

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ELOISE COBELL, ET AL . DOCKET NUMBER: CA 96-125

.
Plaintiffs, .

.
vs. . Washington, D. C.

. June 20, 2011

KENNETH SALAZAR, ET AL . 10:00 A.M.

.
Defendants. .

.

TRANSCRIPT OF FAIRNESS HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE THOMAS F. HOGAN
A UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF: DENNIS M. GINGOLD, ESQUIRE

607 14th Street, NW

9th Floor

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 824-1448

(202) 318-2372 (fax)

dennismgingold@aol.com

KEITH M. HARPER, ESQUIRE

KILPATRICK, STOCKTON, LLP

607 14th Street NW

Suite 900

Washington, D.C. 0005

(202) 508-5844

(202) 585-0919 - fax

kharper@kilpatricktownsend.com

Page 2	Page 4
<p>1 ADAM H. CHARNES, ESQUIRE 2 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON, LLP 3 1001 West Fourth Street 4 Winston-Salem, NC 27101 5 (336) 607-7382 6 (336) 734-2602 (fax) 7 acharnes@kilpatricktownsend.com 8 WILLIAM E. DORRIS, ESQUIRE 9 KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP 10 1100 Peachtree Street 11 Suite 2800 12 Atlanta, GA 30309-4530 13 (404) 815-6104 14 (404) 541-3183 15 bdorris@kilpatrickstockton.com 16 ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, ESQUIRE 17 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON, LLP 18 1100 Peachtree Street 19 Suite 2800 20 Atlanta, GA 30309-4530 21 (404) 815-6500 22 elevitas@kilpatrickstockton.com 23 CRAIG E. BERTSCHI, ESQUIRE 24 KILPATRICK, TOWNSEND & STOCKTON, 25 LLP 26 1100 Peachtree Street, NE 27 Suite 2800 28 Atlanta, GA 30309 29 (404) 815-6493 30 (404) 541-3128 31 cbertschi@kilpatricktownsend.com 32 DAVID C. SMITH, ESQUIRE 33 KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP 34 1001 West 4th Street 35 Winston-Salem, NC 27101-2400 36 (336) 607-7392 37 (336) 734-2611 (fax) 38 dcsmith@kilpatrickstockton.com</p>	<p>1 JOHN T. STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE 2 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 3 Senior Trial Counsel 4 Commercial Litigation Branch 5 P. O. Box 875 6 Ben Franklin Station 7 Washington, D.C. 20044 8 (202) 307-1104 9 (202) 305-4933 10 john.stemplewicz@usdoj.gov 11 THE COURT REPORTER: SUSAN PAGE TYNER, CVR-CM 12 Official Court Reporter 13 United States District Court 14 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. 15 Room 6523 16 Washington, D.C. 20001 17 (202) 354-3267 Susan_Tyner@dcd.uscourts.gov 18 Computer aided transcript prepared with the aid of 19 SpeechCAT.</p>
Page 3	Page 5
<p>1 THADIOUS HOLT, ESQUIRE 2 FOR THE DEFENDANTS: ROBERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQUIRE 3 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 4 1100 L Street, NW 5 Suite 10008 6 Washington, D.C. 20005 7 (202) 616-0328 8 robert.kirschman@usdoj.gov 9 10 MICHAEL J. QUINN, ESQUIRE 11 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 12 Box 875 13 Ben Franklin Station 14 Washington, D.C. 20044 15 (202) 307-0243 16 (202) 514-9613 17 michael.quinn3@usdoj.gov 18 J. CHRISTOPHER KOHN, ESQUIRE 19 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 20 Commercial Litigation Branch 21 Ben Franklin Station 22 P. O. Box 875 23 Washington, D.C. 20044-0875 24 (202) 514-7450 25 (202) 514-9163 (fax) 26 chris.kohn@usdoj.gov 27 PAUL G. WOLFTEICH, ESQUIRE 28 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY 29 799 9th Street, NW 30 Washington, D.C. 20239 31 (202) 504-3705 32 (202) 504-3633 33 paul.wolfteich@bdp.treas.gov</p>	<p>1 P R O C E E D I N G S 2 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. This Honorable 3 Court is now in session. The Honorable Judge Thomas F. 4 Hogan presiding. Please be seated and come to order. 5 Civil action 96-1285. Eloise Cobell, et al, 6 versus Kenneth Salazar, et al. 7 Counsel, please approach the lectern, state your 8 names and who you represent for the record, beginning with 9 plaintiffs' counsel. 10 MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, Dennis Gingold for 11 plaintiffs. 12 Would you like me to identify the -- 13 THE COURT: Yes. For the record, everyone who is 14 here should identify themselves. 15 MR. GINGOLD: Mr. Harper, Mr. Levitas, Mr. 16 Charnes, Mr. Bertschi, Mr. Smith, Mr. Dorris and Mr. Holt. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. 18 MR. KIRSCHMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. For 19 defendants in this case Robert Kirschman from the Department 20 of Justice, and with me at counsel table, also from the 21 Department of Justice, I have Michael Quinn, John 22 Stemplewicz and Chris Kohn. 23 Also at counsel table with us for the Department 24 of Treasury is Paul Wolfteich. 25 I believe joining us will be -- from the</p>

Page 6	Page 8
<p>1 Department of Interior -- Hillary Tompkins, the Solicitor, 2 also. 3 THE COURT: All right, thank you. 4 We are gathered here this morning, and I 5 appreciate -- 6 ARENT FOX: (Unintelligible) from Arent Fox on 7 behalf of Mark Brown. 8 THE COURT: You filed a motion overnight to 9 intervene. I am going to hold that for right now. Thank 10 you. 11 ARENT FOX: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: We are here to consider the petitions 13 for the approval of the settlement in this case that were 14 preliminarily approved last year before we proceeded to have 15 the circulation of the settlement, the opportunity for 16 people to object and to appear, and for explanations to be 17 given to those affected. 18 This is an historic case that has a long history, 19 some tragic and now more recently successful, and I have 20 allowed, in my order, the organization for the fairness 21 hearing today to allow those who wish to appear to be heard 22 to be allowed to speak. 23 But first what I'm going to do is have the opening 24 statements by the plaintiffs and the defendants made. Then 25 I will turn to the objectors, each of which were given a</p>	<p>1 to make the hearing. She appreciates and thanks the court 2 for its opportunity given to speak, but will not be 3 appearing today. 4 With that background then, I will hear from 5 plaintiffs' counsel first. 6 MR. DORRIS: Good morning, Your Honor. If it 7 please the court, I am Bill Dorris, and on behalf of the 8 plaintiffs and class counsel, we would like to thank you for 9 taking on this very difficult, challenging and time- 10 consuming matter, and we appreciate your expeditious 11 handling of it. 12 Plaintiffs respectfully ask this court to bring 13 this epic struggle to a close by the court granting final 14 approval of the settlement agreement which has been 15 ratified, authorized and confirmed by Congress, and signed 16 into law by the President, and to also enter final judgment 17 giving effect the terms of the settlement. 18 Your Honor, it is my privilege today to introduce 19 the class representatives to the court. We have present in 20 the courtroom with us three of the class representatives, 21 and I would like to introduce them to you, and I would ask, 22 please, that they stand so that you will know who they are 23 as I do. 24 First we have Tom Maulson, who is the tribal 25 chairman of the Lac du Flambeau tribe in Wisconsin. We have</p>
Page 7	Page 9
<p>1 reasonable time to hear their objections, and when we 2 conclude that we will have the response to the objections by 3 the plaintiffs and defense counsel, and finally closing 4 remarks and my rulings. 5 I expect this will take some time. I would 6 appreciate quiet as possible in the courtroom, but you are 7 welcome to leave if you need to leave at some point. At an 8 appropriate point we will probably take a recess for the 9 parties here to have a short break as well. 10 So with that in mind, we will follow that course, 11 and the first proceedings then for the court will be to 12 recognize the parties' counsel in this case, to basically 13 give an opening statement, a summary of where we are, the 14 factors that I need to consider as to whether or not this is 15 an appropriate settlement, and sort of a preview of where 16 they are going as we go forward before we hear the objectors 17 in this case. 18 I have arranged to have all of the objections 19 filed. Some were handwritten, many to me. Every one that 20 has been received in this court has been forwarded to 21 counsel if counsel had not gotten them directly, and filed 22 as a part of the court record. 23 I received one by e-mail this morning that is 24 late, but I have looked at it, plus I received an e-mail 25 from Loren Zeipher, Z-e-i-p-h-e-r, saying that she is unable</p>	<p>1 Louisa Rose, the former tribal chairman of the Winnebago 2 tribe in Nebraska, and we have Penny Cleghorn who lives in 3 Apache, Oklahoma. Penny replaced her mother, Mildred, who 4 was one of the original class representatives upon her 5 mother's unfortunate death. 6 Her mother was born in a POW camp with Geronimo, 7 her father having been one of the key lieutenants to 8 Geronimo. Penny, upon her mother's death, was substituted 9 in and approved by the court as a class representative, 10 but we are sorry that her mother could not be here, as so 11 many of the class members have passed away during this long 12 case. 13 Thank you. 14 Your Honor, we have joining us today by telephone 15 from the Blackfeet Reservation in Browning, Montana, the 16 lead plaintiff, Eloise Cobell. She has made countless trips 17 for meetings, and mediation, and trials and hearings here in 18 this court, and in Congress and throughout the country over 19 the past 15 years. But due to health reasons today cannot 20 be present. 21 We would request permission for her to make a 22 brief statement. We have consulted with the defendants, who 23 have no objection to that, and she is on the line, and I 24 would that she be permitted to do so. 25 THE COURT: All right. Rather than have her wait</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p> <p>1 until the later part of the proceeding with her health</p> <p>2 situation, the court will grant that request.</p> <p>3 Ms. Cobell, can you hear us?</p> <p>4 MS. COBELL: Yes, I can.</p> <p>5 THE COURT: All right, Ms. Cobell, you are welcome</p> <p>6 to make a statement concerning this as the lead plaintiff in</p> <p>7 the case.</p> <p>8 MS. COBELL: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>9 My name is Eloise Cobell, and I am an enrolled</p> <p>10 member of the Blackfeet Tribe, and I was born and raised and</p> <p>11 presently reside on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation. I am</p> <p>12 also the lead plaintiff in this litigation. My great</p> <p>13 grandfather was Mountain Chief, the last war chief of the</p> <p>14 Blackfeet Nation.</p> <p>15 I wish I could be there present in today's</p> <p>16 fairness hearing so I could introduce myself personally and</p> <p>17 explain to you how important this settlement is to 500,000</p> <p>18 individual Indian trust beneficiaries. However, physically</p> <p>19 I am unable to do so. Therefore I sincerely thank you for</p> <p>20 the opportunity to participate by phone.</p> <p>21 I want to explain that few, if any, legal cases in</p> <p>22 modern times have embodied the pain of so many people in</p> <p>23 Indian Country, and also embodied the hopes of those</p> <p>24 people. The possibility of settling this century-old</p> <p>25 injustice has provided hope for the future and a light for</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p> <p>1 fractionation, a necessary investment for improving future</p> <p>2 management, and this is tax free.</p> <p>3 In addition, 5 billion has been spent by the</p> <p>4 government on trust reform brought about by the pressure of</p> <p>5 this case, and it has been brought to bear. Nothing like</p> <p>6 this has ever been done for individual Indians.</p> <p>7 I am confident that this court understands our</p> <p>8 history of abuse. Its opinions and decisions speak</p> <p>9 eloquently and sincerely of the challenges we have had to</p> <p>10 face.</p> <p>11 The record is plain to anyone who has spent the</p> <p>12 time to read and understand it. It is permanent testimony</p> <p>13 to the importance of this case and why it has been one of</p> <p>14 the most difficult challenges I have ever faced. In terms</p> <p>15 of settlement, it brings a measure of justice to some of the</p> <p>16 most vulnerable people in this country.</p> <p>17 This settlement is not perfect. I do not think it</p> <p>18 compensates for all of the losses sustained, but I do think</p> <p>19 it is fair, and it is reasonable. That is what matters. A</p> <p>20 fair resolution has been achieved.</p> <p>21 I am convinced that it is the best settlement</p> <p>22 possible. I am convinced, also, that if the settlement</p> <p>23 failed there would be -- there would be many more years of</p> <p>24 litigation with little possibility of a more favorable</p> <p>25 resolution.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p> <p>1 the horizon.</p> <p>2 For over 100 years individual Indians have been</p> <p>3 victimized by the government's gross mismanagement of the</p> <p>4 individual Indian Trust and trust assets, including the</p> <p>5 income earned on our trust land, and for the last 15 years</p> <p>6 this court, alone, has held our hope for the individual</p> <p>7 Indians.</p> <p>8 Successive administrations stubbornly resisted and</p> <p>9 bitterly fought our effort with everything it had. Congress</p> <p>10 was unable to bring resolution despite great effort to do</p> <p>11 so.</p> <p>12 Finally, in 2009, through the extraordinary</p> <p>13 efforts of this court, and class counsel, and class</p> <p>14 representatives, for the first time since this case was</p> <p>15 filed on June 10, 1996, the Executive Branch sat down in</p> <p>16 good faith and negotiated a fair settlement of this case.</p> <p>17 Then in December of 2010, after a year of meeting</p> <p>18 with members of Congress and their staff, we were able to</p> <p>19 obtain Congressional approval of this settlement. In this</p> <p>20 tight budget environment, this was extremely difficult to</p> <p>21 do, particularly since 100 percent of the Senate needed to</p> <p>22 pass the ratification of the settlement.</p> <p>23 What has been accomplished here is historical. A</p> <p>24 3.4 billion settlement with 1.5 billion distributed directly</p> <p>25 to individual Indians, and 1.9 billion to address</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 While you will hear from objectors today, the</p> <p>2 overwhelming majority of class members, over 99.98 percent</p> <p>3 agreed that the settlement is fair and want this matter</p> <p>4 resolved now.</p> <p>5 This support is not surprising to me. When I have</p> <p>6 visited innumerable Indian communities over the last year to</p> <p>7 speak about the settlement, I had heard first-hand the wide</p> <p>8 support of this settlement.</p> <p>9 I don't want to get into details of our</p> <p>10 settlement. Those issues have been fully briefed and have</p> <p>11 been debated. But I know that they will be discussed</p> <p>12 further in this hearing.</p> <p>13 However, I want to address an issue that has been</p> <p>14 addressed by the defendants and a couple of the members of</p> <p>15 Congress. That issue is reasonableness of legal fees for</p> <p>16 our class counsel.</p> <p>17 Often I have said that if we our attorneys are not</p> <p>18 treated fairly and in accordance with controlling law, we</p> <p>19 will never be able to obtain competent lawyers who will be</p> <p>20 willing to battle the government until justice is served,</p> <p>21 for however long that it takes.</p> <p>22 I strongly believe that that is true. An</p> <p>23 overwhelming majority of individual Indian class members</p> <p>24 agree. So please let the message be that lawyers who</p> <p>25 represent native people will be treated no worse or</p>

Page 14	Page 16
<p>1 compensated no less than those who represent people who are</p> <p>2 not Indians.</p> <p>3 Until class counsel accepted our case, we had no</p> <p>4 hope and no remedy for the abuse that we have been forced</p> <p>5 to endure for decade after decade, generation after</p> <p>6 generation.</p> <p>7 Our attorneys have labored tirelessly and at a</p> <p>8 great sacrifice for many years. They have never wavered in</p> <p>9 their commitment to us, and they helped us accomplish</p> <p>10 something that most people thought would be impossible to</p> <p>11 achieve.</p> <p>12 We would not have had the success without our</p> <p>13 class counsel. I urge you to treat them fairly in</p> <p>14 accordance with the law.</p> <p>15 In closing, 124 years of abuse of our trust is</p> <p>16 enough. 15 years of intense, difficult litigation is more</p> <p>17 than enough. Too many of us have died without justice. Any</p> <p>18 more delays will mean that still more will die without</p> <p>19 justice. Enough is enough.</p> <p>20 On behalf of the named Native people, I appreciate</p> <p>21 beyond words what Judge Lamberth, Judge Robertson and you</p> <p>22 have done, and how each of you have stepped up and</p> <p>23 courageously resolved some of the thorniest issues that</p> <p>24 any judge in this country has ever had to address and</p> <p>25 resolve. I am deeply grateful that this court has not</p>	<p>1 an equitable accounting which the government has not and</p> <p>2 cannot provide.</p> <p>3 The additional payments to the trust</p> <p>4 administration class will reflect that all have been damaged</p> <p>5 by poor mismanagement, but that there are individualized</p> <p>6 differences.</p> <p>7 The payments to the members of the trust</p> <p>8 administration class will range from \$800 to well over</p> <p>9 \$100,000, and in a number of instances over \$1 million,</p> <p>10 based on the value of their assets in terms of earnings over</p> <p>11 time as reflected in the best data available.</p> <p>12 The \$1.9 billion land consolidation fund provides</p> <p>13 funding and a vehicle for addressing one of the most</p> <p>14 difficult problems facing the administrators of the trust,</p> <p>15 the presence of highly fractionated ownership interest</p> <p>16 shares.</p> <p>17 These funds provide the ability for the government</p> <p>18 to pay fair market value for the shares, and to be sold on a</p> <p>19 voluntary basis where it would be difficult to sell those</p> <p>20 interests if the people chose to do so.</p> <p>21 In addition, the trust administration -- the land</p> <p>22 consolidation fund provides for the creation of a \$60</p> <p>23 million scholarship fund for Native Americans.</p> <p>24 In addition to being tax-free, significantly, none</p> <p>25 of these payments will diminish the right of any of the</p>
Page 15	Page 17
<p>1 failed us.</p> <p>2 I thank this court again for the opportunity to</p> <p>3 provide my views, and pray and hope that I can see the</p> <p>4 distribution of our settlement funds later this year. That</p> <p>5 is very important to me, my fellow class members and</p> <p>6 justice.</p> <p>7 Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>8 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Cobell, for that</p> <p>9 statement. We wish you well and hope that you will do</p> <p>10 better.</p> <p>11 All right, sir.</p> <p>12 MR. DORRIS: Earlier this month this lawsuit</p> <p>13 entered its sixteenth year. It has been one of the most</p> <p>14 complicated and extensively litigated cases ever in this</p> <p>15 court, or any other court in this land.</p> <p>16 This proposed settlement begins to provide real</p> <p>17 justice for the plaintiff classes, in addition to providing</p> <p>18 for continued trust reform. It ends a David and Goliath</p> <p>19 feat of immense proportions, pitting the all-powerful</p> <p>20 federal government against many of its poorest and most</p> <p>21 marginalized citizens.</p> <p>22 The \$1,512,000,000 in tax-free dollars for the two</p> <p>23 classes will be distributed in a carefully balanced way.</p> <p>24 Each member of the historical accounting class will be paid</p> <p>25 \$1,000 for giving up exactly the same thing, the receipt of</p>	<p>1 class members to receive any other federal benefits or</p> <p>2 welfare.</p> <p>3 This agreement cannot solve all of the problems</p> <p>4 with the trust. Much more work, much more effort will be</p> <p>5 required. But the plaintiffs in the settlement agreement</p> <p>6 insisted on expressly and specifically saying that trust</p> <p>7 reform was not complete.</p> <p>8 As a result of this case, as a result of our</p> <p>9 discussions, and as a result of us now reaching a</p> <p>10 settlement agreement, Secretary Salazar has issued a</p> <p>11 Secretarial order calling for the creation of a commission</p> <p>12 to address further trust reform upon the final approval of</p> <p>13 this settlement.</p> <p>14 Following Your Honor granting preliminary approval</p> <p>15 in December of 2010, the notice program has been</p> <p>16 successfully completed, and notice in the words of Ms.</p> <p>17 Kinsella, one of the most experienced notice contractors,</p> <p>18 was that the notice in this case was extraordinary.</p> <p>19 The court-approved claims administrator has logged</p> <p>20 approximately 1,800 exclusions from the trust administration</p> <p>21 class. Thus, this shows that the right to opt out was a</p> <p>22 meaningful right exercised by a number of people. It also</p> <p>23 shows that the vast, vast majority of the trust</p> <p>24 administration class wants to participate in and accept the</p> <p>25 benefits of this settlement.</p>

