#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

# CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - EASTERN DIVISION

COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF TRIBAL-STATE GAMING COMPACT AND FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF GAMING COMPACT AND FOR DECL. AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

28

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff, City of Temecula, hereby alleges as follows:

# **INTRODUCTION**

- This lawsuit is brought to compel the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians 1. ("Tribe") to fulfill its obligation to mitigate the direct and indirect physical changes in the off-reservation environment created by the expansion of its Casino adjacent to the City of Temecula ("City") as required by the Tribal-State Compact between the Tribe and the State of California.
  - The State and the Tribe negotiated and approved a Tribal-State Α. Compact in 1999 ("Original Compact") that authorized Class III Gaming (Las Vegas-style slot machines) at the Tribe's Casino. In 2006, the Legislature approved an Amendment to the Compact ("2006 Amended Compact") that was approved by the voters at a state-wide referendum election held in February 2008. The Original Compact limited the Tribe to 2,000 Gaming Devices (Las Vegas-style slot machines) in its Casino.
  - B. The obligation to mitigate local, off-reservation impacts is one of the cornerstones of the Compact and particularly the 2006 Amended Compact. As stated in the preamble of the 2006 Amended Compact, one of the purposes of the Amendment was for the Tribe "to enter into arrangements to mitigate to the extent practicable the off-reservation environmental and direct fiscal impacts of its Gaming Facility on local communities and local governments...."
  - C. Following the voter approval of the 2006 Amendment at a statewide referenda election in February 2008, the City is informed and believes that the Tribe has added approximately 2,200 Gaming Devices to its Casino under the authority of the 2006

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Compact but without following the mitigation requirements	of	the
2006 Amended Compact.		

- The Casino is adjacent to the southern boundary of the City of D. Temecula and is substantially surrounded by the boundaries of the City of Temecula. The principal access to the Casino is on City streets between the Interstate 15 Freeway and the Casino.
- E. The additional Gaming Devices have increased traffic to the area of the City surrounding the Casino and have created additional demands on police and fire services within the City.
- F. Section 10.8 of the 2006 Amendment requires the Tribe to prepare a Tribal Environmental Impact Report and to implement measures mitigating impacts from the additional machines through an intergovernmental agreement with the City.
- G. In February 2008, immediately following the voter approval of the 2006 Amendment, the City and the Tribe began negotiations for an intergovernmental agreement as provided in Section 10.8 of the 2006 Amended Compact to address the off-reservation impacts of the added Gaming Devices and to develop a process for the further expansion of the Casino. These negotiations resulted in the approval by the Tribe and the City of an Intergovernmental Agreement on March 9, 2010, along with the approval by the Tribe and the City of a Law Enforcement Memorandum of Understanding between the Tribe, the City, the County of Riverside and the Riverside County Sheriff.
  - 1. The Intergovernmental Agreement provides for a \$2 million annual mitigation fee to the City over 21 years for traffic improvements and police and fire services, subject to certain credits and cost of living increases, as well as a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

///

///

///

special mitigation fee of \$10 million in the fifth year of the Agreement to fund a portion of the cost of the Interstate 15/SR 79 Interchange expansion that is the primary access to the Casino from Interstate 15.

- 2. The Intergovernmental Agreement also provides the framework for the potential expansion of the Casino from 5,000 gaming devices to the 7,500 gaming devices authorized by the 2006 Amended Compact.
- H. Both the City and the Tribe are satisfied with the substantive terms of the Intergovernmental Agreement. The Intergovernmental Agreement, however, is dependent on the Tribe approving an intergovernmental agreement under Section 10.8 of the 2006 Amended Compact with the County of Riverside for off-reservation impacts to the County of Riverside.
- I. Unfortunately, the Tribe and the County of Riverside have not reached agreement on such an intergovernmental Agreement and do not appear likely to ever reach agreement. Therefore, no Tribal EIR and no intergovernmental agreement exist to mitigate the offreservation impacts of the addition of the 2,200 new Gaming Devices installed as required by Section 10.8 of the 2006 Amended Compact.
- J. The City has no alternative but to pursue this legal action to preserve its rights to the full and fair mitigation of the offreservation impacts arising from the additional gaming devices installed in the Casino on the City of Temecula and its citizens.

