

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 IN THE NOOKSACK TRIBAL COURT

8 SONIA LOMELI; TERRY ST. GERMAIN;  
9 NORMA ALDREDGE; RAEANNA  
10 RABANG; ROBLEY CARR, individually on  
11 behalf of his minor son, LEE CARR, enrolled  
12 members of the Nooksack Indian Tribe,  
13  
14 Appellants/Plaintiffs,  
15  
16 v.  
17  
18 ROBERT KELLY, Chairman of the Nooksack  
19 Tribal Council; RICK D. GEORGE, Vice-  
20 Chairman of the Nooksack Tribal Council;  
21 AGRIPINA SMITH, Treasurer of the Nooksack  
22 Tribal Council; BOB SOLOMON,  
23 Councilmember of the Nooksack Tribal  
24 Council; KATHERINE CANETE,  
25 Councilmember of the Nooksack Tribal Council  
and Nooksack General Services Executive;  
LONA JOHNSON, Councilmember of the  
Nooksack Tribal Council; and ROY BAILEY,  
Tribal Enrollment Office official,  
Appellees/Defendants.

NO. 2013-CI-CL-001  
NOTICE OF APPEAL

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

I. AUTOMATIC STAY

N.T.C. § 80.06.010 grants an automatic stay until the Nooksack Court of Appeals  
“upholds the judgment or dismisses the appeal.” The filing of this Notice triggers such stay,  
preserves the *status quo*, and halts all Appellees’ acts as challenged in Appellants’ Second

1 Amended Complaint.

## 2 II. INTRODUCTION

3 Come now Appellants,<sup>1</sup> pursuant to N.T.C. §§ 80.03.010 and 80.04.010, and appeal the  
4 final judgment of the Nooksack Tribal Court ("Trial Court") in the above-captioned and  
5 numbered case dated August 9, 2013. N.T.C. § 80.04.030(b).

6 This appeal is simple. Under Nooksack law, *Ex parte Young* allows Appellants to sue  
7 Appellees, in their official capacity, if they have violated Nooksack law. *Lomeli v Kelly*, Order  
8 Denying Permission for Interlocutory Appeal (Nooksack Ct. App. 2013), 4, fn. 4. Appellees  
9 have violated Nooksack law in several ways:

- 10 • By refusing to hold Constitutionally mandated public meetings of the Tribe for seven  
11 consecutive months;
- 12 • By depriving Appellants of due process in violation of the Nooksack Constitution;
- 13 • By initiating disenrollment proceedings on their own accord; and
- 14 • By initiating disenrollment proceedings without first providing any evidence  
15 whatsoever that those Nooksacks subject to disenrollment do not meet the  
16 membership requirements of Article II, Section 1 of the Nooksack Constitution.

17 The Trial Court erred in several other ways, but its principal failure to understand and correctly  
18 apply *Ex parte Young* overshadows its other errors and requires reversal and remand by the  
19 Nooksack Court of Appeals.

## 21 III. ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

---

22  
23 <sup>1</sup> Pursuant to N.T.C. § 80.04.030, Appellants represent that all parties in this matter are listed in the caption.  
24 Appellants are represented by Gabriel S. Galanda, Anthony S. Broadman, and Ryan D. Dreveskracht, of Galanda  
Broadman, PLLC. Appellees are represented by Grett Hurley and Rickie W. Armstrong, Office of Tribal Attorney,  
Nooksack Indian Tribe, and Thomas P. Schlosser, *et al.*, of Morisset, Schlosser, Jozwiak & Somerville.

1       **A. Decision And Order Denying Defendant's Motion To Strike In Part And Granting**  
2       **In Part (April 23, 2013)**

3               **1. Parts of the Decision Subject to Review and Effects on Case**

4               The Trial Court erred in striking Exhibit A to the Declaration of Diantha Doucette.  
5       Decision And Order Denying Defendant's Motion To Strike In Part And Granting In Part, at 5.  
6       Therein, Appellees' counsel of record admits "the descendants of Annie George James qualify  
7       under other sections of the Constitution, in particular the category in Article II, section 1(H), that  
8       'encompasses 'persons who possess at least 1/4<sup>th</sup> degree Indian blood and who can prove  
9       Nooksack ancestry to any degree.'" The effect of this error led to the Trial Court dismissing  
10      Appellants' Complaint and incorrectly refusing to enjoin Appellees from carrying out the illegal ,  
11      disenrollment of Appellants. Had the Trial Court taken Appellees' public admission against  
12      interest into account, it would have revealed the frivolity of Appellees' substantive defenses.  
13      Appellees' counsel of record has previously discounted the very arguments Appellees now  
14      advance.

