Cesar Caballero, in Pro Se
6368 Pleasant valley Rd.
El Dorado, CA 95623
Ph: 530 303-8350
Email : contact@MiwokTribe.us

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians,

AKA Redhawk Casino,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Shingle Springs Band of Miwoks Indians,

AKA, USPTO Trademark Owner,

Cesar Caballero, Et. Al.

Defendants

Case No.: 2:08-CV-03133-JAM-AC

Defendant's Response to MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT Failure to meet Rule 56,
Court has Sua Sponte Powers to Apply Federal Rule 12(b)1 No subject matter jurisdiction, Federal Rule 12(b)6 No Relief can be granted should be applied

amended doc. 256

I, Cesar Caballero, as the Chief of the aboriginal "historic tribe" of Miwoks from Shingle Springs and USPTO recognized trademark owner declare the following:

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT SHOULD BE DENIED

The Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment should be denied 1) Plaintiff's case is not ripe as it is complex, the Bureau of Indian Affairs should be joined, and a full evidentiary hearing is required in the interest of justice as requested in my Response to Plaintiff's 3rd Amended Complaint, 2) The Regulatory Agencies provided by Congress have primary subject matter jurisdiction over the matters in this case and the court cannot decide on this matter without their assistance. This court has Sua Sponte Power to order a Judicial Review of those agencies before making any decisions.

Regulatory Agency Responsibilities

The United States Patent and Trademark Office has jurisdiction over matters of Trademark. According to the USPTO, Cesar Caballero is the rightful owner/registrant of the trademark "Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians". Mr. Caballero filed the Trademark based on the historic ethnic heritage of his people.

Congress created the Department of Interior, which by and through Bureau of Indian Affairs, has jurisdiction over Native American Affairs for the sole purpose of insuring the preservation and survival of the HISTORIC First Nations, and is the determining agency in error, of which whose error in administering trust benefits has caused this controversy. According to 12(b)1 the court has the power to resolve this "controversy". The controversy in this case is not that of "membership" but of **"Governance"**. The Historic Shingle Springs Miwoks of El Dorado County have been and always shall have a separate and equal right to self-governance from that of the Sacramento-Verona Band of Indians.

The "controversy" in this case is caused specifically by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and without explanation from the BIA the court cannot rule in this case. The court needs to order the Director of the BIA, Troy Burdick to appear and publically review the documents describing the group of people known as the Sacramento-Verona Band of Homeless Indians and the "historic" Miwok of El Dorado County to alleviate the controversy.

What is "Tribal Affiliation "?

According to BIA records, the Sacramento-Verona Band are not "Miwok", they are "Maidu and Hawaiian", yet they call themselves the "Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians". The Director of the BIA needs to appear in this court and explain the definition of "Tribal Affiliation" and what procedures allow a group, such as the Sacramento-Verona Band of Miwok Indians, to assume the tribal affiliation of the "Shingle Springs Band of Miwoks Indians". In otherwords how did one group convert the name and benefits of another group?

Prayer

Therefore I am requesting the court DISMISS the Plaintiff's action under Federal Rule 12(b)1 for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and all domain names and media to be returned to Defendant, Cesar Caballero. The court can also Dismiss this case under Federal Rule 12(b)6 on the basis that Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

CONVEYANCE OF ISSUES AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I, Cesar Caballero, generally DENY ALL Plaintiff's allegations and causes of action as Plaintiff is not the legally recognized owner of the trademark according to the United States Patent and Trademark Office which is the controlling Federal agency of Trademarks. Even if Plaintiff's claim to the trademark "Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians" were true, which it is not, my actions are protected by the First Amendment and the safe harbor provisions of the Lanham Act.

Plaintiff, has spent the last three years in court an untold tens of thousands of dollars and caused me to spend three months in jail, yet still has failed to describe or provide evidence of any activities, intent or profit attributed to me or the indigenous Miwok tribe that can be described as Trademark Infringement, Cyber squatting, False Advertising or Unfair Competition. Therefore no relief can be granted.

This lawsuit illustrates how corporations use money in courts to deny a the "Historic" people their unalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Plaintiff is an extremely powerful and wealthy corporation, masquerading as indigenous Miwoks aboriginal to Shingle Springs. Plaintiff's case is designed to frighten myself and my peers and exhaust our limited resources. Plaintiff is using the court to deny me my unalienable rights to refer to my birth right, a Miwok from Shingle Springs, to free and political speech, to educate the public regarding who the real "Historic" tribe is and to petition the government for redress of grievances. Plaintiff's own testimony and evidence already in the court file, which we will showcase in this motion, plainly and publically shows that the Plaintiffs are not who they say they are. **The Plaintiffs are imposters**.

THE IMPOSTERS NEEDED TO PROVE TWO POINTS TO THE COURT AND HAVE FAILED MISERABLY

1) Imposters needed to prove that they are the rightful owners of "Shingle Springs Miwok Band of Indians". The imposters have failed to prove to the court their personal ethnic identities as indigenous Miwoks of El Dorado County, Shingle Springs by providing BIA issued identification that they are Miwoks aboriginal to Shingle Springs, El Dorado, California. Therefore the imposters have no claim to the name "Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians" which is the proper descriptive identity of the Defendants [EX1].
    a. The Imposters have found the means, motive and opportunity to defraud the public through and by an error of the Bureau of Indian Affairs acknowledgment system and bribing El Dorado County with a ~$250 million settlement. This can be proven beyond a shadow of a doubt in any court of law.
    b. Only the BIA can correct this error with this court's guidance. Therefore the Imposters' complaint should be dismissed for failing to state a claim on which relief can be granted.
2) The Imposters needed to prove that Mr. Caballero financially benefitted from the use of the mark in competition with the Imposter's Red Hawk Casino activities. The Imposters have found no such monetary gain from a competing casino. Even if this claim were true, which it is not, Plaintiff still is not Miwok from Shingle Springs and therefore has no claim to the trademark.

Even if the Imposters' allegations were true, display of a word mark, domain name, and Youtube videos in the discourse of public opinion, education and petitioning the government for grievances is protected speech under the US and California Constitutions, the Lanham Act, and California Civil Code of Procedure 425.16. For these reasons Imposters' complaint must fail.