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

# **PARTIES**

- 2. The City is a municipal corporation duly incorporated under the laws and Constitution of the State of California, and is situated in the County of Riverside in the State of California.
- The Tribe is a federally recognized sovereign Indian tribe which operates a gaming facility located at 45000 Pechanga Parkway, Temecula, California 92592 (the "Gaming Facility"), pursuant to the Original Compact and as thereafter amended.
- 4 Real Party in Interest, State of California (the "State"), is a sovereign State of the United States of America, and is a party to the Original Compact, as thereafter amended.
- 5. Real Party in Interest, Arnold Schwarzenegger, is the Governor of the State of California, and is a signatory on behalf of the State of California to various amendments to the Original Compact.
- Real Party in Interest, Edmund G. Brown, Jr., is the Attorney General of the State of California, and is charged with enforcing the laws of the State of California.
- 7. Real Party in Interest, California Gambling Control Commission, is a regulatory body of the State of California, and is responsible for, inter alia, administering the provisions of various Tribal-State gaming compacts, including the Original Compact.
- The City is unaware of the true names or precise capacities, whether 8. individual, governmental, or otherwise, of those real parties in interest named herein as Roes 1 through 10, inclusive, and will seek leave to amend this complaint to state their true identities and precise capacities when ascertained.
- 9. The City is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times material hereto, real parties in interest Roes 1 through 10, inclusive, were and now are either the agents or principals of each of the other defendants or real parties in

interest, and of each other, and in such capacity or capacities, participated in the acts
and conduct alleged herein, or have some legal or equitable responsibility for the acts
and conduct alleged herein.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 10. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to the Section 10.8.9 of the August 2006 Amendment to the 1999 Original Compact.
- 11. Venue is proper in the Eastern Division of the Central District as the Gaming Facility is located in this judicial district.

# THE 2006 AMENDMENT TO THE 1999 COMPACT

- 12. Pursuant to the Original Compact, the Tribe was permitted to operate no more than 2,000 Class III gaming devices, as defined in 25 U.S.C. § 2703(8). These gaming devices include what are commonly known as "Las Vegas-style" electronic slot machines.
- 13. The Tribe also operated devices designed to support Class II gaming, as defined in 25 U.S.C. § 2703(7)(A). Class II gaming includes bingo and card games. Pursuant to federal law, the State may not regulate the number of Class II gaming devices that the Tribe may operate.
- 14. Pursuant to the Original Compact, and until February 2008, the City is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the Tribe operated 2,000 Class III gaming devices, and approximately 1,600 Class II gaming devices.
- 15. In August 2006, the Tribe and the State entered into an agreement to amend the 1999 Compact (the "2006 Amended Compact"). Under Section 4.3.1 of the 2006 Amended Compact, the Tribe would be allowed to increase the number of Class III gaming devices at its Gaming Facility from 2,000 to 7,500, an increase of 5,500 Class III gaming devices.

3

5

8

9

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

- As stated in the preamble of the 2006 Amended Compact, one of the 16. purposes of the Amendment was for the Tribe "to enter into arrangements to mitigate to the extent practicable the off-reservation environmental and direct fiscal impacts of its Gaming Facility on local communities and local governments. . . . "
- To implement the statement of purpose quoted in paragraph 16, Section 10.8.1(a) of the 2006 Amended Compact requires that "Before the commencement of any Project as defined in Section 10.8.7 herein, the Tribe shall prepare a tribal environmental impact report, (hereafter 'TEIR'), of the Project pursuant to the process set forth in this Section 10.8. . . . The TEIR shall provide detailed information about the Significant Effect(s) on the Off-Reservation Environment which the Project is likely to have. . . ."
- Under Section 10.8.7 of the 2006 Amended Compact, a Project is 18. defined as "any activity occurring on Indian lands, a principal purpose of which is to serve the Tribe's Gaming Activities or Gaming Operation and which may cause either a direct physical change in the off-reservation environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the off-reservation environment. This definition shall be understood to include, but not be limited to, the construction or planned expansion of any Gaming Facility and any construction or planned expansion, a principal purpose of which is to serve a Gaming Facility. . . . "
- As part of the TEIR process, pursuant to Section 10.8.4 of the 2006 19. Amended Compact, the Tribe is required to prepare a Final TEIR. The Final TEIR consists of: (i) the draft TEIR or a revision of the draft; (ii) comments and recommendations received on the draft TEIR either verbatim or in summary; (iii) a list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the draft TEIR; (iv) the responses of the Tribe to significant environmental points raised in the 26 review and consultation process; and (v) any other relevant comments and information added by the Tribe.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	Prior to the commencement of any project, as defined	in the 2006				
2	Amended Compact, and "no later than when the Tribe issues its Final TEIR, the					
3	Tribe shall offer to begin negotiations with the County and any impacted City in					
4	which the Gaming Facility is located or adjacent to, (hereafter 'Impacted City'), and					
5	upon the County's and/or any Impacted City's acceptance of the Tribe's offers, shall					
6	6 negotiate with the County and any Impacted City and shall enter into enforceable					
7	written agreements with the County and any Impacted City " Section 10.8.8 of					
8	8 the 2006 Amended Compact.					
9	9 21. As stated in Section 10.8.8 of the 2006 Amended Cor	npact, the required				
10	0 "Intergovernmental Agreement" must include:					
11	1 (i) Provisions providing for the timely mitigation of any	Significant Effect				
12	on the Off-Reservation Environment (which effects n	nay include, but are				
13	not limited to, adverse changes in aesthetics, agricult	ural resources, air				
14	4 quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geological	ogy and soils,				
15	5 hazards and hazardous materials, water resources, lar	nd use, mineral				
16	6 resources, traffic, noise, utilities and service systems,	and cumulative				