Page 18	Page 20
<p>1 In terms of objections, out of the approximately</p> <p>2 500,000 members of the classes, we have logged 92</p> <p>3 objections, some of whom will be here to speak today, with</p> <p>4 the majority of those objections only going to some</p> <p>5 particular aspect of the settlement and not the overall</p> <p>6 settlement itself.</p> <p>7 However, no comment or objection received during</p> <p>8 the notice period identifies any reason that this historic</p> <p>9 settlement agreement should not be provided -- should not be</p> <p>10 approved.</p> <p>11 We have responded in writing in detail to the</p> <p>12 objections, and we will address them later today.</p> <p>13 A few have said we should have held out for more.</p> <p>14 We say that in light of the Court of Appeals' decision in</p> <p>15 Cobell 22, the settlement is fair and reasonable and brings</p> <p>16 to a close intractable litigation.</p> <p>17 Even the Court of Appeals in Cobell 22, Your</p> <p>18 Honor, called the resolution of this case a Gordian knot,</p> <p>19 and indicated that its prior decisions -- almost apologized</p> <p>20 that its prior decisions pointed to no clear exit from this</p> <p>21 legal morass.</p> <p>22 At least one of the objectors incorrectly contends</p> <p>23 that there was a \$7 billion offer on the table that the</p> <p>24 plaintiffs rejected in 2005. That is simply not true. No</p> <p>25 such offer was ever made.</p>	<p>1 plaintiff classes, can foster the continued trust reform</p> <p>2 started by the pressure from this case, and can lead to the</p> <p>3 better relations between the government and Native Americans</p> <p>4 for the years ahead.</p> <p>5 Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>6 THE COURT: Thank you.</p> <p>7 Let me break in for a minute here. We have more</p> <p>8 of a crowd than we expected.</p> <p>9 (Whereupon, the court conferred with his courtroom</p> <p>10 deputy.)</p> <p>11 THE COURT: I am going to invite those who have to</p> <p>12 stand -- we are going to be here three or four hours -- it</p> <p>13 will be difficult -- to come up and sit in the jury box. I</p> <p>14 think I have about 12 seats there available. So those who</p> <p>15 want to come up and sit down in the jury box -- it will be</p> <p>16 too long to stand all day.</p> <p>17 We can also sit a couple over at the extra counsel</p> <p>18 table over there.</p> <p>19 (Whereupon, people from the audience took the suggested</p> <p>20 seats.)</p> <p>21 THE COURT: At this point the court recognizes the</p> <p>22 government counsel to address the court on their opening</p> <p>23 statement at this time.</p> <p>24 Mr. Kirschman.</p> <p>25 MR. KIRSCHMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.</p>
Page 19	Page 21
<p>1 A few others, all of whom have stood on the</p> <p>2 sidelines and out of the fray for these 15 years now say</p> <p>3 that the class representatives and class counsel should not</p> <p>4 be paid what is otherwise provided for by precedence and</p> <p>5 controlling law.</p> <p>6 We say that until the class representatives and</p> <p>7 class counsel stood together to hold the government</p> <p>8 accountable for over 120 years of abuse, a task that almost</p> <p>9 everyone thought was impossible -- the abuse had continued</p> <p>10 for over a century with no end in sight.</p> <p>11 By making it clear that the trustee can be and</p> <p>12 will be held accountable, the equation between the trustee</p> <p>13 and the beneficiaries has been rewritten, the lines redrawn,</p> <p>14 and the relationship between the trustee and the</p> <p>15 beneficiaries fundamentally changed for all times.</p> <p>16 In addition to the \$3.4 billion in real justice</p> <p>17 flowing from this settlement, and the \$5 billion in trust</p> <p>18 reforms to date as a result of this case, this case stands</p> <p>19 as permanent testimony for future generations, historians</p> <p>20 and scholars as to what our clients have endured and what</p> <p>21 they have now overcome, and it also stands as a beacon of</p> <p>22 hope and a wellspring of inspiration for all other oppressed</p> <p>23 people.</p> <p>24 In closing, we ask for approval of the proposed</p> <p>25 settlement so that it can begin to bring real justice to the</p>	<p>1 May it please the court, defendants join with</p> <p>2 plaintiffs in asking that the court approve this historic</p> <p>3 settlement. The settlement is one of the largest ever</p> <p>4 entered into by the United States. It is fair, reasonable</p> <p>5 and adequate for both classes.</p> <p>6 As the court noted in the In re: Vitamins case,</p> <p>7 the following factors determine whether this settlement</p> <p>8 should be approved:</p> <p>9 One, whether the settlement is a result of arms</p> <p>10 length negotiations.</p> <p>11 Two, the terms of the settlement in relation to</p> <p>12 the strength of the plaintiffs' case.</p> <p>13 Three, the status of litigation at the time of</p> <p>14 settlement.</p> <p>15 Four, the reaction to the class.</p> <p>16 Five, finally, the opinion of experienced counsel.</p> <p>17 Here, Your Honor, in this case these factors</p> <p>18 justify your approval of this settlement. Defendants'</p> <p>19 primary concern is that this settlement should be the final</p> <p>20 resolution of all claims of class members covered by the</p> <p>21 settlement. Defendants, like Congress, truly seek to turn a</p> <p>22 new page through this settlement.</p> <p>23 Historically, the court subsequently considering</p> <p>24 whether a settlement was binding has looked to the trial</p> <p>25 court's articulated reasons for approving it. For that</p>

Page 22	Page 24
<p>1 reason, Your Honor, we respectfully request that this</p> <p>2 court, pursuant to Rule 23(e), provide written findings</p> <p>3 that this settlement is, indeed, fair, reasonable and</p> <p>4 adequate.</p> <p>5 Congress has, of course, authorized, ratified and</p> <p>6 confirmed this settlement through the Claims Resolution Act</p> <p>7 of 2010, and the President demonstrated his support for it</p> <p>8 by promptly signing the legislation into law.</p> <p>9 The involvement in Congress and the President in</p> <p>10 the settlement process supports a determination that the</p> <p>11 settlement comports with the Constitution and is fair and</p> <p>12 reasonable.</p> <p>13 THE COURT: Excuse me one second.</p> <p>14 If anyone has a cell phone on or a Blackberry on,</p> <p>15 please turn them off. We are getting a buzzing in the</p> <p>16 communications here, and it makes it hard to hear. Any cell</p> <p>17 phones, Blackberries, any electronic equipment, you have to</p> <p>18 turn them off, not just silence them.</p> <p>19 MR. KIRSCHMAN: I was keeping time. I will turn</p> <p>20 off my Blackberry, Your Honor.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: It interferes with our electronics</p> <p>22 here trying to hear. Thank you.</p> <p>23 MR. KIRSCHMAN: The involvement of Congress, as I</p> <p>24 said, and the President, Your Honor, supports the</p> <p>25 determination that the settlement comports with the</p>	<p>1 authority to determine how the United States should carry</p> <p>2 out its trust obligations. That is the law of this case,</p> <p>3 and these principles were recently confirmed in the Supreme</p> <p>4 Court's case in Hickory Apache.</p> <p>5 Even outside of the context of Indian litigation,</p> <p>6 Your Honor, Congress has the authority to change the</p> <p>7 statutory rights of litigants, and our brief in support of</p> <p>8 this settlement cites numerous cases that establish that</p> <p>9 authority.</p> <p>10 Here Congress has acted well within its authority</p> <p>11 to resolve a past statutory trust duty, namely, Interior's</p> <p>12 implied duty to conduct an historical accounting. The 2010</p> <p>13 Act is Congress's rational recognition, Your Honor, that</p> <p>14 this case presents unique challenges to the parties, to this</p> <p>15 court, and even to Congress, and that the best resolution of</p> <p>16 the dispute is a comprehensive one that could not be</p> <p>17 achieved in any other forum.</p> <p>18 It is also very important, Your Honor, as Mr.</p> <p>19 Dorris noted, that as part of the 2010 Act, Congress funded</p> <p>20 \$1.9 billion for the Department of the Interior to conduct</p> <p>21 its Land Consolidation Project, to address the critical</p> <p>22 issue of fractionation.</p> <p>23 Turning to the first factors set out in In re:</p> <p>24 Vitamins, the settlement should be approved as a product of</p> <p>25 arms-length negotiations. Contrary to what some have said,</p>
Page 23	Page 25
<p>1 Constitution and is fair and reasonable.</p> <p>2 Congress subjected this settlement to an enhanced</p> <p>3 and independent scrutiny on behalf of the class members for</p> <p>4 a year, which is a strong additional indication that the</p> <p>5 classes were adequately represented in this process.</p> <p>6 Congress also did not serve as a mere rubberstamp.</p> <p>7 As you are aware, it held hearings, and vetted the terms of</p> <p>8 this settlement, and even caused the original terms of the</p> <p>9 settlement to be modified to ensure that class members were</p> <p>10 being treated fairly and reasonably.</p> <p>11 For example, Your Honor, the 2010 Act required the</p> <p>12 parties to modify the settlement agreement by reallocating</p> <p>13 \$100 million that had initially been intended for the Land</p> <p>14 Consolidation Program to augment the minimum settlement</p> <p>15 payments that would be paid to the trust administration</p> <p>16 class.</p> <p>17 Another example, Your Honor, is the fact that</p> <p>18 Congress has asked this court to consider the special status</p> <p>19 of class members as beneficiaries when it considers an</p> <p>20 appropriate amount to award in attorneys' fees and incentive</p> <p>21 awards.</p> <p>22 Congress's role in the settlement thus requires</p> <p>23 this court to conduct an analysis different than in some</p> <p>24 traditional settlement cases. As the court is aware,</p> <p>25 Congress is a settler of Indian trust, and has the plenary</p>	<p>1 there is simply no collusion here. The settlement is the</p> <p>2 result of nearly 15 years of intense litigation, and it</p> <p>3 comes after several attempts at settlement over the course</p> <p>4 of the litigation, and months of good-faith, intense</p> <p>5 negotiations between the parties.</p> <p>6 The settlement is also fair and reasonable when</p> <p>7 viewed in light of the strength of plaintiffs' cases,</p> <p>8 another factor in In re: Vitamins. This is certainly true</p> <p>9 in regard to the historical accounting class.</p> <p>10 In fact -- and again Mr. Dorris noted this, after</p> <p>11 several trials and more than 14 years of litigation, the</p> <p>12 scope of the historical accounting still remains unresolved</p> <p>13 today. It is, however, now firmly established that</p> <p>14 Interior's performance of the historical accounting is</p> <p>15 subject to the willingness of Congress to fund it.</p> <p>16 In addition, Your Honor, Interior must provide</p> <p>17 only the best historical accounting possible in light of</p> <p>18 whatever amount might be funded by Congress. That is the</p> <p>19 law of the case.</p> <p>20 And in 2008, Your Honor, when this court heard</p> <p>21 evidence regarding restitution claims and afforded every</p> <p>22 presumption to the plaintiffs, it awarded only \$455.6</p> <p>23 million as restitution for the inability, as the court found</p> <p>24 at the time, to perform the historical accounting.</p> <p>25 Of course, the D. C. Circuit in 2009 later vacated</p>