Discussion

This is the case of a wealthy non-indigenous group of people, backed by overwhelming corporate resources abusing trademark law to prevent the poor indigenous, **Historic**, Miwok Indian tribe and concerned US Citizens* from engaging in protected speech with government agencies and providing public education, based on Federal public records, about the genealogical history of the corporate backed group previously known as the "Sacramento-Verona Band of Homeless Indians".

*The Court needs to take Judicial Notice of linked Case 2:12-cv-00548-JAM-DAD, specifically the Response of Mary Ann Harper, in which the Imposters are SLAPP suing everyone they can name in a desperate fishing expedition.

If the Imposters' trademark theory were correct, no news site or blog could use marks to identify mark holders, or links to point to further information about the mark holders, without risking a lawsuit. Plaintiff, Imposters are WRONG.

> Lanham Act decisions recognize that trademarks do not give a mark holder veto power over all uses of its mark, and for good reason. Online and off, trademarks— words, symbols, colors—are also essential components of everyday language, used by companies, consumers and citizens to share information. *See* Kozinski, *Trademarks Unplugged*, 68 N.Y.U. L. REV. 960, 973 (1993) ("[trademarks] often provide some of our most vivid metaphors, as well as the most compelling political imagery in political campaigns . . .. [A]llowing the trademark holder to restrict their use implicates our collective interest in free and open communication."); *see also* Denicola, *Trademarks as Speech: Constitutional Implications of the Emerging Rationales for the Protection of Trade Symbols*, 1982 WIS. L. REV. 158, 195-96 ("Famous trademarks . . . become an important, perhaps at times indispensable, part of the public vocabulary. Rules restricting the use of well-known trademarks may therefore restrict the communication of ideas."). Thus, legislators and courts have taken care to ensure that trademark rights are not used to impose monopolies on language and intrude on First Amendment values. *See, e.g.*, *Rogers v. Grimaldi,* 875 F.2d 994, 998 (2d Cir. 1989) ("Because overextension of Lanham Act restrictions . . . might intrude on First Amendment values, we must construe the Act narrowly to avoid such a conflict."); *CPC Int'l v. Skippy, Inc.*, 214 F.3d 456, 462 (4th Cir. 2000)**("[i]t is important that trademarks not be 'transformed from rights**

against unfair competition to rights to control language.'" (quoting Lemley, *The Modern Lanham Act and the Death of Common Sense*, 108 YALE L.J. 1687, 1710-11 (1999)).

Secondly, Section 1125(c)(3)(B) exempts "*all forms* of news reporting and news commentary" from federal anti-dilution claims. 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(B) (emphasis added) *cf. Illinois High School Ass'n,* 99 F.3d at 246 ("IHSA could not have sued Musburger or CBS for referring to 'March Madness' in a news program (including a program of sports news)) (citing *L.L. Bean v. Drake Publishers,* 811 F.2d 26 (1st Cir. 1987). This exemption was crafted for the precise reason highlighted here: absent such a safe harbor, it would be difficult for any source of which the trademark owner disapproves of to provide accurate information to the public. Further, the exemption applies to any article that "is written for the purpose of conveying information to the public"—whether the article is published by a less traditional online news source or brick and mortar media. *Bidzirk LLC v. Smith,* 2007 WL 3119445 (D.S.C. Oct. 22, 2007) (news reporting exemption applied to article on blog regarding eBay auction listing company); *see also generally Lovell v. Griffin,* 303 U.S. 444, 452 (1938) ("[t]he press in its historic connotation comprehends every sort of publication which affords a vehicle of information and opinion."); *von Bulow v. von Bulow*, 811 F.2d 136, 144 (2d Cir. 1987) (newsgatherer's privilege applies if reporter had intent to use materials to disseminate information to the public and such intent existed at the inception of the newsgathering process); *Shoen v. Shoen*, 5 F.3d 1289, 1293 (9th Cir. 1993) (same). Indeed, courts in this Circuit have not hesitated to apply traditional news privileges to "nontraditional" reporters. *See, e.g. Desai v. Hersh*, 954 F.2d 1408, 1412 n. 3 (7th Cir. 1992) (finding the reporter's privilege applicable to book author under Illinois' statutory definition of reporter); *Builders Assoc. of Greater Chicago v. County of Cook*, 1998 WL 111702, *5 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 12, 1998) (holding advocacy group's information-gathering for political purposes as privileged where it was gathered with the intent to disseminate the information to the public).

For these reasons the Plaintiff's case will fail.

Imposters' Admissions

Imposters, are transplants from Sutter and Sacramento County for the purpose of forming the Redhawk Casino and are "Maidu and Hawaiian" according to BIA Records on file with this court.

1) The Imposters, admit in their complaint to being previously called the Sacramento-Verona Band of Homeless Indians.
2) The Imposters admit that they are not "Miwok".
3) The Imposters admit that they are claiming "Miwok" and the location "Shingle Springs" as part of their alleged "corporate trademark".
4) The USPTO recognizes Cesar Caballero as the lawful trademark holder. Further the Imposters, seeking a venue more conducive to their mis-representations, moved their challenge from the USPTO to Federal Court because they knew that the USPTO would dismiss their case. Therefore the USPTO, the lawful jurisdictional agency has been prevented from doing their legislatively described duty to determine who is the lawful holder of the trademark.
5) The Imposters have a multitude of damning documents in this court file, including a hand written note to the BIA from Fonseca and other "family members" stating that they are the "Sacramento Verona Band of Homeless Indians [EX 2]

The Imposters's admissions are enough evidence for this court to dismiss this case with prejudice under 12(b)1 and 12(b)6 but let's continue with our discussion.

FACTS

1) The Imposters are not Miwok indigenous to El Dorado County, according to Department of Interior Agents John Terrell, C. E. Kelsey, and most recently in the testimony of Miles William Wirtz, CASE NO. CIV.S-02-1818 GEB KJM, El Dorado County v. Gale Norton Secretary of the Interior. The Court needs to take Judicial Notice of this case.

2) The Imposters are not Miwok indigenous to El Dorado County according to the 2003 El Dorado County Board of Supervisors Position Statement, "Records from the Bureau of Indian Affairs disclose that two unrelated groups from the Indians from Sutter and Sacramento counties, jointly referred to as the 'Sacramento-Verona Band of Homeless Indians' for administrative convenience, never functioned historically as a tribe, never had a relationship with El Dorado County, and were never formally or properly "recognized" by the federal government as an 'Indian tribe.' [EX 3].

