## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

DEBORAH K. HENDRIX, ANGIE A. REVELL, PHILIP J. HENDRIX III, PHYLLIS A. ATTOCKNIE,

Plaintiffs

CIV-08-605

VS.

WALLACE COFFEY, Individually and as a Citizen of the United States and State of Oklahoma, and as a member of the Comanche Business Committee, as are the following; RONALD REDELK, EDDIE MAHSEET, LANNY ASEPERMY, JANICE BIGBEE, and DONNA WAHNEE, tribal enrollment Director,

**Defendants** 

JUN 11 2008

ROBERT D. DENNIS CLERK
U.S. DIST. 60 URT; WESTERN DIST OF ONLA.

CIV. NO.

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR TEMPORARY
INJUNCTION AND FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTION
AFTER TRIAL ON THE MERITS AND FOR DAMAGES.
IN THE ALTERNATIVE FOR INJUNCTIONS, AS PRAYED AND FOR
DECLARATORY JUDGEMENT, FOR ALL COSTS
AND FOR ATTORNEY FEES

# JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT PART ONE

Plaintiffs are *Pro Se*, without means to hire an attorney. They believe the Honorable Court has federal question jurisdiction over the subject matter, as well as the persons, parties to this complaint for temporary injunction and for permanent injunction after trial on the merits. This case arises under the Constitution, treaties and civil rights laws of the United States.

Plaintiffs are Comanche Indian citizens of the United States and State of Oklahoma, the

same as the Defendants. This suit entails the illegal deprivation of Plaintiff's federal due process and equal protection of the Law (See: Plaintiff's Exhibit "A" and "B" attached hereto).

- Defendants have deprived Plaintiff's of vested federal protected rights without due process and equal protection of the laws in direct violation of the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968 as it stands in pari materia and in tandem with other civil rights statutes which are in pari materia, and in tandem with the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968 (25 U.S. Code - Indians - Section 1301-03). The deprivation of rights also contravenes the U.S. Civil Rights Acts of 1866, 1870, 1871, 1964, and 1968.
- These Acts were designed to protect all people (the citizens of the United States from each other, states from each other, and the world) as it effects their lives, liberty and property. They are mostly in tandem and in pari materia with the United States Constitution Bill of Rights and Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. Congress was given constitutional authority to enforce such rights by proper legislative. Where in pari materia, upon the same matter or subject, they are construed together. State vs. Gerhardt, 145 Ind. 439, 44 N.E. 469, 33 LRA 313; U.S.C.A. Jones v. Meyers, 392 U.S. 409 (1968). The Meyer case applied the Act of 1866, a Housing Act. The Court in 1968, with Justice Stewart speaking for a seven man majority adopted the view of first Justice Harlin, that the Thirteenth Amendment became part of the Constitution so that Congress could have the power to remove the "badges of slavery" from the Nation.
- In 1964 Congress authorized the Attorney General to intervene, in any civil rights suit in which there is an allegation of the denial of equal protection of the laws. Using this authority, the Department of Justice has intervened in several major suits against school districts.

Then, as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, Congress adopted specific federal criminal legislation to protect persons in the exercise of their civil rights against injury, intimidation, or interference either by private individuals or public officials. Under this Act, it is now a crime to interfere with or attempt to interfere with or injure any person because he is voting or campaigning in any election, serving on a federal jury, working for a federal agency, or participating in any federal or federally assisted program. It is also a federal crime to interfere with or injure or intimidate any person because of his race, color or religion while he is attending a public school, working for any employer, serving on a state jury, or using a common carrier in public accommodation. Also protected under the law are persons who are trying to encourage or help persons secure civil rights. Law officers are exempt from this Act only during the course of their duties for actions to suppress a riot or a civil disorder. Commission of any of the Acts interdicted by the federal law is also a violation of state law, so Congress limited federal prosecutions to those instances when the Attorney General certifies, in writing, that federal prosecution is in the public interest and necessary to secure substantial justice thus the federal authorities will not act if the state does. Also, Congress provided for uniform provisions that should avoid any discrimination in the selection of federal juries.

The Civil Rights Act of 1968 has further strengthened the Justice Department's authority to protect constitutional rights and to act against racially motivated crimes. The Department's more active role has had an impact, it has alerted state and local officers to the fact that they violate at their own peril the rights and privileges protected under the Thirteenth Amendment. The Thirteenth Amendment applies to all persons (unlike the Fourteenth Amendment) and not just to those acting under color of law. By its own force the Thirteenth Amendment prevents all forms of involuntary servitude; it also empowers

Congress to pass whatever laws are necessary and proper to prevent slavery or
involuntary servitude.

For a hundred years, some people, including first Justice Harlin, have argued that the Thirteenth Amendment gave Congress the authority to legislate against all "badges of slavery", specifically against racial discrimination in all its forms, regardless of the source. But the Supreme Court construed the Thirteenth Amendment narrowly so that slavery would mean only physical compulsion or peonage (a condition of compulsory servitude based on indebtedness of the worker to the employer). Thus, it was held that Congress received no power from the Thirteenth Amendment to legislate against racial discrimination.

Jones vs. Meyers, though concerned about discrimination in housing, created a different look at the Thirteenth Amendment, which applies to all persons. Though some private acts of discrimination may not be unconstitutional, they may be illegal. States have the authority to protect a person's property rights against infringement by others, so they have the authority to protect a person's civil rights as does the national government. The weakness of some of these civil rights acts which appear as statutes, such as the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968, is that they make no special provision for enforcement other than by regular court action instituted by public prosecution or through the initiation of law suits by the person being discriminated against.

Most Indian citizens lack the money to prosecute a lawsuit and if/and when they undertake to file a civil suit, the Court has been less than eager to take action. The ineffectiveness of criminal laws against discrimination is mostly because of the inherent view that Indians were not considered "persons" for purposes of inclusion under the

Fourteenth Amendment with regard to the protection of their rights. The Courts were quick to decide that Indians were made citizens by birth in the Fourteenth Amendment; they were considered to be separate and apart. Referred to as "denizens" not citizens.

- The Plaintiffs here, however, allege that they are entitled to civil rights protection of their identity, life, liberty and property, and to national protection and guarantees of their rights of American citizenship.
- American citizenship confers upon Plaintiffs some very special rights. First of all, an American citizen obtains state citizenship merely by residing in a state. (Residence, as used in the Fourteenth Amendment, means domicile or the place one calls "home"). To Plaintiffs, Oklahoma is home. The legal status of domicile is not to be confused with the fact of physical presence. He may be living in a state and his domicile may be another and it is from state citizenship that many of our most important rights flow.
- States determine subject to constitutional limitations who shall vote, not merely for state and local officials but also for national officials, and in the Plaintiff's case – tribal officials. States could also confer the right to vote on aliens but do not, yet citizenship is an essential (but not sufficient) requirement to vote and hold office.
- Do American citizens have rights other than the right to become citizens of the state in which they reside? The Supreme Court in the Slaughter House cases (1873) carefully distinguished between privileges of United States citizens and of state citizens, holding that only privileges attaching to national citizenship are those that "owe their existence to the federal government, its national character, its constitution, or its laws".
- These privileges of United States citizenship have never been completely enumerated, but they include the right to use the navigable waters of the United States; to assemble peacefully;

to petition the national government for redress of grievances; to be protected by the national government on the high seas; to vote, if qualified to do so under laws, in national elections and to have one's vote counted properly, and to travel throughout the United States. Travel dealing with the concept of "locomotion" is another arena where a host of civil rights and liberties arise from.