15              **2. Legal Mistake**

16              Once Exhibit A was disseminated beyond the attorney-client relationship, it was either  
17      not privileged or recipients had the ability to waive such privilege. Appellants respectfully  
18      request that this Court of Appeals reverse that part of the Trial Court's April 23, 2013 decision.

19       **B. Order Denying Motion For Preliminary Injunction (May 20, 2013)**

20              **1. Parts of the Decision Subject to Review and Effects on Case**

21              The Trial Court erred by holding that tribal sovereign immunity operates as a bar to  
22      prospective injunctive relief against tribal officers sued in their official capacity. Order Denying  
23      Motion For Preliminary Injunction, at 9. The effect of this error led to the Trial Court dismissing  
24

1 Appellants' Complaint and incorrectly refusing to enjoin Appellees from carrying out the illegal  
2 disenrollment of Appellants.

3 The Trial Court also erred by holding that Appellees did not "act[] outside the procedures  
4 set out in Title 63" when they initiated disenrollment proceedings on their own volition, against  
5 over three hundred Nooksacks, without first providing any evidence whatsoever that those  
6 Nooksacks subject to disenrollment do not meet the membership requirements of Article II,  
7 Section 1, of the Nooksack Constitution. *Id.* at 13. The effect of this error led to the Trial Court  
8 dismissing Appellants' Complaint and incorrectly refusing to enjoin Appellees from carrying out  
9 the illegal disenrollment of Appellants.

10 The Trial Court's errors are found on pages five through thirteen of the Order Denying  
11 Motion For Preliminary Injunction. Appellants respectfully request that this Court of Appeals  
12 reverse those parts of the Trial Court's May 20, 2013 decision. N.T.C. § 80.04.030(c).

## 13 **2. Legal Mistakes**

### 14 ***a. Tribal Sovereign Immunity***

15 The Trial Court committed an error of law by holding that tribal sovereign immunity  
16 operates as a bar to prospective injunctive relief against tribal officers sued in their official  
17 capacity, except in those instances where "the actions taken by [tribal officers] clearly and  
18 unambiguously violate their official duties" in an "egregious" manner. Order Denying Motion  
19 For Preliminary Injunction, at 9. The Trial Court cited no tribal or federal common law authority  
20 to support its novel "egregiousness conduct" rule for the application of *Ex parte Young*.<sup>2</sup> To  
21

---

22  
23 <sup>2</sup> Nor does it appear to Appellants that any other court in the land has ever held that the application of *Ex parte*  
24 *Young* "only gives rise to prospective injunctive relief when the government officials act *well* outside the scope of  
their duties." Order Denying Motion For Preliminary Injunction, at 7 (emphasis added). Indeed, the Trial Court  
cites no legal authority for that standard either.

1 Appellants' knowledge, not one court, in any jurisdiction, ever, has held that the application of  
2 *Ex parte Young* depends on the egregiousness of the constitutional or statutory violation alleged.

3 Indeed, in order for the *Ex parte Young* doctrine to apply, the tribal officer need not take  
4 any action at all—the mere threat of commencing an unconstitutional or unlawful proceeding is  
5 sufficient to trigger the exception. *See Edelman v. Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651, 680 (1974) (*Ex parte*  
6 *Young* applies to “officials with authority to enforce . . . laws ‘**who threaten and are about to**  
7 **commence proceedings** . . . to enforce against parties affected an unconstitutional act . . . may  
8 be enjoined . . . .”) (quoting *Young*, 209 U.S. at 156; emphasis added). In short, “the inquiry into  
9 whether suit lies under *Ex parte Young* **does not include an analysis of the merits of the**  
10 **claim.**” *Verizon Md., Inc. v. Pub. Serv. Comm’n of Md.*, 535 U.S. 635, 646 (2002) (emphasis  
11 added).