Page 26	Page 28
<p>1 that money award, now making any monetary payment to this</p> <p>2 class as a result of any litigation extremely unlikely.</p> <p>3 The approximately \$360 million that will be paid</p> <p>4 to settle the historical accounting claims is a substitute</p> <p>5 for the receipt of the information that would have been in</p> <p>6 the historical statements of account, and it is clearly fair</p> <p>7 and reasonable.</p> <p>8 The trust administration class terms are also</p> <p>9 fair and reasonable, Your Honor, in light of the litigation</p> <p>10 risks involved in proving such individual claims. This</p> <p>11 settlement dedicates a historic amount of approximately \$1</p> <p>12 billion to pay for potential trust administration claims,</p> <p>13 the merits of which have hardly been tested let alone</p> <p>14 established.</p> <p>15 No history of successful litigation of individual</p> <p>16 Indian trust administration claims exists to undermine the</p> <p>17 reasonableness of this settlement amount. Certainly no</p> <p>18 objectors have pointed to any.</p> <p>19 There are problems of proof, Your Honor, related</p> <p>20 to these cases. The statute of limitations would often be</p> <p>21 up applicable, and the cost of litigation also poses a very</p> <p>22 real risk that little, if any, recovery is available under</p> <p>23 the trust administration claims for most individuals.</p> <p>24 The facts that have been developed throughout this</p> <p>25 litigation do not demonstrate a basis for a larger amount,</p>	<p>1 Instead, the only relevant consideration, Your</p> <p>2 Honor, is whether the settlement, because it is otherwise</p> <p>3 fair and reasonable, also affords due process to the absent</p> <p>4 class members.</p> <p>5 In reviewing the constitutionality of the</p> <p>6 settlement in that regard, Your Honor, the court should be</p> <p>7 directed by the protections set out in the Phillips</p> <p>8 Petroleum v. Shutts Supreme Court case.</p> <p>9 Those are, Your Honor:</p> <p>10 One, sufficient notice to the class.</p> <p>11 Two, a meaningful opportunity for dissatisfied</p> <p>12 class members to object and be heard.</p> <p>13 Three, a meaningful chance to opt out of the</p> <p>14 class.</p> <p>15 And four, adequate representation of the class by</p> <p>16 their representatives.</p> <p>17 As detailed in the parties' briefs and in the</p> <p>18 declarations from Kinsella Media and the Garden City Group,</p> <p>19 the notice provided to class members were unprecedented and</p> <p>20 extraordinarily thorough.</p> <p>21 The 90-day notice period clearly satisfied due</p> <p>22 process. As the court is aware, courts routinely allow only</p> <p>23 30 to 60 days.</p> <p>24 It is also very important, Your Honor, that the</p> <p>25 notice was carried out in a unique way to account for the</p>
Page 27	Page 29
<p>1 and in fact the facts that have been established demonstrate</p> <p>2 just the opposite. Those facts led this court to a reject</p> <p>3 plaintiffs' \$47 billion claim when they were seeking</p> <p>4 restitution.</p> <p>5 In addition, Your Honor, the billion dollars is to</p> <p>6 be paid to the trust administration class, and it is a</p> <p>7 significant percentage of the almost \$6 billion of receipts</p> <p>8 that have flowed through the IIM system into the IIM</p> <p>9 accounts during the period that is covered by this</p> <p>10 settlement.</p> <p>11 This settlement thus strikes a fair and reasonable</p> <p>12 balance between the government's need for the resolution of</p> <p>13 its liability on those claims and reasonable compensation</p> <p>14 that is likely beyond the practical reach of most individual</p> <p>15 beneficiaries.</p> <p>16 Despite objections that the trust administration</p> <p>17 class is improper because it cannot meet the Rule 23</p> <p>18 requirements -- Rule 23 elements of commonality, Congress</p> <p>19 properly authorized class certification here without</p> <p>20 applying those elements.</p> <p>21 Congress's power to do this was established in</p> <p>22 Shady Grove Orthopedics Association, and in other cases we</p> <p>23 have cited in our brief. As a result, the class</p> <p>24 certification tests from Rule 23(b)(3) are not relevant</p> <p>25 here.</p>	<p>1 numerous locations of many of the class members, the rural</p> <p>2 areas in which member many of the class members live, and</p> <p>3 the several languages that are spoken by many of the class</p> <p>4 members.</p> <p>5 After the notice, Your Honor, class members were</p> <p>6 also given a fair opportunity to be heard, both in writing</p> <p>7 and today through this fairness hearing. The class members</p> <p>8 were also given a meaningful opportunity to opt out as</p> <p>9 addressed by Mr. Dorris.</p> <p>10 Although some have objected that they could not</p> <p>11 make an informed decision because there was no historical</p> <p>12 accounting, that misperceives the purpose of the historical</p> <p>13 accounting.</p> <p>14 That would have led to the provision of</p> <p>15 transaction histories and account balances, but it did not</p> <p>16 require, and was never contemplated to require the</p> <p>17 production of trust records.</p> <p>18 Class members were also informed of what rights</p> <p>19 they would forgo and what rights they would retain should</p> <p>20 they choose to opt out.</p> <p>21 Finally, Your Honor, looking at the elements under</p> <p>22 Shutts, the class representatives here are adequate for</p> <p>23 settlement purposes.</p> <p>24 In this District case law establishes that there</p> <p>25 are two criteria for determining the adequacy of the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 representation and those are:</p> <p>2 One, that the named representatives must not have</p> <p>3 antagonistic or conflicting interests with the unnamed</p> <p>4 plaintiffs.</p> <p>5 And two, that the representative must be able to</p> <p>6 vigorously prosecute the interest of the class.</p> <p>7 No evidence has been presented to show that</p> <p>8 criteria have not been met here. The court should give</p> <p>9 great weight, Your Honor, to the numerous objections to</p> <p>10 class counsel's request for attorneys' fees and the named</p> <p>11 plaintiffs request for incentive awards.</p> <p>12 The objections -- the issue of attorneys' fees</p> <p>13 elicited the most objections of any other issue raised by</p> <p>14 the objectors. As some objectors noted, Your Honor, you</p> <p>15 should not be swayed by class counsel's request for \$224</p> <p>16 million in fees and expenses into believing that somehow</p> <p>17 that makes an award of \$99.9 million more palatable, because</p> <p>18 it does not.</p> <p>19 As we established in our brief that we filed</p> <p>20 earlier, a \$50 million fee is more than reasonable, and that</p> <p>21 should include all expenses, Your Honor.</p> <p>22 It is also in accord with the stated position of</p> <p>23 Congress, as I mentioned earlier, that this court consider</p> <p>24 the fact that these fees will be coming from class members</p> <p>25 who are beneficiaries of a Federal trust.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 Indian claimants from the need</p> <p>2 to litigate thousands of</p> <p>3 expensive, time-consuming,</p> <p>4 individual actions to recover</p> <p>5 any compensation for their</p> <p>6 claims."</p> <p>7 Congress acted in the same manner here as enacting</p> <p>8 the 2010 Act, Your Honor, and has made it possible after</p> <p>9 decades of disputes to have individuals receive compensation</p> <p>10 without having to pursue costly, time-consuming litigation.</p> <p>11 And finally, Your Honor, as plaintiffs have noted,</p> <p>12 it is important to understand that 90 -- only 90 of about</p> <p>13 450 class members have objected to this settlement. It is</p> <p>14 92.</p> <p>15 THE COURT: 90 out of 450,000?</p> <p>16 MR. KIRSCHMAN: Hum?</p> <p>17 THE COURT: 90 out of 450,000?</p> <p>18 MR. KIRSCHMAN: Approximate 450,000. We don't</p> <p>19 have final numbers on class members, but it is approximately</p> <p>20 450,000.</p> <p>21 That comes out to approximately point zero two</p> <p>22 percent, Your Honor; and as Mr. Dorris noted, only 1,800</p> <p>23 individuals opted out of the trust administration class, and</p> <p>24 of those, 1,100 were Quapaw Tribe members, who are intending</p> <p>25 to participate in a separate suit in the Court of Federal</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 However, Your Honor, having said that, the mere</p> <p>2 request for a large amount of fees and incentive awards does</p> <p>3 not render the representation of the class inadequate. It</p> <p>4 is very important that here, Your Honor, that it is up to</p> <p>5 you to determine what a reasonable attorneys' fee and</p> <p>6 incentive award is. Your Honor, you have the authority to</p> <p>7 scrutinize these requests and determine an appropriate</p> <p>8 amount.</p> <p>9 The key then he is here, in the context of this</p> <p>10 litigation, do the incentives of the class representatives</p> <p>11 align with the absent class members? And we believe, Your</p> <p>12 Honor, that they certainly do.</p> <p>13 In light of the above, Your Honor, and looking at</p> <p>14 the status of the litigation, which is another factor under</p> <p>15 In re: Vitamin, approval of the settlement is clearly</p> <p>16 justified. After the D. C. Circuit remanded this case back</p> <p>17 to this court in 2009, it was clear that there could be more</p> <p>18 years of litigation as Mr. Dorris noted.</p> <p>19 Also, Your Honor, the D. C. Circuit in Little Wolf</p> <p>20 versus Lujan found that the legislation that it was</p> <p>21 considering met the rational basis standard where it was,</p> <p>22 quote:</p> <p>23 "Rationally related to the</p> <p>24 government's legitimate interest</p> <p>25 in protecting thousands of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 Claims.</p> <p>2 Now we do not represent that these numbers mean</p> <p>3 that everyone in the class favors this settlement. But what</p> <p>4 it surely shows, Your Honor, is that there is an overall</p> <p>5 favorable reaction from class members to this settlement and</p> <p>6 its terms.</p> <p>7 In conclusion, Your Honor, there is in this</p> <p>8 District a long-standing judicial attitude favoring class</p> <p>9 action settlements in appropriate cases, and this is clearly</p> <p>10 such a case. We appreciate Your Honor's careful review of</p> <p>11 the issues, and respectfully request that pursuant to Rule</p> <p>12 23(e) that the Court finally approve this settlement as</p> <p>13 fair, reasonable and adequate.</p> <p>14 Thank you.</p> <p>15 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kirschman. I</p> <p>16 appreciate it.</p> <p>17 We are at the point of having the opening remarks</p> <p>18 of counsel as to the background and history of this</p> <p>19 litigation and their request by both parties for the court</p> <p>20 to approve it as fair, reasonable and adequate.</p> <p>21 Now to go to the objections at this time, the</p> <p>22 objectors' statements. I have given them five or 10 minutes</p> <p>23 each, that they will stay with the objections that they</p> <p>24 filed and not go into other non-relevant areas.</p> <p>25 The simplest way to do it is we tried to outline</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 them in alphabetically order, no matter what their objection 2 was. So at this time the court is going to proceed with 3 that order. 4 I said alphabetical. Looking at it it doesn't 5 look alphabetical on the list to me. I thought it was 6 alphabetical. I don't think -- oh, it is first name 7 alphabetical. Thank you. 8 We have copies here of what the objections were. 9 I am going to call on all of on Aldine Farrier first, 10 please, F-a-r-r-i-e-r for the record. 11 All right, we are ready to go. 12 MS. FARRIER: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 I'm here today to object to the Indian Trust 14 settlement of the \$3.4 billion, resulting from the Cobell 15 versus Salazar law suit, and challenge its settlement. 16 First of all, the legal fees are excessive, and 17 they rob the Indian account holders of compensation due to 18 them. 19 This is not a fair settlement for the class. How 20 many of us 250,000, 300,000 IIM account holders are 21 represented in this lawsuit? Will we actually benefit from 22 this settlement? How many IIM account holders will receive 23 sufficient amounts, and how many will benefit beyond their 24 rights and will receive monies who have not incurred 25 injuries?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 lands? Will it be taken into account that the value of 2 other minerals, and water, et cetera, which lie beneath the 3 topsoil will be calculated in for future revenues? Mining, 4 grazing, timber, riverbed rights, et cetera, will those be 5 included in this settlement? 6 I object to this court's acceptance of Congress's 7 waving of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in order to 8 enable the trust administration class. This appears to be 9 another instance where Indian people are treated differently 10 in the federal system than any other class. 11 Excuse me. Native American people have served 12 this country -- excuse me -- in times of war and peace. 13 They are upstanding citizens. Shame on this administration 14 for signing this legislation approving this settlement, and 15 shame on the court. 16 Thank you. 17 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Farrier. 18 The court recognizes Ben Carnes, C-a-r-n-e-s, who 19 has filed a written objection with the court and asked to 20 speak. Mr. Carnes. 21 MR. CARNES: Let me know if this is too close. I 22 speak really low. 23 THE COURT: Yes, please. Thank you. 24 MR. CARNES: I will try to stick to my points, but 25 I need to lead up to it.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 If this settlement is allowed to continue, how in 2 the future will we settle claims that have never been 3 litigated? This is a dangerous precedent as it allows 4 Congress to create causes of action where none exist. 5 With this settlement the U.S. government can now 6 say that it is closing out 122 years of financial 7 mismanagement. This accounting only covers the time period 8 between October 25, 1994, and September 30, 2009. Only 9 those IIM account holders with open accounts during this 15 10 year span will benefit. 11 The government claims to not be able to provide 12 accountings to -- for the accounts to Indian people. In the 13 meantime, where are all of the persons responsible for this 14 mismanagement of the funds and land-use? They should be 15 held responsible, be expelled from their jobs, tried in a 16 court of law and sent to prison. 17 The federal government has been charged to protect 18 our lands, and now this settlement is yet another vehicle to 19 take more land away from us. 20 Further, the fractionated ownership interests are 21 not defined in the action. This settlement encourages IIM 22 account holders who are living in poverty -- living in 23 extremely poverty stricken areas to sell their lands for 24 pennies on the dollar. 25 Who will determine fair market value for those</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 My name is Ben Carnes. I am a full blood of the 2 Choctaw Nation. I have never called myself an American 3 Indian, a Native American or an American citizen. I am a 4 citizen of a sovereign Indian Nation. 5 When the Europeans came to our country, we had a 6 sacred spiritual connection to our lands. We had a 7 spiritual connection to the way that we live, the waters 8 that we drink, the resources of this land that we used. 9 We were met with a way of life from Europe that 10 construed land as property to be owned. You cannot walk 11 on this land. You cannot drink water off of this land. 12 But these people came, and they were hungry. They 13 were afraid of the way of life that they had in Europe, and 14 so we welcomed them here. We showed them how to grow food 15 We showed them how to hunt. We showed them to find 16 medicines. 17 Then they asked for a little bit of land. So, 18 okay, we will reserve this part for ourselves, and you can 19 have this, and it continued on. Eventually somehow we ended 20 up in the custody of the War Department, and through the War 21 Department we now have the Department of Interior and Bureau 22 of Indian affairs. 23 My people were asked to join the alliance against 24 Jackson. We said no, we will fight. If it was not for my 25 people there would be no America here today. About four or</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>1 five years later, my people were one of the first ones that 2 were sent to what they call Indian Territory on the Trail of 3 Tears. 4 Then Senator Dahl came and looked at the people 5 and said, you know what, there is a problem here. They are 6 not selfish. They are not like us, so we have got to break 7 these lands up into allotments. 8 I'm pretty angry about everything that I have 9 read and learned. I can understand that the attorneys are 10 tired. I can understand Ms. Cobell is tired. But I'm 11 tired, too. 12 I mean the Marshall Trilogy, which you understand, 13 Worcester versus Georgia, the Macintosh case -- you know, we 14 were considered wards of the federal government. How long 15 do we remain wards of the federal government? Because in 16 this settlement, I don't feel it is fair. 17 I feel that this settlement is nothing more than a 18 cover-up. You know, pitch a few crumbs -- a few dollars out 19 here, and get them quiet, and now you can never bring up 20 these issues again. This case is closed. 21 No, it is not closed. Where did this money go? 22 You know, through their efforts these attorneys, after we 23 found out that the Department of Interior destroyed 24 evidence, they destroyed records, who were they trying to 25 protect?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p> <p>1 I also understand, too, that when the other judge 2 was removed from this case, Judge Lamberth, I felt that the 3 people's heart had dropped to the floor, because Judge 4 Lamberth was not being biased. He was angry. He was more 5 angry than I am right now. 6 I'm doing my best to control my emotions, but he 7 let it out, because the Department of Interior disobeyed, 8 disobeyed, disobeyed, and disobeyed. So he lashed out at 9 them. 10 And what frightens me about this change of judges 11 is the same thing that happened to one of our Indian people. 12 His name is Leonard Peltier. They changed judges on him, 13 and we see what happened to him. 14 So when these attorneys want to know where I was? 15 Well, I was probably out there on a highway hitch-hiking 16 somewhere, advocating for Leonard Peltier. 17 I was probably in front of a Senate Select 18 Committee testifying on religious rights of Native 19 prisoners. 20 I was probably in Hawaii, testifying for a Senate 21 Select Committee who stood up and walked out on me because 22 they did not like what I had to say. 23 Or I was probably sitting in front of the White 24 House after Leonard Peltier was denied parole fasting, a 25 spiritual fast. I was there because I thought these</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>1 I feel like this case needs to go on. We need to 2 investigate who stole the money? When did they steal it? 3 Are they still alive? Are they still in public office? Can 4 they be prosecuted? 5 You know, this relationship that we have with the 6 federal government needs to be end -- come to an end. We 7 can manage our own trust. We are adults. 8 You know, I challenge the federal government to 9 show us that we are incompetent to manage our own affairs, 10 because if we could become free of the federal government, 11 then maybe we would not have to comply with the Indian 12 Reorganization Act in which the court government tells us 13 how to create tribal councils, how to have chiefs, because 14 this becomes a system of political patronage and a lot of 15 corruption. 16 You know, I just recalled, too, that one of the 17 attorneys in their response to the fairness hearing said, 18 where were we when all of this was going on? Well, I 19 inherited this from my mother. She died in 1996, right as 20 this case started. And two or three years ago someone said, 21 hey, you can get a lot of money. Go check it out. 22 And so I looked, and I found out that I am a 23 member of this class. So I tried to research and study it. 24 It is a lot. I can understand the effort that has gone into 25 this.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p> <p>1 attorneys would carry this case through. I thought we were 2 going to see justice. 3 But you know, I think one of the estimates was 4 \$166 billion, and now it is 3.4. I know the numbers have 5 changed, but I did my math. That is barely 2 percent. So 6 the Department of Interior takes a knife, they stick it in 7 our back to the hilt, and I have to pull out two percent and 8 it is a victory? I don't think so. I cannot agree with 9 that. 10 I cannot agree what I heard Ms. Cobell said 11 earlier, that the majority of the class members support 12 this. What I feel from my conversation with the Indian 13 people is, we cannot win. It is the federal government. 14 They are going to do what they are going to do, so I might 15 as well cut the few dollars. That is a voice out of 16 resignation. So, you know, I had to come and address these 17 points and these issues. 18 And I'm also concerned, too, about the attorney 19 fees. As I understand it, a lot of cases, especially under 20 Section 1983 of the Civil Rights Complaint, the losing party 21 usually carries the attorney fees. 22 You know, if the attorneys want to ask for 224 23 million, or asked for a billion, let the federal government 24 pay for it. They are the ones that created this mess. We 25 should not have to -- it shouldn't have to come out of our</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 settlement to take that.</p> <p>2 When it comes to land consolidation, that is</p> <p>3 another mess that Department of Interior, Senator Dahl,</p> <p>4 created.</p> <p>5 Do not dare -- do not take any land from our</p> <p>6 people, no matter how badly fractionated you think it is,</p> <p>7 because I mentioned Senator Dahl said, we are not selfish.</p> <p>8 That is because we lived our ways of life in communal</p> <p>9 living. We didn't have no idea about we owned this much.</p> <p>10 You know, I have talked to friends on the</p> <p>11 Roosevelt Reservation. They cannot use their land, even if</p> <p>12 it is fractionated, because tribal council is getting to</p> <p>13 well, you can't do this. This is not yours. This is alien</p> <p>14 to our way of thinking.</p> <p>15 Maybe there are 500 areas in 100 acres. There is</p> <p>16 not enough land to build a house on. Well, you know what,</p> <p>17 that is enough land to grow food on. They can grow food</p> <p>18 year, after year, after year, and feed a large community of</p> <p>19 people. That could go a lot further than \$1,500.</p> <p>20 You know, if they want to buy the land at fair</p> <p>21 market value -- that is something I did not hear in the</p> <p>22 settlement. We have an inherent right of sovereignty to</p> <p>23 this land -- our connection to this land.</p> <p>24 What are they going to pay for sovereignty? I</p> <p>25 have five acres with 13 family members, and you cannot buy</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 see the case through.</p> <p>2 So when these attorneys say, where was I? I was</p> <p>3 doing what I needed to do. And I thought they were here,</p> <p>4 too. But, you know, we are not ready to settle, and I want</p> <p>5 to make one more point on behalf of myself, and possibly</p> <p>6 others, but it is up to them.</p> <p>7 I did not opt out of this case, because I had</p> <p>8 hoped to come to this court and present my arguments that</p> <p>9 the attorneys -- the case would go on. Let's look at</p> <p>10 eliminating the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Let's look at</p> <p>11 restoring all of our assets and resources back into our</p> <p>12 management.</p> <p>13 Then I want to stay in this case, but if you rule</p> <p>14 in support of this settlement, then I will see what I can do</p> <p>15 about appealing, and once I have no more recourse for</p> <p>16 appealing, then I would wish to opt out.</p> <p>17 And I would also ask that you allow everyone else</p> <p>18 who remained a part of this case until it comes to that last</p> <p>19 step, because all of those people who opted out were afraid</p> <p>20 of being parsed up, and they didn't want to be a part of.</p> <p>21 That was too premature.</p> <p>22 We should wait until the last minute, because</p> <p>23 maybe something might happen today. Maybe somebody's voice</p> <p>24 in here may touch your heart. Maybe there are some issues</p> <p>25 that they bring up it will just become so apparent that you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 my piece for a trillion. You don't have enough money to buy</p> <p>2 my piece of sovereignty. That belongs to me.</p> <p>3 You know, if anything else, because of the</p> <p>4 mismanagement by the Department of Interior and the BIA,</p> <p>5 they need to start buying surrounding land and bring it in</p> <p>6 so people could have a place to live, because on the Turner</p> <p>7 Mountain Reservation, it is not large enough to accommodate</p> <p>8 housing for all of their people.</p> <p>9 There are people on the wait list to have an</p> <p>10 Indian home built on the Reservation. It is not large</p> <p>11 enough. So do not take from us. We have lost way too much</p> <p>12 already.</p> <p>13 You know, if I had had the time I would have</p> <p>14 brought a map to show the 1700s, 1500s -- all of what they</p> <p>15 call the United States is all black. But now you look at</p> <p>16 what is left of the Indian land, we don't have anymore to</p> <p>17 give.</p> <p>18 I don't usually read from speeches. You know, I</p> <p>19 am not an attorney, and I'm not a politician. I speak from</p> <p>20 right here in my heart. This is not fair. This is not</p> <p>21 just.</p> <p>22 I was under the impression that this case was</p> <p>23 going to go until the end. You know, I can say that because</p> <p>24 the lawsuit against Long Hair and the Oklahoma State Prison</p> <p>25 System, I stayed in prison voluntarily for two more years to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 may rule that way.</p> <p>2 So I want to thank you for giving me the time,</p> <p>3 because I do believe I went over by ten minutes, but I</p> <p>4 appreciate it.</p> <p>5 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Carnes. I appreciate</p> <p>6 it.</p> <p>7 The next objector who wished to address the court</p> <p>8 was Carol Good Bear and also Darwin Good Bear</p> <p>9 MS. GOOD BEAR: Good morning, Your Honor.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: Good morning. Thank you.</p> <p>11 MS. GOOD BEAR: I am Carol Good Bear of the Mandan</p> <p>12 Hidatsa and Arikara Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation</p> <p>13 of North Dakota. I am a member of the Mandan and Hidatsa</p> <p>14 Tribe in particular.</p> <p>15 I am objecting to the proposed settlement of the</p> <p>16 historical accounting class, and I challenge the</p> <p>17 plaintiffs' suitability as a representative of all account</p> <p>18 holders.</p> <p>19 The named plaintiffs told us the suit was about an</p> <p>20 accounting. They each received their accounting and</p> <p>21 actively prevented the rest of us -- the rest of the class</p> <p>22 from receiving the account statements that were prepared for</p> <p>23 us at great expense.</p> <p>24 The government told the Court of Appeals in oral</p> <p>25 argument on May 11, 2009 and that the plaintiffs each</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 received transaction-by-transaction reports going back to 2 their predecessors. These reports, the government said, 3 revealed a single error of \$60.94 for one plaintiff, and 4 collectively they had been overpaid 3,000. 5 Now they say their claims are common and typical 6 enough to justify their representation of all account 7 holders. I think fairness demands that their account 8 statements be put on the records so that a determination can 9 be made. 10 I think I'm entitled to a ruling by the judge who 11 will rule on this settlement if these named plaintiffs 12 really do have -- still have claims that are common and 13 typical of those of us who have had a good deal of money go 14 through our accounts. In the alternative I think this judge 15 has a duty to examine the account statements prepared for 16 the named plaintiffs and rule on their suitability to 17 represent me. 18 The \$1,000 payments some class members will 19 receive is many thousands of times the amount they have 20 received in their accounts. My \$1,000 payment will be less 21 than one percent of the amount that has gone through my 22 account. 23 My account alone has had more money go through it 24 over a 30-year period -- has had more money -- is over 25 100,000 of the class members put together. It simply is not</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 My account alone had more than 100,000 go through it during 2 the settlement period, and I don't think I should be 3 required, Your Honor, to accept the same settlement as will 4 be provided to the thousands of account holders who have 5 never even had one dollar in their accounts. 6 I think those of us who are not similarly situated 7 should be required to accept the same settlement. I do not 8 think due process permits these results. 9 I think that we should be permitted to opt out of 10 the historical accounting. Not one of the plaintiffs is 11 from my reservation, Your Honor. Not one of them has an oil 12 lease from the same land, from the same geological 13 formation, from the same reservoir, even the same geological 14 province. 15 There is no plaintiff from the most active and 16 largest oilfield in the nation. The money in the Fort 17 Berthold accounts, or that should be in the Fort Berthold 18 accounts, has very little in common with what should be in a 19 very small account, for example, in Nebraska and Montana, 20 Oklahoma or Wisconsin. 21 This litigation has revealed that thefts and 22 embezzlements have occurred, and even those accounts will 23 not be made whole. Instead, every account holder will be 24 treated equally in spite of the known difference, and each 25 will receive \$1,000, regardless of the amount actually</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 fair or reasonable that we should all receive the same 2 payment. 3 I do not think the that Constitution's guarantee 4 of due process permits this court to require me to settle 5 the balance in my account by putting into the same amount -- 6 by putting into the same amount that it has put into 7 accounts that were opened just days before the settlement 8 period closed. 9 I do not think that this settlement is fair, Your 10 Honor. My account predates the settlement period. The 11 class membership is flawed. Class representatives do not 12 represent me. My account is not only older than many other 13 IIM accounts, but my account is even older than a lot of the 14 account holders. 15 My account predates the settlement period, and 16 some of the class members have accounts that have been 17 opened just since the settlement was announced. It is not 18 fair or reasonable to treat equally an account that was 19 opened for pennies the day before the settlement period 20 ended with an account like mine that has been open for 21 decades and had more than \$100,000 go through it in a period 22 of 30 years. 23 This settlement would pay out more than 107 24 million to over a hundred thousand individuals who do not 25 even have 15,000 if you put all of their accounts together.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 stolen or embezzled. 2 In any fair settlement there should be some 3 relationship between a settlement payment and the amount of 4 damages, or the risk of loss, or the value of the claim 5 being settled. 6 In this proposed settlement there is no such 7 relationship. The proposed settlement for the historical 8 accounting class is simply not fair or reasonable. In fact 9 it perpetuates the very kind of wrongful treatment of IIM 10 account holders the plaintiffs complained of throughout this 11 law suit. 12 The government presumably will no longer have any 13 obligation to audit leases of my land, to determine what 14 should have been paid into my account. At least it is not 15 clear to me just exactly what is being settled for the 16 historical accounting class. 17 Will this settlement be used as a defense against 18 my claims for an audit of my leases because my account 19 balance has been settled for this period? 20 In their response to objections the plaintiffs are 21 all over the map on this topic as to just what the 22 settlement is. They state that a common trustee makes all 23 of the claims suitable for treatment as a class for 24 settlement purposes. 25 They state that all trust assets are managed in</p>

Page 50	Page 52
<p>1 common. They state that their so-called experts' reports of</p> <p>2 several years ago justify the amount and the methods of</p> <p>3 paying the settlement. They claim the IIM trust assets are</p> <p>4 all managed in common.</p> <p>5 They state that the government's trust management</p> <p>6 and accounting systems are common to the class as a whole.</p> <p>7 In fact, the systems for accounting for my oil and gas</p> <p>8 income are emphatically not the same as those in accounting</p> <p>9 for my grazing income. They are not even in the same</p> <p>10 agency, and they do not even interface electronically.</p> <p>11 The plaintiffs state many things in their response</p> <p>12 that are simply and plainly wrong.</p> <p>13 That points out to a bigger problem in this</p> <p>14 settlement. There are no longer any adversaries or</p> <p>15 adversarial positions in this lawsuit. In this lawsuit both</p> <p>16 the parties owe me a fiduciary duty, and both parties are</p> <p>17 telling this court that my objections are irrelevant,</p> <p>18 unsupported and misplaced.</p> <p>19 This court should consider -- should reconsider</p> <p>20 whether this lawsuit is even properly before the court. The</p> <p>21 plaintiffs say that Congress has, quote, unquote, ratified</p> <p>22 this settlement.</p> <p>23 That is another way of saying that this court's</p> <p>24 only remaining duty is to rubberstamp the settlement, and</p> <p>25 the Constitution does not permit such a demeaning role for</p>	<p>1 written submission that I have reviewed.</p> <p>2 MS. GOOD BEAR: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.</p> <p>3 THE COURT: All right, then we will move down to</p> <p>4 Celestia Fast Horse Two Eagles.</p> <p>5 Is Celestia Fast Horse Two Eagles here from</p> <p>6 Plymouth, Minnesota?</p> <p>7 (No response.)</p> <p>8 THE COURT: We have not had a call that she could</p> <p>9 not come in today. She had filed a request to be heard and</p> <p>10 had written an objection.</p> <p>11 A PERSON FROM THE AUDIENCE: Your Honor, my name</p> <p>12 is Karen (unintelligible). I am from the Blackfeet</p> <p>13 Reservation in Montana. I wrote to ask to speak at this</p> <p>14 hearing, and I would like to if somebody -- I don't think I</p> <p>15 made it on the agenda. I never did hear from --</p> <p>16 THE COURT: I am sorry, what was your full name</p> <p>17 again?</p> <p>18 A PERSON FROM The AUDIENCE: Karen, K-a-r-e-n.</p> <p>19 THE COURT: I don't have anything here that you</p> <p>20 had written in to ask for a hearing</p> <p>21 A PERSON FROM THE AUDIENCE: Yeah. I wrote to</p> <p>22 both places that it said that little pamphlet that I got,</p> <p>23 and I would like --</p> <p>24 THE COURT: In a little but I will let you talk to</p> <p>25 counsel when we take a break, and see if we can find out who</p>
Page 51	Page 53
<p>1 the federal courts.</p> <p>2 The prospect for more, quote, unquote, very</p> <p>3 expensive litigation that you wanted to avoid, Judge Hogan,</p> <p>4 when you urged Congress to pass this authorizing legislation</p> <p>5 cannot be permitted to cloak the wholesale violation of</p> <p>6 class members' rights to the protection of the federal</p> <p>7 rules, federal law and the Constitution of the United</p> <p>8 States.</p> <p>9 Your Honor, I would urge this court to reject the</p> <p>10 settlement of claims that have never been presented in this</p> <p>11 litigation and that are not supported by any evidence or</p> <p>12 testimony.</p> <p>13 And, Your Honor, I would ask that you excuse my</p> <p>14 brother, Darwin. He could not make it here because of</p> <p>15 financial reasons, and I'm thankful to be here to present</p> <p>16 today.</p> <p>17 And also being near Father's Day weekend I want to</p> <p>18 thank my late father, Lawrence Kingsey Good Bear, who served</p> <p>19 six years in the Navy, who was present at the bombing of</p> <p>20 Pearl Harbor, and he fought for my right to get to present</p> <p>21 here today and to be heard.</p> <p>22 Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Good Bear. I</p> <p>24 appreciate you coming in, and will recognize your brother's</p> <p>25 objections, which are somewhat similar to yours in his</p>	<p>1 that is. I have made a list of everything that came in</p> <p>2 here.</p> <p>3 A PERSON FROM The AUDIENCE: I would like to speak</p> <p>4 if I may.</p> <p>5 THE COURT: We will talk with counsel.</p> <p>6 Ms. Celestia Fast Horse Two Eagles is not here</p> <p>7 apparently. I would then go down to Charles Colombe, C-o-l-</p> <p>8 o-m-b-e.</p> <p>9 He is also not here -- from Mission, South Dakota,</p> <p>10 MR. CARNES: (Unintelligible.)</p> <p>11 THE COURT: We cannot hear you. I am sorry, why</p> <p>12 don't you come to the mic so we can get a record of what you</p> <p>13 are saying please, sir.</p> <p>14 Thank you, Mr. Carnes.</p> <p>15 MR. CARNES: I am not speaking officially for</p> <p>16 Charles Colombe, but I talked with one of his friends that</p> <p>17 works for him, and he said that he is not able to come due</p> <p>18 to doctor's orders. He is receiving treatment in Oklahoma</p> <p>19 City.</p> <p>20 And also, Your Honor, I wanted to add, too, that a</p> <p>21 close friend of mine I spoke with, Jason Nathaniel Corwin,</p> <p>22 is not going to be here today either. He had a prior</p> <p>23 commitment, and there was just no way that he could come,</p> <p>24 and he didn't have time to write a statement and send a</p> <p>25 power of attorney.</p>