- The right to travel, the basic freedom of persons to move from place to place, has in recent years become the subject to considerable litigation. Except for persons under legal restraint committed to jail, subject to the draft, out on bail and so forth - all American citizens may travel throughout the Nation and no state may impose any barriers to this from of movement.
- The right of American citizens to live in the United States, in these days of war and tyranny is the most precious right citizens can have. Aliens have no such rights.
- Congress has the right and power to provide a uniform rule for naturalization. This was accomplished when all Indian citizens born within the territorial limits of the United States were declared to be citizens thereof under the Act of June 2, 1924 (43 Stat. 253). This Act is codified at 8 U.S. Code 1401 (2) (b).
- The importance of this is not to be understated. Each of these Plaintiffs has expanded rights to federal protection. As Indian citizens they are entitled to the full panoply of rights afforded all other citizens of the United States including their rights to protection of identity, life, liberty and property by federal, state and local (tribal) governments.
- This Indian United States Citizenship and Naturalization Act accords all Indians born here full U.S. citizenship and reserves to them their rights to share in all tribal and other properties. This is today, more than ever, basic to self-government. The preservation of the rights of

Indians granted by the United States Constitution is within the full intendment of the law of the land which is the right to due process and equal protection of the law, federal, state, or tribal and applies to all Indian citizens equally *in pari materia* with the civil rights acts of the United States. Any other interpretation would render individual rights of Indian citizens meaningless. Tribal, State, and Federal responsibilities are under these legal and political realities for reasons there can be no tribal, state, or federal organizations of citizen Indians outside the required civil rights acts of the United States, and as citizens, the Indians, each of them, are entitled to the protection of their civil rights as accorded all other citizens.

All civil rights acts in pari materia and in tandem upon the same matter and subject are to be construed together as required by due process and to equal protection of law. The subject of citizenship once granted is not a subject to be negotiated at the whim of legislation.

Once the uniform rule for citizenship is provided, the rights and immunities of citizenship cannot be construed as less than it is to allow any other citizen, Indian or non-Indian, to subject the Indian citizens to the deprivation of their federal rights to the due process and equal protection of the law.

Congress is authorized to legislate on Indian Affairs under the Constitution and that power to legislate is plenary insofar as the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache (KCA) treaties with the United States are concerned. The Supreme Court has said that it is powerless to inquire into the motives of Congress which prompted Congress to legislation with reference to the treaties entered into with the KCA tribes, and so held in 1903 in Lone wolf v. Hitchcock, 187 U.S. 553 (1903).

The application of U.S. Citizenship and civil rights protection to the KCA Indians on the part of

Congress is basic to self-government. And the violation of this protection of civil rights among the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Indians is rising. This violation is being perpetuated on these citizen Indians by tribal officials acting illegally and at their own peril. Idealistically no other citizen Indian or non-Indian citizen may deal with their rights except within the full intendment of the protective guarantees of their civil rights to federal protection. The Indian Civil Rights Act is, in pari materia with the full intendment of American citizenship under 8 U.S. Code 1401(b), the Thirteenth Amendment and Civil Rights Acts. The KCA Indians evolved under the treaties and allotment acts and their legal position after allotments in generality evolved under the direction of congress as have their individual rights they have under such statutes include rights to public land Indian allotments. SEE 25 U.S. Code 334,336,345-346; 8 U.S. Code 1401 (b); 28 U.S.C.1353, etc.

No KCA Indian has the right to deny due process or equal protection, nor the power to disenfranchise any other persons of such rights under any pretext of acting under to color of either federal, state, or tribal law. They (as in the case of the Defendants) are powerless to claim immunity from civil rights injunctions against actions that would jeopardize the individual rights of citizen Indians as these citizen Indians have been accorded protection from those Indians and non-Indians under the evolving system of congress from the days when Indians were considered denizens prior to citizenship. All of the actions of every Indian are subject to the prohibitions of the Civil Rights Acts of 1968 which are in pari materia.

Therefore, the Honorable Court has federal question jurisdiction as a political reality and the

Courts of the United States has referred to the federal position of the United States in Indian Affairs holding that the United States has "moral obligations of the highest responsibility and trust" towards Indians (Seminole Nation v. U.S., 316 U.S. 286, 297 (1942), and must use "great care" in its dealings with them (U.S. v. Mason, 412 U.S. 391, 398 (1973) so that consequently any governmental action that affects Indians' interests must be judged "by the most exacting fiduciary standards." (Seminole Nation, 316 at U.S. 297).

Case 5:08-cv-00605-M

- Four jurisdictional statutes are important in this context: Title 28, U.S.C. Section 1331 (written as 28 U.S.C. 1331, 28 U.S.C. 1362, 28 U.S.C. 1353 and 28 U.S.C. 1343(a); Section 1331 confers jurisdiction on the federal courts over any civil action which "arises" under the Constitution, Laws or Treaties of the United States". This statute is extremely important to Indians and tribes because it allow federal courts to protect the many federal rights Indians have under treaties and statutes. Civil rights jurisdiction appears in several statutes in Title 42 U.S.C.
- The Fourteenth Amendment does implicitly what the Fifteenth Amendment does explicitly.

  "The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude". The Fifteenth Amendment also empowers Congress to enact any law necessary and proper to enforce the prohibitions of the Amendment.
- Civil rights primarily involves two (2) statutes: The Civil Rights Act of 1866 makes it a federal crime for any person acting under the color of law willfully to deprive any person of a right secured or protected by the Constitution; and the Civil Rights Act of 1870 (Ku Klux Klan Law) makes it a federal offense for two or more persons to conspire to deprive a

citizen from the enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or federal laws.

- The Civil Rights Act of 1871 provides for suit for damages and injunctions for deprivations of rights secured by the Constitution and provides for civil rather than criminal remedies.
- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 directs: each federal department and agency which is empowered to extend federal financial assistance to any program or activity, by the way of grant, loan, or contract to take the necessary action to insure that no person in the United States shall, on grounds of race, color or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefit of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.
- The Economic Opportunities Act of 1964 has been an important civil rights program. American Indians, at least on or near an Indian reservation have certain rights because of their status as Indians, such as employment preferences. But any Indian outside the scope of authority or contrary to law can have no claim to obedience. The Constitution protects our rights to become and remain citizens. 8 U.S.C. 1401(b) and the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968 declare our civil rights are not to be infringed upon, and that is a right basic to the concept of self-government.
- When dealing with the citizenship rights of citizens, in essence, the Court has ruled that what the Constitution gives, Congress may not take away, Afroyim v. Rusk, 387 U.S. 253 (1967). The power of Congress is to provide a uniform rule for naturalization. This rule, affecting Indians is codified at 8 U.S.C. 1401 (b), (Act of June 2, 1924, 43 Stat. 253).

# PART II OPERATIVE FACTS

Against this backdrop the Defendants, five of the seven member Comanche Business Committee (CBC) and the Comanche enrollment director have conspired, one with the other, to subject three of the four Plaintiffs to a tribal banishment calling it "disenrollment", which is not within the scope of their tribal authority or employment. The Constitution of the Comanche Nation, this being the Nation's premier legal documental law (1976), has no provisions regarding "disenrollment" of tribal members. The fourth Plaintiff seeks protection under the law preventing the CBC from violation of civil rights or retaliatory actions against said Plaintiff due to help given to secure civil rights of co-Plaintiffs.

Like other Comanche Indians, Plaintiff Deborah K. Hendrix (C-4568) was enrolled as a member of the Comanche Nation based upon her direct descendancy of her Comanche grandfather, Otto Wells (Koommahroso), an original allottee (1901), as well as her constitutionally mandated blood quantum. This tribal affiliation being enforced due to the enrollment of her father, Charles Ellis Wells (C-5968) born January 10, 1914. Both she and her father are entered in the Comanche base roll (1976). She is a U.S. citizen by birth and a Comanche Indian by birth. She is not now nor has never been enrolled in any other Indian tribe as a member. Ms. Hendrix's mother though is of Caddo blood. SEE Exhibit "C".

