defendants aver the amendments speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their

This paragraph quotes the amendments to the California Rancheria Act.

31.

C.

7

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

Defendants' Answer to Complaint for Breach of the Rancheria Act, Breach of Fiduciary Obligation, Declaratory and Injunctive Relief — No. 5:10-cv-00270-JW 6

contents.

Ultra Vires Termination of Plaintiff Nevada City Rancheria

- 32. Defendants deny paragraph 32.
- 33. Defendants admit the first sentence. Defendant are without knowledge or information as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of the second sentence and, therefore, the allegations are denied. Defendants are without knowledge or information as to truth or falsity of the allegations in the third sentence and, therefore, the allegations are denied. As to the fourth sentence, Defendants admit that the Johnsons agreed to the distribution plan and that the Johnsons were elderly. Defendants are without knowledge or information as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in the fifth, sixth, and seventh sentences and, therefore, deny those allegations. Defendants deny the allegations in the eighth sentence. Defendants deny all remaining allegations in paragraph 33.
 - 34. Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph.
- 35. Defendants are without knowledge or information as to truth or falsity of the allegations in the first sentence and, therefore, the allegations are denied. The second sentence is a conclusion of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.
- 36. As to the first, third, and fourth sentences, Defendants are without knowledge or information as to truth or falsity of the allegations and, therefore, deny the allegations. As to the second sentence, Defendants admit that Frank and Quila Jones sought an assignment on the Rancheria and deny all remaining allegations in this sentence. Defendants deny any remaining allegations in this paragraph.

37. The first sentence constitutes a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation therein. As to the second sentence, Defendants admit the BIA engaged in substantial outreach on and off Rancherias to ensure that any termination took place with due process protections in place. The third sentence quotes Progress Report No. 4 – Public Law 85-671 (September 26, 1958). Defendants aver the Report speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.

- 38. Defendants deny the allegations in the first and second sentences. Defendants are without knowledge or information as to the truth or falsity of the third sentence and, therefore, the allegations are denied. Defendants deny the allegations in the fourth sentence.
- 39. Defendants deny the allegations in the first sentence. As to the second sentence, Defendants admit that the BIA did not have to pay the cost of providing infrastructure and that a press clipping at the time indicated Mr. Johnson did not want to leave the Rancheria. As to the third sentence, Defendants admit that the distribution plan included only Peter and Margaret Johnson as distributees. As to the fourth sentence, Defendants admit that the BIA did not incur costs of providing educational and vocational training or construction of roads and sanitation and water systems. Defendants deny all remaining allegations in this paragraph.
 - 40. Defendants deny this paragraph.
- 41. This paragraph quotes the opinion in *Seminole Nation v. United States*, 316 U.S. 286, 297 (1942). Defendants aver the opinion speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 42. This paragraph constitutes Plaintiff's characterization of the California Rancheria Act. Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
 - 43. This paragraph constitutes legal conclusions, to which no response is required.

- 54. Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph.
- 55. This paragraph characterizes the complaint in the *Hardwick* litigation. Defendants aver the complaint speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 56. This paragraph characterizes the complaint in the *Hardwick* litigation. Defendants aver the complaint speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 57. Defendants admit the first sentence. The second and third sentences characterize the amendment to the complaint. Defendants aver the amended complaint speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 58. This paragraph characterizes the stipulated settlement in the *Hardwick* litigation. Defendants aver the settlement speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 59. This paragraph characterizes the opinions in *Smith v. United States*, 515 F. Supp. 56 (N.D. Cal. 1975), *Knight v. Kleppe*, Civ. No. C-74-005 WTS (N.D. Cal. 1976), *Duncan v. Andrus*, 517 F. Supp. 1 (N.D. Cal. 1977), and *Duncan v. United States*, 667 F.2d 36 (Ct.Cl. 1981). Defendants aver the opinions speak for themselves and are the best evidence of their contents.
- 60. This paragraph quotes from and characterizes the stipulated judgment in the *Hardwick* litigation. Defendants aver the settlement speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 61. Defendants admit the first sentence. The second sentence characterizes the stipulated judgment in the *Hardwick* litigation. Defendants aver the settlement speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.

E. <u>Nevada City Rancheria Was Erroneously Omitted From the *Hardwick* Restoration Judgment</u>

- 62. Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph.
- 63. This paragraph constitutes a legal conclusion to which no response is necessary. To the extent a response is necessary, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.

