```
THE LIN LAW FIRM, A PROFESSIONAL
   LAW CORPORATION
  ELIZABETH P. LIN (SBN 174663)
  2705 S. Diamond Bar Blvd.. Suite 398
  Diamond Bar, CA 91765
  Telephone: (909) 595-5522
  Facsimile: (909) 595-5519
  Counsel for Plaintiffs
5
6
7
                     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8
                   SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9
  RONALD D. ALLEN JR., RAYMOND
                                       CASE NO. 12-CV-1668-WOH-KSC
  BOZIGIAN, ALEXANDRA M.
  CASTOR, KEITH DENVER, MILTON )
  DENVER, JESSICA FLOREZ,
                                       NOTICE OF ADDITIONAL RECENT
12
  ANTHONY FREEMAN, MIKKI A.
                                       AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
  GRABER, MIKE HACKMAN,
                                       PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO
13
  JOSEPH HARRIS, NIKKI D. HARRIS, )
  GINA HOWARD, BEN JOHNSON
                                       DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
  PAUL JOHNSON, BONNIE J. KING,
                                       DISMISS
  BRITTNEY LUTTERS, CHERYL
15
  MAJEL, JULIEANNE MENDOZA.
  LUANNE MORO, KALCIE
                                       DATE: March 1, 2013
  ONTIVEROS, KIRSTEN
                                       TIME: 10:00 am
  ONTIVEROS, VIKKI L. OXLEY,
JOEY PINK, MATTHEW PINK, JOHN)
RANDOLPH, LILLIAN VANCE, and
                                       CTRM: 14B - The Honorable William
17
                                               Q. Hayes
18
  MARIA J. VIVANCO
19
                  Plaintiffs,
20
        VS.
   ROBERT H. SMITH, LEROY H.
   MIRANDA JR., KILMA S. LATTIN,
   THERESA J. NÍETO, and DION
  PEREZ
23
                  Defendants.
24
25
26
27
28
   NOTICE OF ADDITIONAL RECENT AUTHORITIES
```

1

3

13

17

18

19 20

22

23

24

25

26

27

Plaintiffs hereby submit the following additional recent authorities in further support of their opposition to Defendants' pending motion to dismiss.

In Maxwell v. Cnty. of San Diego, No. 10-56671, 2013 U.S. App. LEXIS 3106 (9th Cir. Feb. 14, 2013), attached hereto as Exhibit A, the Ninth Circuit, in concluding that paramedics from the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians Tribal Fire 6 Department were not entitled to tribal sovereign immunity, adopted a remedy-7 focused analysis. There, the Ninth Circuit held that where "the plaintiff seeks" money damages 'not from the state treasury but from the officer[s] personally," the sovereign was not "the real, substantial party in interest," and sovereign 10 | immunity did not apply to protect the tribal employees from suit. *Id.* at \*27. 11 Likewise, in the case at bar, Plaintiffs seek money damages from the Individual 12 Defendants personally, instead of from the Tribe. See Complaint, at 61.<sup>2</sup>

In Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District v. Lee, 14 No. CV-08-08028-PCT-JAT, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10952 (D. Ariz. Jan. 28, 15 2013), attached hereto as Exhibit B, the court rejected arguments by current and 16 former justices of the Navajo Nation Supreme Court that they could not be subject to suit because they were protected by sovereign immunity. The court determined

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Although the Ninth Circuit ordered that its previous *Maxwell* opinion dated September 13, 2012 (which appears at 697 F.3d 941) be withdrawn, the new superseding *Maxwell* opinion by the Ninth Circuit is substantially similar to its previous opinion. See Exhibit A to Notice of Recent Authorities in Support of Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, filed on December 17, 2012 (Docket No. 26).

Earlier, Defendants had argued that *Maxwell* was not "settled Ninth Circuit law" because petitions for rehearing were pending. See Defendants' Response to Plaintiffs' Notice of Recent Authorities in Support of Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, filed December 19, 2012 (Docket No. 28). Given the Ninth Circuit's denial of the petitions for panel rehearing and the petitions for hearing en banc, 2013 U.S. App. LEXIS 3106, at \*2, Maxwell is now settled Ninth Circuit law.

that even if the tribal justices had been acting in their representative capacity and within the scope of their authority, they were not entitled to dismissal from the suit under the Ex parte Young doctrine, as plaintiff had alleged an ongoing violation of federal law and sought prospective relief. Id. at \*\*10-16. The court further held that the Navajo Nation was not a necessary party required to be joined under Fed. R. Civ. P. 19(a) because the Navajo official defendants sufficiently represented the tribe's interests in the case. *Id.* at \*46.

DATED: February 19, 2013

THE LIN LAW FIRM, A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION ELIZABETH P. LIN

/s/ Elizabeth P. Lin ELIZABETH P. LIN

2705 S. Diamond Bar Blvd., Suite 398

Diamond Bar, A 91765 Telephone: (909) 595-5522 Facsimile: (909) 595-5519 ElizabethL@thelinlawfirm.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28