Plaintiff Angie A. Hendrix Revell, (C-11318), is the daughter of Deborah K. Hendrix. Plaintiff
Philip J. Hendrix III (C-11319) is the son of Deborah. Both of these individuals were
accepted as members of the Comanche Nation on February 5, 1994 based upon the
enrollment of their mother and father as well as meeting all constitutional requirements.

Plaintiffs believe that this malicious act of "disenrollment" is a conspiratory scheme initially

conceived by members of the CBC in their attempt to thwart Plaintiff Deborah Hendrix's concerted efforts to gather information relevant to mismanagement of tribal programs and funds. Each of these Defendants have hidden agenda's prompting this retaliatory scheme that has in fact, deprived Ms. Hendrix of her rightful participation in tribal activities and programs. This intrusive action has violated her rights to due process and denied her equal protection rights under the aforementioned laws. Specifically:

- > Denial of due process regarding impending adverse action
- Failed to give opportunity to present evidentiary documents
- > Denial of voting rights
- > Denial of rights to participate of tribal governmental processes
- > Denial of right to run for a vacant tribal council seat
- > Denied right to appeal to an unbiased forum
- > Denial of tribal program benefits
- > Denial of right to seek medical assistance through Indian Health Service
- > Denial of pharmaceutical/prescription assistance for needed medications
- Denial of financial educational benefits
- Denial of annual tribal casino revenues
- > Subjected to obloquy and illegal invasions of her privacy

Plaintiff will show the Court documentation relevant to the previous mentioned affronts and will provide witnesses.

Plaintiff's daughter, Angie A. Wells Revell, submitted a petition to recall Business

Committeeman Lanny Asepermy for cause, this was one reason for the illegal action

taken against her by Wallace Coffey and co-defendants. Rather than complete the process as established by tribal law, Defendants issued an inflammatory full page ad in local newspaper declaring petition fraudulent and implied federal criminal action is being taken against the petitioner. BIA law enforcement investigator informed Defendants that there was nothing under present Comanche petition law that Plaintiff Revell violated. Defendants have violated Plaintiff Revell's right to petition for grievances regarding Defendant Asepermy's valid civil rights violations against tribal members. To this day, Defendants have not completed recall petition process nor acknowledged receipt of BIA findings. By the issuance of this news release, Defendants proposed to hold her up to ridicule in her community and impugn her integrity. Defendant Wahnee played a part in this illegal attempt to circumvent tribal law by calling petition signers inquiring if they actually signed Petition in question and if they would reconsider keeping their signatures on said petition. Another violation of Plaintiff Revell's civil rights. In reality, the Comanche Nation is largely at the mercy of mismanagement. There are those that prefer the status quo to cover their extra curricular activities under the name of the Nation having phony address in several states without tribal knowledge. Several tribes have been used for dishonest ventures and money washing. Being able to operate without recourse is a problem that needs looking into. Assistance of the Courts should not be lightly denied.

Plaintiff's Exhibit "C" shows that the CBC wrongfully allege that Plaintiff's, Deborah K. Hendrix, Angie A. Hendrix Revell, and Philip J. Hendrix III are not Comanche. Plaintiff Hendrix III is in actually quilt by association. Ms. Hendrix's has a full-blood older sister, and two brothers who have been not been denied citizenship nor abused in like manner.

## **PART III**

Prayer: Plaintiff's pray for temporary injunction restraining Defendants from carrying out their plan to deprive Plaintiffs of their rights to due process and equal protection of the laws and or to deprive Plaintiff of any rights reserved to them under the Indian Citizenship and Naturalization Act of June 2, 1924 (43 Stat. 253 – Codified at 8 U.S. Code 1401(b), their rights to shall in "all tribal programs, monies and other property".

Although all the rights reserved to Comanche Indian citizens under the "other property" clause has not as yet been fully denominated, such rights are absolutely equal to those of every other Comanche Indian citizen and many are federal benefits or are protected by federal Civil Rights Acts and the Constitution of the United States and State of Oklahoma.

The Indian Civil Rights Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. Sections 1301-03) is in pari materia with and in tantem with the continuing purpose of Congress to afford Indian citizens with due process and equal protection in their rights which cannot be confiscated by any other members of the Tribe without due process, equal protection of the laws and just compensation as a matter of their protected federal rights which are involved.

Said injunction to include an immediate temporary injunction preventing Defendants from carrying out their orders to halt all services to Plaintiffs by reason of "disenrollment".

Again, the disenfranchisement of Plaintiffs is illegal. Moreover, the Comanche Nation receives federal funding from the United States for the majority of tribal programs and these programs are abused when the members are abused and rights denied.

Plaintiffs Exhibit "D" shows that the Business Committee, acting ultra vires to their authority assumed they could violate the rights of Plaintiffs at will and "disenroll" Plaintiffs and in so doing are well with their right when they have no right whatsoever to "disenroll" anyone.

What has happened is on April 18, 2008 (See Exhibit "D"), the Defendants have notified all tribal departments of the alleged legal action and Defendant Donna Wahnee, together with a tribal administrator issued a letter to all departments which continues the erroneous claim that "with assistance of the Bureau of Indian Affairs - several tribal members have been disenrolled" with the Comanche Nation.

This is false as is all of Defendants claims. All departments however have been alerted to deny Plaintiffs all benefits of all programs afforded by the tribe. They are federally subsidized programs and all agencies that afford these programs (almost all tribal programs) are required to halt all federal funding when they violate federal guidelines and deny civil rights, or due process and equal protection of the law to any person.

Plaintiffs are affected, for instance, the tribal pharmaceutical/prescription assistance program, now denies to Plaintiff's needed medications they had been assisting with. Plaintiff's son and daughter are denied educational benefits, etc. These federally funded programs are ended at the whim of those whose jobs in office are short lived and not in accordance with law.

The Indian Civil Rights Act, 25 U.S.C. Sections 1301-03, 1988, therefore, a temporary injunction should issue to prevent the illegal election process from continuing and outcome be recognized without the rightful participation of Plaintiff Deborah K. Hendrix. The Defendants have wrongfully set up the parameters of participation by the wrongfully removal on Ms. Hendrix name from the official ballot as recognized by Comanche Nation General Council assemble April 19, 2008. This tribal council is established by the Comanche Nation Constitution and the "Supreme governing body of the Comanche Nation".

The situation is one where irreparable damage and harm is taking place and Defendants can do as they choose. Plaintiffs whom suffer the harm and damage can do nothing about it without the assistance of the Court.

Plaintiffs have been illegally disenfranchised from their identities, are subjected to lass of property and suffer irreparable harm and damage with no let up. Plaintiffs pray for temporary injunction and for permanent injunction after trial on their merits, and for all other relief as seem reasonable and just to the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

Plaintiffs;

Deborah K. Hendrix, ET AL, Plaintiffs

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on	_, 20008, I served the attached
document by: Certified Mail, Return Receipt Re	equested.
On the following:	
Wallace Coffey	
P.O. Box 908	
Lawton, Ok 73502	
Ronald Red Elk	
109 Venable Dr.	
Anadarko, OK 73005	
Edmond Mahseet	
P.O. Box 109	
Apache, OK 73006	
Lanny Asepermy	
P.O. Box 247	
Apache. OK 73006	
Jenice Bigbee	
423 E. Rogers Dr.	
Stillwater, OK 74075	
Donna Wahnee 405 S. 10 <sup>th</sup>	
Walters, OK 73572	

# **United States District Court Western District of Oklahoma**

### **EXHIBITS**

- Exhibit A: Letter from Dan Deerinwater, Regional Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs.
- Exhibit B: Memo dated April 22, 2008 from Wallace Coffey to take Deborah Hendrix off the election ballot, with copy of how each member voted.

Memo dated April 24, 2008 from Wallace Coffey deleting Deborah Hendrix

Minutes of the April 17, 2008 meeting.