technological, and/or other considerations.

(ii) Provisions relating to reasonable compensation for law enforcement, fire protection, emergency medical services and any other public services to be provided by the County and any Impacted City to the Tribe for the purposes of the Tribe's Gaming Operation as a consequence of the Project.

Project, unless the parties agree that the particular mitigation is

infeasible, taking into account economic, environmental, social,

effects), where such an effect is attributable, in whole or in part, to the

Provisions providing for a mitigation of any effect on public safety (iii) attributable to the Project, including any reasonable compensation to the County and any Impacted City as a consequence thereof.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

(iv) Provisions providing for reasonable compensation for programs designed to address gambling addiction.

### **IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2006 AMENDED COMPACT**

- 22. On February 5, 2008, the voters in the State of California rejected an attempt to nullify the 2006 Amended Compact. As a result of the election, the 2006 Amended Compact was ratified.
- 23. The City is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that immediately following the February 5, 2008 election, the Tribe immediately switched out approximately 1,600 Class II gaming devices at the Gaming Facility and replaced them with approximately the same number of Class III gaming devices.
- 24. The City is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that since February 2008, the Tribe has added additional Class III gaming devices to the Gaming Facility, bringing the total number of Class III gaming devices installed at the Gaming Facility to more than 3,600.
- The Tribe has advertised and marketed the expanded availability of 25. Class III gaming devices.
- Due at least in part to the increased number of Class III gaming devices, 26. traffic to and from the Gaming Facility – including traffic on streets located in and affecting the City of Temecula – has increased due to the increased number of patrons at the Gaming Facility.

#### FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# (Violation of Tribal-State Compact Agreement)

27. The City incorporates by reference as though fully set forth herein all allegations contained in paragraphs 1-26 of this complaint.

28 ///

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 28. The Tribe's actions in increasing the number of Class III gaming devices located at the Gaming Facility constitutes a "project" as defined in Section 10.8.7 of the 2006 Amended Compact.
- Consequently, the Tribe was obligated, pursuant to the 2006 Amended Compact, to prepare a TEIR to assess the off-reservation impacts, including traffic and emergency services impacts, caused by the increase in the number of Class III gaming devices located at the Gaming Facility.
- Additionally, the Tribe was required, pursuant to Section 10.8.8 of the 30. 2006 Amended Compact, to negotiate and finalize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City to mitigate the impacts to the City caused by the increase in Class III gaming devices at the Gaming Facility.
- The Tribe failed to prepare the required TEIR for the increase in Class 31. III gaming devices, and thereby violated and breached the 2006 Amended Compact.
- The Tribe failed to negotiate and finalize an Intergovernmental 32. Agreement with the City, and thereby violated and breached the 2006 Amended Compact.
- Unless enjoined by this Court, the City is informed and believes, and 33. thereon alleges, that the Tribe will continue to breach the 2006 Amended Compact by refusing to prepare the required TEIR for the increase in Class III gaming devices and by refusing to negotiate and finalize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City.
- The City has no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law, and 34. injunctive relief is necessary.

# SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# (For Declaratory Relief)

The City incorporates by reference as though fully set forth herein all 35. allegations contained in paragraphs 1-34 of this complaint.

	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

An actual controversy exists between the City and the Tribe in that the 36. Tribe has failed to prepare a TEIR to analyze the off-reservation impacts caused by the increase in the number of Class III gaming devices, and has failed to negotiate with the City and to finalize an Intergovernmental Agreement. Consequently, the City contends that the Tribe has acted in violation of its obligations under the 2006 Amended Compact. The Tribe disagrees with the City's position.

