1 Magistrate Judge J. Kelley Arnold 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 8 AT TACOMA 9 10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, No. CR07-5656JKA-3 11 Plaintiff, **DEFENDANT NOEL'S REPLY** 12 MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS COUNT ONE v. 13 14 ANDREW NOEL, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 INTRODUCTION 18 Defendant moved the Court to dismiss Count One of the Indictment on grounds that he 19 cannot be charged with Conspiracy where it cannot be known before the fact whether the 20 offense he allegedly conspired to commit is applicable. To such argument, the Government 21 22 responded by arguing that <u>Anderson v. Evans</u> established the applicability of the law to him and, 23 consequently, defendant conspired to violate the law. 24 **ARGUMENT** 25 The applicable test in this circuit is that a federal law of general applicability 26 27 applies to Indian tribes and tribal members unless (a) it infringes upon internal intramural 28 REPLY MEMORANDUM RE MOTION

29

TO DISMISS COUNT ONE - 1

Towtnuk Law Offices, Ltd.
Sacred Ground Legal Services, Inc.
1703 Creekside Loop, Suite 110
Yakima, WA 98902-4875
towtnuklaw@msn.com

relations between the tribe and its members; (b) the legislative history of the statute demonstrates a Congressional intent that the law not apply to Indians; or (c) the application of the law would abrogate rights guaranteed by treaty. *Lumber Industry Pension Fund v. Warm Springs Forest Products*, 939 F. 2d 683 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991); *Donovan v. Couer d'Alene Tribal Farm*, 751 1113 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985).

Not only are general federal laws not *always* applicable to Indian tribes and their members in this Circuit, where the government seeks to apply a criminal statute to the conduct of a Treaty Indian exercising *treaty hunting or fishing rights*, the applicable "conservation necessity" test requires that the Government, must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the harvest of that particular species of animal at the time it was taken in that particular vicinity had a harmful impact upon the conservation, or viability, of its species. Specifically, the Government must be able to establish beyond a reasonable doubt that the conservation statute it seeks to apply to the Treaty Indian is both "reasonable" and "necessary" for conservation. *See generally, State* v. Miller, 102 Wash. 2d 678 (1984). A conservation regulation is "necessary" only if it is demonstrated that its application is required for the perpetuation of the species in a given area. Id. *See also, State v. Buchanan*, 138 Wash. 2d 186 (1999). In Miller, the Washington State Supreme Court, relying extensively upon a U.S. Supreme Court decision, Washington Department of Game v. Puvallup Tribe, 414 U.S. 44 (1973), held that the appropriate test is:

"Conservation" as used in Supreme Court decisions and herein is limited to those measures which are reasonable and necessary to the perpetuation of a run or species of fish... "reasonable" means that a specifically identified conservation measure is appropriate to its purpose; and "necessary" means means that such purpose in addition to being reasonable must be essential to conservation.

REPLY MEMORANDUM RE MOTION TO DISMISS COUNT ONE - 2

21

23

22

24

25 26

27

28 29

REPLY MEMORANDUM RE MOTION TO DISMISS COUNT ONE - 3

Consequently, it can be seen that, in this Circuit, there are specific rules governing the applicability of federal laws to tribal members. The elements of Conspiracy include an agreement to commit an act that constitutes an offense against the laws of the United States. Since such applicability cannot be determined by a Treaty Indian before the fact, how can there be a conspiracy to commit an unlawful act? In their opinion, they would ordinarily be thinking that the only conspiracy or agreement they were engaging in was a conspiracy to exercise their treaty rights.

With particular reference to the Government's response that <u>Anderson v. Evans</u> has already established the applicability of the Marine Mammal Protection Act to the defendants notwithstanding their Treaty, that still does not address Count 1 (A) (Conspiracy to violate the Whaling Convention Act). There is no similar ruling establishing that the Whaling Convention Act may lawfully be applied to a tribal defendant under facts similar to those involved in this case. Where a defendant must guess as to whether his conduct runs afoul of a statute which may or may not be applicable to him as a matter of law, that would have a chilling effect on the exercise of any rights and raises serious due process concerns as to whether the defendant could have reasonable notice of whether his conduct was prohibited.

## **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the motion should be granted.

Respectfully submitted, this 17<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2008,

/s/ Jack W. Fiander

Towtnuk Law Offices, Ltd. Sacred Ground Legal Services, Inc. 1703 Creekside Loop, Suite 110 Yakima, WA 98902-4875 towtnuklaw@msn.com

Jack W. Fiander, WSBA # 13116 1 Counsel for Defendant Andrew Noel 1703 Creekside Loop, Suite 110 2 Yakima, WA 98902-4875 3 (509) 969-4436 4 Certificate of Service 5 The foregoing was filed electronically with the Clerk of Court and served on counsel on the 6 above date as follows: 7 James Oesterle, AUSA 8 Carl Blackstone, AUSA 700 Stewart Street, Suite 5220 9 Seattle, WA 98101 10 Jim.oesterle@usdoj.gov 11 /S/Jack W. Fiander 12 Jack W. Fiander 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 REPLY MEMORANDUM RE MOTION 29 TO DISMISS COUNT ONE - 4

Towtnuk Law Offices, Ltd.
Sacred Ground Legal Services, Inc.
1703 Creekside Loop, Suite 110
Yakima, WA 98902-4875
towtnuklaw@msn.com