Exhibit C: Letter from Caddo Tribe certifying Deborah Hendrix was never on the Caddo roll.

Copy of the Comanche base roll.

Fathers Comanche enrollment cards.

Comanche Census roll of Comanche births with Ms. Hendrix's fathers, grandfather and grandmother.

Exhibit D: Memo from Johnny Wauqua, Tribal Administrator directing all departments not to provide services to those on the list.



## United States Department of the Interior

Bureau of Indian Affairs Southern Plains Regional Office P. O. Box 368 Anadarko, Oklahoma 73005

N REPLY REFER TO:
Tribal Government Services

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 'A' 4 pages

MAY 2 7 2008

Deborah Hendrix 820 N.E. Cherry Rd. Elgin, Oklahoma 73538

Dear Ms. Hendrix:

We have reviewed your protest dated May 12, 2008, from the action of the Comanche Business Committee (CBC) taken on April 17, 2008, purportedly disenrolling you as a member of the Comanche Nation. Your letter states that your rights under the Indian Civil Rights Act have been violated by the CBC in the following regards.

As described in your letter, you have not been provided due process:

- 1. No proper notice was provided you prior to the disenrollment action.
- 2. You had no opportunity to refute the allegation against you at the purported meeting.
- 3. You have not been properly advised in writing of your appeal rights.
- 4. No proper appeal forum has been provided you by the CBC from its decision of April 17th

Further you allege that you have not been provided equal protection under the constitution as follows:

- 5. The Comanche Nation has no ordinance or procedure adopted on disenrollment.
- 6. The CBC acted improperly by removing you from the list of candidates by telephone and not at a duly called meeting.

We are accepting your protest due to the potential conflict of interest that the Anadarko Agency Superintendent, Betty Tippeconnie, may have in this matter due to the candidacy of her husband for the same position that you had been nominated for.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has an interest in the integrity of tribal membership rolls because individuals use their membership to obtain federal services or funds. Additionally, the Bureau, because of the possibility of violating a person's rights in a disenrollment action, may review those matters to assure that the standards established under the Indian Civil Rights Act (ICRA) and a tribe's constitution are met. These standards are generally of due process and equal protection. Due process, at a minimum, grants a person the right of notice to an adverse action, a hearing at which he or she can present evidence to refute any allegations, and an appeal procedure to an impartial review forum.

Disenrollment is an extremely serious action. In addition to making a person ineligible for the benefits and services of his tribe, disenrollment could effectively end an individual's opportunity to be a member of any Indian tribe. It would make him ineligible for Bureau programs that require tribal membership; it could possibly affect a person's right to have land in trust status. For this reason, the tribe has the burden of proof to establish that a member is not properly enrolled. From our examination of the materials you provided, we find the following noted irregularities in the action taken against you.

To our knowledge the Comanche Nation does not have an enrollment ordinance adopted by the Tribal Council. Under Article V Section 7(a) the Tribal Council is authorized to "change, modify, alter, or revoke membership rules." This is the only reference to membership rules; it implies that the Tribal Council, having the authority to modify or revoke such rules, also is authorized to adopt them.

Article VI Section 7(a) grants the Comanche Business Committee (CBC) only the authority to "establish and maintain the tribal membership roll. . ." In other words, the CBC is authorized to keep the roll current. There is no authority for the CBC to make or adopt membership rules.

The Anadarko Agency provided a copy of the Comanche Nation's ENROLLMENT RULES AND REGULATIONS which is undated and not supported by a resolution. Unless these rules have been adopted by the Tribal Council, they are not in effect.

In the absence of a procedure and specific authority to disenroll persons, the Comanche Business Committee cannot proceed arbitrarily in removing a person from its roll. First it must be determined which body has the authority to conduct disenrollment proceedings. Since the constitution is silent on this issue, the CBC cannot presume it has that authority. It would also need to adopt some provisional procedures governing disenrollment which protect an individual's rights. The proper body to adopt rules for any enrollment related matter is the Tribal Council as discussed above.

According to the submitted documents you were enrolled in 1976 under Article III Section 1(b) and have been continuously a member of the Comanche Nation since then. There is also evidence from the Anadarko Agency and Caddo Tribe that you were never a member of the Caddo Tribe of Oklahoma. The only evidence the CBC presented to support its action was the relinquishment dated December 11, 1975, approximately 5 months prior to you being advised of your enrollment in the tribe. You were previously advised by the Deputy Regional Director (IS) that this may have been a requirement for the enrollment for the Kiowa-Comanche-Apache per capita payment of 1976. We are not certain that this is the case, or if the tribe required it to complete your enrollment file. However, even if you had been a member of the Caddo Tribe, that membership ended when you presented the relinquishment to the Comanche Nation and were accepted as a member of that tribe. It would not constitute dual enrollment. The relinquishment states in part:

2. EXHIBIT A'

I am making this relinquishment voluntarily and I understand that I will no longer be considered a member of the Caddo Tribe of Indians if accepted as a member of the Comanche Tribe . . . (emphasis added)

This language clearly expresses the intent of the document which is to sever membership (if that had been the case) in the Caddo Tribe at the time of your enrollment in the Comanche Nation. The Nation erred in using this document as a basis for your disenrollment. Further, the weight of the evidence from the Anadarko Agency and Caddo Tribe support your contention that you were never a member of the Caddo Tribe.

The Nation failed to comply with a the basic guarantees of due process in that you were not advised of the hearing on April 17, 2008, and afforded an opportunity to present your evidence. It also failed to provide adequate notice of your appeal rights in that the letter dated April 18, 2008, does not state whether there will be a hearing or when that hearing would be. This letter also cites an erroneous authority for the appeal process. Further, a decision is not usually final and in effect until all appeals are exhausted or the time to file an appeal has expired, unless the governing law or rule provides that it will be in effect immediately.

The appeal to the CBC violates the due process guarantees since it is not appealed to a separate unbiased board or body from the one which took the initial action. This is not a true appeal and does not meet the requirement of due process. At this time the Nation appears to lack a forum for enrollment disputes.

Subsequent to the meeting of April 17th, the CBC twice attempted to remove you from the ballot for the next election based on your disenrollment. These efforts on April 22<sup>nd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> were by "phone vote". The constitution provides at Article VI that the CBC will conduct business at meetings at which a quorum is present. There is no provision for transacting business by "phone vote" whether it is a conference call or by polling CBC members by phone. Actions taken outside of a properly called meeting with a quorum present are void.

Based upon our examination of the information you provided and the Constitution of the Comanche Indian Tribe, we tentatively find your disenrollment invalid. Your rights under the ICRA were violated by the lack of proper procedures and selective enforcement. Also, the CBC acted in an unconstitutional manner in voting to remove you from the ballot by telephone polls.

We are, by copy of this letter with enclosures, providing the Comanche Nation an opportunity to submit documents supporting its action within 10 days of receipt. The Nation is to provide you a copy of its response also. These documents should, at a minimum, include the notice calling the special CBC meeting of April 17th and the minutes from that meeting, a copy of the duly adopted enrollment ordinance, a copy of the notice and evidence of delivery to you for the April 17th meeting, copies of other evidentiary documents supporting the Nation's contention of dual enrollment, and a copy of your appeal rights advising you of your right to a hearing and to present evidence. If documents are received, we will examine them and make a final decision in this matter. Should the Nation not respond timely with supporting documents, then the above decision will become final and appeal rights will be given the parties.

3. EXHIBIT A'

If the Comanche Nation feels that it needs technical assistance in reviewing its enrollment policies or procedures, the Branch of Tribal Government Services is available at the Nation's request.