PRAYER

Plaintiff, City of Temecula, prays for a judgment of this Court:

# On the First Claim for Relief

- Enjoining and requiring the Tribe to prepare a TEIR, as defined in the 1. 2006 Amended Compact, to analyze the off-reservation impacts caused by the increase in the number of Class III gaming devices at the Gaming Facility;
- Enjoining and requiring the Tribe to negotiate with the City and to 2. finalize an Intergovernmental Agreement as defined in the 2006 Amended Compact;
- 3. Enjoining and prohibiting the Tribe from operating more than 2,000 Class III gaming devices located at the Gaming Facility, until a TEIR is prepared and until the Tribe and the City have finalized an Intergovernmental Agreement all as required by Section 10.8 of the 2006 Amended Compact.

# On the Second Claim for Relief

For a declaration by this Court that the Tribe violated the 2006 4. Amended Compact by failing to prepare a TEIR to analyze the off-reservation impacts caused by the increase in the number of Class III gaming devices, and by failing to negotiate with the City and finalize an Intergovernmental Agreement. ///

UNITED STATES I	DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRIC	T OF CALIFORNIA
CITY OF TEMECULA, a municipal corporation,	CASE NUMBER
PLAINTIFH	7 10 - 07378 DSF (1/2
v.	
PECHANGA BAND OF LUISEÑO INDIANS, [SEE ATTACHED]	SUMMONS
DEFENDANT(S).	
TO: DEFENDANT(S): PECHANGA BAND OF LUIS	EÑO INDIANS and [SEE ATTACHED]
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, RC	le 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer ochELLE BROWNE, whose address is ELES, CALIFORNIA 90071. If you fail to do so,
your miswer or metter war the search	
	TERRY NAFISI
	Clerk, U.S. District Court
Dated:	By: Deputy Clerk
	(Seal of the Court)
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States of a United States	ates agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed
CV-01A (12/07) SUM	MMONS CCD-1A

11086-0146\1288652v1.doc

1	CITY OF TEMECULA vs. PECHANGA BANK OF LUISENO INDIANS, et al.
2	CONTINUED FROM SUMMONS CAPTION:
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor of the State of California; EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General of the State of California; CALIFORNIA
4	State of California; EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General of the
5	GAMBLING CONTROL
6 7	COMMISSION; and ROES 1-10, inclusive,
8	Real Parties in Interest.
9	
10	
11	CONTINUED FROM SUMMONS "TO DEFENDANTS":
12	AND TO REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST: STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
13	ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor of the State of California; EDMUND
14	G. BROWN, JR., Attorney General of the State of California; CALIFORNIA
15	GAMBLING CONTROL COMMISSION; and ROES 1-10, inclusive
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26 27	
27	
۵٥	