Page 54	Page 56
<p>1 THE COURT: I don't have anything from him. All</p> <p>2 right, thank you, sir. We will pass Mr. Colombe. I have</p> <p>3 his written objections here from the Rosebud Sioux Tribe</p> <p>4 expressing his concerns.</p> <p>5 Below him is Darlene Pipeboy. Ms. Darlene Pipeboy</p> <p>6 is here? She is from the Lake Traverse Reservation.</p> <p>7 MS. PIPEBOY: Good morning. My name is Darlene</p> <p>8 Renville Pipeboy.</p> <p>9 (Whereupon, Ms. Pipeboy spoke in a foreign language</p> <p>10 that the court reporter was unable to report.)</p> <p>11 MS. PIPEBOY: The uniqueness of Native American</p> <p>12 people -- an elderly gentleman, not Indian, said, if the</p> <p>13 Native people die, we will die, too. And that is very true.</p> <p>14 We look at the context. Lake Traverse</p> <p>15 Reservation, 1867. 9 million acres. It included two</p> <p>16 reservations. One in North Dakota and one in South Dakota.</p> <p>17 Our current -- let me check here.</p> <p>18 Our current acreage is 107,000 acres as compared</p> <p>19 to 9 million. I think the extent of government intervention</p> <p>20 into the livelihood and (foreign word) -- we say, I am</p> <p>21 Renville/Pipeboy. All of these allotted lands are held by</p> <p>22 (foreign word) families.</p> <p>23 I am a Renville. My grandfather -- if you'll</p> <p>24 excuse me for a minute -- my grandfather was the head man of</p> <p>25 the 1867 Allotment Act. He did not sign, but they allowed</p>	<p>1 we are looked at in terms of -- however the Bureau of Indian</p> <p>2 Affairs choose to keep records.</p> <p>3 They fractionated the land areas on paper. My</p> <p>4 grandfather holds 320 acres of land. If you fractionate</p> <p>5 his land, I guess we all own a teaspoon of dirt. But when</p> <p>6 you go out to Lake Traverse Reservation, his 300 acres are</p> <p>7 still there. They still need to be utilized by family</p> <p>8 members.</p> <p>9 The extent of fractionation, I'm sure you all</p> <p>10 aware of Michael Larsen. He did a research paper on the</p> <p>11 extent of fractionation on reservations. He came to Lake</p> <p>12 Traverse. I was one of the individuals who gave comment.</p> <p>13 He said Gabriel Renville and Winona Crawford, their probates</p> <p>14 were the worst because they had so many errors.</p> <p>15 So when we look at the Allotment Act and the</p> <p>16 fairness of it and you come to Cobell, Cobell says, money</p> <p>17 will be given to buy out all of the fractionated lands.</p> <p>18 If this happens you will decimate Lake Traverse</p> <p>19 Reservation. When people live in poverty and you offer them</p> <p>20 money, they're going to accept money. Why? Because they</p> <p>21 have to eat.</p> <p>22 You know, this issue of poverty is one of the</p> <p>23 issues. How dare Cobell use people to find a way to define</p> <p>24 a determination of what to do with fractionated lands?</p> <p>25 Those lands are not fractionated. They are fractionated on</p>
Page 55	Page 57
<p>1 the Allotment Act to pass.</p> <p>2 His probate was quite extensive. When we look at</p> <p>3 traditional ways -- excuse me. Okay. He was born in 1824.</p> <p>4 He died in 1892, two years after the Allotment Act.</p> <p>5 In our traditional ways, Gabriel Renville, he had</p> <p>6 three wives. One of the wives was my grandmother. Those</p> <p>7 are accepted traditional ways at that time, whether or not</p> <p>8 people objected to them.</p> <p>9 Sitting Bull, he once said -- the agent came to</p> <p>10 tell him, you have to get rid of one of your two wives.</p> <p>11 Sitting Bull said, you tell them which one has to leave.</p> <p>12 Okay, the same situation.</p> <p>13 My grandmothers -- I call them all my</p> <p>14 grandmothers. I love them all. The first wife,</p> <p>15 Tukanmanikiye Win. She is my grandmother. Her name is</p> <p>16 Mary G. Renville. She was an allottee. They had 10</p> <p>17 children. Six of them died because of, shall we say,</p> <p>18 economic reasons.</p> <p>19 The second wife, Tunkantiomani Win. She was Anna</p> <p>20 T. Renville. She also had 10 children. Seven of them died.</p> <p>21 Three survived.</p> <p>22 The third wife, Witeca Win, Sophia Renville. She</p> <p>23 had six children. One of them died.</p> <p>24 This is the extent of Gabriel Renville's probate.</p> <p>25 Paper upon paper. You know, It is unconscionable to me that</p>	<p>1 paper. If we do the research we will find this out, and</p> <p>2 part of it is here.</p> <p>3 We take deference. We are not intellectuals. You</p> <p>4 will have to excuse us if we do not talk English -- speak</p> <p>5 English well.</p> <p>6 It says if the settlement becomes final you will</p> <p>7 give up your right to sue the federal government for claims.</p> <p>8 Lake Traverse is very unique if all of this land is</p> <p>9 allotted, for all reservations have tribal trust land.</p> <p>10 And when we look at the allotted lands, it is not</p> <p>11 part of the court issues. If you lived on allotted lands,</p> <p>12 you are tax-free. We do not have to pay taxes. And we</p> <p>13 enjoy that right. So we see the Cobell case as another way</p> <p>14 for the United States government, and whomever else, to take</p> <p>15 our land, and we will not allow that to happen.</p> <p>16 When we look at case law, the United States</p> <p>17 government created the policy. We did not. There is the</p> <p>18 Wheeler-Howard Act, the IRA, Indian Reorganization Act,</p> <p>19 okay. All of the tribes in the thirties were to come to the</p> <p>20 agency and vote whether or not they wanted to accept. Lake</p> <p>21 Travers voted against the IRA. We are non-IRA.</p> <p>22 We do not follow -- excuse me, fall under the</p> <p>23 policies and the statutes of the United States government.</p> <p>24 Why? Because we are a traditional government, and we chose</p> <p>25 to do so. So the acts and policies do not apply to us.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 The vote count, which is also a matter of</p> <p>2 historical reference, I believe it was 335 to 200.</p> <p>3 THE COURT: You have about two more minutes,</p> <p>4 please, Ms. Pipeboy. Thank you</p> <p>5 MS. PIPEBOY: 335 to 266.</p> <p>6 These are, again, all of the lands that have</p> <p>7 already escheated on our reservation. We have lost. So we</p> <p>8 disagree. We disagree with Cobell. The lack of informed</p> <p>9 consent. We as historical as an account class cannot opt</p> <p>10 out. We have the right to exclude ourselves.</p> <p>11 We say we maintain inalienable rights to our land.</p> <p>12 I think I read that in the Constitution somewhere.</p> <p>13 We also object to the Indian education</p> <p>14 scholarship. We realize education is a good thing, but</p> <p>15 funds for education should come from treaty entitlement, and</p> <p>16 should not be part of the class action case. So we object.</p> <p>17 We object to the Cobell case, and we will continue to do so,</p> <p>18 whether it is in this court or whether it is at the</p> <p>19 International Court.</p> <p>20 Thank you.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Pipeboy.</p> <p>22 I have next on my list, and I was asking my clerk</p> <p>23 to find the written objection -- I don't seem to have it --</p> <p>24 of Dorothea Wilson.</p> <p>25 MR. HARPER: Your Honor?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 settlement agreement and the settling parties motions filed</p> <p>2 on May 16, 2011.</p> <p>3 Counsel requested individual --</p> <p>4 THE COURT: You will have to slow down.</p> <p>5 MR. JACOBS: My statement is quite lengthy, and</p> <p>6 that is the reason I was going at such a fast rate.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: I don't think you will be able to read</p> <p>8 all twenty some pages of written --</p> <p>9 MR. JACOBS: I only have 14 pages.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: Go ahead and read your statement, but</p> <p>11 you do have to read slowly so the court reporter can get it</p> <p>12 down so we have it for the record and everybody can read in</p> <p>13 the future.</p> <p>14 MR. JACOBS: Okay.</p> <p>15 THE COURT: Thank you.</p> <p>16 MR. JACOBS: I am thankful that the court allows</p> <p>17 up to 10 minutes, which is still a short time to object, to</p> <p>18 a voice over 124 years of grievance. My individual</p> <p>19 grievance covers the 99 year period beginning in 1912.</p> <p>20 I am a supposed member of the historical class,</p> <p>21 and confine my objections to the historical class issues. I</p> <p>22 request that this court decide whether or not I'm properly</p> <p>23 designated as a member of the historical class and offer the</p> <p>24 following in support of my response and opposition to forced</p> <p>25 membership in the historical class for the following</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Yes.</p> <p>2 MR. HARPER: Keith Harper for the record.</p> <p>3 THE COURT: Yes.</p> <p>4 MR. HARPER: Your Honor, Ms. Wilson and Mr.</p> <p>5 Solomon Quinn are the next two in order. They filed</p> <p>6 identical objections to Ms. Pipeboy. In fact it was just a</p> <p>7 photocopy of the same objection.</p> <p>8 THE COURT: I see.</p> <p>9 MR. HARPER: And we would just ask the court that</p> <p>10 if they are heard that they be limited to speaking on issues</p> <p>11 that have not already been touched upon.</p> <p>12 THE COURT: I understand. They both filed</p> <p>13 identical objections to Ms. Pipeboy?</p> <p>14 MR. HARPER: That is correct.</p> <p>15 THE COURT: I just didn't have a Xeroxed copy of</p> <p>16 it. I just had the original.</p> <p>17 Is Ms. Wilson here? Or is Mr. Quinn here?</p> <p>18 (No response.)</p> <p>19 THE COURT: All right, thank you. We will go to</p> <p>20 Mr. Eddie Jacobs. Mr. Jacobs has filed objections to the</p> <p>21 settlement. Good morning, Mr. Jacobs.</p> <p>22 MR. JACOBS: Thank you, Your Honor. My name is</p> <p>23 Eddie Jacobs. I am a Muscogee Creek Nation citizen, and I</p> <p>24 am an account holder, and respectfully request the court's</p> <p>25 permission to enter my oral response and opposition to the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 reasons.</p> <p>2 One, Eddie Jacobs' administrative claim satisfies</p> <p>3 the definition of an exception to the class because it is</p> <p>4 action filed on their own behalf prior to the June 10, 1996.</p> <p>5 The Cobell original complaint and amended</p> <p>6 complaint define the exception to the Cobell class as</p> <p>7 historical class consisting of those individual Indians --</p> <p>8 Indian beneficiaries -- exclusion of those who prior to the</p> <p>9 filing of the complaint on June 10, 1996, had filed action</p> <p>10 on their own behalf stating a claim for historical</p> <p>11 accounting.</p> <p>12 B, trust administration class consists of those</p> <p>13 individual Indians exclusive of persons who filed action on</p> <p>14 their own behalf.</p> <p>15 I originally asked for a reconciliation of my</p> <p>16 father's, Johnny Jacobs, IIM account in 1987. Since then I</p> <p>17 have continuously asked Department of Interior officials to</p> <p>18 examine my IIM documentation for an accounting and</p> <p>19 reconciliation.</p> <p>20 My hopes for success were elevated in 1993 when</p> <p>21 Mr. Jim Paris, Director of the Office of Trust Fund</p> <p>22 Management stated in his January 29, 1993 letter to me.</p> <p>23 This is recognized as a valid task.</p> <p>24 I believe the Department of Interior officials</p> <p>25 were considering reconciling my records when Cobell filed</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 this class action in 1996.</p> <p>2 After filing, the Department of Interior</p> <p>3 officials would not or could not discuss my claim, because</p> <p>4 they arbitrarily decided that I was a class member, even</p> <p>5 though there appears to be some doubt by the Department of</p> <p>6 Justice.</p> <p>7 In 1998 a letter from the DOG counsel, Louis S.</p> <p>8 Weiner, the plaintiffs' counsel, Mr. Weinter stated:</p> <p>9 "Should our understanding of</p> <p>10 the scope of the class</p> <p>11 certification be incorrect,</p> <p>12 or should you elect to allow</p> <p>13 us to communicate directly</p> <p>14 with Mr. Jacobs, please let</p> <p>15 us know."</p> <p>16 In 2060 DOG counsel Robert E. Kirschman, Junior's</p> <p>17 letter requested plaintiffs' counsel contact me regarding my</p> <p>18 status and stated:</p> <p>19 "If you have a different</p> <p>20 understanding, please let us</p> <p>21 know."</p> <p>22 Plaintiffs' counsel never contacted me. The fact</p> <p>23 is I did not learn the Justice Department wrote Plaintiffs'</p> <p>24 counsel about my claim until I read this letter attached to</p> <p>25 defendants' response to plaintiffs' opposition for motion to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 that these errors were made</p> <p>2 prior to the automation of</p> <p>3 the system."</p> <p>4 Many errors were made prior to the computer system</p> <p>5 -- computer era. Yet the settlement leaves all of these</p> <p>6 errors unaccounted for.</p> <p>7 The U.S. Solicitor Edward Kohn, October 16, 1998</p> <p>8 letter -- reference letter provides defendants turn my</p> <p>9 documents over to plaintiffs' counsel. Additionally, Kohn's</p> <p>10 letter shows both settling parties had my records, and</p> <p>11 neither offered them to the court.</p> <p>12 Both parties previously stated there was no record</p> <p>13 with full knowledge I had records until -- I mean dating</p> <p>14 back to World War I era.</p> <p>15 How is the denial of my claim for an adequate</p> <p>16 representation fair? The fact that defendants and</p> <p>17 plaintiffs decided there was a historical accounting of</p> <p>18 class members without obtaining a ruling from this court is</p> <p>19 not fair.</p> <p>20 More recently and equally unfair, the Garden City</p> <p>21 group third-party administrators decided that I'm a member</p> <p>22 of both Cobell classes without even knowing the relevant</p> <p>23 facts.</p> <p>24 In all fairness I ask this court to decide whether</p> <p>25 or not I am an exception to the historical class. I</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 compel attorneys to sign statements of nonparties or release</p> <p>2 Eddie Jacobs, as attachment A and C filed September 21st,</p> <p>3 2006.</p> <p>4 Your Honor, for your convenience may I present a</p> <p>5 copy of defendants' response to the court? Settling parties</p> <p>6 have access to the documents on DOG's own website.</p> <p>7 Defendants' reference letters and other -- and my</p> <p>8 other documents offered prior to my action brought in 1987</p> <p>9 and reaffirmed in 1994 satisfies the requirement of the</p> <p>10 exception to the Cobell class.</p> <p>11 My claim is further supported by my father and my</p> <p>12 documents dating back to 1912, first brought to the BIA</p> <p>13 officials and the U.S. Solicitor's Office, and then later to</p> <p>14 the Office of Special Trustee.</p> <p>15 Harold Bloom, Assistant Inspector General, stated</p> <p>16 in his August 15, 1988 letter to me in response to my</p> <p>17 request for reconsideration of an audit that:</p> <p>18 "It is our decision not to</p> <p>19 audit your individual Indian</p> <p>20 money account."</p> <p>21 Mr. Bloom's letter confirms that I started my</p> <p>22 action prior to 1996 and shows that the DOG had my records</p> <p>23 in their possession.</p> <p>24 Additionally, he stated:</p> <p>25 "It is also important to note</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 respectfully request the court make this decision so I may</p> <p>2 proceed with my action I began in 1987 and reaffirmed</p> <p>3 pursuant to the 1994 Trust Reform Act, Section 4012.</p> <p>4 I fulfilled the requirements of the 1994 statute</p> <p>5 before this class action was filed, yet both settling</p> <p>6 parties refuse to recognize my claim and supporting</p> <p>7 documents, even though the Office of Special Trustee</p> <p>8 recognized by documents and offered to perform a</p> <p>9 reconciliation accounting if plaintiffs' counsel would</p> <p>10 release me from the class. Plaintiffs would not.</p> <p>11 Without an accounting and reconciliation, there</p> <p>12 has been no chance to finish what I started in 1987 and</p> <p>13 reaffirmed in 1994. I repeatedly asked plaintiffs' counsel</p> <p>14 to protect my interests and those of Oklahoma Five Civilized</p> <p>15 Tribes and individual Indians, but they refused to answer</p> <p>16 any of my letters.</p> <p>17 Your Honor, may I present copies of these letters</p> <p>18 to the court for the record?</p> <p>19 THE COURT: Sure.</p> <p>20 MR. JACOBS: The settling parties already have</p> <p>21 them in their files, but I would like you to examine them as</p> <p>22 further proof of my statements here today.</p> <p>23 Plaintiffs stated in their May 16, 2000 motion</p> <p>24 that class settlement is the only realistic means to provide</p> <p>25 compensation and restitution relief to IIM Trust</p>

Page 66	Page 68
<p>1 beneficiaries for the government's breach of trust and other</p> <p>2 wrongful conduct associated with its mismanagement of the</p> <p>3 IIM Trust.</p> <p>4 I disagree. If defendants provide an</p> <p>5 administrative hearing where an unbiased accounting and</p> <p>6 reconciliation can be accomplished based on supporting</p> <p>7 documentation, there should be no need of filing a case in a</p> <p>8 court of law. Besides, I understand the administrative</p> <p>9 claims must be exhausted before an action may be brought in</p> <p>10 a higher court.</p> <p>11 I respectfully ask this court to examine the</p> <p>12 reasons why plaintiffs' counsel failed to respond to Eddie</p> <p>13 Jacobs questions or recognize my request for help with the</p> <p>14 Oklahoma Five Civilized Indian issues not brought in this</p> <p>15 case.</p> <p>16 I understand why the defendants did not want my</p> <p>17 documents brought, since they would provide evidence of the</p> <p>18 wrongdoings and the mistakes which they are unwilling to</p> <p>19 admit.</p> <p>20 Eddie Jacobs' claim is sufficiently distinct from</p> <p>21 the class. All other class members, plaintiffs' counsel,</p> <p>22 have knowledge of reasons cited and all of Eddie's reference</p> <p>23 letters to plaintiffs' counsel.</p> <p>24 The plaintiffs and the defendants should already</p> <p>25 have my letters in the records, because I mailed them to</p>	<p>1 objector speaking. I missed one objector. I was told that</p> <p>2 Solomon Quinn, whose name I mentioned earlier, was actually</p> <p>3 here sitting in the jury box, and I missed him. I apologize</p> <p>4 for that. So Mr. Quinn, if you want to come up at this time</p> <p>5 and address the court you may do so.</p> <p>6 Your objection was the same as Ms. Pipeboy, so I</p> <p>7 hope you won't repeat what she said. It has to be in some</p> <p>8 area we didn't cover.</p> <p>9 MR. QUINN: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>10 Why I am here? I inherited my ancestors' land. I</p> <p>11 inherited land from my ancestors, and why I opted out,</p> <p>12 because I believe that in the Cobell case what was awarded -</p> <p>13 - maybe we should have gotten some lands back so that we</p> <p>14 could be more self-sufficient.</p> <p>15 I did not make the statement that everything is</p> <p>16 coming from my heart. I apologize for that. But I hope</p> <p>17 what all is said from my relatives that are here that it can</p> <p>18 be honored, and I appreciate that you have us here.</p> <p>19 And that is all I have to say right now.</p> <p>20 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Quinn. I appreciate</p> <p>21 your coming up.</p> <p>22 MR. QUINN: Thank you very much.</p> <p>23 THE COURT: We will turn back to Alan H. Yamamoto</p> <p>24 representing various objectors.</p> <p>25 Is he here today?</p>
Page 67	Page 69
<p>1 the parties, to Judge Robertson, and select members of</p> <p>2 Congress.</p> <p>3 The reason my claim is sufficiently different are</p> <p>4 -- there are 16 reasons. I could read those --</p> <p>5 THE COURT: You have about two minutes left.</p> <p>6 MR. JACOBS: Well, in closing then -- I felt like</p> <p>7 the time period wasn't adequate to address all of my issues,</p> <p>8 and I can provide the court with a copy of my documents and</p> <p>9 the letters which I have.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: Do you have them with you, those</p> <p>11 letters?</p> <p>12 MR. JACOBS: I have them right here.</p> <p>13 THE COURT: You can give them to my clerk of</p> <p>14 court, and we will have them filed.</p> <p>15 MR. JACOBS: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>16 THE COURT: All right, thank you, sir.</p> <p>17 We are going to take a break. The court reporter</p> <p>18 has been going without a break for over an hour and a half,</p> <p>19 and it is only reasonable to take a short break. We will</p> <p>20 take about a 10 minute recess. We will be back and take up</p> <p>21 Mr. Yamamoto on behalf of several -- an attorney</p> <p>22 representing several objectors when we return.</p> <p>23 All right, a 10 minute recess.</p> <p>24 (Recess.)</p> <p>25 THE COURT: We are going to resume with the</p>	<p>1 (No response.)</p> <p>2 THE COURT: He filed an appearance and a brief on</p> <p>3 behalf of the following individuals. He is from Alexandria,</p> <p>4 Virginia, an attorney. It was be on behalf of Feron Thunder</p> <p>5 Hawk, Laura Begay, Louise and Joe Marie Murphy.</p> <p>6 Are any of those individuals here who would like</p> <p>7 to speak since their attorney is not apparently?</p> <p>8 (No response.)</p> <p>9 THE COURT: Then his brief on behalf of their</p> <p>10 interests has been filed, and I have reviewed it, concerning</p> <p>11 the issues that he raised regarding both the amounts of the</p> <p>12 award and the settlement terms on the land purchase, about</p> <p>13 extending it, as well as the objectives to the attorney</p> <p>14 fees, expenses and incentive awards.</p> <p>15 We will pass on then to Jason Nathaniel Corwin</p> <p>16 from Spencer, New York.</p> <p>17 Is he here today?</p> <p>18 (No response.)</p> <p>19 THE COURT: Mr. Corwin had filed an objection</p> <p>20 objecting to it because of a lack of a full accounting. We</p> <p>21 will pass on Jason Nathaniel Corwin.</p> <p>22 Ms. Judith A. Heart Warrior Chosa, C-h-o-s-a. Is</p> <p>23 Ms. Chosa here?</p> <p>24 (No response.)</p> <p>25 THE COURT: Ms. Chosa had filed a notice with an</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 interest -- intent to appear, bust did not file any 2 objections, per se, just said that she wanted to appear and 3 testify before the court. 4 (No response.) 5 THE COURT: We will waive Ms. Chosa. 6 The next I have is a counsel, Theodore Frank, on 7 behalf of Kimberly Craven, objection to attorneys' fees, 8 incentive payments and awards, and as to the structure of 9 the settlement class action. 10 We received a lengthy brief from Mr. Frank. He 11 has also been heard on motions before the court previously. 12 All right, Mr. Frank. 13 MR. FRANK: May it please the court, Theodore 14 Frank, pro bono, for class member Kimberly Craven. Ms. 15 Craven could not be here today because of the cost of 16 travel, but she supports this objection, obviously. 17 THE COURT: Right. 18 MR. FRANK: And we would like to join Carol Good 19 Bear's objection, and I hope I can be half as eloquent as 20 she was. 21 A District Court judge evaluating a class action 22 settlement has a fiduciary duty to the unrepresented members 23 of the class to vigilantly protect those absent class 24 members' rights. 25 The settling parties asked to have Your Honor</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 changing the underlying substantive law. Nor can Congress 2 pass a statute overriding the individual Constitutional 3 protections of due process currently enshrined in many parts 4 of Rule 23(a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil 5 Procedure. 6 Section 101(c) of the 2010 Act merely authorizes 7 the government to settle the case, a prerequisite to 8 settlement taking place because of the need for 9 Congressional authorization of the billions of dollars to be 10 spent. 11 The ratification is permission for the Executive 12 Branch to go forward rather than an order to the Judicial 13 Branch to disregard the requirements of Rule 23(e). 14 THE COURT: Slowed down. 15 MR. FRANK: In advance I gave the court reporter a 16 copy of my remarks to help her. 17 Nor could Congress give such an order. The 18 federal government is adverse in litigation to the absent 19 class members and would be nonsensical to say that it is 20 owed deference in the decision of whether or not a 21 settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable. Congress's 22 litigation decisions deserve no deference. 23 In fact Congress contemplated that this court 24 might have valid reasons not to certify the class. Reading 25 section 101(d)(2)(A) of the Act it says:</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 abdicate that duty and defer to some Congressional plenary 2 power. This position in their briefs reflects a 3 fundamental misunderstanding of both the Claims Resolution 4 Act -- 5 THE COURT: Slow down a little bit for the 6 reporter, please. Thank you. 7 MR. FRANK: And of the role of Congress and the 8 courts in government's litigation. 9 Our briefing presents several independent grounds 10 for rejecting the settlement, but I would like to focus on 11 two issues in response to the parties' briefing today. 12 THE COURT: All right. 13 MR. FRANK: First, Congress did not and cannot, 14 for Constitutional reasons, divest this court of its Rule 23 15 review of this class-action proceeding. 16 Second, as a matter of the Rule 23 review, this 17 settlement and class, in general, falls far short of the 18 minimal constitutional Rule 23(e) thresholds. 19 First, the Claims Resolution Act did not make the 20 settlement into law. Rather, it merely endorsed and funded 21 an Executive Branch decision to settle litigation and left 22 the ultimate resolution to this court. 23 Congress could not constitutionally have done what 24 the settling parties claim they did. Congress may not 25 dictate the rules of decision in an individual case without</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 "Notwithstanding the requirements 2 of the FRCP, the court in 3 litigation may certify the trust 4 administration class." 5 May certify, Your Honor, rather than shall certify 6 the trust administration class. And the facial 7 constitutionality of the statute is preserved only by the 8 fact that Congress did not mandate the certification of the 9 class. 10 Those valid reasons for withholding certification 11 is contemplated by Congress surely include certifications 12 that would violate the due process rights of the absent 13 class members. 14 Apart from the due process ramifications, the 15 second reason for Congress's deference to the judicial 16 determination of class certification and settlement is 17 obvious. Congress cannot constitutionally dictate the rule 18 of decision in a pending case without changing the 19 perspective substantive law. 20 That is a simple separation of powers principle 21 from the United States versus Klein, which neither party 22 cites, reaffirms in several opinions in this court, and in 23 fact more recently in this very case in the D. C. Circuit in 24 2004 which held that there was no Klein violation because a 25 particular law repealed the substantive underlying law.</p>