Sincerely,

(Sgd.) Dan Deerinwater

Regional Director

cc: Anadarko Agency Superintendent
RD's file copies
Subject/chrony(tcommon\wp\Comanche\Debbie Wells)
SCHANEY 05/22/08

4. EXHIBIT A'

Page 1 of 9 Case 5:08-cv-00605-M Document 1-4 Filed 06/11/2008



DATE:

April 22, 2008

TO:

Elaine Noyebad, Election Board

FROM:

Wallace Coffey, Chairman

RE:

**Ballots** 

A vote was taken from all the Comanche Business Committee Members to take Deborah Hendrix off the ballots for elections. As you can see attached is a listing of the votes and majority vote wins it has passed to take Mrs. Hendrix off. If you have any questions pertaining to this matter please contact my office at 580-492-3797.

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT 'B'

1

PHONE: 580-492-4988 TOLL FREE: 1-877-492-4988 FAX: 580-492-3796 Case 5:08-cv-00605-M Document 1-4 Filed 06/11/2008 Page 2 of 9



## **COMANCHE BUSINESS COMMITTEE PHONE VOTE OF** DO YOU VOTE TO TAKE OFF DEBORAH HENDRIX OF THE ELECTION BALLOTS? April 22, 2008 3:40 p.m.

Ronald Redelk

Vote – YES/Take Off

Edward Tahhahwah, Jr. Vote - NO/Keep On

**Edmond Mahseet** 

Vote - YES/Take Off

**Lanny Asepermy** 

Vote - YES/Take Off

Jenice Bigbee

Vote - YES/Take Off

Clyde Narcomey

Vote - NO/Keep On

**VOTES FOR TAKE OFF = 4 Majority vote wins VOTES FOR LEAVE ON=2** 

COMANCHE NATION P.O. BOX 908 / LAWTON. OK 73502

PHONE: 580-492-4988

TOLL FREE: 1-877-492-4988

FAX: 580-492-3796



DATE:

April 24, 2008

TO:

Elaine Noyebad, Election Board

FROM:

Wallace Coffey, Chairman

RE:

Qualifying Candidates & 2009 Budget

A vote has been taken from all the Comanche Business Committee Members to qualify the candidates and the 2009 budget. Attached is a list of the votes and majority vote wins to approve both with the deletion of Mrs. Hendrix. Please type up a letter to Mr. Rainey for Edward Tahhahwah to sign today after 5 p.m. If you have any questions pertaining to this matter please contact my office at 580-492-3797.



# COMANCHE BUSINESS COMMITTEE PHONE VOTE OF QUALIFYING CANDIDATES AND 2009 BUDGET April 24, 2008 4:30 p.m.

**Wallace Coffey** 

Vote - Abstain

Chairman

Ronald Redelk

Vote - YES

Vice-Chairman

Edward Tahhahwah, Jr. Vote - YES

Secretary-Treasurer

**Edmond Mahseet** 

Vote - YES

Committeeman #1

Lanny Asepermy

Vote - YES

Committeeman #2

Jenice Bigbee

Vote - YES

Committeeperson #3

Clyde Narcomey

Vote – Abstain

Committeeman #4

**VOTE PASSED = 5 majority vote wins** 

AGAINST= 0

ABSTAIN= 2

EXHIBIT B

COMANCHE NATION P.O. BOX 908 / LAWTON. OK 73502
PHONE: 580-492-4988 TOLL FREE: 1-877-492-4988 FAX: 580-492-3796

4.

Page 102 Page 104 1 our employees. Once they severed their ties with 1 this done tonight. 2 2 MS. WAHNEE: Can I ask a question the tribe, they were charged -- what were they charged? What was it you told us that one time? 3 while you're doing that? If you're going to MR. NORMAN: Mr. Chairman, can we go 4 remove these from the roll, is it immediate? 4 5 5 Because I have to provide a list tomorrow for the into executive session? 6 6 election board for their sign-in for Saturday. MR. COFFEY: Okay. 7 MR. NORMAN: I think it would be wise 7 And if this constitutes immediate withdrawal, I 8 before Mr. Papahronis begins to talk. 8 need to have them removed from the list tomorrow 9 MS. BIGBEE: I make the motion that 9 to make them ineligible voters. 10 10 we go into executive session. MR. NORMAN: I think that's the point MR. ASEPERMY: Second. 11 11 of action. 12 MR. COFFEY: All right. Motion made 12 MS. WAHNEE: That's the point? 13 by Committee Person Jenice Bigbee to go into 13 Okay. executive session. Second by Committeeman Lanny 14 14 MR. COFFEY: Then it's effective Asepermy. Do we have any discussion? Hearing 15 15 immediately. And then that's going to happen 16 none, all those in favor signify by saying "aye". 16 through here, including Debbie Hendrix, and then 17 17 Charles Wells. 18 18 MS. WAHNEE: Then I will -- because I MR. COFFEY: All those opposed, same 19 sign. All those abstain, same sign. Motion 19 can -- then I can have these removed tomorrow once 20 carried. 20 we get the document tomorrow, once we get the 21 21 documentation on that. (Executive session held from 22 5:12 p.m. to 8:25 p.m.) 22 MR. COFFEY: But he would have to be MR. COFFEY: Motion to approve 23 23 suspended, right? 24 MS. BIGBEE: Yes. Resolution 55-08. The last one was on the child 24 25 welfare code. I don't know if we have any after 25 MR. NORMAN: You'll need a separate Page 103 Page 105 1 that, so 55-08, to remove individuals on List motion to suspend the approval --1 2 Number 732 from the Comanche membership roll, due MR. COFFEY: "Whereas, the 2 to the fact that they are still enrolled in 3 3 documentary evidence furnished by the Caddo Nation 4 another tribe. Is that sufficient? 4 Enrollment Department confirms that the named 5 MS. WAIINEE: Which would constitute 5 individual, Deborah K. Wells Hendrix was an 6 dual enrollment, because that's what it is. 6 enrolled member of the Caddo Nation and the MS. BIGBEE: Do you need a motion? 7 7 Comanche Nation Enrollment Department received a 8 MR. COFFEY: Yes. 8 conditional relinquishment from the above named 9 MS. BIGBEE: I make that motion to 9 individual to enroll with the Comanche Nation on 10 approve Resolution 55-08. 10 December 11, 1975. The Comanche Nation 11 MR. COFFEY: Motion made by Committee 11 Constitution ratified 1966 approved January 9, 1967 did not allow for an open enrollment period. 12 Person Jenice Bigbee to approve Resolution 55-08 12 to remove individuals on List Number 732 from 13 13 The application for enrollment was received after 14 Comanche membership roll, due to the fact that 14 the 90 day period after approval of the 15 they are still enrolled in another tribe, which 15 constitution for a choice of tribal affiliations. constitutes dual enrollment. A second has been 16 16 "Whereas, Article III, Section 3(c), 17 made by Committeeman Eddie Mahseet. All those in 17 of the tribe's Constitution and Bylaws approved 18 favor signify by saying "aye". 18 January 9, 1967 provides, "Any person eligible for 19 (Aye.) membership in the Comanche Nation under the 19 MR. COFFEY: All those opposed, same 20 20 provisions of Section 1 of this Article shall be 21 sign. All those abstain, same sign. 21 considered as member of the Comanche Nation. 22 MR. NARCOMEY: Abstain. 22 unless: 23 MR. COFFEY: I'll get this to y'all 23 "(c) The person after the adoption 24 tomorrow, or you need it tonight? of this constitution by his or her affirmative 24 25 MR. BURSON: Might as well get all 25 action or, if a minor, by the affirmative action

27 (Pages 102 to 105)