12 As the Nooksack Court of Appeals noted in *Olson v. Nooksack*, 6 NICS App. 49  
13 (Nooksack Tribal Ct. App. June 20, 2001):

14 Various tribal courts as well as the Ninth Circuit have adopted [the *Ex parte*  
15 *Young*] rule in order to ensure that the requirements of ICRA and other federal  
16 and tribal statutes are enforceable against tribal officials. In *Moran v. Council of*  
17 *the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes*, 22 Ind. L. Rep. 6149 (C.S. & K.T.  
18 Ct. App. 1995), the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribal Court of Appeals . . .  
19 held that **the *Ex parte Young* doctrine applies to permit actions against tribal**  
20 **officials when such officials are alleged to have acted beyond the scope of**  
21 **their authority.** *Id.* at 6157; *see also Burlington Northern R.R. Co. v. Blackfeet*  
22 *Tribe*, 924 F.2d 899, 902 (9th Cir. 1991), *cert. denied*, 505 U.S. 1212 (1992)  
23 (“[T]ribal sovereign immunity does not bar a suit for prospective relief against  
24 tribal officers allegedly acting in violation of federal law.”). The *Moran* case was  
cited favorably in *Smith d/b/a Frosty’s v. Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes*,  
23 Ind. L. Rep. 6256, 6257-58, (C.S. & K.T. Ct. App. 1996), which held that  
individual tribal officers and employees have “no immunity to declaratory and  
injunctive relief.” “[I]f plaintiff could show that the council policies were  
contrary to federal law or the tribal constitution, she would be entitled to  
injunctive relief against the individuals charged with enforcement of the  
policies.” *Id.* at 6258. The Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals has also recognized  
the *Ex parte Young* doctrine in an action brought against officials acting outside  
the scope of their authority. In *Tamiami Partners, Ltd. v. Miccosukee Tribe Of*

1 *Indians Of Florida*, 63 F.3d 1050 (11th Cir. 1995), the court relied on *Ex parte*  
2 *Young* in affirming the district court's ruling that the Tribe's sovereign immunity  
did not shield the individual Appellees from Tamiami's suit (emphasis added).

3 *Id.* at 54-55 (emphasis added); *see also Cline v. Cunanan*, No. NOO-CIV-02/08-5, at 6  
4 (Nooksack Ct. App. Jan. 12, 2009) (*Ex parte Young* provides the "framework to determine  
5 whether injunctive or declaratory relief is available.").<sup>3</sup> Appellants have shown that Appellees'  
6 acts are contrary to the Nooksack Constitution and Title 63; that they have acted beyond the  
7 scope of their authority; that they threaten and are about to commence unlawfully initiated  
8 disenrollment proceedings. The *Ex parte Young* doctrine clearly applies to permit Appellants'  
9 claims for prospective injunctive relief.

10 In formulating its "egregious conduct" rule, it has become readily apparent that the Trial  
11 Court has confused **sovereign immunity** with **qualified immunity**:

12 In a qualified-immunity setting, the plaintiff bears the burden of showing that the  
13 constitutional right allegedly violated was clearly established at the time of the  
14 challenged conduct. Such a plaintiff can also prevail by **showing that the**  
**conduct at issue is so egregious** that no reasonable person could have believed  
that it would not violate clearly established rights.

15 *Purvis v. Oest*, 614 F.3d 713, 717-18 (7th Cir. 2010) (emphasis added). But "an official sued in  
16 his **official capacity** may not take advantage of a qualified immunity defense." *Mitchell v.*  
17 *Forsyth*, 472 U.S. 511, 556 n.10 (2006) (citing *Brandon v. Holt*, 469 U.S. 464 (1985)) (emphasis  
18 added). That defense applies only to those tribal officials sued in their **personal capacities**. *See*  
19 *Desalle v. Bickham*, No. 00-3562, 2002 WL 1791550, \*1 n.2 (E.D. La. Aug. 1, 2002) ("[T]he  
20 qualified immunity defense only applies to personal capacity claims.").