3) El Dorado County settled with the Sacramento-Verona Band of Homeless Indians, knowing they were not the Shingle Springs Miwok but gaining over ~$250M in revenue. The settlement agreement included allowing Redhawk Casino to be built on the Shingle Springs Rancheria, which now gives the Plaintiff the illusion of "Sovereignty".

   a. This is important for the court to understand…according to IGRA only federally-recognized Indian groups aboriginal to the Rancheria are allowed to conduct Nevada-style gaming. 25 U.S.C. 2703(5). Therefore the Imposters needed to solve this problem to open their casino on the Rancheria. They did this by assuming the identity of the indigenous Miwok tribe of Shingle Springs and paying off the County of El Dorado to shut up [EX 4].

4) [EX 5] The Bureau of Indian Affairs Index of Land Records shows that 240 acres, known as the "Shingle Springs Rancheria" was purchased by an Act of Congress for the use by the MeWuk Tribe of El Dorado County.

ARGUMENT

The Imposters' lawsuit against the "Historic" Miwok indigenous to Shingle Springs, is comparable to an athletic team corporation suing the actual indigenous people to prevent the use of their own legal description of location and ethnicity that is their unalienable right. "Miwok" is simply a corporate mascot to the Sacramento-Verona Band corporation and is not their legal genealogical tribal affiliation which tells the public that these people are of historic ancestry and important to California history.

Typically native nations sign-off, giving permission to corporations to use their tribal identification…for example the Seminole Tribe of Florida officially sanctions the use of the Seminole as Florida State University's nickname and of Chief Osceola as FSU's mascot. To my knowledge, the Historic Miwok have not sanctioned the Imposters use of their genealogical and tribal identifier as the mascot of the Imposters corporate trademark.

In 2003, specifically, to alleviate public confusion by the Imposters' "use" of the local Miwok as a mascot, the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors published an official Position Statement which was on the county website up until recently. One of the goal's of this position statement was to explain the County's grievances to its residents, surrounding the building of the Redhawk Casino and to alleviate ANY public confusion caused by the Sacramento-Verona Band's usage of the word string, "Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians". In that position statement the Board of Supervisors explains that the Imposters are not the indigenous Miwok of El Dorado County. The Board of Supervisors did this to protect the heritage of El Dorado County as the people of El Dorado are proud to still have their Miwok. Still the indigenous Miwok are suffering from this confusion as the Imposters have been working very hard to usurp the locals Miwok's identity.

If this court continues to allow the Sacramento-Verona Band of Homeless Indians, to continue to call themselves "Miwok" under Corporations law…this court will be sanctioning irreparable harm to ALL true Miwok Indians of California, the US Tax Payer and people of El Dorado County . "Miwok" is a genealogical tribal identification and legal description of California Indigenous tribes and is protected by the United States Congress. This court must stop the further destruction of the indigenous Miwok people by ordering the BIA to correct their administrative error by publically walking this court and the people of the United States through all the records from the earliest census of El Dorado County through today and explain how we ended up with a casino run by an imposter group calling themselves Miwok.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has failed the People of the United States and the California Indians by allowing group of people who are "Hawaiian and Maidu" to usurp the "Miwok" racial

identity and formal Recognition status in order to conduct corporate business as a "lawsuit immune" sovereign nation. In a recent deed to the Shingle Springs Rancheria, the BIA admits that the Sacramento-Verona Band of Homeless Indians voted themselves to be Miwok. In other words the BIA agent who signed the deed knew that there was something fishy that needed to be clarified to the public and noted it in the deed.

This court has the power to prevent the Imposters from continuing to use Corporations Trademark law and the mere inference of Native American Sovereignty to abuse of the Citizens of the United States and the indigenous Miwok. The Miwok, US citizens and legitimate corporations have been left with the inability to ask the court for protection and damages due to fraud, breach of contract and malicious prosecution by the Imposters. Basically the Imposters got a free ticket to harass and scare people into silence without redress. The BIA must be ordered by this court to correct its error immediately to prevent future harm caused by the malicious prosecution claims for Trademark Infringement by the Imposters.

THIS IS A SLAPP SUIT

The Imposters are clearly on a fishing expedition. The Imposters' motive, mission and actions are the absolute definition of a SLAPP suit (strategic lawsuit against public participation). A SLAPP is a lawsuit that is intended to censor, intimidate, and silence critics by burdening them with the cost of a legal defense until they abandon their criticism or opposition which is EXACTLY what the Imposters are trying to do to me and the other defendants in this case and linked Case 2:12-cv-00548-JAM-DAD. Defendants request the court waive the Plaintiff's claim of Sovereign Immunity to pursue a SLAPP back suit or other civil action for damages.

APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS

Rule 12(b)(1) Motion

Where subject matter jurisdiction is lacking, dismissal under Rule 12(b)(1) is appropriate MacKay v. Pfiel, 827 F.2d 540, 543 (9 tCir. 1987). Once the defendant objects to a lack of subject matter jurisdiction, plaintiff bears the burden of establishing that the court has subject

matter jurisdiction. Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 561 (1992). To survive a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(1), plaintiff must prove that the Court has jurisdiction to hear the case. Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co., 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994) ("Federal courts are of limited jurisdiction...It is to be presumed that a cause lies outside this limited jurisdiction, and the burden of establishing the contrary rests on the party asserting jurisdiction.").

12(b)(6) Motion

A motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) tests the sufficiency of a complaint. Kost v. Kozakiewicz, 1 F.3d 176, 183 (3d Cir. 1993). Under Rule 12(b)(6), the defendant bears the burden of demonstrating that the plaintiff has not stated a claim upon which relief can be granted. Fed. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6); see also Hedges v. United States, 404 F.3d 744, 750 (3d Cir. 2005). In Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, the Supreme Court stated that "a plaintiff's obligation to provide the 'grounds' of his 'entitle[ment] to relief' requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do." 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). Following Twombly, the Third Circuit has explained that the factual allegations in the complaint may not be "so undeveloped that it does not provide a defendant the type of notice which is contemplated by Rule 8." Phillips v. County of Allegheny, 515 F.3d 224, 233 (3d Cir. 2008). Moreover, "it is no longer sufficient to allege mere elements of a cause of action; instead 'a complaint must allege facts suggestive of [the proscribed] conduct.'" Id. (alteration in original) (quoting Twombly, 550 U.S. at 563 n.8). Furthermore, the complaint's "factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." Id. At 234 (quoting Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555). "This 'does not impose a probability requirement at the pleading stage,' but instead 'simply calls for enough facts to raise a reasonable expectation that discovery will reveal evidence of the necessary element.'" Id. (quoting Twombly, 550 U.S. at 556).