Page 74	Page 76
<p>1 But that did not happen here. There was no 2 underlying repeal of Rule 23, and as such, the 3 interpretation of the Act that the settling parties urge 4 upon this court would violate Klein. 5 The 11th Circuit addressed exactly this issue in 6 the Terry Schiavo case where the concurrence addresses these 7 issues. 8 Now the government argues in the context of a 9 lawsuit settlement that Congress has sort of carte blanche 10 to extinguish rights, that they can pass a statute and 11 settle the lawsuit that way. For that they rely upon dicta 12 in Sheridan Square and some related cases. 13 I think that that is an incorrect reading of 14 Sheridan Square. That was a fact intensive decision. But 15 even if the government's reading is correct, Sheridan Square 16 was superseded by the Supreme Court in United States versus 17 Winstar, which they also failed to bring to the court's 18 attention. 19 In Winstar, of course, the court held that 20 Congress cannot resolve contractual disputes by pulling the 21 rug out from under the private contracting party. 22 Now what is true in the contractual context is 23 even more so in the fiduciary trust context. The plenary 24 power of Congress, with respect to Indian law, does not 25 change that. We've seen courts apply Winstar to the Indian</p>	<p>1 and the class that constitutionally requires 2 decertification. 3 The incentives no longer align, and that is the 4 government's own test. The class can no longer trust that 5 the representatives' interests are their own interests, 6 because with \$13 million at stake, the class representatives 7 have as much incentive to sign off on an unfair settlement 8 as a fair settlement, and as much of an incentive to 9 approve an unfair -- sign off on an unfair \$223 million 10 windfall for the attorneys as they do for a fair attorney's 11 fee. 12 Now we don't know why Ms. Cobell changed her mind, 13 but we do know that she did change her mind after the 14 possibility of millions of dollars for settlement approval 15 became available to her. 16 Before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs 17 Oversight on March 29, 2007, Ms. Cobell testified that the 18 trust administration claims were worth billions of dollars, 19 and that's why a \$7 billion legislative solution that would 20 not have needed court approval was rejected by the 21 plaintiffs. And that is the same one that the plaintiffs 22 said did not exist, but somehow she testified about it. 23 There has been no admission that she was mistaken 24 or incorrect in her previous testimony. This was not 25 addressed in Cobell 22, which obviously had nothing to do</p>
Page 75	Page 77
<p>1 law context on a couple of occasions. 2 Cherokee Nation versus Levitt, 543 U.S. at 646, 3 and I also refer you especially to Judge Gajarsa's 4 concurrence in the Federal Circuit in 1999 in Babbitt versus 5 Oglala Sioux, 194 F. 3rd, 1374. An ex post extinguishment 6 of fiduciary rights is impermissible. 7 Now this is all just to show that the court cannot 8 defer to Congress and must undertake its own Rule 23 9 evaluation. When this court reaches the merits of the Rule 10 23 questions, you will find that the class certification is 11 woefully deficient under Rule 23 and constitutional 12 standards, and that the settlement does not meet the 13 requirements of interclass equity that Rule 23(e) requires. 14 Now our objection details at length several 15 independent reasons to reject the settlement under 23(a)(b) 16 and (e). But I would like to bring the court's attention 17 to the problem of the adequacy of the representation in 18 particular, and Ms. Good Bear touched upon this. 19 The settling parties do not dispute that this is a 20 constitutionally compelled inquiry under Shutts, recently 21 reaffirmed in Concepcion. 22 The lawyers have agreed to ask for -- excuse me, 23 the plaintiffs have asked for an unprecedented \$13 million 24 windfall for the class representatives. In doing so, they 25 create a conflict of interest between the representatives</p>	<p>1 with the trust administration claims, which were only bought 2 for the first time with respect to the preliminary approval. 3 And now the class is getting a fraction of what was 4 available to them in 2007. 5 We see Ms. Cobell's brief supporting settlement 6 contradicting what she told Congress in that 2007 testimony. 7 My client, Ms. Craven, argued that settlement was unfair 8 because it failed to take into account the individualized 9 circumstances of class members with widely disparate claims 10 under the trust administration class. 11 MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I would like to object at 12 this time. These issues are a field from what was presented 13 by Mr. Frank in his brief. 14 THE COURT: Sir, are you going into a new area 15 that you did not raise previously? 16 MR. FRANK: No, Your Honor. We are defending an 17 argument that we made in our brief in response to an 18 argument that they made for the first time after we filed 19 our brief. 20 MR. HARPER: Your Honor, he is discussing issues 21 that were raised in what is now a stricken brief, Your 22 Honor. 23 THE COURT: Right. 24 MR. HARPER: And that is impermissible, of course. 25 THE COURT: I think that is a problem.</p>

Page 78	Page 80
<p>1 MR. FRANK: Well, they argued that the brief</p> <p>2 should be stricken because I would have an opportunity to</p> <p>3 raise it at the fairness hearing, and now they are saying</p> <p>4 that I can't raise them at the fairness hearing because the</p> <p>5 brief was stricken.</p> <p>6 THE COURT: I will give you a couple of minutes to</p> <p>7 finish that up.</p> <p>8 MR. FRANK: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>9 Ms. Cobell's brief, and this is what I'm</p> <p>10 responding to, she claimed that no such people existed, that</p> <p>11 there was nobody out there who had their sizable claim</p> <p>12 transfer to another class member.</p> <p>13 But Ms. Cobell herself testified in 2007 about</p> <p>14 James Kennerly, an example that demonstrates exactly what we</p> <p>15 are talking about in our April 20th objection. She told</p> <p>16 that Congress that his trust land was pilfered by oil</p> <p>17 companies over decades without any compensation because of</p> <p>18 misadministration of her trust claims.</p> <p>19 She told Congress that he was entitled to</p> <p>20 millions, and now she would have his claim for misallocated</p> <p>21 oil royalties be resolved for \$500 without an accounting,</p> <p>22 because all that are available in his trust account are the</p> <p>23 pennies that he didn't -- because he never received the oil</p> <p>24 royalties in the first place, and all of those claims are</p> <p>25 waived in the trust administration class, which groups</p>	<p>1 inapposite. A \$2,500 incentive payment to a \$7,500</p> <p>2 incentive payment, these are not the sort of incentive</p> <p>3 payments that distort incentives or create conflicts the way</p> <p>4 \$13 million does. And as Judge Easterbrook said in Murray</p> <p>5 versus GMAC:</p> <p>6 "It is inherently impermissible</p> <p>7 for parties seeking to litigate</p> <p>8 on behalf of a class to take a</p> <p>9 widely disproportionate share</p> <p>10 of the settlement proceeds of</p> <p>11 litigation."</p> <p>12 And if Ms. Good Bear is correct, they are taking \$13 million</p> <p>13 for a claim that was worth under 60.</p> <p>14 Now the Kennerly case and the other issues that we</p> <p>15 discussed in our April 20 objection demonstrates the</p> <p>16 constitutional problem of cohesiveness. It is not enough</p> <p>17 for there to be a single common issue. The underlying class</p> <p>18 has to be sufficiently and predominantly cohesive to be</p> <p>19 treated identically, and that simply is not possible in the</p> <p>20 sprawling trust administration class.</p> <p>21 The parties fail to identify a single example of a</p> <p>22 class this individualized with this many disparate claims</p> <p>23 being certified as a single class.</p> <p>24 When courts refer to rough justice, the standard</p> <p>25 that the parties ask this court to take, the rough justice</p>
Page 79	Page 81
<p>1 together dozens of widely disparate claims. I have never</p> <p>2 seen a class certified that sprawling. And the parties do</p> <p>3 not point to any class that spawned that has ever been</p> <p>4 certified.</p> <p>5 That \$500 is the same as a hypothetical Indian,</p> <p>6 and it is not hypothetical, because we have just heard</p> <p>7 about a hundred thousand Indians with an average of \$.15</p> <p>8 each, who are getting the same \$500. But these two entirely</p> <p>9 unrated claims are in the same impermissibly sprawling</p> <p>10 class.</p> <p>11 So why is Ms. Cobell now arguing that Mr.</p> <p>12 Kennerly's claims don't exist? Is the possibility of an</p> <p>13 outsized multimillion payday why? We don't know. Mr.</p> <p>14 Kennerly did not opt out. We don't know why Ms. Cobell did</p> <p>15 not tell what she told Congress was her close personal</p> <p>16 friend that she settled his multimillion dollar claim for</p> <p>17 \$500.</p> <p>18 Maybe she was wrong in what she told Congress.</p> <p>19 We don't know, but we do not have any explanation for why</p> <p>20 that story has changed. We have no admission that they</p> <p>21 were incorrect or mistaken in that earlier testimony. And</p> <p>22 given incentives that \$13 million creates, to change the</p> <p>23 story and forget about Mr. Kennerly, no explanation would be</p> <p>24 adequate.</p> <p>25 The cases the parties cite to the contrary are</p>	<p>1 that the courts are talking about, you know, they are</p> <p>2 leveling off small claims.</p> <p>3 You have the consumer fraud case, and somebody</p> <p>4 with four boxes of cereal gets treated the same way as</p> <p>5 somebody who bought two boxes of cereal, and given a de</p> <p>6 minimis claims, it is okay to sort of even that out for the</p> <p>7 ease of administration.</p> <p>8 You cannot do that in a case where there are</p> <p>9 millions of dollars at stake. And see, for example, the</p> <p>10 Reynolds versus Beneficial National Bank case -- I believe</p> <p>11 we cited that -- where it was only the smallness of the</p> <p>12 claim that permitted that sort of leveling.</p> <p>13 It does not refer to a scything of the entire</p> <p>14 class, where those who are entitled to nothing get the same</p> <p>15 as those who Ms. Cobell earlier claims are entitled to</p> <p>16 millions.</p> <p>17 I would like to bring to the court's attention</p> <p>18 something that contradicts Ms. Cobell's statement that the</p> <p>19 Indian community supports the attorneys' fee award here.</p> <p>20 Last week the General Assembly, at the 2011 mid-</p> <p>21 year session of the National Congress of American Indians in</p> <p>22 Milwaukee, Wisconsin, they adopted a resolution endorsing</p> <p>23 the government's request that attorneys' fees and expenses</p> <p>24 and costs in this case be capped at \$50 million.</p> <p>25 They also supported the fee application of NARF.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 We do not take a position on that.</p> <p>2 THE COURT: Did they object to the settlement</p> <p>3 overall?</p> <p>4 MR. FRANK: They did not object to the settlement</p> <p>5 to my knowledge.</p> <p>6 You know, the majority of Indians should not</p> <p>7 object to this settlement. This settlement is a windfall</p> <p>8 for the majority of Indians. The problem is the inter-class</p> <p>9 equity problems, that there are substantial minorities that</p> <p>10 the settlement does not treat fairly and cannot treat</p> <p>11 fairly.</p> <p>12 We raised several other issues in our objection.</p> <p>13 I am short on time. I am happy to answer any questions you</p> <p>14 might have.</p> <p>15 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Frank.</p> <p>16 MR. FRANK: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>17 THE COURT: The next was Ms. Loren Zephier. She</p> <p>18 notified the court this morning by e-mail that she is unable</p> <p>19 to attend. She thanks the court for the opportunity but</p> <p>20 will not be able to be here.</p> <p>21 We will than to go to Margie Eder, E-d-e-r. Ms.</p> <p>22 Eder has filed objections to the court continuing this case</p> <p>23 as well as to the settlement.</p> <p>24 MS. EDER: Good morning, Your Honor.</p> <p>25 THE COURT: Good morning.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 held.</p> <p>2 You wrote in the beginning of this lawsuit, all</p> <p>3 plaintiffs printing this action on their own behalf and on</p> <p>4 behalf of all persons similarly situated. All. And I don't</p> <p>5 mean to be yelling, but it sounds like I am.</p> <p>6 Judge Hogan, I request of the court to set the</p> <p>7 attorney fees at \$50 million and no more. The attorneys</p> <p>8 were full knowledge to the risks that are involved in this</p> <p>9 type of lawsuit.</p> <p>10 My family has held the IIM accounts since the</p> <p>11 creation of the IIM and has suffered greater damage, more</p> <p>12 than most in this court, and certainly more than these</p> <p>13 attorneys that sit before us and ask for more money, and are</p> <p>14 willing to take away what little most will receive in this</p> <p>15 settlement.</p> <p>16 Every member of my family before me is dead. My</p> <p>17 parents, to my grandparents, to make great parents -- great-</p> <p>18 grandparents, and so on. Do you understand this? None of</p> <p>19 them will receive any compensation for the horrific</p> <p>20 mismanagement of their lands, their minerals, their oil,</p> <p>21 their gas leases, all of which was their money and could</p> <p>22 have helped them to escape the vastness of the poverty in</p> <p>23 which they lived.</p> <p>24 Yet I am forced to listen to those that claim that</p> <p>25 they are representing me and my family for my better</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 MS. EDER: Your Honorable Judge Hogan, I would</p> <p>2 like to thank you for allowing me to come here and speak</p> <p>3 concerning this opposition hearing. I did want to wish</p> <p>4 Eloise good health, and I'm praying for her, and I would ask</p> <p>5 that you would relay that message to her.</p> <p>6 However, you attorneys, and I am referring to you</p> <p>7 at this table, the Lord God rebukes you, because you want to</p> <p>8 line your pockets by robbing a people of that which is not</p> <p>9 yours to take.</p> <p>10 You consider within yourself that you are entitled</p> <p>11 to more, and you should not be of a greedy heart. \$233</p> <p>12 million is not right. Nor should it even be considered by</p> <p>13 this court.</p> <p>14 You entered into this lawsuit knowing full well</p> <p>15 that you could receive nothing or very little. Now that</p> <p>16 the settlement is coming to a close, you think within</p> <p>17 yourselves that you are to receive hundreds of millions of</p> <p>18 dollars.</p> <p>19 You claim to be representing us for the good of</p> <p>20 the Native American people, yet the fees that you are</p> <p>21 attempting to negotiate, those fees will take more from a</p> <p>22 poor people, and that is a shame on you.</p> <p>23 In God's mercy you were given grace to continue on</p> <p>24 in this lawsuit, but your greed has overcome you, and you</p> <p>25 have lost your vision for the righteous sake that you once</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 interests.</p> <p>2 By the attorneys own tongues, their desire is for</p> <p>3 more, while I am to settle for less -- \$1,500, while they</p> <p>4 are attempting to walk away with millions upon millions.</p> <p>5 Yet I am the one who has held my account since 1965. 46</p> <p>6 years.</p> <p>7 I do not know of others personally that own in</p> <p>8 combination 720 acres of their own land. I own land in</p> <p>9 Montana, in North Dakota, in South Dakota. My land has</p> <p>10 cattle, oil, gas, minerals, pasture, water and even highways</p> <p>11 on it.</p> <p>12 I have seen others that are not native raise</p> <p>13 their family on my land and make a living enough to care for</p> <p>14 their families very, very well, all the while that I</p> <p>15 received less than \$165 a year from it. And it is my land.</p> <p>16 My land.</p> <p>17 Why should I live as an impoverished woman when I</p> <p>18 own all of this land? And if I do not agree to lease my</p> <p>19 land, then the laws will lease it anyway to another.</p> <p>20 I hold leases in my possession, and they are right</p> <p>21 here. And I would submit this as documentation if you want</p> <p>22 it, that I am offered and paid one penny -- that is right</p> <p>23 here.</p> <p>24 Second one, the undersigned hereby accepts the</p> <p>25 offer of zero zero. Nothing.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p> <p>1 Here is another one. Attached is a notice to 2 lease two point five acres. This lease is for 50 years. I 3 think on this one I have to be 104 years old. I don't think 4 I'm going to live that long, and I think the cost of -- what 5 do they call it? The cost of inflation or whatever that 6 goes right along with it -- anyway. 7 I watch my land that I share with my sisters 8 diminish. The same plot of land -- now I have much, much 9 land, was 11 acres. This is just one area. It was 11 10 acres. It is now down to five. I didn't die. It did not 11 go to my children. I am -- I think I am still alive. I am 12 still here. 13 I will remain silent no longer. Nor will any 14 steal from my children, and the blessings of God will seal 15 that, and I know this. Enough is enough. The attorneys 16 have insulted my family with their proposed settlement and 17 the greedy request that they have. 18 They want millions of dollars, and they readily 19 expect my family to accept peanuts -- I mean none of you 20 would accept it yourself if you had to live it. 21 This whole lawsuit should just go away, or it 22 should be reconfigured fairly to all Native people, not just 23 so the attorneys become multimillionaires at the expense of 24 me, and my family, and the Native American people. 25 I ask that you would remember the names of my</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p> <p>1 happening here is that it is very obvious -- I have 2 documentation of land abuse, mismanagement, and they are 3 going to base this off -- like I get 162 -- maybe \$162 every 4 year. 5 But that \$162 is being based off of downright 6 thievery, and yet I have had my land since 1965, sir. And 7 then there are other people that are going to come in and 8 they may have one transaction, and they're going to walk 9 away with thousands upon thousands of dollars, but based on 10 just -- because I don't have a whole lot of money in my 11 account, and I wonder why? 12 Well, it shows in my documentation. It is getting 13 stolen, and my land is being removed from me. I am going to 14 get like \$1,500. And it is wrong, because it is being based 15 on untruth of what really is. 16 It is like you have got a whole piece of pie, and 17 they are only going to base it on the one piece of pie I 18 have left. What happened to the rest of the pie? Because I 19 owned that whole pie, and I don't know how else to explain 20 that. 21 I bought my records here. They are dated back 22 from 1965. I was told by a Senator -- when I talked to him 23 he said, why doesn't anybody else have documentation? And 24 then I was also told that whoever held all of these papers 25 destroyed them.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p> <p>1 family that cannot speak from the grave concerning this 2 settlement when you decide which direction to go with it. 3 They were warriors, moms and dads, sons and daughters, and 4 even veterans of war to help this country retain its 5 freedom. And all of them are deceased. 6 There names were Main Horn, Fixes Up, Bunch of 7 Beads, Fighter, Long Nine, Light on Land, Barrel, and Jack 8 Eater was a Purple Heart recipient more than once, who was 9 my father. They are all dead, too. Minnie Two Shoes. She 10 is my oldest sister, and she was one of the founders of the 11 Native American Journalist Association, and she just passed 12 on last April. 13 My family records date back before the beginning 14 of my reservation, and it is documented on my reservation, 15 which is in Poplar Montana, the Fort Peck Indian 16 Reservation. And our family was to the government in trust. 17 \$1,500 for 46 years in it? And 233 million to you 18 guys, and you have already received money? 19 THE COURT: Ms. Eder, you are repeating yourself. 20 MS. EDER: I know. I've got go stop that. 21 THE COURT: Let's finish up. 22 MS. EDER: I'm repeating myself. 23 Well, that is my opposition, and I do have one 24 other thing. One of the attorneys said something about that 25 it was fair, but it is not really fair, because what is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p> <p>1 Well, I did not destroy mine. I kept mine. And, 2 sir, if you would like to review them, I would put them in 3 trust for you if I could get a copy -- I don't want them to 4 disappear. 5 THE COURT: I think you had better keep them for 6 right now. 7 MS. EDER: Anyway, I'm done. 8 THE COURT: I don't want you to lose them. 9 MS. EDER: No. Thank you. 10 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Eder. I appreciate it. 11 The court recognizes Ms. Mary Aurelia Johns from 12 Nebraska. 13 Good afternoon, Ms. Johns. 14 MS. JOHNS: Good afternoon. 15 My name is Mary Aurelia Johns, also known as Mary 16 Lee Johns. I am an enrolled member of the Cheyenne River 17 Sioux tribe, and I am an IIM account holder. In fact, I 18 have had my account for 49 years, since 1962 when my mother 19 died. My lands -- my trust lands are on the Cheyenne River 20 Sioux Reservation in South Dakota. 21 I am objecting to the proposed a settlement in the 22 Cobell versus Caesar -- Salazar case because of -- however, 23 before I begin my discussion of why I am objecting, I would 24 like to take this opportunity tell you why I did not opt 25 out.</p>