Page 106			Page 108
1	of his or her parents or legal guardian becomes a	1	MR. ASEPERMY: Is there one more
2	recognized or enrolled member of another Indian	2	resolution?
3	tribe with the full rights, privileges and powers	3	MR. MAHSEET: Two.
4	of membership under the rules of said other tribe,	4	MR. ASEPERMY: Two?
1 5	which said affirmative action and subsequent	5	MR. COFFEY: Yeah, I'm almost done.
6	recognition or enrollment shall automatically	6	MR. ASEPERMY: Anybody not get your
7	effect a permanent withdrawal from membership in	7	financial reports on the CBC
8	the Comanche Nation and a relinquishment of all	8	MS. WAHNEE: We picked up somebody's.
9	rights and benefits thereunder; or	9	MR. ASEPERMY: Johnny, you got a
10	"Now therefore be it resolved, that	10	copy?
11	individual named above, be removed from the	11	MR. WAUQUA: Yeah, we got a couple
12	tribe's membership roll because of the inadvertent	12	extra over here, too.
13	approval outside an open enrollment period and 90	13	MS. BIGBEE: Maybe it's mine.
14	day period after constitutional approval,	14	MR. COFFEY: Okay. I'll entertain a
15	"Be it further resolved, that the	15	motion to approve Resolution Number 57-08 to
16	individual named be officially notified of the	16	remove Angie Hendrix-Revell and Phillip Hendrix,
17	automatic withdrawal of her name from the Comanche	17	III, from the Comanche Nation because they are
18	Nation's membership roll, stating the reasons for	18	members of the Caddo Nation, which constitutes
19	such disenrollment."	19	dual enrollment. Do we have a motion to that
20	I have a motion to that affect. This	20	effect?
21	will be Resolution Number 56-08.	21	MR. ASEPERMY: I make that motion,
22	MR. REDELK: Mr. Chairman, I make	22	Mr. Chairman.
23	that motion.	23	MR. COFFEY: Motion has been made by
24	MR. MAHSEET: I second.	24	Committeeman Lanny Asepermy. Do we have a second?
25	MR. COFFEY: Ron, motion, Eddie,	25	MR. MAHSEET: I'll second.
	Page 10	7	Page 109
1	second. Okay. A motion made by Vice-Chairman Ron	1	MR. COFFEY: All right. For the
2	RedElk to approve Resolution Number 56-08 to	2	record, I think that this these minutes must be
3	remove Mrs. Deborah K. Wells as an enrolled number	3	taken because we're talking about for the past
4	of the Comanche Nation because the application	4	several months, people have been screaming and
5	her application did not meet Comanche Nation	5	talking about an audit of the enrollment. At that
6	constitutional requirements.	6	time, there has been probably accusations made
7	Does that sound satisfactory to you	7	against each individual based upon not abiding by
8	girls?	8	the constitution or not being members of the
9	A second has been made by	9	tribe.
11	Committeeman Eddie Mahseet. Any discussion?	10	Whatever their presumptions were,
12	Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying "aye".	11	they made it public, and they made it very evident
13		12 13	that they had issues for concern. In other words,
14	(Aye.) MR. COFFEY: All those opposed.	14	it created a ripple effect amongst our Comanche
15	MR. NARCOMEY: No.	15	people, because they are concerned, and they have
16	MR. COFFEY: All those abstain.	16	inquiries. And our enrollment office has received
17	That's 56-08. Motion carried. One no, no	17	letters requesting looking into somebody's
18	abstentions.	18	application, searched and researched somebody's enrollment application to determine are they
19	MR. TAHHAHWAH: Mr. Chairman, before	19	really Comanche or what?
20	we move on, could we have Johnny explain the	20	And as a result of that, this is what
21	purchase of the golf course on the south side of	21	action we have, those seven, eight, individuals,
22	Lawton?	22	Deborah Hendrix did not abide by the
23	MR. ASEPERMY: We've got one more	23	constitutional provisions, and another one that
24	resolution.	24	were constitute dual enrollment. But you have the
25	MR. TAHHAHWAH: Oh, there is?	25	minutes, and this is action taken in a meeting
			-7

28 (Pages 106 to 109)

Page 112 Page 110 1 officially called at a Comanche Business Committee 1 MS. WAHNEE: A laptop. 2 2 meeting. Do we have any discussion? MR. COFFEY: He does? 3 MR. ASEPERMY: And you provided a 3 MS. BIGBEE: I think you mentioned before, people are going to say, well, Wallace did 4 number of disks that you've not seen? 4 it. Wallace didn't do it. The CBC voted, and the 5 MS. WAHNEE: Within a two-week 5 6 6 motion passed, therefore Wallace had to sign these period, the election board had requested eleven 7 7 documents. It wasn't just Wallace. different disks of the enrollment information. 8 8 MR. ASEPERMY: And I might want to MR. COFFEY: This is pending, right? 9 add that there are others pending further 9 MS. WAHNEE: This is pending, right. 10 investigation. 10 MR. COFFEY: Pending, what? 11 MS. WAHNEE: There's approximately 11 MS. WAHNEE: I don't know if you want 12 200 more pending. 12 to say research or just --MR. WAUQUA: Pending eligibility. 13 MR. ASEPERMY: Approximately 200, 13 14 Mr. Chairman, that are pending investigation, too. 14 MS. WAHNEE: Pending eligibility of 15 MR. COFFEY: Well, that's what I'm 15 enrollment, yeah. And I should have that within 16 saying. Somebody has made accusations and that 16 the next, you know, 30 days, for sure. Because 17 person that was accused said, well, let's find out 17 she said it's going to take her some time to get 18 what's going on. So, now, you've got a ripple 18 out of archives, but they've got to request it and effect across the nation which may affect 200 19 19 have it shipped in and then pull it out. 20 individuals on our tribal enrollment. Okay. Any 20 MR. ASEPERMY: Would it be better to 21 further discussion? 21 say pending research of current enrollment 22 MR. ASEPERMY: Now, this on Angie and 22 status? 23 Phillip, this is a dual enrollment. 23 MR. NORMAN: Pending eligibility. 24 MR. COFFEY: Dual enrollment, And 24 MR. ASEPERMY: Because she's already 25 Debbie's because it didn't abide by constitutional 25 trying to prove -- pending research. Page 111 Page 113 requirements. Any further discussion? Hearing 1 MS. BIGBEE: Should part of the 2 none, all those in favor signify by saying "aye". 2 motion also include him returning all of the 3 3 (Aye.) enrollment disks that he may have? 4 MR. COFFEY: All those opposed, same 4 MS. WAHNEE: Well, he stated he sent 5 sign. All those abstain, same sign. 5 them all to Mr. Rainey. And Mr. Rainey told me 6 MR. NARCOMEY: Abstain. 6 he's only had four or five, two of which were 7 7 MR. COFFEY: One abstention. corrupted. But we had -- our software, when we 8 All right. One more action item, a 8 were trying to run it, it was corrupting the CD. 9 motion. This is a Resolution Number 57 --9 So two of those we know are corrupted, and then 10 MS. BIGBEE: 58. 10 Mr. Rainey received two complete enrollments after MR. COFFEY: No, because he's got 55, 11 11 that. 12 and this is 56, so this will be 57. This won't be 12 MR. ASEPERMY: Mr. Wauqua, does he 13 a resolution, it'll be a motion. 13 have a cell phone that belongs to the nation? 14 MS. WAHNEE: That's a motion, yeah. 14 MR. WAUQUA: I think so. 15 MR. COFFEY: This will be a motion 15 MS. WAHNEE: I do know that since 16 that Mr. Charles Wells will be suspended effective 16 last week, that all correspondence with 17 immediately from --17 Mr. Rainey, as far as the enrollment information, MR. NORMAN: Chairman of the Election 18 18 goes directly to Rainey. I don't turn any of that 19 19 information over to the election board anymore. I Board. 20 MR. BURSON: As an election board 20 send it straight to Mr. Rainey. And up until I became director, Mr. Rainey advised me that they'd 21 member. 21 always done that, they'd always sent everything 22 MR. WAUQUA: He also has a computer, 22 23 laptop computer that has the enrolled numbers and 23 directly to him, and he handled it. people on there, too. We need to get that back. 24 24 And when I took over, that's when the MR. COFFEY: He has one, personally? 25 25 election board said, no, you give it to us. And,