Notwithstanding Twombly, the basic tenets of the Rule 12(b)(6) have not changed. The Knit With v. Knitting Fever, Inc., No. 08-4221, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30230, at *6 (E.D. Pa. Apr. 8, 2009). The general rules of pleading still require only a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, not detailed factual allegations. Phillips, 515 F.3d at 231. Moreover, when evaluating a motion to dismiss, the court must accept as true all well-pleaded allegations of fact in the plaintiff's complaint, and must view any reasonable inferences that may be drawn therefrom in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. Id.; Buck v. Hampton Twp. Sch. Dist., 452 F.3d 256, 260 (3d Cir. 2006). Finally, the court must "determine whether, under any reasonable reading of the complaint, the plaintiff may be entitled to relief." Pinkerton v. Roche Holdings Ltd., 292 F.3d 361, 374 n.7 (3d Cir. 2002).

California Anti-SLAPP invoked

Generally, a "SLAPP" is a (1) civil complaint or counterclaim; (2) filed against individuals or organizations; (3) arising from their communications to government or speech on an issue of public interest or concern. SLAPPs are often brought by corporations, real estate developers, government officials and others against individuals and community groups who oppose them on issues of public concern. SLAPP filers frequently use lawsuits based on ordinary civil claims such as defamation, conspiracy, malicious prosecution, nuisance, interference with contract

and/or economic advantage, ip, and trademark as a means of transforming public debate into lawsuits having the effect of "chilling" public redress of a grievance.

Cal. Code of Civil Procedure 425.16.

(a) The Legislature finds and declares that there has been a disturbing increase in lawsuits brought primarily to chill the valid exercise of the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and petition for the redress of grievances. The Legislature finds and declares that it is in the public interest to encourage continued participation in matters of public significance, and that this participation should not be chilled through abuse of the judicial process. To this end, this section shall be construed broadly.
(b) (1) A cause of action against a person arising from any act of that person in furtherance of the person's right of petition or free speech under the United States or California Constitution in connection with a public issue shall be subject to a special motion to strike, unless the court determines that the plaintiff has established that there is a probability that the plaintiff will prevail on the claim.
(2) In making its determination, the court shall consider the pleadings, and supporting and opposing affidavits stating the facts upon which the liability or defense is based.
(3) If the court determines that the plaintiff has established a probability that he or she will prevail on the claim, neither that determination nor the fact of that determination shall be admissible in evidence at any later stage of the case, and no burden of proof or degree of proof otherwise applicable shall be affected by that determination.
(c) In any action subject to subdivision (b), a prevailing defendant on a special motion to strike shall be entitled to recover his or her attorney's fees and costs. If the court finds that a special motion to strike is frivolous or is solely intended to cause unnecessary delay, the court shall award costs and reasonable attorney's fees to a plaintiff prevailing on the motion, pursuant to Section 128.5.
(e) As used in this section, "act in furtherance of a person's right of petition or free speech under the United States or California Constitution in connection with a public issue" includes:
(1) any written or oral statement or writing made before a legislative, executive, or judicial proceeding, or any other official proceeding authorized by law;
(2) any written or oral statement or writing made in connection with an issue under consideration or review by a legislative, executive, or judicial body, or any other official proceeding authorized by law;
(3) any written or oral statement or writing made in a place open to the public or a public forum in connection with an issue of public interest;
(4) or any other conduct in furtherance of the exercise of the constitutional right of petition or the constitutional right of free speech in connection with a public issue or an issue of public interest.

THE COURT'S SUA SPONTE POWERS TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTION AND INDEGENOUS MIWOK

The Court's primary responsibility is to protect the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution protects the unalienable rights of the people which include the freedom to express their opinion in a public forum, petition their government for grievances and to claim their birth right of being a Miwok from Shingle Springs [EX 1]. The Plaintiff's claimed Sovereign Nation status cannot limit Mr. Caballero's Constitutional rights to petition for that status to be reviewed and overturned, otherwise a false status could never be reversed.

Further , the Congress has legislated agencies, with responsibilities and resources to manage a situation like this. Sometimes these agencies, made of people, lose their way and need to be ordered by a court to explain their actions to the very same citizens being attacked by the monsters they mistakenly created. In other words, the BIA made this mess by mistakenly allowing the Imposters to use a label that doesn't belong to them. The BIA needs to be ordered to clean it up. The court has the Sua Sponte power to order a JUDICIAL REVIEW of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to show Federal records the lineal decent of both the Sacramento-Verona Band (Imposters) and the Miwok of El Dorado and how they determined who receives what trust benefits. The court then has the power to order the BIA to correct its errors.

Further the only reason this corporation continues to file malicious lawsuits is because it hides behind a misplaced cloud of "sovereign immunity" created by the agencies who's very mission is to insure our tax dollars are properly used as intended and protect all US citizens and Native Americans. The faked "sovereign immunity" of the Imposters leaves innocent citizens the inability to protect themselves in a court of law.

ORDERS REQUESTED

1. The court recognizes that it does not have subject matter jurisdiction of Trademark or Native American Affairs under 12(b)1 and tentatively dismisses this case pending JUDICIAL REVIEW of Federal records.
2. The court retains administrative review of this case for the purpose resolving this controversy by conducting a JUDICIAL REVIEW of BIA records to determine who the Sacramento-Verona Band of Homeless Indians and who are the "Historic"

aboriginal Shingle Springs Miwok of El Dorado County are.

3. The Court Orders the current Director of the Pacific Regional office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to appear in this court with all records pertaining to the Sacramento-Verona Band of Homeless Indians, the Miwoks of Shingle Springs and the Shingle Springs Rancheria to explain to this court and citizens of the United States, the genealogical history of the two tribes documented by BIA Agents John Terrell and C. E. Kelsey known as the Sacramento-Verona Band of Homeless Indians and all Miwok Indians of El Dorado County. Upon the conclusion of this JUDICIAL REVIEW the court will make final orders of determination.