Page 90	Page 92
<p>1 It took a great deal of struggle to make this</p> <p>2 decision. I chose not to opt out because if everyone opted</p> <p>3 out there would be no one to tell you what was wrong with</p> <p>4 this agreement, and I knew that it would be important for</p> <p>5 you to know why a person like myself objects to this</p> <p>6 agreement.</p> <p>7 My objections are as follows: I challenge the</p> <p>8 suitability of the named plaintiffs to maintain this action</p> <p>9 on behalf of myself.</p> <p>10 One, according to the federal government, the</p> <p>11 plaintiffs have received a personal accounting, yet those of</p> <p>12 us who they purport to represent have not. Furthermore, the</p> <p>13 plaintiffs have asked this court to prohibit the government</p> <p>14 from sending an accounting statement to me.</p> <p>15 Two, the plaintiffs by asking for an incentive</p> <p>16 award, no longer have commonality with the other IIM account</p> <p>17 holders and now represent only themselves. Trying to</p> <p>18 collect these awards and asking this court to rule that the</p> <p>19 agreement is fair and reasonable, and to give a final</p> <p>20 approval to the settlement, this is an obvious conflict of</p> <p>21 interest.</p> <p>22 I also challenge the plaintiffs' assertion that</p> <p>23 their claims are similar to mine, which has resulted in</p> <p>24 their being allowed to negotiate this agreement with the</p> <p>25 federal government that resulted in the trust administration</p>	<p>1 class for trial, how can the court then reasonably certify</p> <p>2 the trust administration class for settlement?</p> <p>3 Two. These administration claims under the trust</p> <p>4 administration class are the most egregious claims, and yet</p> <p>5 this class, according to the negotiated agreement is the</p> <p>6 last to be paid after the attorneys, the plaintiffs and the</p> <p>7 historical accounting class.</p> <p>8 This is neither fair nor reasonable. These</p> <p>9 payments will bear no relationship to any estimate or actual</p> <p>10 damages to an individual's assets, but purely on what is</p> <p>11 left over and how much has gone through the IIM account of</p> <p>12 those who are in the class.</p> <p>13 However, my strongest objection is to the</p> <p>14 following fact:</p> <p>15 The very idea that individuals, who I never agreed</p> <p>16 to represent me, should then take it upon themselves to</p> <p>17 negotiate, on my behalf, with the federal government that</p> <p>18 has over many, many, many years, mismanaged the lands that I</p> <p>19 inherited from my great great grandmother, Cleans as She</p> <p>20 Comes, my great grandfather, Poor Buffalo, my great</p> <p>21 grandmother, Grows in a Day, my grandmother Sara Poor</p> <p>22 Buffalo, my grandmother Mabel Dupree, and my mother, Marie</p> <p>23 Justice.</p> <p>24 The allotment of Lakota lands began under the law</p> <p>25 of 1889 that broke up the great Sioux reservation and</p>
Page 91	Page 93
<p>1 class being created.</p> <p>2 This claim that commonality is based on the fact</p> <p>3 that IIM account assets are all held in trust by the federal</p> <p>4 government. This is not true, and I object to the assertion</p> <p>5 for the following.</p> <p>6 One. Each lease agreement that is approved by the</p> <p>7 federal government under its responsibility as a trustee has</p> <p>8 separate regulations and laws that govern the terms,</p> <p>9 obligations and management of these leases.</p> <p>10 Two. The laws that govern these leases, for</p> <p>11 example, are the American Indian Agricultural Management</p> <p>12 Reform Act, which governs my lands, are totally different</p> <p>13 than the Mineral Leasing Act or American Indian Forest and</p> <p>14 Woodlands Act.</p> <p>15 Mismanagement claims that individuals have under</p> <p>16 all of these types of leases do not share a common basis in</p> <p>17 law, and the facts that would be required to support these</p> <p>18 claims will be entirely different from the plaintiffs.</p> <p>19 There is no commonality for this class to be certified.</p> <p>20 In regard to the certification of the trust</p> <p>21 administration class, I have questions that need to be</p> <p>22 answered.</p> <p>23 One, my questions to this court are this: Would</p> <p>24 these claims have enough in common to take the</p> <p>25 administration class to trial? If you cannot certify the</p>	<p>1 provided for the allotment of the five smaller reservations</p> <p>2 that were created under this act.</p> <p>3 The Lakota were then forced to move to these</p> <p>4 allotments when the federal government began stopping the</p> <p>5 distribution of rations. They were then told that they had</p> <p>6 to grow their own food or starve, thus forcing the Lakota to</p> <p>7 accept the allotment of the lands.</p> <p>8 These lands that I inherited were specifically</p> <p>9 chosen by my great grandfather, who knew which lands he</p> <p>10 wanted, because they were in the same area that his family</p> <p>11 had spent many, many winters. They are truly our</p> <p>12 traditional lands.</p> <p>13 He knew that the lands were rich grasslands that</p> <p>14 would provide for his family. These lands did provide for</p> <p>15 several generations of our family by allowing us to have</p> <p>16 cattle and horses, but now these lands, because of</p> <p>17 mismanagement by the federal government, have been</p> <p>18 overgrazed to the point where very few cattle can be</p> <p>19 nourished for the entire summer.</p> <p>20 Moreover, the large cottonwood stands are no</p> <p>21 longer there to protect the river that flows through my</p> <p>22 family's lands.</p> <p>23 Not once has the federal government ever</p> <p>24 determined just how much damage has been caused to these</p> <p>25 lands by the overgrazing that allowed prairie dogs, evasive</p>

Page 94	Page 96
<p>1 species of weeds, and other ecological damages to the once</p> <p>2 productive lands on my reservation.</p> <p>3 By allowing the certification of the trust</p> <p>4 administration class, I'm being denied the right to know</p> <p>5 exactly how much damage has been done and to be represented</p> <p>6 fairly and adequately as required by due process under the</p> <p>7 United States Constitution.</p> <p>8 Because this action purports to settle the trust</p> <p>9 administration claim, thi8s settlement may forever preclude</p> <p>10 my claims against the Bureau of Indian Affairs from</p> <p>11 mismanagement related to the land itself.</p> <p>12 I ask, can I sue for restoration of these damages</p> <p>13 after the settlement?</p> <p>14 As you can see, sir, these lands are precious.</p> <p>15 They hold the bones of my people. There are many graves on</p> <p>16 this land that are directly related to me.</p> <p>17 For the 14 years of this litigation of this case,</p> <p>18 I was continually assured that it was only about an</p> <p>19 accounting and never about our lands. Then in the last</p> <p>20 minute the land was brought in, and those of us who are tied</p> <p>21 to this land now face this new interjection into a case that</p> <p>22 was not about land.</p> <p>23 With this in mind, I also would like to say</p> <p>24 something about what this gentleman on the side and what</p> <p>25 this gentleman on the side talked about in regards to</p>	<p>1 And that is one of the things, if you truly want</p> <p>2 to know about these two gentleman speaking supposedly on our</p> <p>3 behalf, actually are stating the truth about only two</p> <p>4 percent or whatever they said, 99 point something percent of</p> <p>5 people who did not -- who chose to participate, then you</p> <p>6 must have to go back and research exactly what took place.</p> <p>7 That was a very, very legalistic form that they</p> <p>8 sent out. A 16-page form that was sent out to individuals</p> <p>9 who may not even have a sixth-grade education. And I am not</p> <p>10 trying to put down my people, but there were very educated,</p> <p>11 very knowledgeable individuals who were chairmen of certain</p> <p>12 tribes who, in fact, were against this whole process in the</p> <p>13 beginning, and did not read that document.</p> <p>14 I read it, and I was saying, do you realize that</p> <p>15 you have to do this? And they said, no. Let me see that.</p> <p>16 So I was passing my document around at a National Congress</p> <p>17 of American Indians meeting so that people, who should have</p> <p>18 known better, should have read it, and they didn't.</p> <p>19 And that is why I want you to question these two</p> <p>20 individuals who stood up and said, this was the best</p> <p>21 notification service ever done for Indian people.</p> <p>22 THE COURT: There was a TV and radio, was also not</p> <p>23 followed at all?</p> <p>24 MS. JOHNS: Well, people don't -- traditionally --</p> <p>25 traditionally, people don't participate by ignoring</p>
Page 95	Page 97
<p>1 notification. They stated that this notification regarding</p> <p>2 these class actions -- this class-action suit was the best</p> <p>3 that has ever been done.</p> <p>4 A 16-page document was sent down to the</p> <p>5 reservations to people who, I guess, were on some kind of a</p> <p>6 list, and were told, you know -- but you have to understand,</p> <p>7 culturally our people do not react to documents sent by the</p> <p>8 federal government. They throw it on the side, just like</p> <p>9 probably more people in United States than you can imagine</p> <p>10 getting a letter from the federal government would probably</p> <p>11 do. Throw it on the side.</p> <p>12 Historically, every time Indians have won an</p> <p>13 award, from the Alaska Native Lands Claim Settlement Act, to</p> <p>14 the War Eagle Act, of which my children were both entitled</p> <p>15 to, you had to participate by filling out a form and saying</p> <p>16 you wanted to participate.</p> <p>17 This process went against historical and</p> <p>18 traditional manners of which Indian people have come to</p> <p>19 realize that if they wanted to participate they had to fill</p> <p>20 out a form.</p> <p>21 My sister, who is one of the most intelligent</p> <p>22 individuals that I know of, was shocked when I told her --</p> <p>23 she said, well, I opted out. And I said, well, did you send</p> <p>24 in the information? And she said, no. I did not fill out</p> <p>25 the forms, so therefore I'm not participating.</p>	<p>1 something. That is the way it is traditionally. You have</p> <p>2 to look back into the history of our people.</p> <p>3 They did not go to the -- they didn't go to the</p> <p>4 meetings where they were discussing IRA because they did not</p> <p>5 agree with the IRA. They stayed home. As a result of them</p> <p>6 staying home, it appeared that they supported it. But this</p> <p>7 is -- if you look historically, culturally you can ask any</p> <p>8 individual who knows something about Native people, then you</p> <p>9 will find that out.</p> <p>10 I just also want to say something, and I'm going</p> <p>11 to say it with the understanding, sir, that I do know that</p> <p>12 you have an important position, okay. But I also would like</p> <p>13 for you to remove yourself, sir, from these rulings of</p> <p>14 fairness of this proposed settlement.</p> <p>15 And I ask you, because I have read press reports</p> <p>16 by reputable journalists where you publicly stated on</p> <p>17 Friday, 15 October, 2010, that you urged Congress to quickly</p> <p>18 approve the settlement of the individual Indian trust case</p> <p>19 known as Cobell versus Salazar, quote, on its own merit,</p> <p>20 unquote.</p> <p>21 By stating that the settlement was a fair one</p> <p>22 and that the, quote, the merits are very clear, unquote,</p> <p>23 you urged Congress, quote, in the strongest terms, unquote,</p> <p>24 to approve the settlement, quote, as soon as possible,</p> <p>25 unquote.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p> <p>1 By these very statements you have gone on record</p> <p>2 in support of this agreement without waiting to hear from</p> <p>3 the very people that this settlement impacted the most. As</p> <p>4 a result, I fear that my statements, and the statements of</p> <p>5 others here today, have been given without -- what is the</p> <p>6 term, just to speak, I guess. Just to talk -- and will not</p> <p>7 receive the objective, fair and impartial consideration that</p> <p>8 I have the right to expect from a federal judge.</p> <p>9 We have a right to the appearance of fairness and</p> <p>10 impartiality. We do believe that your public statements</p> <p>11 have placed a cloud of doubt over your ability to rule</p> <p>12 fairly on a matter that your public statements suggest you</p> <p>13 may have already prejudged.</p> <p>14 So sir, I ask for justice for myself, my children,</p> <p>15 my grandchildren, but most of all my great grandchildren.</p> <p>16 My great granddaughter and my great grandson.</p> <p>17 You have heard several times several people</p> <p>18 talking about individuals who have passed away. My family,</p> <p>19 there are very few of the older ones left. That is true.</p> <p>20 But my family has always considered the grandchildren way</p> <p>21 more important than themselves. In fact my grandmother</p> <p>22 would go without food so that she could feed my sister when</p> <p>23 we were in very poor circumstances.</p> <p>24 So I ask for justice great-granddaughter and my</p> <p>25 great-grandson, who are the eighth generation of my family</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p> <p>1 So these are the kinds of things that you have not</p> <p>2 heard. You have not heard this from either the federal</p> <p>3 government's side or the plaintiffs' side. These are the</p> <p>4 individuals -- they're going to tell you that everything is</p> <p>5 so wonderful out in Indian Country, and that \$1,500 is the</p> <p>6 best deal that they could have gotten us. This is not true</p> <p>7 at all.</p> <p>8 I would forgo the \$1,500 if the federal government</p> <p>9 agreed to come in, place certain kinds of programs and redo</p> <p>10 the lands and bring them back to where they once were before</p> <p>11 they got a hold of them.</p> <p>12 So I just -- you know, again, I think that it is</p> <p>13 really important for you to see the statements that you have</p> <p>14 made. I think that for those of us who come before you</p> <p>15 asking for justice that it is going to be very important for</p> <p>16 you to think about the fact that this may not be a very good</p> <p>17 settlement for those of us who own land.</p> <p>18 I thank you again for allowing me to speak. Thank</p> <p>19 you.</p> <p>20 THE COURT: Thank you for coming down. I</p> <p>21 appreciate it.</p> <p>22 Is Mr. Richard Monette here?</p> <p>23 MR. HARPER: Your Honor, could I be heard for a</p> <p>24 moment?</p> <p>25 THE COURT: About Mr. Monette? He is just going</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p> <p>1 who would inherit the Cleans As She Comes lands. The</p> <p>2 question is, what condition will these lands be when they</p> <p>3 inherit?</p> <p>4 And that is what this whole concept of this trust</p> <p>5 administration class is about. It is about the land. And</p> <p>6 we have a statement in Lakota Country, the land and the</p> <p>7 people are one. Without our land, without the health of</p> <p>8 our land, then we are never going to be able to sustain a</p> <p>9 life.</p> <p>10 The majority of tribes in my part of the country,</p> <p>11 which is North Dakota, South Dakota and Nebraska, especially</p> <p>12 North Dakota, South Dakota and Montana, the majority of</p> <p>13 Indian people's economics are based on agriculture. And if</p> <p>14 our lands are no longer productive, that means that we no</p> <p>15 longer can support our families on our lands, and this is</p> <p>16 what has happened over the years.</p> <p>17 These lands have continually been degraded because</p> <p>18 of unscrupulous people who, for example -- there are several</p> <p>19 people that work for the Bureau of Indian Affairs on my</p> <p>20 reservation who also had -- who were supposed to be the</p> <p>21 individuals who were supposed to oversee the land.</p> <p>22 They had -- they also had permits on leases. So</p> <p>23 they were overgrazing the lands that they had leased. So</p> <p>24 how could they then question the overgrazing of lands -- the</p> <p>25 lands that my family owns?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p> <p>1 to speak for himself.</p> <p>2 MR. HARPER: Pardon me?</p> <p>3 THE COURT: He is just going to speak for himself.</p> <p>4 MR. HARPER: Yes. He is speaking for himself, and</p> <p>5 Your Honor, he has made an objection regarding speaking for</p> <p>6 -- with respect to the trust administration class. He is</p> <p>7 opted out of that class.</p> <p>8 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Monette, good</p> <p>9 afternoon. You are going to speak for yourself. You're not</p> <p>10 eligible to speak for the others.</p> <p>11 They said you opted out of the trust class?</p> <p>12 MR. MONETTE: Yes.</p> <p>13 THE COURT: All right. I will hear you about what</p> <p>14 you would like to discuss on the historical class.</p> <p>15 MR. MONETTE: I appreciate your holding this</p> <p>16 hearing and giving everyone the opportunity to present their</p> <p>17 objections. I really only have one main objection, and</p> <p>18 maybe a couple that will go along with it.</p> <p>19 The main objection I would like to weave into a</p> <p>20 story, as I have no choice, since my elders asked me to come</p> <p>21 here and say what I'm about to say, and not necessarily to</p> <p>22 speak as a lawyer. So I know you've heard some personal</p> <p>23 stories here, but if you could humor one more witness, it</p> <p>24 would be nice.</p> <p>25 When I was green behind the ears just out of law</p>

Page 102	Page 104
<p>1 school, the Native American Rights Fund came to my</p> <p>2 reservation, and I had just been offered a job with my</p> <p>3 tribe, and they were talking about bringing this law suit.</p> <p>4 To cut to the chase, I can say from my</p> <p>5 understanding at that point that it was my understanding,</p> <p>6 and I think the chairwoman of my tribe, that all we really</p> <p>7 wanted was an accounting, and some of us wanted to know what</p> <p>8 happened to our land.</p> <p>9 I know you have heard some of the stories, so</p> <p>10 story is representative of a lot of other people. I hope I</p> <p>11 don't bore you and I will hurry.</p> <p>12 My tribe entered into a treaty of 1863. My great</p> <p>13 great great grandfather known as Little Shell walked out of</p> <p>14 the treaty negotiations because he thought it was unfair.</p> <p>15 That treaty was being negotiated on the Minnesota/North</p> <p>16 Dakota border, and he went west, further into North Dakota</p> <p>17 where one of our homelands was.</p> <p>18 In 1882 the President unilaterally reduced that</p> <p>19 reservation, or what we had left from that treaty. It was</p> <p>20 about 10 million acres, and they reduced it to 20 townships</p> <p>21 and gave the tribe \$1 million. It is known in the official</p> <p>22 annals as the ten cent treaty.</p> <p>23 Despite that, two years later the President again</p> <p>24 unilaterally, without Congressional authorization, reduced</p> <p>25 that reservation to two townships. Next to nothing compared</p>	<p>1 reservation.</p> <p>2 When my mother was six she was taken from home and</p> <p>3 sent to an Indian boarding school for six years. She was</p> <p>4 not allowed to come home for six years -- summers or</p> <p>5 anything. She left being able to -- being fluent in Cree</p> <p>6 and Chippewa languages, and she came back afraid to speak</p> <p>7 either after having been told not to.</p> <p>8 She met my father later, much later, and they were</p> <p>9 removed under the relocation program. So I'm also going</p> <p>10 through some of the United States' policies for us, the</p> <p>11 treaty terms, the assimilation of policies, and now the</p> <p>12 relocation policy where they took a lot of the young Indian</p> <p>13 men out to do work, hard labor, for America.</p> <p>14 My dad was with the group that went out to the</p> <p>15 West Coast where he was a dynamiter for building dams,</p> <p>16 hanging 300 feet off the ground, laying dynamite into the</p> <p>17 walls of the mountains so the dam would come down when they</p> <p>18 blew it up.</p> <p>19 I was born there in Seattle. My mother contracted</p> <p>20 cancer, and we move back to the reservation shortly</p> <p>21 afterwards, and I grew up on the reservation with my family.</p> <p>22 Her cancer came back, and she pulled us all</p> <p>23 together, her children, and she told us about the land in</p> <p>24 Montana, and what it meant to her, and what it should mean</p> <p>25 to us, that it was in coal and oil country, and it was</p>
Page 103	Page 105
<p>1 to what we had. Some said it was in retaliation for Little</p> <p>2 Shell's refusal to negotiate.</p> <p>3 Then along came the Allotment Act which was -- is</p> <p>4 the font of a lot of what we have in front of us, and our</p> <p>5 reservation was too small. There was not enough land for</p> <p>6 allotments for everybody. Our people ended up with</p> <p>7 allotments in Minnesota, South Dakota, Western North Dakota.</p> <p>8 2,600 allotments in Montana. Anywhere from 250 to 600 miles</p> <p>9 away.</p> <p>10 My grandmother was assigned her allotment in</p> <p>11 Western North Dakota, 200 miles away. It was quickly</p> <p>12 discovered that her allotment would hold coal. So she was</p> <p>13 unilaterally removed from that allotment and put on another</p> <p>14 one, this time further away in Montana.</p> <p>15 My grandfather and my grandmother both got</p> <p>16 allotments, but my grandmother's was closer to the</p> <p>17 reservation, so they stayed there.</p> <p>18 Over half of that tribe died of starvation over</p> <p>19 the next three years, and there is an official monument on</p> <p>20 our reservation indicating that fact. They almost died of</p> <p>21 starvation.</p> <p>22 My mother was born, and they move back to the</p> <p>23 reservation, away from an allotment that had no roads going</p> <p>24 through it. No access to water. They were supposed to make</p> <p>25 a living there. So they left, and they went back to the</p>	<p>1 strategically located by a lake. She also told us about our</p> <p>2 grandfather's allotment as well.</p> <p>3 The next year she died. I was eight years old.</p> <p>4 My dad, he worked hard and he played hard, and within a year</p> <p>5 I was often spending days alone on my own. Nicely we had --</p> <p>6 the Housing and Urban Development had built a housing</p> <p>7 project on the reservation, and it had sort of a split</p> <p>8 level, and I found a place to sleep under their often so I</p> <p>9 wouldn't be too afraid at night, because they built our</p> <p>10 house between the Tomahawk Bar, the Arrowhead Bar, the</p> <p>11 Legion Bar, the VFW, and the rest of the housing project.</p> <p>12 So people often pounded out the doors, or broke windows, or</p> <p>13 just walked in. So I slept under the stairwell often.</p> <p>14 It was an interesting, scary -- I would like to</p> <p>15 think character building sort of experience.</p> <p>16 After she died I got sent to the Catholic Mission</p> <p>17 School where I was sexually assaulted by a priest. So then</p> <p>18 they threatened to send me to boarding school, and the two</p> <p>19 weeks before I was supposed to go I ran away, and they could</p> <p>20 not find me. I stayed with my mother -- my mother's mother,</p> <p>21 my grandmother, for weeks on end.</p> <p>22 So by the time I was 11 I staying alone for weeks</p> <p>23 on end, and by the time I was 14 I lived alone in a house</p> <p>24 for about a year -- until one of my brothers move back and</p> <p>25 moved in for a short while.</p>