29 (Pages 110 to 113)

Page 114 Page 116 1 of course, they brought me memos that was signed, 1 three pages of documents, it took us five trips 2 and that's where I'd given them the information, 2 all day in Anadarko just to find three pages. 3 3 and they in turn sent it to Mr. Rainey. That's MR. COFFEY: It's contingent upon --4 and he's going to come and ask. You know they're when Mr. Rainey had advised me that he was 4 5 concerned about the roll and the information. 5 going to all come ask. So you're going to have to 6 6 say, well, this was information supplied to you by because --7 7 the Caddo Enrollment Office. And we haven't MR. MAHSEET: Doesn't Charles own his 8 8 own computer service there in Anadarko? He's got received all the documentation, but it all started 9 a big billboard sign right by his smoke shop. 9 with these here. 10 MR. COFFEY: That might be Rodney. 10 MS. WAHNEE: Okay. MR. WAUQUA: That's his brother, I 11 11 MR. COFFEY: And somebody requested 12 12 that it be looked into Deborah Hendrix's issue, think. 13 13 and you found these other things, which was with MR. MAHSEET: Is it Rodney or --14 MS. WAHNEE: I have no idea. 14 regard to her, as well as her children, and he's 15 MR. COFFEY: Motion that Mr. Charles 15 affected by all that, too. 16 Wells be suspended from the election board pending 16 MS. WAHNEE: His child, one of them, 17 the conclusion of an investigation to determine 17 too. Her son, too. His kids are on that list. 18 eligibility of enrollment. This further includes 18 too. 19 a return of all property belonging to the Comanche 19 MR. COFFEY: Well, you're talking 20 Tribe Gaming Office. Does that sound right? 20 about that list, you're talking about that 200? 21 MR. BURSON: I would say election 21 MS. WAHNEE: That 200, it's a huge 22 board. 22 ripple effect like you were saying. 23 23 MR. COFFEY: Okay. We have a motion MS. WAHNEE: Validity. 24 MR. BURSON: Does he have a computer and a second effective immediately. Do we have 24 25 of the nation or is it election board any discussion? 25 Page 115 Page 117 1 MS. WAHNEE: He has a laptop from the 1 MR. BURSON: Who seconded? 2 election board and he has a cell phone from the 2 MR. COFFEY: Eddie Mahseet. 3 3 election board. And all those in favor signify by 4 4 MR. ASEPERMY: Return all Comanche saying "aye". 5 5 Nation property -- cell phone, laptop, disks. (Aye.) 6 MR. COFFEY: Effective immediately? 6 MR. COFFEY: All those opposed, same 7 7 MS. BIGBEE: Yes. sign. All those abstain, same sign. 8 MR. COFFEY: Do we have a motion to 8 MR. NARCOMEY: Abstain. 9 9 that effect? MR. COFFEY: Motion's carried, one 10 MR. ASEPERMY: Mr. Chairman, I make 10 abstention. 11 that motion. 11 Okay. What I will do, then, is -- I 12 MR. MAHSEET: So moved. 12 think you need these, Jim. And maybe you can fax 13 MR. COFFEY: Okay. Once again. 13 MS. WAHNEE: Do I have a time frame? 14 14 MR. BURSON: Okay. We'll just copy 15 I mean, what time frame do we give him? 15 them right here. 16 MR. COFFEY: I'll have to do it 16 MR. COFFEY: Because I can't take any 17 17 action without those resolutions. He signed them tomorrow. 18 MS. WAHNEE: No, I mean a time frame 18 all. 19 for the research, because I don't know how long 19 MR. BURSON: Oh, you signed them 20 it's going to take, since they have to request a 20 all? lot of that documentation to be transferred in. 21 21 MR. TAHHAHWAH: Yes. 22 MR. NORMAN: I mean, the concern 22 MR. COFFEY: Well, just like you 23 remains until you get that information, so --23 said, as a result of this investigation, then 24 MS. WAHNEE: Okay. Because I know somebody saying when are y'all going to do an 24 25 just for us to do some of the research to get 25 audit, and then somebody questioned Eddie, then

30 (Pages 114 to 117)

	Case 5.56 ov 50000 W Boodinent 1 4 Thea 50/11/2500 Tage 5 of 5				
Page			Page 120		
1	everybody else is questioning everybody, so	1	MR. COFFEY: Johnny, you take these		
2	MS. WAHNEE: I've been auditing.	2	I've got a doctor's appointment in the morning,		
3	MR. COFFEY: Yes, so this is a result	3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
1	of it. And, you know, she's going to come and	4			
1 5	talk to you.	5			
6	MS. WAHNEE: She'll go through law	6	5		
7	enforcement first. I'm sorry, but, you know	7	.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
8	MR. ASEPERMY: Well, I would advise	8	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
9	that	9			
10	MS. WAHNEE: I don't want the	10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
11 12	disruption that I had before.	11	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
13	MR. ASEPERMY: I would advise,	12	Stay, Tjast Mant to		
14	because of the hostility sometimes displayed by	13	,		
15	some of our nation members that maybe we could put		in the same of the		
16	one of your law enforcement officers in the new	15	i james a stage a stage working your		
17	conference room or somewhere. You never know	16	C y y y		
18	what's going to happen. People get angry. And it might go beyond cussing out.	17 18	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
19		19	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
20	MS. WAHNEE: Or my tires get the air let out of them, again.	20	processing processing the control of		
21	MR. COFFEY: You only got one good	21			
22	foot left, too.	22	1		
23	MS. WAHNEE: And I've only got one	23			
24	good foot.	24	1		
25	MR. ASEPERMY: I would advise that	25	,		
	The territory of the second of				
	Page 1	19	Page 121		
1	they post an enforcement officer somewhere in the	1	MS. BIGBEE: I don't know how the		
2	vicinity of your workplace, because you've got	2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
3	other employees' safety and maybe	3	,		
4	MS. WAHNEE: I have to look out for	4	MR. ASEPERMY: We talked about it for		
5	their safety.	5	the last two hours.		
6	MR. ASEPERMY: I don't know.	6	MS. BIGBEE: It was very seriously		
7 8	MS. WAHNEE: I know just with just	7	you know, to follow the constitution and do with		
9	the last time and, honestly, this is just me	. 8	what we feel that's correct and the proper thing		
10	with the issue that we had with Eddie's ordeal	9	to do.		
11	I got harassed a lot, to the point where it	10	MR. COFFEY: All right. We've got		
12	disrupted my day-to-day work with my staff. And my staff as soon as we saw someone come into	11 12	how many people out there?		
13	the building, my staff were, like, shut the doors,	13	(Discussion held off the record.)		
14	lock the doors, you deal with it. And, you know,	14	MR. WAUQUA: At the last monthly meeting, y'all had voted on or decided to buy the		
15	that's sad that my staff can't feel safe or feel	15	land by Mr. Dodd out west of Lawton, Indiahoma		
16	comfortable in their own department. And that's a	16	that way. And Mr. Coffey had sent me out there to		
17	shame.	17	look at it to see what we could do or what could		
18	MR. COFFEY: Yeah, but you've got	18	be done with it. And he instructed and said that		
19	locks on your doors.	19	we might be able to use it for the fair or put the		
20	MS. WAHNEE: I've got locks on my	20	buffalo out there or something, which it is a very		
21	doors. But when they come to the window and	21	nice place, but it was too far out, from what I		
22	they're screaming and yelling and they're ringing	22	looked at, to see would be to place the fair		
23	off the hook, that's disruptive to my staff. I	23	there, to move it, but it is a good place.		
24	just don't want to go through that. And I know	24	I wished it was closer to town, so we		
25	there's going to be a lot of outflow from it.	25	would have the accommodations for people to stay.		
-	J. J. S.		the tast are accommodations for people to stay.		