4. The court orders the BIA to correct its mistake and give the appropriate historical and ethnic designations to each tribe along with the appropriate Trusts Benefits for each tribe within 6 months.

5. A "Waiver of Sovereignty" for the Shingle Springs Rancheria is awarded to Cesar Caballero to file a counter-suit for SLAPP, malicious prosecution, harassment, intentional infliction of emotional distress and other counter-claims not yet known.

6. Dismiss linked Case No.: 2: I 2-CV-00548-JAM-DAD

7. Dismiss linked Case No. 2:12-cr-00181-GEB

8. Plaintiff, Shingle Springs Band of Miwoks Indians of Shingle Springs Rancheria, AKA, the Sacramento-Verona Band of Homeless Indians, AKA, Red Hawk Casino are ordered to make Cesar Caballero and the Historic Miwok whole by returning all EINs, Business Licenses, Domain Names, Bank Accounts, YouTube and other media accounts returned to Defendant, Cesar Caballero and his tribe, within 15 days. A $1000 day penalty will be awarded to Mr. Caballero for every

day late.

9. Plaintiff, Shingle Springs Band of Miwok of Shingle Springs Rancheria, to pay all Defendant's Attorney's fees and costs of litigation within 30 days.

Verification

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that I have read the above complaint and I know it is true of my own knowledge, except as to those things stated upon information and belief, and as to those I believe it to be true

Dated, February 3, 2013

Cesar Caballero, In Pro Se

EX 1

United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
Pacific Regional Office
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, California 95825

IN REPLY REFER TO:

OCT 0 8 2004

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that **Cesar Caballero**, date of birth **November 29, 1969** is not enrolled. However, based on the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Pacific Region, Judgment Fund Roll of California Indians, he is the Grandson of **Joseph A. Blackwell, Miwok (Act of September 21, 1968 (82 Stat. 860 & 861)), Roll Number 6154, Folder Number 16118**, and the Great Great Grandson of **Rosa Craig, 4/4 Indian, (Act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 602)), Roll Number 4083, Application Number 7481.**

Therefore, based on the stated relationship and the information shown in the records in this Office, Cesar Caballero has been determined to be a descendant of individuals listed on the Judgment Fund Roll of California Indians and his Tribal Affiliation is **Miwok**.

Sincerely,

Regional Director

EX 2

We, the undersigned survivors of the 1916 list of Sacramento Verona Band of Indians, want the Shingle Springs Rancheria sold.

Millie Cruz — Upland Calif

Ernie Fonseca — Bryte Calif.

Hickey J. Murray Sr. — New Castle, Ca. 95658

[illegible] Thompson — Sacto. Calif.

(no) Pamela H. [illegible] — [illegible] Broderick, Calif

January 20, 1974

EXHIBIT E

EX 3

POSITION STATEMENT SHINGLE SPRINGS CASINO [.pdf]

The Board of Supervisors has taken a consistently strong position against the construction and operation of a gambling casino on the Shingle Springs Rancheria. Many County residents have expressed to us the reasons why they feel that this huge proposed casino in Shingle Springs would be a disaster for the County. Some are against gambling altogether, some fear the inevitable increase in crime, some oppose placing a commercial development of this magnitude in the midst of a rural residential area, many businesses feel it unfair to have to compete with a tribe which pays no income or real property taxes, some are concerned about the additional drain on already depleted public resources, some lament the eyesore that casino-style architecture will create in the pastoral oak woodland of the central County, and many are concerned about the numerous negative environmental impacts the casino will cause. The Board has heard and understands these concerns, and is adamantly opposed to the building of a casino that will degrade the quality of life in El Dorado County in so many ways.

Many people do not understand the enormity of what is proposed. Existing gaming compacts with the State allow up to 2,000 slot machines per facility. This means a casino 25% larger than the largest currently at Lake Tahoe. Gaming tribes (including the Shingle Springs band) have recently written the Governor asking that compacts be renegotiated to allow even more slots. Incidentally, the existing compacts allow each tribe to have two casinos.

The casino Environmental Assessment (EA) states that the "hotel and casino complex" will occupy 381,250 square feet. That's about seven times the size of the average full size supermarket, about four times the size of the Home Depot planned for Placerville Drive and about three times the size of the Wal-Mart that just opened on Missouri Flat Road. This size estimate includes a 250 room five story hotel, but does not include the "five level parking structure" for 3,000 cars. The casino complex would be the second largest building ever in El Dorado County (the largest is the Cable Data building in the El Dorado Hills business park). The EA states that the casino structure itself will be 115 feet tall, making it the tallest building in the County. The project will cover 29 acres of land with impervious surfaces.

The Rancheria does not have sufficient water supply to serve a casino, so the casino operators plan to either haul in 25 truck loads a day of water, a practice deemed unacceptable by the State Department of Health Services except for emergencies, or to use potable water from the El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) which would be illegal because the terms of the Rancheria's annexation into the EID service area stipulates that EID water deliveries can only be used for residential purposes.

This part of the County is notorious for not "perking" and thus is generally unable to have septic systems. The casino plans to use a high tech waste water treatment system, recycle as much of the treated effluent as it can and hope that it can get rid of the rest. They apparently intend to put a 1.8 million gallon recycled water storage reservoir "built into the top of the hill," and also to store ten years worth of "biosolids" on site. Their plan says that they will dispose of the 76,000 gallons per day of treated effluent they cannot recycle by spreading it on 6 to 7 acres of leach field. This works out to about ½ inch per day of effluent over the 6-7 acres, which is about 6 times more than the amount that the Environmental Management Department believes is possible for the soil to absorb. The tribe has not identified a contingency plan in the event that its risky experiment with sewage disposal fails.

This is a planning nightmare– no rational planner and no sensible public official would ever approve a commercial project of this magnitude in an area zoned for rural residences. Yet this band and its gambling financiers claim to have the right to build such a monstrosity because of a distortion of history. When this parcel of land was purchased by the federal government in 1920 for two unrelated groups of 34 individuals living in Sutter and Sacramento Counties, who had no historic relationship to El Dorado County and no tribal relationship to one another, no one contemplated that 83 years later the consequences would be to allow anything like this.