Page 106	Page 108
<p>1 That was the life I lived, but always thinking 2 about my heritage, and where I came from, and what my 3 parents left. 4 Thankfully I could play football well. So when I 5 quit school the coaches would come and get me and make me 6 come back. I played basketball, the starting five. I ran 7 track, and was very fast. I played baseball when we could 8 have it -- when we could afford a baseball. The whole 9 tribe. 10 I made it through school in those conditions. 11 They were very difficult. So it bothers me to no end to see 12 what seems to me to be nothing but yet another policy of the 13 federal government being foisted upon my people, a policy 14 that on the one hand almost looks like a reparation, and 15 this should not be deemed a reparation. 16 One of my colleagues on the law school faculty, 17 right after it first started hitting the news that this was 18 settling, said finally you Natives are getting paid for what 19 you have lost, and they view it as a repartition. 20 That scares me, because the last time that the 21 American public viewed an action of the courts and Congress 22 as a repartition it was in 1946 to 1951 when they formed the 23 Indian Claims Commissions and brought all of these cases to 24 finally get rid of this. 25 Well, they thought they'd finally gotten rid of it</p>	<p>1 THE COURT: Yes. I am going to call upon her. I 2 have a note here. 3 And then is there anyone else who is actually on 4 the list that was registered to testified that I have said 5 could therefore that I have not talked with? 6 I have got a power of attorney for Doris Lewis 7 Warner and that's -- Donald Lewis Warner, and that I had -- 8 Gerald Warner had filed an objection, and if I missed you on 9 the paper, I didn't see it on the paper, but that is all 10 right, because you did file an objection. 11 Mr. Warner, do you have him on your list to 12 testify -- as objecting today? 13 MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Mr. Warner had been 14 listed as one of the objectors. Plaintiffs opposed him 15 representing his father I believe. 16 Defendants do not oppose him testifying here 17 today. 18 THE COURT: I just got in a power of attorney. 19 MR. HARPER: Yes, Your Honor. We did initially 20 object, but in light of the power of attorney we would 21 withdraw that objection. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Warner, why don't you come up, 23 please. I did just receive the power of attorney, and I 24 will make it part of the record. I am referring to your 25 elderly father you are now going to represent in this</p>
Page 107	Page 109
<p>1 by 1951, and in 1953 Congress passed the termination act. 2 So the very thought that Americans get in their mind that 3 you finally -- you Indians are getting what you are owed and 4 what you deserve, is a step before them thinking, now let's 5 move on without this, and that would destroy our people back 6 home. 7 So it bothers me to no end that we have young 8 people, Native Americans included, maybe not Native 9 Americans with my experience, but Native Americans at least 10 by skin color, who would help to settle this kind of an 11 action, separating a man now from his heritage much the way 12 U.S. policy separated a boy from his mother, and that is an 13 unfairness. 14 I want to say on the one hand, of course they're 15 going to leverage that equity, and they're going to get rich 16 off of it some of these young lawyers -- and some of the old 17 lawyers. This is America after all. 18 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Monette. 19 As to any others who have not yet been called who 20 have been listed, did I miss anyone who is listed to 21 testify? A lady stood up originally. Who is -- 22 A PERSON FROM THE AUDIENCE: I would like to. 23 THE COURT: Who is on the list that I didn't call. 24 MR. HARPER: Counsel is here for Verlita Sugar. 25 She is the last on the list.</p>	<p>1 matter. Thank you, sir. 2 MR. WARNER: Thank you, Your Honor. I want to 3 thank you and this court for allowing me to speak on behalf 4 of my father, Donald Lewis George Walking Shield Warner, as 5 he is recovering from a recent surgery, and he would like to 6 be here to speak for himself. 7 My father and I are enrolled members Fond du Lac 8 band of the Minnesota Chippewa tribe. My name is Gerald 9 Legarde Warner. I am the great great great grandson of one 10 of this country's greatest leaders that has ever set flesh 11 upon this earth. 12 My grandfather, Abraham Gall was the leader of 13 the Hunkpapa Dakota Sioux of the great Sioux Nation. This 14 Sioux Nation is the same one this very government has 15 written into their laws making it illegal to up-rise the 16 Sioux Indian. 17 The Sioux tribe was a proud, 1 million strong, and 18 by the time of the Battle of the Little Big Horn and 19 Custer's last stand, there were only 4,000 remaining. 20 My grandfather was one who signed the treaty 21 alongside this government that brought peace to all warriors 22 with the great Sioux Nation. This treaty was for all Native 23 Americans in this country to live peacefully on these 24 reservations. 25 The trade off was the white man get all of the</p>

Page 110	Page 112
<p>1 lands in question east of the Mississippi, and for the lands 2 west of the Mississippi to the Pacific Ocean was Native 3 American reservations. 4 My grandfather also included in the same agreement 5 that he wanted five things: Food, clothing, housing, 6 schooling and medical for seven generations, and the 7 government agreed. For those of you who might not know, 8 seven generations to Native people means forever. 9 It was just a short time later this very same 10 government needed more lands, for they, too, did not realize 11 just how many people were still coming to this great land, 12 which has not stopped today. 13 This is where the allotments, blood quantum, and 14 this trust in question comes into the picture and why we are 15 here addressing it today. This very same government took it 16 upon themselves to decide how much land these people should 17 get, and disguising it as being proud land owners, and to 18 these trusting people, unknowingly, what was about to happen 19 to them again. 20 This government also took upon themselves the 21 duties of the trustee, because this government decided that 22 these people were not smart enough to handle their own 23 affairs. 24 My great grandfather was a medicine man and a 25 tribal judge for his people, who was looked upon and known</p>	<p>1 family that have left this earth, and they have never been 2 probated for 70 years, and they continue today having active 3 IIM accounts? 4 What about my great aunt that this same government 5 cannot find since 1940? She was placed on the OSD Website 6 and after my calling she was removed to the BIA Office. I 7 then asked for a probate, and the two-year investigation and 8 court appearance with probate. That was thrown out by the 9 judge for not enough research through the Social Security 10 Administration. 11 A year later I called the probate officer, and I 12 was told the Social Security Administration reported this 13 person has a social number and is currently active, and this 14 government still cannot find her. 15 It seems to me that these government offices are 16 not communicating and further proof that the new accounting 17 system is not working. 18 How is my great aunt being protected by this 19 proposed fair settlement if this government cannot find her? 20 What about all of the others on the government's own OSD 21 Website? 22 The monetary part of this proposed settlement, the 23 historical accounting class and trust administration class 24 is far short from what all of the courts that have had this 25 case brought before them, and all have found this government</p>
Page 111	Page 113
<p>1 as a fair and honorable person. My father is the oldest 2 living descendent of this great leader today. My father is 3 also a fair and honorable person, and this is a vision and 4 goal for myself. 5 On my great grandfather's headstone there is an 6 inscription saying: An honest man should never -- should 7 always be remembered. 8 By the rights as allowed by the laws of this 9 country, and the treaties and our U.S. Constitution, we are 10 natural born American citizens and have all of the rights 11 given by these laws. The proposed settlement is in clear 12 violation of the U.S. Constitution, Amendment One: 13 "Whereas Congress shall make no 14 law abridging the freedom of 15 speech or the right to petition 16 the government for redress of 17 grievances." 18 And amendment 14, citizenship rights, and all of paragraph 19 1. 20 Using the excuse of time gone by for destruction 21 of lives is wrong. The 'cannot opt out' portion of the 22 proposed historical class settlement is unconstitutional, 23 starting but not limited to the U.S. Constitution, Amendment 24 One. 25 Who is protecting the interests of the ones of my</p>	<p>1 guilty of wrongdoing. 2 The trust administration class part of this 3 settlement was never part of the original lawsuit, but it is 4 attempting to take the majority of the so-called fair class 5 settlement monies from these 300,000 IIM account holders 6 that also make up the historical class, and this should 7 never have been allowed in the settlement. 8 This case was filed in 1996 for 300,000 9 individuals, and these are the ones that have been patient 10 over 120 years, even though many have gone and many are 11 aging, but in the end these individuals -- in the end are 12 the individuals that this case is about, and any final 13 judgment should be the same. 14 Then let the probate laws do their job by 15 distributing what these laws already provide for. Any 16 settlement should follow historically established probate 17 laws, with the heirs standing in the shoes of the 18 descendants, sharing the descendant's shares, and heirs 19 should not share equally with descendant's siblings. Then 20 let the probate laws do their job of distributing the 21 original landowner's share of property, including these IIM 22 accounts. 23 The trustee and government officer since 1966 to 24 2011, today, have allowed the undivided interest in my 25 father's and co-owners lands, giving my father a payment of</p>

Page 114	Page 116
<p>1 \$.76 an acre. These lands have been growing the wheat for</p> <p>2 the bread that many of us eat today. Hasn't there been a</p> <p>3 slight increase in cost of a loaf of bread since 1966?</p> <p>4 In 1974, when of my father's frustrating attempts</p> <p>5 to investigate concerns about his lands, he discovered in</p> <p>6 the records that he was allowed to see -- he found an equal</p> <p>7 shareholder and co-owner was not receiving the \$.76 an acre,</p> <p>8 but in fact was getting \$35 an acre for the same interest in</p> <p>9 the land. This is 46 times higher than what my father</p> <p>10 received.</p> <p>11 As of today and since 1949 the maximum yearly</p> <p>12 total my father has ever received is about \$700 a year.</p> <p>13 This also means in 1974 that same co-owner was getting a</p> <p>14 minimum of \$32,200 a year.</p> <p>15 Using the proposed trust settlement fund chart, my</p> <p>16 father would be getting a maximum of \$2,500, and his equal</p> <p>17 partner and co-owner getting \$125,000.</p> <p>18 My father discovered this and confronted the</p> <p>19 person that was responsible for the lease agreements, and</p> <p>20 also for getting the government trustee approval. This</p> <p>21 person looked directly at my father and told him that he</p> <p>22 knew too much, and if he did not leave he would not. The</p> <p>23 same person worked his way through the government BIA</p> <p>24 offices and retired.</p> <p>25 All leases for land in this country have used the</p>	<p>1 MR. WARNTER: Well, in the settlement they are</p> <p>2 offering what was in his account at that time and what</p> <p>3 could have been in his account if it was today worth 79</p> <p>4 times what he got, and then his would be different on this</p> <p>5 chart.</p> <p>6 THE COURT: I see.</p> <p>7 MR. WARNER: So anyway, today there are no</p> <p>8 leases, even today, and I have got another letter signed by</p> <p>9 my father. He has never received the leases he has asked</p> <p>10 for.</p> <p>11 My father was told in 1949 by the Tribal Realty</p> <p>12 Office that his land and mineral rights were worthless.</p> <p>13 Hearing this was very disconcerting, so he asked the farmers</p> <p>14 who were farming his land, and they offered him \$250 an acre</p> <p>15 back in 1973. Today's offer from the government is \$100 an</p> <p>16 acre in 2011.</p> <p>17 He also asked the South Dakota Assessor's Office,</p> <p>18 and the same type of land in the same area is \$800 an acre.</p> <p>19 THE COURT: Why don't you finish up your</p> <p>20 objections then, please?</p> <p>21 MR. WARNER: And finally in closing, I just want</p> <p>22 to put a face to this historical class. This is my father.</p> <p>23 This case is about a real person that I have been given</p> <p>24 authority -- and for me, personally, a great honor to speak</p> <p>25 for.</p>
Page 115	Page 117
<p>1 railroad lease agreements for the basis of rents. They have</p> <p>2 always used one quarter of the crop for a fair price per</p> <p>3 acre. Today's average is still one quarter of the crop and</p> <p>4 \$60 an acre.</p> <p>5 This is 79 times what my father receives today.</p> <p>6 This clearly shows that this government has not fixed the</p> <p>7 problem, and this clearly shows a future legal action.</p> <p>8 We have asked every year since 1949, at the tribe,</p> <p>9 the BIA office, for copies of all leases. The tribe totally</p> <p>10 refuses, and the BIA's exact words were, we have them.</p> <p>11 After returning several times after time searching, they</p> <p>12 admitted having no leases on file.</p> <p>13 A letter I can supply you today shows the last</p> <p>14 response, April 20, 2006, from the OSD fiduciary trust</p> <p>15 officer David Shaw. We have had no response after this</p> <p>16 letter.</p> <p>17 THE COURT: They're concerned what the settlement</p> <p>18 is because the government will still be involved with</p> <p>19 setting the value on these leases, et cetera, that it is</p> <p>20 unfair?</p> <p>21 I'm trying to focus your objections to the</p> <p>22 settlement. I recognize your problem with the Bureau of</p> <p>23 Indian affairs on the individual leases your father had, and</p> <p>24 that he has not been equitably paid, but how does that apply</p> <p>25 to the settlement that we are talking about here?</p>	<p>1 My father is an 83-year-old man sitting at home</p> <p>2 recovering from surgery. My dad is a proud member of the</p> <p>3 Fond du Lac Band of the Minnesota Chippewa tribe, and like</p> <p>4 his father, and mother, and sisters before him, he has</p> <p>5 struggled all of his life to survive and make a living for</p> <p>6 his family.</p> <p>7 In spite of his daily struggle he has managed to</p> <p>8 hold on to his Indian trust land, just like his ancestors</p> <p>9 before him.</p> <p>10 He has made it known to all of his 11 children and</p> <p>11 29 plus grand and great grandchildren that in this country</p> <p>12 and the world that without land you are nothing. Without</p> <p>13 your traditional land you lose your connectedness with your</p> <p>14 ancestors, community and culture. We can clearly see this</p> <p>15 happening in this country and as this nation is helping</p> <p>16 militarily all over the world.</p> <p>17 My father is proud to be a United States citizen,</p> <p>18 and proudly to serve his country in the military for the</p> <p>19 freedoms we all have, and taught his children to respect</p> <p>20 this country and their Indian heritage.</p> <p>21 Like his parents, and grandparents, and all of his</p> <p>22 family who came before him, he trusted in the United States</p> <p>23 government to perform their fiduciary duty to keep his land</p> <p>24 safe, productive, and to ensure that it would be there for</p> <p>25 his children, and their children, and all of their children</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 to come.</p> <p>2 Instead, he now faces losing his land as the</p> <p>3 government blames fractionization as the reason they failed</p> <p>4 to perform their self-proclaimed legally responsible</p> <p>5 fiduciary duty for the Indian Trust land held in trust for</p> <p>6 himself and his family.</p> <p>7 Now he is being asked to take fractions of pennies</p> <p>8 on the dollar for money due him for which the federal</p> <p>9 government failed to negotiate leases, properly account for,</p> <p>10 and then deposit into his account.</p> <p>11 I would ask the court, do not approve this unfair</p> <p>12 settlement, and to make sure that land owners are given an</p> <p>13 adequate relief due them for the negligence of the federal</p> <p>14 government, and that the landowners are not stripped of</p> <p>15 their Indian Trust land and the rights afforded them under</p> <p>16 the U.S. Constitution of this country.</p> <p>17 Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>18 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Warner. I appreciate</p> <p>19 your coming in. Thank you.</p> <p>20 Is there anybody that is on the list? One lady</p> <p>21 came up earlier and said -- I don't know if she had filed a</p> <p>22 written objection or not.</p> <p>23 Do you just want to come up and tell me your</p> <p>24 situation, ma'am -- in the pink there.</p> <p>25 You're not on the list, and I am not going to have</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 just wanted more money, because I have great concerns.</p> <p>2 I have this philanthropy program called EL,</p> <p>3 Elongation of Life, and I had money coming from here for the</p> <p>4 future generations that was supposed to build the mind and</p> <p>5 body of the people who have suffered and everything.</p> <p>6 Myself, I am a fourth-generation. My daughter's a</p> <p>7 fifth generation, and now we have her daughter, who is a</p> <p>8 sixth generation, and she has -- I have seventh generation</p> <p>9 children who were given funds, and it was quite obviously</p> <p>10 lost or stolen in the mail, and that has gone on for a long,</p> <p>11 long time.</p> <p>12 I would just like some investigation into a few of</p> <p>13 the things that have happened on our reservation.</p> <p>14 Another one is this, that I heard that we were</p> <p>15 finally getting some money. I was pleased. I felt good and</p> <p>16 great. It says here in the Great Falls paper of last year:</p> <p>17 "The trust fund amounts. The</p> <p>18 Interior Department owes a total</p> <p>19 of 63 point some million to more</p> <p>20 than 54,000 people, but federal</p> <p>21 officials cannot find them."</p> <p>22 All right I am one. I have walked up to several</p> <p>23 people and said --</p> <p>24 THE COURT: Ma'am, this does not really pertain to</p> <p>25 the immediate objections we are talking about, and you had</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 people just start testifying just out of the audience,</p> <p>2 because we can't have that.</p> <p>3 Would you give your name for the record and where</p> <p>4 you are from, please?</p> <p>5 MS. KIPP: Karen Kipp.</p> <p>6 THE COURT: State your name into the microphone</p> <p>7 here.</p> <p>8 MS. KIPP: Thank you, Honorable Judge.</p> <p>9 My name is Karen K. Kipp. I'm from the Blackfeet</p> <p>10 Reservation in Browning, Montana.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: Had you written in an objection?</p> <p>12 MS. KIPP: Well, I do own a lot of land and</p> <p>13 mineral resources, surface rights, mineral rights, and I</p> <p>14 have never really received a decent check with royalties for</p> <p>15 lease, oil rights, anything. It has always had to go</p> <p>16 through --</p> <p>17 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: You don't have to hold the</p> <p>18 mic so close.</p> <p>19 MS. KIPP: Oh, okay. It has always gone</p> <p>20 transcript charity, you know, and other things needed on the</p> <p>21 reservation. I have had to buy all of the food, all of the</p> <p>22 clothes --</p> <p>23 THE COURT: Did you write an objection to us about</p> <p>24 this settlement?</p> <p>25 MS. KIPP: No -- yeah. I just asked to speak. I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 not filed, apparently, a timely and proper objection. So we</p> <p>2 are not going to continue. If you have concerns you can</p> <p>3 talk to counsel, or talk to the people from the Interior</p> <p>4 Department about your foundation or whatever it is.</p> <p>5 MS. KIPP: All right. I would also like to bring</p> <p>6 to your attention the importance of building the foundations</p> <p>7 at these wind farms. I think they are a little out of</p> <p>8 control. I think the --</p> <p>9 THE COURT: People have asked me for a lot of</p> <p>10 things today. This is the first time anyone has talked</p> <p>11 about wind farms. But that is all right.</p> <p>12 MS. KIPP: Well, we have wind farms on our</p> <p>13 reservation.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.</p> <p>15 What the court is going to do is take a luncheon</p> <p>16 recess. We will return -- it is 1:15. We are going to</p> <p>17 return at 2:00 o'clock. At 2:00 -- go ahead.</p> <p>18 MR. HARPER: Your Honor, according to our records,</p> <p>19 we had one more objector4 that was on your list.</p> <p>20 THE COURT: We will take care of that then. I am</p> <p>21 sorry, I thought I covered everybody.</p> <p>22 Who did I miss, Ms. Sugar?</p> <p>23 MR. HARPER: Ms. Sugar, represented by counsel.</p> <p>24 THE COURT: I have a note on that. Didn't we get</p> <p>25 a note on Sugar? I am sorry, I thought I had gotten a note</p>

Page 122	Page 124
<p>1 that she had somehow withdrawn, but come in. That is all 2 right. I misunderstood. I had written myself a note about 3 Ms. Sugar, and I thought that something had come in that had 4 changed her mind, but I'm happy to hear from you for 5 representing Ms. Sugar. 6 Would you identify yourself for the record? 7 MS. WORK: May it please the court, my name is 8 Susan Work. I'm there with local counsel, Joe Membrino, and 9 I am representing Verlita Sugar. 10 THE COURT: Let me get her objection back up 11 again. All right, I've got it here. I do recall this about 12 the five tribes. Thank you. 13 MS. WORK: Ms. Sugar is a full blooded Cherokee 14 citizen who owns a small, undivided restricted mineral 15 interest in eastern Oklahoma within the boundaries of the 16 Cherokee Nation. 17 The Cherokee Nation is one of the so-called five 18 civilized tribes, which also includes the Muscogee Creek 19 Nation, the Chickasaw Nation, the Choctaw Nation, and the 20 Seminole Nation. 21 These tribes were removed from southeastern United 22 States to Indian territory in the 1930s, and at that time 23 they acquired fee title to their lands, which actually 24 resulted in a unique situation for the tribes when allotment 25 occurred, and it has an impact with respect to the</p>	<p>1 it is necessary to research the titles for all of these 2 tracks and all of the fractionation that is involved in each 3 county. 4 The most recent of these federal law is the act of 5 August 4, 1947, and that act continues the same limitations 6 with regard to blood quantum, the same state jurisdiction 7 issues. 8 The federal government still maintained a trust 9 responsibility to the five tribes and to the individual 10 allottees. The federal government managed realty offices 11 for each of the tribes and maintained some form of land 12 title records, but not to the extent that you see elsewhere 13 in the United States. 14 There was also a special office set up in Tulsa. 15 It is a field office of the United States Department of 16 Interior Solicitor's Office, and there are several attorneys 17 in that office that appear in state court proceedings to try 18 to assist in protecting the interests of the individual 19 restrictive landowners. 20 So there is still significant federal fiduciary 21 responsibility with regard to these lands, but there are 22 many problems with land titles involving the lands because 23 of the complicated nature of the federal laws. 24 This leads to the problem with identification of 25 the trust administration class, because it is easy to prove</p>
Page 123	Page 125
<p>1 identification of trust management class in the Cobell 2 case. 3 At the time of allotment in the early 1900s, the 4 five tribes' allotments, including the Cherokee Nation's 5 allotments, were all in restricted status. But shortly 6 after that, Congress began to pass a series of special 7 federal laws that apply to only the five tribes, and began 8 to remove the restricted status of those lands based on -- 9 primarily based on the blood quantum of the individual 10 owners. 11 This resulted in the practically immediate loss to 12 the restricted land owners of their lands, those that were 13 less than half blood, in the early 1900s. 14 The laws that got passed not only imposed these 15 limitations with regard to blood quantum, but they also gave 16 the state courts authority to act as federal 17 instrumentalities in the probate of the estates of the 18 restricted allotments, and in the approval of sales of the 19 restricted allotments, and in the lease of mineral interests 20 of the restricted allotments. 21 As a result, the records maintenance for these 22 restricted allotments are primarily found in the state court 23 system in the various state county offices. In the 24 Cherokee Nation alone there are 14 counties. So that 25 requires -- in order to identify the restricted landowners,</p>	<p>1 persons that have IIM accounts. They are atomically in the 2 trust administration class. But there are not that many 3 restricted landowners, or Cherokee landowners at least, that 4 also have IIM accounts. 5 The reason for that is because under the special 6 federal laws the -- well, I would same most of the -- a 7 great deal of the income from restricted lands comes from 8 oil and gas, and the special federal laws concerning oil and 9 gas leases allowed -- or at least were interpreted by the 10 Department of Interior to allow direct pay to individual 11 owners. 12 So of course they are not covered in this 13 particular class as far as any mismanagement of their 14 incomes, but that's part of the problem, because there is 15 now -- there are very are few IIM accounts. 16 It is estimated that there are about 1,800 17 Cherokee IIM accounts. That places a burden on the 18 individual Cherokee restricted landowners to establish that 19 they have a demonstrable interest -- ownership interest in 20 restricted property. 21 That is difficult to do because of the disarray of 22 all of the records related to the land titles. The Cherokee 23 Nation has only recently -- well, they were notified in June 24 -- well actually they were notified -- the tribe was 25 notified about a week ago, June 8, that it would receive 2.6</p>