# UNITED STATE ISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT A CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box	x if you are representing yourself		DEFE	ENDANTS		Married Andrew Control of the Contro
CITY OF TEMECULA, a municipal corporation		l l	HANGA BAND OF E ATTACHED]	LUISEÑO INDI	ANS; and	
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Addivourself, provide same.)  ROCHELLE BROWNE  RICHARDS   WATSO  355 S. GRAND AVE  LOS ANGELES, CA  (213) 626-8484 t  (213) 626-0078 f	and GINETTA L. GI N   GERSHON NUE, 40TH FLOOR 90071 elephone	-		neys (If Known)		
	N (Place an X in one box only.)	[1]	II. CITIZEN (Place an	NSHIP OF PRINCIPAL X in one box for plaintiff	PARTIES - For Diversity and one for defendant.)	Cases Only
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	X 3 Federal Question (U Government Not a P		Citizen of This S	PTF DEF	Incorporated or Principal I of Business in this State	PTF DEF
2 U.S. Government Defendar	nt 4 Diversity (Indicate C	itizensnip	Citizen of Anoth	ner State 2 2	Incorporated and Principa of Business in Another Sta	
		' 1	Citizen or Subje Foreign Cour		Foreign Nation	6 6
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in or X l Original 2 Remove Proceeding State C	ved from 3 Remanded from		stated or pened	5 Transferred from anothe (specify):	or district	Judge from
V. REQUESTED IN COMP	LAINT: JURY DEMAND:	Yes		k 'Yes' only if demanded in		
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.I					COMPLAINT: \$ 0,00	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (C	ite the U.S. Civil Statute under w	hich you are	filing and write	a brief statement of cause	e. Do not cite jurisdictions	I statutes unless diversity.)
FEDERAL COMMON LA	W VIOLATION O	F TRIB	AL-STATE	E COMPACT AGR	EEMENT; DECLA	RATORY RELIEF
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Pla	ce an X in one box only.)					
OTHER STATUTES	CONTRACT		ORTS	TORTS	PRISONER	LABOR
400 State Reapportionment	IIO Insurance		AL INJURY	PERSONAL PROPERTY	PETITIONS	710 Fair Labor Standards Act
410 Antitrust	120 Marine	310 Air		370 Other Fraud	510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	
430 Banks and Banking	130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument		plane Product bility	371 Truth in Lending	1 0	Relations
450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc.	150 Recovery of		sault, Libel &	380 Other Personal	530 General	730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting &
460 Deportation	Overpayment &		nder	Property Damage	535 Death Penalty	Disclosure Act
470 Racketeer Influenced	Enforcement of		i. Employers' bility	385 Property Damage	540 Mandamus/ Other	740 Railway Labor A
and Corrupt Organizations	Judgment	340 Ma		Product Liability		790 Other Labor
480 Consumer Credit	151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted		rine Product	BANKRUPTCY	550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	1
490 Cable/Sat TV	Student Loan (Excl.		ibility otor Vehicle	422 Appeal 28 USC	FORFEITURE/	791 Empl. Ret. Inc.
810 Selective Service	Veterans)		otor Vehicle	423 Withdrawal 28	PENALTY	Security Act
850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange	U153 Recovery of Overpayment of		duct Liability	USC 157	610 Agriculture	PROPERTY RIGHTS
875 Customer Challenge 12	Veteran's Benefits		her Personal ury	CIVIL RIGHTS	620 Other Food & Drug	820 Copyrights 830 Patent
USC 3410	160 Stockholders' Suits		rsonal Injury-	442 Employment	625 Drug Related	R40 Trademark
890 Other Statutory Actions	X 190 Other Contract	Me	ed Malpractice	443 Housing/Acco-	Seizure of	SOCIAL SECURITY
891 Agricultural Act 892 Economic Stabilization	195 Contract Product Liability		rsonal Injury- oduct Liability	mmodations 444 Welfare	Property 21 US	861 HLA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923)
Act	196 Franchise		bestos Personal		630 Liquor Laws	863 DIWC/DIWW
893 Environmental Matters	REAL PROPERTY	lnj	jury Product	Disabilities -	640 R.R. & Truck	(405(g))
894 Energy Allocation Act	210 Land Condemnation	1	ability	Employment  446 American with	650 Airline Regs 660 Occupational	864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g))
895 Freedom of Info. Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determi-	220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	(1)	RATION ::  ituralization	Disabilities -	Safety/Health	FEDERAL TAX SUITS
nation Under Equal	240 Torts to Land		oplication	Other	690 Other	870 Taxes (U.S.
Access to Justice	245 Tort Product Liability	463 Hz	beas Corpus-	440 Other Civil		Plaintiff or Defendant)
950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	290 All Other Real Property		ien Detaince	Rights	1	871 IRS - Third Party
Since Sintuites			ther Immigration		BAP /	26 USC 7609
	ANKA	SIA	A	AMONO	THE TE	DRI.
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Cose Number		<u> </u>	A 4 9 4 9	mai / p	
AFTER CO	MPLETING THE FRONT SIL	E OF FOR	M CY-71, CO	MPLETE THE INFORM	IATION REQUESTED I	BELOW.

OCT - 1 200

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES If yes, list case number(s):	6: Has this action be	een previously filed in this c	court and dismissed, remanded or closed? X No Yes			
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: If yes, list case number(s):	Have any cases bee	n previously filed in this co-	urt that are related to the present case? X No Yes			
.,	vil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case:  heck all boxes that apply)  A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or  B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or  C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or					
processor come,	g the following info	rmation, use an additional s ity outside of this District; S	sheet if necessary.) State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. intiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b).			
County in this District:* RIVERSIDE			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
and an experience of the second secon		· ·	State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. endant. If this box is checked, go to item (c).			
County in this District:* RIVERSIDE			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California, or Foreign Country			
Note: In land condemn		nty outside of this District; Selocation of the tract of la				
County in this District:*  RIVERSIDE			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country			
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bo Note: In land condemnation case			ra, or San Luis Obispo Counties			
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORN	EY (OR PRO PER):	Mineta D. G.	Date OCTOBER 1, 2010 IOVINCO			
or other papers as required by	y law. This form, ap	, proved by the Judicial Confi	information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings erence of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)			
Key to Statistical codes relating	to Social Security C	ases:				
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement o	f Cause of Action			
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))				
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)				
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))				
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))				
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.				
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))				

CV-71 (05/08)