The casino expects to receive 3.7 million visitors in the first year of operation. From the day it opens the casino will attract almost 10,000 car trips on Highway 50 every weekday, and almost 15,000 car trips per day on Saturdays. That's what the casino backers admit; we believe they have underestimated the actual traffic to minimize the negative environmental impacts, and we believe that the true traffic problem will be much worse. The Board of Supervisors has struggled for years to insure that the car carrying capacity of Highway 50, which the taxpayers of the State and County paid to build over the years, is not degraded by new development unless that new development pays the cost of replacing the capacity it uses up. The voters of the County agreed with this principle by adopting Measure Y (the "Control Traffic Congestion Initiative") in 1998. The County therefore makes all new development pay for the road capacity it consumes by imposing road impact fees on new residential and commercial development. County road fees cover the impacts to the roads in the immediate area of the development and to the major connector roads in the County. In addition El Dorado County is (we believe) the only local jurisdiction in the state to impose a comprehensive state road fee program. County staff has estimated that a similarly sized commercial project would pay to the County a total road impact fee of $3.1 million, which includes the state highway fee. This casino will pay the County

nothing. Once it is opened, the casino will bring the traffic on Highway 50 in the west end of the County to near gridlock levels, and the traffic will gradually get even worse over time. The Board was particularly dismayed to find that Caltrans approved the planned new interchange serving the casino but failed to impose any defined or enforceable mitigation measures that would help alleviate the traffic problems. The casino's financial analysis, as we understand it, says that it is expected to gross $194 million per year, and after the cost of running the operation, it will net $83.4 million. Thirty percent of that, or $25 million per year, will go to the casino's backers, a gambling company from Minnesota named Lakes Entertainment and its partner, Kean-Argovitz Resorts. This enormous annual profit for the casino backers will be at the expense of the El Dorado County environment.

This many new auto trips will necessarily increase air pollution in the County, yet the environmental document prepared by the casino backers claims that there will be no significant adverse air quality impact. The casino EA reached this conclusion using a methodology which ignored the Sacramento Area Council of Governments and the regional Metropolitan Transportation Plan thresholds. Our experts, and common sense, tell us that air quality will be drastically impacted by the huge increase in traffic. El Dorado County is already ranked 18th out of the 25 most ozone polluted counties in the U.S. by the American Lung Association, and the casino will inevitably make the problem worse.

The casino EA makes many statements that make it sound like many of the obvious negative environmental impacts caused by the casino will be avoided by following county ordinances. For example, it concludes that the casino will not create light pollution because it will follow the County's light ordinance, and that when they move 227,000 cubic yards of dirt during construction they will minimize dust and erosion impacts by following El Dorado County's grading ordinance, and what they admit is a potentially significant health problem with asbestos will be mitigated because they will comply with the County Naturally Occurring Asbestos ordinance. However, the County does not have the ability to enforce its regulatory laws on the Rancheria, and the tribe has not offered to waive sovereign immunity so that these ordinances can be enforced by either the County or by the people who may be potentially harmed if they are not followed. CalTrans has not indicated any method by which it would be able to enforce the mitigation measures it recognizes are needed. We believe that the promises made in the EA to follow county or state environmental ordinances are illusory. This is a continuing difficulty when dealing with the tribe– it's difficult to take seriously any statements or promises that cannot be legally enforced.

Indian tribes pay no local property taxes. If this was a private development, the Assessor has tentatively estimated that it would pay $2.68 million per year in real property taxes. This would put about $536,000 per year in the County general fund to help pay for the variety of services that the County provides, such as law enforcement, social services, libraries, parks, etc. The balance of about $2.14 million per year in property taxes would fund other local governmental programs and services such as fire, ambulance, schools, etc. Since Indian tribes pay no local taxes, the additional hardship the casino will place on local governmental services and the local schools will have to be borne by the taxpayers of the County. Indian tribes pay no income taxes at either the state or federal level. This tax inequality is not only unfair to the taxpayers who have to pay more or receive less to make up for the extra burden imposed by the casino, but it is also unfair to local taxpaying businesses who will be handicapped in competing against the various non-taxpaying casino businesses (43,300 square feet of "food and beverage" sales, plus 4,000 square feet of retail space, plus 142,750 square feet of lodging).

We have heard many horror stories from locations around the state that have already experienced what casinos bring. A San Diego newspaper reports that one Indian casino sucks up so much water from its wells that the neighbors' wells have gone dry, and the value of their houses has plummeted as a result. The tribe cannot be held responsible for the damages it causes because of the shield of sovereign immunity. One supervisor from a county with gambling told us of a local road that used to have one fatal accident every 7 years, but after a casino was built nearby now has 7 fatalities every year. Once again, the tribe does not consider this to be its problem. Patrons will drink at the Shingle Springs Casino, but then drive on our roads, putting all of us and our children at risk. It is reported that a tribe in Southern California provides health insurance to its employees who are tribal members, but not to the other mostly minority and minimum wage casino employees, who cannot afford health insurance and who therefore have to use MediCare, which we all subsidize, for health services. A commonly reported problem is the fact that non-tribal businesses in California must pay for workers compensation insurance so that workers injured on the job have their medical bills paid, and receive some compensation to live on while recuperating. Tribal casinos, on the other hand, are exempt. If casino or hotel workers at an Indian casino are injured on the job, they will have no benefits provided by their employer because the law does not require the Band to maintain workers compensation insurance. Welfare is the only likely recourse, which the County's taxpayers will have to pay for. We have heard an appalling series of similar stories about the many types of problems that casinos cause, which the tribes operating them fail to alleviate. Time Magazine recently ran a series of major articles (one a cover story) which described how Indian casinos generally enrich their already wealthy financiers rather than improve the lot of the Indians, and how they destroy the rural communities in which they are built. ("Wheel of Misfortune," December 16, 2002; "Who Gets the Money?," December 16, 2002; and "Playing the Political Slots," December 23, 2002.) If you haven't read these horrifying stories, please request a copy from the Board of Supervisors Office or get them from Time's web site (www.Time.com). Anyone who believes that casinos make good neighbors is sadly misinformed.