---

21 <sup>3</sup> In *Cline*, *Ex parte Young* did not apply because Appellants were seeking to enjoin the Tribal Council – not named  
22 public officials in their official capacity – for merely enacting an unconstitutional law – not acting in furtherance of  
23 that law – and were seeking "declaratory relief, damages, costs and attorney fees" – not prospective injunctive relief.  
24 No. NOO-CIV-02/08-5, at 1. While the *Cline* Court noted that the application of *Ex parte Young* was "enormously  
complex" in the federal context – naturally, as the determination of whether **federal law** binds tribal governments in  
**federal courts** is not as cut and dry as whether **tribal law** is binding in **tribal courts**, *see e.g. N.L.R.B. v. Pueblo of*  
*San Juan*, 276 F.3d 1186 (10th Cir. 2002) – it is quite uncomplicated in the tribal context. *Cline*, No. NOO-CIV-  
02/08-5, at 7; *see e.g. Honyama v. Nuvamsa*, 7 Am. Tribal Law 320, 324 (Hopi Ct. App. 2008).

1 Here, Appellants have filed suit against tribal officials in their **official capacities** and  
2 their official capacities only. *See* Complaint at ¶¶ 6-14; First Amended Complaint at ¶¶ 6-14;  
3 Second Amended Complaint at ¶¶ 6-13. But the Trial Court mistakenly believes that Appellants  
4 have sued Appellees in their personal capacities. *Supra*.

5 The Trial Court has committed an obvious error of law.

6 ***b. Failure to Address Arguments***

7 The Trial Court also committed an obvious error by failing to address the majority of  
8 Appellants' argument going to the merits. Although Appellants did argue that Appellees  
9 "act[ed] outside the procedures set out in Title 63" when they initiated disenrollment proceedings  
10 on their own volition, this was only one piece of the picture. Order Denying Motion for  
11 Preliminary Injunction, at 13. Appellants also argued that Appellees improperly deprived  
12 Appellants of rights guaranteed by Article II of the Constitution – specifically, that Appellees  
13 unconstitutionally instituted disenrollment proceedings upon Appellants **without an initial**  
14 **showing of any evidence that these members are not Nooksack**, as required by N.T.C. §  
15 63.04.001(B), the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968, 82 Stat. 77 ("ICRA"), and Article IX of the  
16 Nooksack Constitution. *See generally* *U.S. v. Zucca*, 351 U.S. 91, 100 (1956) (requiring that the  
17 federal government, "as a prerequisite to the initiation of [denaturalization] proceedings, file an  
18 affidavit showing good cause.")<sup>4</sup>; *Gorbach v. Reno*, 219 F.3d 1087 (9th Cir. 2000) (noting that

19  
20 <sup>4</sup> The *Zucca* Court went on to note that

21 The mere filing of a proceeding for denaturalization results in serious consequences to a  
22 defendant. Even if his citizenship is not cancelled, his reputation is tarnished and his standing in  
the community damaged. [A] person, once admitted to American citizenship, should not be  
subject to legal proceedings to defend his citizenship without a preliminary showing of good  
cause. Such a safeguard must not be lightly regarded.

23 351 U.S. at 100. Likewise, the mere initiation of disenrollment proceedings against Appellants has resulted in  
24 serious consequences to them; as discussed below, they should not even be subject to proceedings to defend their  
enrollment without a preliminary "present[ation of] written documentation on how the information was obtained that  
warrants disenrollment" or "evidence submitted to support a[ny] statement" that they are not Nooksack. N.T.C. §§

1 citizenship is safeguarded “from abrogation except by a clearly defined procedure” because  
2 “denaturalization may result in loss of both property and life” and “all that makes life worth  
3 living” and holding that “where there is doubt it must be resolved in the citizen’s favor”).

4 The Trial Court’s “summary and conclusory findings,” if there were any findings at all on  
5 this point – it is not clear – are “simply inadequate to allow for satisfactory review.” *Soc’y for*  
6 *Good Will to Retarded Children v. Cuomo*, 902 F.2d 1085, 1089 (2nd Cir. 1990); *see also Neff v.*  
7 *Port Susan Camping Club*, Nos. TUL–CV–GC–2005–0368, TUL–CV–GC–2005–0390, 2007  
8 WL 7011053 (Tulalip Ct. App. Dec. 10, 2007). The Trial Court has committed an obvious error  
9 of procedure in failing to address all of Appellants’ arguments on the merits.