F. The Tribe List Act

- 64. Defendants admit the first sentence. The second sentence quotes from H.R. Rep. No. 103-781, at 3 (1994). Defendants aver the Report speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 65. This paragraph quotes from the Tribe List Act. Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 66. This paragraph characterizes the Tribe List Act. Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 67. This paragraph characterizes the Tribe List Act. Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 68. This paragraph contains legal conclusions, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.
- 69. Defendants admit the first sentence. The second sentence constitutes a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.

Defendants' Answer to Complaint for Breach of the Rancheria Act, Breach of Fiduciary Obligation, Declaratory and Injunctive Relief —

11

27

28

No. 5:10-cv-00270-JW

- 79. This paragraph characterizes Section 8 of the Rancheria Act. Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 80. This paragraph constitutes a legal conclusion, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

- 81. Defendants incorporate by reference the responses in the preceding paragraphs of this Answer as though fully set forth herein.
- 82. This paragraph characterizes Section 9 of the Rancheria Act. Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 83. This paragraph constitutes a legal conclusion, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

- 84. Defendants incorporate by reference the responses in the preceding paragraphs of this Answer as though fully set forth herein.
- 85. This paragraph characterizes the Rancheria Act. Defendants aver the Act speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 86. This paragraph constitutes a legal conclusion, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

- 87. Defendants incorporate by reference the responses in the preceding paragraphs of this Answer as though fully set forth herein.
- 88. This paragraph constitutes a legal conclusion, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.
- 89. This paragraph constitutes a legal conclusion, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.
- 90. This paragraph constitutes a legal conclusion, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.
- 91. This paragraph constitutes a legal conclusion, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.
- 92. This paragraph constitutes a legal conclusion, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

- 93. Defendants incorporate by reference the responses in the preceding paragraphs of this Answer as though fully set forth herein.
 - 94. This paragraph characterizes the Administrative Procedure Act (APA).

Defendants aver the APA speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.

- 95. This paragraph characterizes the APA. Defendants aver the APA speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents.
- 96. This paragraph constitutes a legal conclusion, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.
 - 97. Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph.
- 98. This paragraph constitutes a legal conclusion, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny each and every allegation contained therein.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

The remaining allegations in Plaintiff's Complaint constitute prayers for relief, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny that Plaintiff is entitled to the relief it has requested or to any relief whatsoever.

DEFENSES

- 1. The court lacks jurisdiction over some or all of Plaintiff's claims.
- 2. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims fail to state a claim on which relief can be granted.
- 3. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims are barred by the applicable statute of limitations.
- 4. Some or all of Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of laches.
- 5. Plaintiff lacks standing to bring its claims against Defendants.

1	Dated: May 3, 2010	Respectfully submitted,
2		IGNACIA S. MORENO Assistant Attorney General
3 4		/s/ Devon Lehman McCune DEVON LEHMAN McCUNE
5		Trial Attorney United States Department of Justice
6		Natural Resources Section 1961 Stout St., 8th Floor Denver, CO 80294
7		Tel: (303) 844-1487 Devon.McCune@usdoj.gov
8 9		CHARLES O'CONNOR U.S. Attorney's Office
10		450 Golden Gate Avenue P.O. Box 36055
11		San Francisco, CA 94102 Tel: (415) 436-7200 Charles.OConnor@usdoj.gov
12		Attorneys for Defendants
13 14	OF COUNSEL: Jane Smith	
15	Office of the Solicitor U.S. Department of the Interior	
16	-	
17		
18		
19 20		
20		
22		
23		
24		
25		
2627		
28	Defendants' Answer to Complaint for Breach of the Rancheria Ac No. 5:10-cv-00270-JW	t, Breach of Fiduciary Obligation, Declaratory and Injunctive Relief — 15

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE The undersigned hereby certifies that she is an employee in the Denver Field Office of the United States Department of Justice, Environment and Natural Resources Division, 1961 Stout Street, 8th Floor, Denver, Colorado, 80294, and is a person of such age and discretion to be competent to serve papers. That on May 3, 2010, she served a copy of the attached **DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO** COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF THE RANCHERIA ACT, BREACH OF FIDUCIARY OBLIGATION, DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF on all parties via the CM/ECF Electronic Court Filing system listed below: Michael Vaughn Brady mbrady@scharff.us Michael Erik Vinding mvinding@scharff.us,lbriggs@scharff.us /s/ Karmen Robinson Karmen Robinson Defendants' Answer to Complaint for Breach of the Rancheria Act, Breach of Fiduciary Obligation, Declaratory and Injunctive Relief — No. 5:10-cv-00270-JW