Several counties and local jurisdictions in California have entered into "fair share" agreements with Indian tribes who already have or wish to open or expand casinos, with the purpose of reimbursing the local jurisdiction for the actual burden the casino will place on public services. These agreements typically involve an initial payment calculated to approximate what an equivalent business would pay in one-time impact fees, plus an annual payment calculated to reimburse for the costs of ongoing services such as law enforcement, ambulance, social services, etc. The two most recent County-Tribal agreements were entered into in Yolo and Yuba Counties. Using the figures from those agreements, our calculations show that if the Shingle Springs Band were to pay at the same rate per square foot as the Rumsey Band agreed to pay Yolo County, then they would pay El Dorado County an initial payment of $7 million plus $7.2 million annually. If the Shingle Springs Band were to pay

at the same rate per square foot as the Enterprise Rancheria agreed to pay Yuba County, then they would pay El Dorado County an initial payment of $1.75 million plus $12.5 million annually. The situations in Yolo, Yuba and El Dorado Counties are obviously not all identical. However, the Yolo and Yuba County examples are graphic evidence of the magnitude of the true costs imposed on a community by a casino.

It is clear to us that our constituents are correct: the proposed casino will significantly degrade the quality of life for every resident of El Dorado County. The Board is committed to preventing this loss. This will be an expensive and difficult fight, but once a casino of this magnitude goes in, the battle is lost and County residents will suffer the unfortunate consequences forever. We have challenged the federal government's approval of the tribe's casino Development and Management Agreement with Lakes Entertainment and its partner in federal court on a number of grounds. We feel that the federal government gave the County short shrift by minimizing or ignoring the serious environmental impacts of the casino, and by not imposing any substantial mitigation measures to alleviate those impacts. Under federal law, gaming is only permitted by a federally recognized "Indian tribe" and only on "Indian lands," that is, land held in trust for an Indian tribe. Records from the Bureau of Indian Affairs disclose that the two unrelated groups of Indians from Sutter and Sacramento Counties, jointly referred to at that time as the "Sacramento-Verona Band of Homeless Indians" for administrative convenience, never functioned historically as a tribe, never had any historic relationship with El Dorado County, and were never formally or properly "recognized" by the federal government as an "Indian tribe." The land purchased for them in 1920, which was never the homeland of any Indians and which was never even occupied by the descendants of the Sacramento-Verona group until 1980, was not taken into trust and therefore does not qualify as "Indian lands." The County has also sued Caltrans for failing to follow CEQA in approving the interchange that will destroy the remaining capacity of Highway 50. This litigation is the only way available to us to stop the casino and halt this assault on the El Dorado County way of life. The fight will be expensive, and it is always difficult to predict the outcome of lawsuits, but we believe that our position in the litigation is fully supported by the facts and the law. It would be tragic to do nothing, and afterwards look back and realize the extent of the disaster that had hit the County.

The Governor has stated that he would like to re-negotiate the compact between the 61 gambling tribes and the State, to allow even more slot machines than before, and to require the tribes to mitigate the negative effects of their casinos on the local jurisdictions where they are located. The Governor appears motivated to increase the number of slot machines in return for payments from the tribes to the State to solve the State budget crisis, and we are concerned that the Governor may not fight with the same vigor to assist the local cities and counties which actually experience the bulk of the damage from casinos. We urge all citizens of El Dorado County to call and write the Governor asking him to help us out. In the meantime, the Board of Supervisors will remain committed to doing everything it can to stop or mitigate the casino which a majority of our residents fear will substantially degrade our County.

EX 4

COUNTY COUNSEL
LOUIS B. GREEN

CHIEF ASS'T. COUNTY COUNSEL
EDWARD L. KNAPP

PRINCIPAL ASS'T COUNTY COUNSEL
PATRICIA E. BECK

DEPUTY COUNTY COUNSEL
JUDITH M. KERR
PAULA F. FRANTZ
MICHAEL J. CICCOZZI
DAVID A. LIVINGSTON

EL DORADO COUNTY
OFFICE OF
THE COUNTY COUNSEL

COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER
330 FAIR LANE
PLACERVILLE, CA
95667
(530) 621-5770
FAX# (530) 621-2937

DEPUTY COUNTY COUNSEL
SCOTT C. STARR
TERI M. MONTEROSSO
LESLEY B. GOMES

November 7, 2012

Board of Supervisors
County of El Dorado
330 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667

Honorable Board:

SUBJECT:

Proposed Amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding between the County of El Dorado and the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians

RECOMMENDATION:

Supervisors Sweeney and Briggs recommend that the County enter into the proposed Amendment to the existing MOU, which has already been approved and executed by the Tribe.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

In 2006 the County and the Tribe entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOU) in settlement of the then-pending litigation which challenged the Tribe's proposed Red Hawk Casino on the Rancheria situated along Highway 50. The County had filed a lawsuit in Superior Court challenging the State's environmental analysis regarding the construction of a new interchange on Highway 50 which was necessary to build and operate the proposed casino. *El Dorado County v. California Department of Transportation*, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS000003. The Rancheria was commercially landlocked so without the new interchange the casino could not be built or operated. The County was concerned about the many projected environmental impacts of the casino on the County, including traffic. The County had also filed a lawsuit in federal court challenging the lawfulness of the recognition of the Tribe by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. *El Dorado County v. Gale Norton*, E.D. Cal. CIV S-02-1818 GEB DAD. Only properly recognized tribes can operate casinos on Indian lands, so if that case was successful, the casino project would have to be abandoned. At the time of the settlement, that tribal recognition case was on appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, *El Dorado County v. Norton*, Ninth Circuit Case No. 05-15224. Once again, the County's concern was the environmental and other impacts of the proposed casino on the County and its citizens.

In order to settle the County's litigation which was preventing the construction of the interchange and the casino, the Tribe and the County agreed to a settlement by which the Tribe would pay money to the County which the County could use to mitigate the various expected impacts of the proposed casino, and in return the County would cease its litigation challenging the interchange and casino projects which would allow the projects to go ahead. To effectuate the settlement, the Tribe and the County entered into the "Memorandum of Understanding and Intergovernmental Agreement Between the County of El Dorado and Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians" in September 2006. In consideration for the various monetary payments by the Tribe to the County specified in the MOU, the County agreed to cease its efforts to oppose the Tribe's casino and interchange projects, and to refrain from assisting others in such an effort. The County has fully performed all of its obligations under the MOU. Among other things, the County dismissed its federal tribal recognition lawsuit, and in the Superior court CEQA case, the County assisted the Tribe in winning that case against the remaining private petitioner by formally taking the position that that the MOU payments fully mitigated all impacts. As a result of the County's actions, the Tribe was able to construct the interchange and casino, which have operated successfully ever since.