10 **c. Initiation of Disenrollment Proceedings**

11 The Trial Court also committed an error of law by holding that Appellees did not “act[]  
12 outside the procedures set out in Title 63” when they initiated disenrollment proceedings on their  
13 own volition, against over three hundred Nooksacks, without first providing any evidence  
14 whatsoever that those Nooksacks subject to disenrollment do not meet the membership  
15 requirements of Article II, Section 1, of the Nooksack Constitution. Order Denying Motion for  
16 Preliminary Injunction, at 13. The Nooksack Constitution grants the Tribal Council the  
17 legislative power enact ordinances that “prescribe rules and regulations governing involuntary  
18 loss of membership,” and to “enact ordinances in conformity with this constitution.” Const. Art.  
19 II, secs. 2,4. Assuming that the Tribal Council, in exercising the authority to enact membership  
20 ordinances, had the power to grant themselves the authority to initiate disenrollment proceedings  
21 in Title 63, it is not found there.

22  
23  
24 63.04.001(B), 63.00.004. No such written documentation, no such evidence, no such showing of good cause, has  
been made here.



1 The initiation of disenrollment proceedings is spelled out unambiguously in N.T.C. §  
2 63.04.001(B), which provides that the disenrollment process is to be initiated by “[a]ny tribal  
3 member” upon “present[ation of] written documentation on how the information was obtained  
4 that warrants disenrollment.” *Id.* “Documentation” is defined as “evidence submitted to support  
5 a statement of fact.” N.T.C. § 63.00.004. The requirement that there be some initial showing of  
6 documentary evidence coincides with the general due process right, guaranteed by the ICRA and  
7 Article IX of the Nooksack Constitution, that there be some “showing good cause” prior to being  
8 subjected to an adverse disenrollment proceeding.<sup>5</sup> *Zucca*, 351 U.S. 91.

9 Once such documentation had been presented—it was wholly and indisputably wanting  
10 here—the Enrollment Department was then free to “conduct genealogical research . . . to verify  
11 information presented on enrollment applications” and to “provide recommendations through the  
12 Government Services Executive to the Tribal Council regarding necessary changes to the  
13 membership rolls based on research findings, as necessary.” Declaration of Roy Bailey, at 2. If  
14 the Enrollment Department finds that the nominated Tribal Member does not meet the  
15 “eligibility requirements” and the Tribal Council agrees with that finding, the Tribal Council  
16 issues a resolution to disenroll that tribal member. *Id.* at 2-3. If the Tribal Member disagrees  
17 with the Enrollment Department and Tribal Council’s findings, he or she may “request a  
18 meeting” with the Tribal Council. N.T.C. § 63.04.001(B)(2).

19 At this meeting, “[t]he burden of proof . . . rest[s] with the Tribe” to prove that the tribal  
20 member “fail[s] to meet the requirements set forth for membership in [the] constitution.” N.T.C.  
21 § 63.04.001(B); Constitution, Art. II, sec. 4. If the Tribal Council finds that the Tribe has met  
22 this burden, “[t]he decision of the . . . Tribal Council is final.” N.T.C. § 63.04.001(B)(2); *see*  
23

---

24 <sup>5</sup> As noted above, the Trial Court failed to address the merits of this constitutional argument.

1 also N.T.C. § 63.04.001(B) (“The Tribal Council will have the final say on loss of  
2 membership.”).

3 There is simply no other way to read N.T.C. § 63.04.001. The Trial Court’s holding that  
4 N.T.C. § 63.04.001 somehow implicitly allows that Tribal Council may initiate disenrollment  
5 proceedings at its will—that the Tribal Council may target specific identifiable groups of  
6 Nooksacks for disenrollment simply because they feel like it, without guidance from the law and  
7 without providing any evidence to substantiate its allegations—was an obvious error of law.