31 (Pages 118 to 121)

Caddo Nation of Case 5:08-cv-00605-M Filed 06/11/2008 Oklahoma Post Office Box 487 Binger, Oklahoma 73009 (405) 656-2344 • (405) 656-2345 FAX #(405) 656-2551

April 18, 2008

#### TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Nation Chairperson

This is to certify that the records of this office show that Deborah Hendrix is not enrolled or has never been enrolled with the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma.

CERTIFIED IN BEHALF OF THE CADDO NATION OF OKLAHOMA Title: Emolmut bluk Date: 04-18-08 4-18-08

Case 5:08-cv-00605-M	Document 1-5	HALLOT-NUM-2 ALLOT-NUM-3 ALLOT-NUM-4 ALLOT-NUM-5 BIRTHDATE TRIBE BLOOD BASE-ROLL END  OBERTS  DEBORAH KAY  DEBORAH KAY  TOT 1/4  ART3  BIRTHDATE TRIBE BLOOD BASE-ROLL END  OBERTS  ALLOT-NUM-5 ALLOT-NUM-6 ALLOT-NUM-7 AL  TOT 1/4  ART3  BIRTHDATE TRIBE BLOOD BASE-ROLL END  OBERTS  F U6/21/1949 80B 1/4  ART3  ART3	PER CAPITA/MEMBERSHIP  NUMERIC LISTING - HISTORICAL FILE  NUMERIC LISTING - HISTORICAL FILE
	EXHIBIT C 2.	AUTH FOR ENROLL: FI DATE MI ALLOT-NUI ARTS SIB	PAGE

Case 5:08-cv-00605-M Document 1-5 Filed 06/11/2008 Page 3 of 4 United States Department of Interior BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS ANADARRO AGENCY

> Post Office Box 309, Anadarko, Oklahoma 72005 This is to certify that the records of this office show that Charles Ellis Wells
>
> 1/2 Caddo

> is of 1/2 Comanche degree Indian Blood of the Comanche 1-10-14

Date of Birth ... Roll No.CO05968

Supérintendent

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Your records are filed under this number. Better service can be given you if you will use this number in addition to your name in making appointments and visits to this Hospital or Clinic.

STATION

LAVIII.

PATIENT IDENTIFICATION (Name - Last, First, Middle)

well Charles

EXHIBIT 'C'
3.

S BIRTHS

The physician should cooperate with the Superintendent by reporting all births and deaths coming under his notice and investigating the cause of death in all possible cases. alun LiBare NAME OF FATIER Tielo NAME OF MOTHERS NAME OF CHILD. lah daya Kan DEGRZE OF BLOOD. とうの

=t



#### MEMORANDUM

4-18-08

TO: All Tribal Departments

FROM: Johnny Wauqua, Tribal Administrator Donna Wahnee, Enrollment Director

RE: Disenrollments

7/18/08

At a scheduled meeting of the Comanche Business Committee and after research conducted by the Enrollment Department with assistance of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, several tribal members have been disenrolled with the Comanche Nation. These people have 30 days to appeal this decision of the Business Committee. However, due to being disenrolled these people will no longer be able to receive services from the Comanche Nation.

If you have questions in regards to this disenrollment of if you believe a member you are serving may be one of these disenrolled, please contact our office for a listing of the disenrolled members.

If you are serving a tribal member and are concerned for their enrollment status we will gladly print a CDIB for you and your department.

EXHIBIT"D"
Page 2.



#### **MEMORANDUM**

4-18-08

TO: Comanche Nation Departments

**FROM: Enrollment Department** 

**RE: Disenrolled Members** 

The following tribal members have been disenrolled from the tribe's membership roll 4-17-08 by a majority vote of the Comanche Nation Business Committee. Any questions please contact the Enrollment Department.

Dana Renee Aitson
Roy Dale Aitson
Shirley Hartline
Deborah Hendrix
Phillip Jesse Hendrix III
Darlene Jojola
Phillip Allen Kaulaity
Lucien Lookingglass
Richard Morris
LaDora Nimsey

EXHIBIT D"
2 payes

SJS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

## **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

the civil docket sheet. (Set. it	ASTRUCTIONS ON THE REVI	ROE OF THE FORMI.)			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS  DEGO	CAH KI HE	ENDRIX	DEFENDANTS	ace Coffe	Y, ET AL
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff	Comavote	County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant	Comanche
(E	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	ISES)	-	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES	
				ID CONDEMNATION CASES, L INVOLVED.	ISE THE LOCATION OF THE
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name	, Address, and Telephone Numbe	r)	Attorneys (If Known)		
		Pro se	C I V - 0	8-60	5 L
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF F	PRINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
1 U.S. Government	Federal Question		(For Diversity Cases Only)	TF DEF	and One Box for Defendant)
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government	Not a Party)		I Incorporated or P	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	1 4 Diversity		Citizen of Another State	1 2	
Delendan	(Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	China da Maria da China	of Business In	
			Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	3 Foreign Nation	0 6 0 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box On		EOD EDITION (DENIAL TO)	The latter than the latter tha	
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY	FORFEITURE/PENALTY  610 Agriculture	BANKRUPTCY  D 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES
120 Marine	310 Airplane	362 Personal Injury	620 Other Food & Drug	423 Withdrawal	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antimust
130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Product	Med. Malpractice	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure	28 USC 157	430 Banks and Banking
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability  320 Assault, Libel &	365 Personal Injury - Product Liability	of Property 21 USC 881	PROPERTY RIGHTS	450 Commerce 460 Deportation
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander	☐ 368 Asbestos Personal	☐ 640 R.R. & Truck	320 Copyrights	470 Racketeer influenced and
151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers' Liability	Injury Product Liability	☐ 650 Airline Regs. ☐ 660 Occupational	830 Patent 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations  1 480 Consumer Credit
152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	340 Marine	PERSONAL PROPERT	1	□ 840 Frademark	480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV
(Excl. Veterans)	☐ 345 Marine Product	370 Other Fraud	☐ 690 Other		☐ 810 Selective Service
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal	LABOR  710 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY  B61 HIA (1395ff)	850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle	Property Damage	Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	☐ 875 Customer Challenge
190 Other Contract	Product Liability	385 Property Damage Product Liability	☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations ☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	12 USC 3410 B90 Other Statutory Actions
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	360 Other Personal Injury	Product Liability	& Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	891 Agricultural Acts
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS		FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	441 Voting 442 Employment	510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	7 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act
220 Forectosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	442 Employment  443 Housing/	Habeas Corpus:	Security Act	871 IRS—Third Party	895 Freedom of Information
240 Torts to Land	Accommodations	530 General		26 USC 7609	Act  900Appeal of Fee Determination
245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	444 Welfare 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Othe	r		Under Equal Access
1.) 290 All Ollier Real Property	Employment	550 Civil Rights			to Justice
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	555 Prison Condition	Ī		950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
	Other 440 Other Civil Rights				
V. ORIGIN (Place	an "X" in One Box Only)	Remanded from	4 Reinstated or 5 Transl	ferred from	Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate
T Original IN	tota Court	Appellate Court	Reopened (speci	(v) Litigation	Judgment
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION			filing (Do not cite jurisdictions  S IN PAR MAT	Sold with	A KTAX ICTUMPER
	Brief description of ca	mw of F	iseral rights		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTION 23	DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:  Yes No
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATT	ORNEY OF RECORD		
PRA QEI ()	land de	undain 50	10-588-2448		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY ET AK					
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUE	OGE.