Paragraph A of the MOU notes the existence of programmed 5.3 mile long High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) project for mainline Highway 50, that would add carpool lanes in both directions from the Sacramento County line up to the vicinity of the casino. In paragraph A, the Tribe agrees to pay the County $5.2 million per year for 20 years, an amount that was calculated to be sufficient to fund the expected cost of construction if a bond was obtained. After the MOU was signed, the bond market for Indian casino financed projects crashed, and there was no opportunity to put together a reasonable funding package that would produce the construction funds for the HOV project. The Tribe has made three annual payments as required by paragraph A, and some of it has been spent on engineering and other expenses related to the HOV project. It also turned out that the traffic on Highway 50 was less than originally projected, but the impact of the casino on other roads in the area of the casino was greater than projected. The federal government initiated several economic stimulation programs, including grant funding for road projects that were ready to go to construction. The County applied for and obtained funding from the federal government which has paid for the HOV project, which is currently under construction and projected to be completed this year.

The Board previously designated Supervisors Sweeney and Briggs to coordinate with the Tribe on various matters of mutual interest. During these discussions, the unexpected federal funding which the County directed to the HOV project was raised, as well as the impacts of the casino on roads other than Highway 50. The Tribe's newly built Health Clinic was also discussed. The new Health Clinic is the only medical facility in the area which serves indigent and MediCal patients, both tribal members and non-Indians, and it has seen an increased patient load recently in part because of the casino. It was proposed to amend the MOU to reflect the current reality, and subsequent negotiations have produced the proposed amendment to the MOU.

The proposed Amendment affects only paragraph A of the MOU. Under the Amendment, the Tribe will continue to pay $5.2 million per year, but the amount will increase by 2% every year beginning in December 2017, for the duration of the agreement. These payments can be used by the County not just for the HOV project but for any "qualifying public improvements" including but not limited to road improvements and maintenance, which are located near the casino as

designated on a map made Exhibit A to the Amendment. The County agrees to pay the Tribe an annual payment of $2.6 million per year, increasing by 2% every year beginning in December 2017, to be applied to the health programs at the Tribal Health Clinic which serves both tribal members and non-tribal persons. The Amendment specifically recites that all of the other terms and condition in the MOU remain in full force and effect.

The consideration for the Amendment is that both parties resolve any uncertainty concerning the continuation of the payments in paragraph A once the HOV lane project is completed, and both parties benefit from the County's ability to use that annual payment for "qualifying public improvements" in the vicinity of the casino, including roads that have been impacted by casino-related traffic which will allow easier access to the casino. The Tribe and its members will benefit from the public improvements funded with the money paid pursuant to paragraph A and thus the proposed Amendment will benefit all parties. The amendment furthers the parties' mutual interests in the same manner as the original MOU, and thus the amendment is supported by the same consideration as the original MOU.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The County will continue to receive the $5.2 million annual payment from the Tribe under paragraph A, except that the amount will increase at 2% per year starting in 2017, and the payments will continue for the duration of the Tribe's compact with the State. The use of those funds will no longer be limited to the Highway 50 HOV project but can be used by the County for any "qualifying public improvement" projects located within the delineated geographic area near the casino, which will allow the County to mitigate the impacts of the casino more broadly than the original MOU. No particular projects are specified at this time. The County will spend $2.6 million annually, increasing at 2% per year in 2017, towards the tribal health clinic, which has been impacted by the casino and which serves all citizens of El Dorado County. All of the other payments from the Tribe to the County in the 2006 MOU will remain in full force and effect and are not changed by the proposed amendment.

ACTION TO BE TAKEN FOLLOWING APPROVAL:

The Chairman will execute duplicate originals of the "Amendment of Memorandum of Understanding and Intergovernmental Agreement Between the County of El Dorado and Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians." One original will be given to the Tribe and the other will be filed by the Board Clerk.

Very Truly Yours,

LOUIS B. GREEN
County Counsel

By: _____
Edward L. Knapp
Chief Ass't. County Counsel

EX 5

SECTION 21
TOWNSHIP 10S
RANGE 10E

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
INDEX TO INDIAN LAND RECORDS
Rancheria
RESERVATION El Dorado County, Calif.

O.K.
REALTY

NE 1/4				NW 1/4				SE 1/4				SW 1/4				ALLOT. OR TRACT NO.	ACRES	TYPE OF INSTR.	GRANTOR	GRANTEE	DATE APPD.	RECORDED VOL.	RECORDED PAGE	REMARKS
NE	NW	SE	SW	NE	NW	SE	SW	NE	NW	SE	SW	NE	NW	SE	SW									
												X		X		–	80.00	W.D.	Lucy A. Thomas	U.S.	12/6/15	6	147	6/30/13 (38 Stat. 86) Act of 4/30/08 (35 Stat. 70-76)
				X	X	X	X									–	160.00	W.D.	Claude E. Cooper	" "	3/11/20	7	108	" " 5/25/18 (40 Stat. 570)
				X	X	X	X					X		X		–	2[illegible].00	Act	U.S.	Ma-Wuk Tribe	6/24/16 6/30/68			Shingle Springs Rancheria

LEGEND
F.P. - FEE PATENT
R.F. - RESTRICTED FEE PATENT
T.P. - TRUST PATENT
PREFIXED "G" TO TRACT NO. INDICATES GOV'T.-OWNED LAND

O.T. - ORDER TRANSFERRING INHERITED INTERESTS
C.C. - CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCY
O.R. - ORDER REMOVING RESTRICTIONS
R.D. - RESTRICTED DEED

T.D. - TRUST DEED
W.D. - WARRANTY DEED
R/W - RIGHT OF WAY
PREFIXED "I" TO TRACT NO. INDICATES TRIBAL LAND

P. - PROBATE NO.
X - REGULAR SUBDIVISION
NOS. REPRESENT LOTS

64476