8 Appellants, therefore, respectfully request that this Court of Appeals reverse those parts  
9 of the Trial Court’s April 23, 2013 decision. N.T.C. § 80.04.030(c).

10 **C. Decision And Order Denying Plaintiff’s (sic) Motion For Temporary Restraining**  
11 **Order As To Issues Related To Resolution 13-38 (June 17, 2013)**

12 **1. Parts of the Decision Subject to Review and Effects on Case**

13 The Trial Court erred in denying Appellants’ Second Emergency Motion for Temporary  
14 Restraining Order. Each part of the Decision And Order Denying Motion For Temporary  
15 Restraining Order As To Issues Related To Resolution 13-38 leading to this result is subject to  
16 review, including the following instances at the noted parts of the Court’s decision:

17 The Court held that “Appellants ask this Court to enjoin Appellees from acting in  
18 furtherance of Resolution 13-38. Appellants argue that Appellees are not covered by sovereign  
19 immunity because their actions in passing Resolution 13-38 and otherwise supporting the  
20 proposed Constitutional Amendment constitute actions outside of their official duties as Tribal  
21 Council members, giving rise to an *Ex Parte Young* theory.” Decision And Order Denying  
22 Motion For Temporary Restraining Order As To Issues Related To Resolution 13-38, at 4.

1 The effect of these parts of the Trial Court's decision is that the Trial Court dismissed  
2 Appellants' Complaint and incorrectly refused to enjoin Appellees from carrying out the illegal  
3 disenrollment of Appellants.

## 4 **2. Legal Mistakes**

5 As explained above and below, the Trial Court's ongoing misapprehension of *Ex Parte*  
6 *Young* is legal error. The doctrine applies when an official does something illegal, not only when  
7 an official does something illegal outside the scope of their authority.

### 8 **D. Order Denying Appellants' Second Emergency Motion For Temporary Restraining** 9 **Order As To Issues Relating To Tribal Council Meetings (June 19, 2013)**

#### 10 **1. Parts of the Decision Subject to Review and Effects on Case**

11 The Trial Court erred in denying Appellants' Second Emergency Motion for Temporary  
12 Restraining Order. Each part of the Order Denying Appellants' Second Emergency Motion for  
13 Temporary Restraining Order As To Issues Relating To Tribal Council Meetings leading to this  
14 result is subject to review, including the following instances at the noted parts of the Court's  
15 decision:

16 The Trial Court held that Appellants sued Appellees in their individual capacity. Order  
17 Denying Appellants' Second Emergency Motion For Temporary Restraining Order As To Issues  
18 Relating To Tribal Council Meetings, at 4.

19 The Trial Court held that Appellees did not violate Nooksack Law by refusing to hold  
20 regular meetings. *Id.* at 1-7.

21 The Trial Court held that Appellees did not violate Nooksack Law by refusing to hold  
22 special meetings. *Id.* at 7-9.

23 The Trial Court held that *Ex parte Young* "might apply when the relief is against the  
24 individual Appellees acting outside the scope of their authority[.]" *Id.* at 1-7.

1 The Trial Court held that Appellants lacked standing to challenge Appellees' refusal to  
2 hold special meetings. *Id.* at 9.

3 The effect of these parts of the Trial Court's decision is that the Trial Court dismissed  
4 Appellants' Complaint and incorrectly refused to enjoin Appellees from carrying out the illegal  
5 disenrollment of Appellants.

## 6 **2. Legal Mistakes**

7 The Court erred in holding that Appellants sued Appellees in their individual capacity.  
8 Order Denying Appellants' Second Emergency Motion For Temporary Restraining Order As To  
9 Issues Relating To Tribal Council Meetings, at 4. Appellants sued Appellees as officials. *Ex*  
10 *parte Young* requires a suit in a government agent's official capacity. Here, again, Appellants  
11 sued the tribal officials in their official capacities and their official capacities only. *See*  
12 Complaint at ¶¶ 6-14; First Amended Complaint at ¶¶ 6-14; Second Amended Complaint at ¶¶ 6-  
13 13.

14 The Trial Court erred in applying *Ex parte Young* incorrectly. The Trial Court held that  
15 *Ex parte Young* "might apply when the relief is against the individual Appellees acting outside  
16 the scope of their authority[.]" *Id.* at 1-7. As set forth above and below, the Trial Court's serial  
17 errors related to *Ex parte Young* make its entire approach to this case problematic. *Ex parte*  
18 *Young* applies under Nooksack Law, when an official violates Nooksack law—not only when an  
19 official violates the law and that illegal conduct is egregious, or intentional. *Lomeli v Kelly*,  
20 Order Denying Permission For Interlocutory Appeal (Nooksack Ct. App. 2013), at 4, fn. 4.

21 Appellants, therefore, respectfully request that this Court of Appeals reverse those parts  
22 of the Trial Court's June 19, 2013 decision. N.T.C. § 80.04.030(c).

## 23 **E. Amended Order Granting Appellees' Motion to Dismiss Second Amended** 24 **Complaint (August 7, 2013)**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**1. Parts of the Decision Subject to Review and Effects on Case**

The Court erred in dismissing Appellants' Second Amended Complaint. Each part of the Amended Order Granting Appellees' Motion To Dismiss Second Amended Complaint<sup>6</sup> leading to this result is subject to review, including the following instances at the noted parts of the Court's decision:

The Trial Court did not take the non-moving parties' facts as true, and resolve all factual disputes in the non-moving parties' favor. Order Granting Appellees' Motion To Dismiss Second Amended Complaint, 2.

The Trial Court held that the Constitution "now allows membership based on seven possible claims, A through G." *Id.*

The Trial Court held, again, that "[e]ach of the Appellees were sued in their personal capacity as the Appellants allege that the Appellees lost their sovereign immunity protection by virtue of their actions being outside the scope of their official duties." *Id.* at 8.

The Trial Court held that for it to apply *Ex parte Young*, it was required to "find first that the Appellees acted outside the scope of their authority." *Id.* at 9, 13, 14-15.

The Trial Court held that requests for disenrollment can be made by those other than individual tribal members; it held that Enrollment Staff can bring such actions. *Id.* at 10-12.

The Trial Court held that even though Appellants qualify for membership under Section 1(H) of the Constitution, Appellees did not violate the Constitution in disenrolling them. *Id.* at 14.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Trial Court amended its August 6, 2013 Order Granting Appellees' Motion To Dismiss Second Amended Complaint in order to correct more than one "drafting and typographical errors" therein. Amended Order Granting Appellees' Motion To Dismiss Second Amended Complaint, at 1, fn.1

1 The Trial Court held that refusing to hold public meetings does not violate the law. *Id.* at  
2 17-18.

3 The Trial Court held that Appellants lack standing. *Id.* at 18-19.

4 The effect of these parts of the Trial Court's decision is that the Trial Court dismissed  
5 Appellants' Complaint and incorrectly refused to enjoin Appellees from carrying out the illegal  
6 disenrollment of Appellants.

## 7 **2. Mistakes**

8 The Trial Court was required to accept Appellants' facts as true and resolve all factual  
9 disputes in Appellants' favor. It failed to do so.

10 The Trial Court held that the Constitution "now allows membership based on seven  
11 possible claims, A through G," but members who were enrolled before the recent election remain  
12 eligible for membership under the Constitutional provisions applicable when they were enrolled.

13 The Trial Court erred in finding, yet again, that Appellants sued Appellees in their  
14 personal capacities. Appellees were sued in their official capacity. *See* Complaint at ¶¶ 6-14;  
15 First Amended Complaint at ¶¶ 6-14; Second Amended Complaint at ¶¶ 6-13. This continuing  
16 and repeated error illustrates the Trial Court's failure to apprehend *Ex parte Young*.

17 Under Nooksack law, when "an official commits an act prohibited by law, he acts beyond  
18 his authority and is not protected by sovereign immunity." *Lomeli v Kelly*, Order Denying  
19 Permission For Interlocutory Appeal (Nooksack Ct. App. 2013), 4, fn. 4. To be clear, (a) when  
20 an official violates the law (b) he acts beyond his authority and (c) is not protected by sovereign  
21 immunity. Future illegal official acts can be enjoined. While the Trial Court quoted this  
22 passage, it erred in utterly failing to apply it. *See* Order Granting Appellees' Motion To Dismiss  
23 Second Amended Complaint, at 9. Instead, the Trial Court reversed the calculus, perverting the  
24

1 Nooksack Court of Appeals' directive, and making its application of *Ex Parte Young* a kind of  
2 legal Möbius strip that can never be applied.

3 *Ex parte Young*, everywhere, in every court, including the Nooksack Court of Appeals  
4 and therefore the Trial Court, dictates that when officials violate the law, they are not immune.  
5 They can be sued. Sovereign immunity does not prevent suits against them to bar future  
6 violations of the law. The Trial Court, however, erred by asking first whether Appellees were  
7 acting in their official capacity. Its application of the doctrine is backwards and, again, appears  
8 to stem from confusion between *Ex parte Young* and suits against officials in their personal  
9 capacities.

10 Under the applicable Tribal statute, requests for disenrollment must be made by  
11 individual tribal members, not enrollment staff or elected leaders. The Trial Court erred in  
12 holding to the contrary.

13 The Trial Court erred in holding that even though Appellants qualify for membership  
14 under Section 1(H) of the Constitution, Appellees did not violate the Constitution in disenrolling  
15 them. *Id.* at 14. Appellees conduct is clearly unconstitutional and the Trial Court erred in  
16 holding to the contrary.

17 The Trial Court erred in holding that refusing to hold public meetings does not violate the  
18 law. Nooksack law requires meetings that Appellees have illegally refused to hold.

19 The Trial Court erred in holding that Appellants lack standing. The Trial Court's  
20 application of the doctrine of standing is incorrect. Appellants clearly have standing because  
21 they have been injured (disenrolled) in particular by Appellees' illegal conduct—these were not  
22 generalized meetings but meetings that Appellants' were entitled to. Had Appellees met and  
23  
24

1 acted legally as required by Nooksack law, Appellants would not now be subject to  
2 disenrollment.

3 Appellants, therefore, respectfully request that this Court of Appeals reverse those parts  
4 of the Trial Court's August 7, 2013 decision. N.T.C. § 80.04.030(c).

5 **F. Judgment (August 9, 2013)**

6 **1. Parts of the Decision Subject to Review and Effects on Case**

7 The Judgment is subject to review to the extent it incorporates and relies on previous  
8 erroneous decisions by the Trial Court. The Judgment terminated Appellants' case.

9 The effect of the Judgment is that the Trial Court dismissed Appellants' lawsuit and  
10 incorrectly refused to enjoin Appellees from carrying out the illegal disenrollment of Appellants.

11 **2. Legal Mistakes**

12 The Trial Court erred in the Judgment to the extent the Judgment incorporates and relies  
13 on previous erroneous decisions by the Trial Court as set forth above. Appellants, therefore,  
14 respectfully request that this Court of Appeals reverse the Trial Court's August 9, 2013  
15 Judgment. N.T.C. § 80.04.030(c).

16 DATED this 12th day of August, 2013.



17  
18 Gabriel S. Galanda  
Anthony S. Broadman  
Ryan D. Dreveskracht  
Attorneys for Appellants  
GALANDA BROADMAN, PLLC  
8606 35th Ave. NE, Suite L1  
P.O. Box 15146  
Seattle, WA 98115  
20  
21 (206) 557-7509 Fax: (206) 299-7690  
22  
23  
24



- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

1. I am over eighteen years of age and am competent to testify, and have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein. I am employed with Galanda Broadman, PLLC, counsel of record for Appellants.

Grett Hurley  
Rickie Armstrong  
Tribal Attorney  
Office of Tribal Attorney  
Nooksack Indian Tribe  
5047 Mt. Baker Hwy  
P.O. Box 157  
Deming, WA 98244

Thomas Schlosser  
Morisset, Schlosser, Jozwiak & Somerville  
1115 Norton Building  
801 Second Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98104-1509

The foregoing statement is made under penalty of perjury under the laws of the Nooksack Tribe and the State of Washington and is true and correct.

DATED this 12th day of August, 2013.

  
GABRIEL S. GALANDA