Page 126	Page 128
<p>1 million from the Department of Interior to fund a project to</p> <p>2 get individual restricted members' information researched</p> <p>3 and entered into the TAAMS system.</p> <p>4 Of course the TAAMS system -- what we understand</p> <p>5 based on meetings that have been held is that the Department</p> <p>6 of Interior, which is going to be responsible for providing</p> <p>7 information to the trust administrator with respect to</p> <p>8 demonstrable interests in restricted properties, applies to</p> <p>9 -- probably will be very beneficial to most tribes, but not</p> <p>10 to the five tribes, because there is no TAAMS system for the</p> <p>11 restricted five tribes land owners.</p> <p>12 It is estimated that it will take two to three</p> <p>13 years, using these funds, to be able to identify the tracks</p> <p>14 that are subject to restricted status and who the individual</p> <p>15 restricted landowners are.</p> <p>16 That does not even take into account the multitude</p> <p>17 of unprobated estates involving restricted property, and</p> <p>18 that is a related issue, because -- well, it is not</p> <p>19 necessarily related to identification of the trust</p> <p>20 administration class, but it is related to the</p> <p>21 participation, because if you have a deceased restricted</p> <p>22 land owner and there has been an IIM account set up for</p> <p>23 their estate, but there has been no probate filed, the way</p> <p>24 the settlement agreement reads, the heirs will not receive</p> <p>25 even -- like if there are six heirs, they will not even</p>	<p>1 basically, and they do not have Internet access. Many do</p> <p>2 not even necessarily have television access, and if they</p> <p>3 have not received written notice, then there is also an</p> <p>4 issue of whether there has been fair notice given to these</p> <p>5 people.</p> <p>6 Thank you.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: Thank you very much. I appreciate</p> <p>8 that approach.</p> <p>9 We will take our lunch recess. I will extend it</p> <p>10 now because of that thing for one hour so I can go through</p> <p>11 these notes about what I have been listening to. Be back at</p> <p>12 2:25. At that point the attorneys for the plaintiffs and</p> <p>13 the government will have an opportunity to respond to these</p> <p>14 objections.</p> <p>15 We have given a lot of time for that. I will see</p> <p>16 how much time they will need, and then we will move forward</p> <p>17 after that with the rest of the hearing.</p> <p>18 All right, 2:25.</p> <p>19 (Luncheon recess.)</p>
Page 127	Page 129
<p>1 receive a one sixth share of the estimated \$800 that would</p> <p>2 be given to the trust administration class.</p> <p>3 The reason that they have not filed probates is</p> <p>4 because they have to go out and hire an attorney to file a</p> <p>5 probate. In the rest of the country, federal administrative</p> <p>6 law judges are used to probate estates involving trust</p> <p>7 property.</p> <p>8 Another issue that is important here, I think</p> <p>9 also, relates to the notice issue. If the federal</p> <p>10 government does not even know who the restricted landowners</p> <p>11 are, then how can notice be given to the restricted</p> <p>12 landowners?</p> <p>13 I've heard about -- people have talked today about</p> <p>14 individuals receiving lengthy explanations of the proposed</p> <p>15 settlement. I have not checked. I am not aware of whether</p> <p>16 there has been an attempt to send notices like that out to</p> <p>17 restricted landowners of the Cherokee Nation or the other</p> <p>18 four tribes.</p> <p>19 Also, I would just like to mention that three of</p> <p>20 the counties in northeastern Oklahoma within the boundaries</p> <p>21 of the Cherokee Nation are in the most poor, high poverty</p> <p>22 level counties in Oklahoma. Those counties also have a</p> <p>23 significant Indian population and significant restricted</p> <p>24 lands.</p> <p>25 Many of these landowners live out in the hills,</p>	<p>1 A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S</p> <p>2 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: This Honorable Court is</p> <p>3 again in session. Please be seated and come to order.</p> <p>4 Recalling Civil Action 96-1285, Eloise Cobell, et</p> <p>5 al, versus Kenneth Salazar, et al.</p> <p>6 THE COURT: All right, in the recess two matters.</p> <p>7 One is there was an original objector, Judith A. Chosa, C-h-</p> <p>8 o-s-a, who could not be here today, but I was informed that</p> <p>9 she had asked the court to note that her objection be lodged</p> <p>10 and be made a record of the court. Let me pull it out just</p> <p>11 refer to it for a minute.</p> <p>12 She asked if this could be shared with the parties</p> <p>13 here. She gives a history of the Indian peoples, and what</p> <p>14 she calls people destroying their way of life, and that</p> <p>15 there is no amount of money to rectify that, and that</p> <p>16 payment should be, rather, to a monthly income so the land</p> <p>17 could be made, and homes could be built, and there would be</p> <p>18 income to live on.</p> <p>19 She also complained about the parents being from</p> <p>20 two different tribes, only the one of blood one parent is</p> <p>21 counted, and that is not fair.</p> <p>22 That was Ms. Chosa, who had asked to make sure</p> <p>23 that that was recognized in the record, and her full written</p> <p>24 objections are in the record.</p> <p>25 I was informed over lunch that there was an</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p> <p>1 individual, Ms. Short Bill. Ms. Short Bill had sent a 2 notice in that came in a day late but IO think had been 3 mailed now it looks like in a timely basis, and counsel have 4 no objection to her making a statement, so if Ms. Short Bill 5 would like to come up. 6 Is Ms. Short Bill here, please? 7 MS. SHORT BILL: Thank you, Your Honor, for 8 letting me speak today. 9 My name is Vanie Short Bill, and I am a member of 10 the Rosebud Sioux Tribe. I am also a member of both the 11 historical account class and the trust administration 12 class. 13 According to an article from Indian Country today 14 entitled, Warrior Woman, Eloise Cobell said that she decided 15 to settle with the federal government because so many IIM 16 account holders were dying off. 17 My Uncle Red, who lived most of his life homeless 18 and without a job, was one of those members who did not live 19 to see a payment. He died in 2007. 20 I do agree that this case needs to be settled 21 before more members of the class die off, but let's do so in 22 a manner that is prudent so as to prevent any future or 23 existing gross mismanagement of trust funds. 24 I object to two portions of the settlement 25 agreement. Both pertain to section F that involves the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p> <p>1 Section 2212 to 12: 2 "Removal of liens upon payment 3 into the acquisition fund states 4 that the Secretary shall --" 5 Not may, but shall. 6 "-- remove the lien once the 7 purchase price has been paid 8 to the acquisition fund, except 9 in those cases where the tribe 10 has jurisdiction over the land 11 authorizes the Secretary to 12 continue the lien so that more 13 acquisition funds can be 14 generated." 15 Without a system in place to notify when the 16 purchase price is paid, the Secretary will never be in a 17 position to advise the tribe that the lien can be satisfied, 18 nor get the needed authorization to continue holding the 19 lien. 20 I blatantly disagree with the statement made at 21 page 49 of the response to objections that states -- in 22 quotation marks -- 23 "In no way does the land 24 consolidation fund undermine 25 sovereign rights."</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p> <p>1 trust land consolidation fund. 2 My first objection is that no settlement funds be 3 expended on the purchase of fractionated interests until 4 prudent measures are put in place to appropriately account 5 for and manage the trust funds that are used in satisfying 6 the liens. 7 With each interest that is purchased a lien on all 8 revenue is placed against it until the purchase price paid 9 for has been recouped. According to the Indian Land 10 Consolidation Act and the American Indian Probate Reform 11 Act, once the purchase price is recouped, then the lien is 12 to be removed, and the tribe should hold beneficial title 13 free and clear of any lien. 14 I have reason to believe that there currently is 15 no trust system in place within the Great Plains region of 16 the Bureau of Indian Affairs that currently tracks the 17 amount of revenue -- that accurately tracks the amount of 18 revenue produced by each interest, nor is the purchase price 19 for the interest tracked in any of the trust systems. 20 Without storing or tracking the purchase price 21 paid for the interests, or the revenue it is generated, how 22 would the Secretary ever know when to satisfy the lien so 23 that the respective tribe can decide how the revenue will 24 then be applied? 25 Part four, and I'm quoting, removal -- from</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 This current practice undermines the tribe's 2 sovereignty, because the Secretary is not notifying them 3 when the purchase price is recouped and allowing them to 4 decide for themselves whether the lien should continue or 5 not. The law clearly states in -- states that this is their 6 decision to make, not the Secretary's. 7 The manner in which the revenue is being managed 8 is also an infringement on tribal sovereignty. It is to be 9 -- in quotation marks, again, from the Indian Land 10 Consolidation Amendments: 11 "To be used to acquire undivided 12 interests on the reservation 13 from which the income was derived." 14 Each month all revenue goes into one acquisition 15 fund. This is the revenue from those interests that were 16 purchased through the Indian Land Consolidation Program. It 17 is always used to purchase interests nationally that are 18 located only on those reservations where a tribe has 19 participated in the program. 20 But if there are not current willing sellers of 21 the particular reservation, then the revenue brought in from 22 that reservation can be used for making purchases on another 23 reservation for another tribe -- a blatant violation of the 24 law. 25 There needs to be a mechanism in place that</p>

Page 134	Page 136
<p>1 earmarks those funds of each tribe participating in the</p> <p>2 program so that, for example, Rosebud funds are not -- the</p> <p>3 Rosebud Sioux Tribe's funds are not spent on any other</p> <p>4 tribe.</p> <p>5 I am petitioning the court to place an injunction</p> <p>6 on any purchases of fractionated interests in accordance</p> <p>7 with 25 U.S.C. 2201 until proper mechanisms are in place</p> <p>8 that accurately keep track of the purchase price paid for</p> <p>9 each interest and track all revenue that interest produces</p> <p>10 so that it can be applied to satisfy the lien.</p> <p>11 There also needs to be a separate acquisition</p> <p>12 fund for each tribe so that the revenue paid back into it is</p> <p>13 only used to purchase interests for that particular</p> <p>14 reservation.</p> <p>15 The second objection that I have pertains to</p> <p>16 section 7 entitled, consent or conveniences. I do not think</p> <p>17 that it is right to automatically deem consent for a</p> <p>18 convenience for people who have been deemed, whereabouts</p> <p>19 unknown.</p> <p>20 Based on first-hand experience, and I worked for</p> <p>21 the Bureau of Indian Affairs for 30 years. I also own my</p> <p>22 individual Indian money account since 1976. Many people's</p> <p>23 IIM accounts are coded 'whereabouts unknown' simply because</p> <p>24 they moved and forgot to change their address.</p> <p>25 I, for one -- my revenue is two cents a year. So</p>	<p>1 a lot of other Native American people, the number one</p> <p>2 underlying problem with the whereabouts unknown issue is</p> <p>3 that they simply forget to change their address or notify</p> <p>4 the government of where they are at when they move.</p> <p>5 The objections I have can easily be remedied</p> <p>6 through the authority of this court and with the funds being</p> <p>7 set aside for trust reform. According to the United States</p> <p>8 Census, the average income of Indians living on the</p> <p>9 reservations is 4,478.</p> <p>10 As stated in an article from National Relief</p> <p>11 Charities from Inner-C Programs.org, the standard of life on</p> <p>12 some Indian reservations is equal to that of Third World</p> <p>13 countries.</p> <p>14 Just think what \$1,800 would mean to a person</p> <p>15 living in poverty in Libya? I wonder what it would have</p> <p>16 meant to my Uncle Red?</p> <p>17 I pray that the settlement agreement is approved</p> <p>18 before more members of the class die, including my 86-year-</p> <p>19 old mother, but I pray that it is does so in a manner that</p> <p>20 does not cause further harm and further infringements on the</p> <p>21 rights of Native American individuals such as my</p> <p>22 grandchildren, and all of the tribes throughout our</p> <p>23 country.</p> <p>24 I thank you for this opportunity to be heard, and</p> <p>25 I also have left a package that further describes my</p>
Page 135	Page 137
<p>1 when I move do you think I'm going to be worried about my</p> <p>2 two cents a year? No, and I don't change my address.</p> <p>3 The government has paid me hundreds if not</p> <p>4 thousands of dollars finding people. I know how critical it</p> <p>5 is for me to contact the government where I'm at, yet I</p> <p>6 forget, knowing what I know. And a lot of other people do</p> <p>7 this because they just simply forget to change their</p> <p>8 address.</p> <p>9 Some of these people are in the military and are</p> <p>10 in foreign countries fighting for our freedom. Why would we</p> <p>11 want to undermine their Constitutional rights to convey</p> <p>12 their real property as they so choose and not the</p> <p>13 Secretary?</p> <p>14 I am petitioning the court to require the parties</p> <p>15 to seek a legislative remedy that provides for an amendment</p> <p>16 to the United States Postal Change of Address Form so that</p> <p>17 it asks if the addressee is Native American and owns an</p> <p>18 individual Indian money account.</p> <p>19 It could provide a check box that if checked</p> <p>20 authorizes the Post Office to notify the Secretary of their</p> <p>21 change of address.</p> <p>22 I did a study -- I'm a student at A.S.U.. and I</p> <p>23 did a study on the ramifications of the Indian probate</p> <p>24 process, and after interviewing several homeless people that</p> <p>25 I found in Arizona and South Dakota, A.S.U. professors, and</p>	<p>1 concerns regarding the current mismanagement of funds that</p> <p>2 is going on with the Indian Land Consolidation Program.</p> <p>3 Thank you.</p> <p>4 THE COURT: Thank you.</p> <p>5 Yes. I have gotten and I saw the package and have</p> <p>6 supplied that to counsel. Thank you.</p> <p>7 I just wanted to advise counsel, and over lunch</p> <p>8 you may have seen this, but the Supreme Court came down with</p> <p>9 the Wal-Mart class-action decision this morning, and I was</p> <p>10 worried whether or not that had any effect on our case.</p> <p>11 That is Wal-Mart Stores versus Duke, et al,</p> <p>12 decided today, reversing the 9th Circuit's certification of</p> <p>13 class, commonality issues.</p> <p>14 One of the other cases that has also recently</p> <p>15 come down, April 27, is AT&T Mobility versus Vincent</p> <p>16 Conceptions -- Concepcion, I guess, out of the 9th Circuit</p> <p>17 as well. Another one by Justice Scalia, who also wrote the</p> <p>18 Wal-Mart case. That came out of the Federal Arbitration Act</p> <p>19 matter, but they talked about basically what the</p> <p>20 constitutional requirements may be under notice and opt out</p> <p>21 rights.</p> <p>22 If you haven't looked at that you may want to look</p> <p>23 at that.</p> <p>24 With that, I will turn back to the response both</p> <p>25 by the plaintiffs' counsel and by defense counsel to the</p>

Page 138	Page 140
<p>1 objections, and they can break them down either individually</p> <p>2 or in groups as they wish as to the fundamental objections</p> <p>3 made that I have heard.</p> <p>4 We have heard some very telling stories and</p> <p>5 concerns, I think, raised in good faith by people who</p> <p>6 traveled a very long way here, I'm sure sometimes with great</p> <p>7 difficulty and expense, to present their issues to the</p> <p>8 court.</p> <p>9 The one objection had been made asking the court</p> <p>10 whether it could be fair or not, basically because I had had</p> <p>11 status calls with this case as it proceeded on to my</p> <p>12 calendar after it had been removed Judge Lamberth by the</p> <p>13 Court of Appeals for the bias, and then Judge Robertson</p> <p>14 took it over and tried part of the claims. This case was</p> <p>15 then reversed by the Circuit, the 450 million or so that</p> <p>16 he awarded for restitution for the failure to do an</p> <p>17 accounting.</p> <p>18 It was reversed by the Circuit and eventually came</p> <p>19 to me as a senior judge, and I did encourage the parties to</p> <p>20 settle if at all possible. That is absolutely accurate.</p> <p>21 Abraham Lincoln said that the worst thing that could happen</p> <p>22 to you is a person to be involved in a lawsuit.</p> <p>23 The potential after what we call Cobell 22 -- you</p> <p>24 can see how many cases have been up there in the Court of</p> <p>25 Appeals -- was very dim for the plaintiffs at that point, I</p>	<p>1 never been paid fairly. That it does not reflect the true</p> <p>2 amounts in the IIM accounts because of either not being</p> <p>3 fairly paid or because there has not been a lot of money put</p> <p>4 in lately when there should have been, or whatever the</p> <p>5 various objections that went to those areas was.</p> <p>6 Then the bottom line was the objection to the</p> <p>7 historical accounting should not be settled because there</p> <p>8 has been no accounting for the individuals, and there will</p> <p>9 be no accounting, and that is unfair.</p> <p>10 These are trustees who had the obligation, just</p> <p>11 like your bank does with your bank account, hopefully, to</p> <p>12 keep track of the money, and pay it to you when it is due,</p> <p>13 and they have not done that.</p> <p>14 It has been established since 1999 by this court</p> <p>15 that there was mismanagement and not proper accounting of</p> <p>16 the monies due to the American Indians. The issue here</p> <p>17 really is, is this the fair and equitable way to resolve the</p> <p>18 matter under our laws of the United States as they currently</p> <p>19 exist?</p> <p>20 It will never be perfect. Nothing could resurrect</p> <p>21 120 years of either intentional or negligent management --</p> <p>22 mismanagement and harm done, I'm sure.</p> <p>23 Historically I am not sure that any settlement</p> <p>24 could cure the mistakes that have been made and harm caused</p> <p>25 or wrongs done. The object really today is, is this</p>
Page 139	Page 141
<p>1 think in reality, in certain areas of getting a substantial</p> <p>2 recovery, at least in the historical accounting class, and</p> <p>3 because the damages have been reversed and there were only</p> <p>4 400 and some million awarded by Judge Robertson, not what is</p> <p>5 considered here to be potentially -- and obviously at that</p> <p>6 point 14 years or so of litigation, now 15, it is incumbent</p> <p>7 upon the court to see whether or not a matter could be</p> <p>8 settled.</p> <p>9 That does not change my obligation to be fair and</p> <p>10 consider this case -- we call it de novo, considered new, as</p> <p>11 to the objections and whether or not this is a fair and</p> <p>12 adequate and reasonable settlement or not.</p> <p>13 The fact that I encouraged that there should be a</p> <p>14 settlement and it would have to go to Congress, because</p> <p>15 there was so much money involved, and it could not come out</p> <p>16 of the normal funds available to the government. So I am</p> <p>17 not going to recuse myself on that basis.</p> <p>18 So I will go forward now with first the</p> <p>19 plaintiffs, and then defense counsel can respond to the</p> <p>20 objections that have been raised, both legal objections as</p> <p>21 to the notice of provisions and opt-out provisions as well</p> <p>22 as the objections that would seem in some way practical</p> <p>23 objection as to not being able to evaluate the leases</p> <p>24 properly.</p> <p>25 They've never been evaluated properly. They have</p>	<p>1 particular settlement to this set of facts before this</p> <p>2 court, which doesn't settle every claim that every Native</p> <p>3 American may have against the government, is it the</p> <p>4 appropriate way to go about it, and is it fair, reasonable</p> <p>5 and adequate based upon the factors that the court has to</p> <p>6 consider under the law.</p> <p>7 So I will hear from plaintiffs first, and then I</p> <p>8 will hear from defendants after that.</p> <p>9 MR. HARPER: Thank you, Your Honor, good</p> <p>10 afternoon.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: Good afternoon.</p> <p>12 MR. HARPER: May it please the court. Your</p> <p>13 Honor, we have heard today from 13 objectors, and there have</p> <p>14 been a total of 92 objectors who have filed papers in the</p> <p>15 appropriate timeframe.</p> <p>16 First of all, I would like to thank those -- on</p> <p>17 behalf of the legal team I would like to thank those folks</p> <p>18 who have come forward today and provided their views. It is</p> <p>19 a critically important part of the process.</p> <p>20 We do not agree with them, but this is about every</p> <p>21 class member having the opportunity to be heard. This is</p> <p>22 about their day in court.</p> <p>23 At the same time, Your Honor, we are mindful that</p> <p>24 by definition when we hear from objectors we hear from the</p> <p>25 displaced, however few. But we cannot forget at the same</p>

Page 142	Page 144
<p>1 time that they are the few. We cannot forget that for every</p> <p>2 one of the individuals presenting today, there are literally</p> <p>3 tens of thousands of beneficiaries out in Indian Country who</p> <p>4 want this settlement, who have chosen to participate in this</p> <p>5 settlement, and they are waiting a final resolution to get</p> <p>6 their due.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: What about the argument that notice</p> <p>8 was not sufficient because of the Indian culture of not</p> <p>9 reading the mail from the federal government, or not having</p> <p>10 access to TV or Internet?</p> <p>11 MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I too am from Indian</p> <p>12 Country. I am a member of the Cherokee Nation. I can tell</p> <p>13 you that I heard that objection as well. There is some kind</p> <p>14 of notion that there may be some deficiencies in members of</p> <p>15 the class, and they're not able to understand, or they don't</p> <p>16 act like others act.</p> <p>17 I will tell you that that has not been my</p> <p>18 experience, and I just don't share those kind of</p> <p>19 paternalistic older notions of what Indian people, and the</p> <p>20 talents that they bring to the table, and what they</p> <p>21 understand about the law.</p> <p>22 We have been out to Indian Country. We have made</p> <p>23 visits to 50 different reservations. I myself have been to</p> <p>24 about 25 over the past couple of months during the notice</p> <p>25 process, and what we have found is that there are many</p>	<p>1 resolve these claims.</p> <p>2 During our visits I can tell you that every one of</p> <p>3 us who went out there -- from Ms. Eloise Cobell, to members</p> <p>4 of the litigation team, we saw what was near unanimous</p> <p>5 support for this resolution.</p> <p>6 People understood, similar to what the court has</p> <p>7 just articulated, that this does not right every wrong that</p> <p>8 has occurred over the centuries of mismanagement involved in</p> <p>9 this case. But what they do also understand is that this is</p> <p>10 a groundbreaking, record-breaking settlement, \$3.4 billion,</p> <p>11 that is ultimately fair and which they want to participate</p> <p>12 in.</p> <p>13 Your Honor, for those individuals who have been</p> <p>14 displeased or unhappy with it, they have had the opportunity</p> <p>15 for the trust administration class to opt out. Those who</p> <p>16 have wanted to, and there have been some who have selected</p> <p>17 to opt out, but that is far different than the idea that the</p> <p>18 settlement should not be approved, which would deprive the</p> <p>19 remainder of the class from enjoying the benefits of the</p> <p>20 settlement that they have chosen to enjoy.</p> <p>21 Your Honor, at the end of the day, actions speak</p> <p>22 louder than words. The actions that class members have</p> <p>23 taken is to participate.</p> <p>24 Your Honor, many if the issues that were raised</p> <p>25 today are similar and the same issues raised in written</p>
Page 143	Page 145
<p>1 individuals, thousands of people that we have met with that</p> <p>2 understand what is going on with this litigation, and they</p> <p>3 have decided to participate in it.</p> <p>4 So I don't think that there is any evidence to</p> <p>5 establish that. Certainly, Your Honor, Ms. Kinsella, in her</p> <p>6 affidavit, has set forth in great detail exactly the robust</p> <p>7 nature of this notice process.</p> <p>8 There were TV ads. There were radio ads. There</p> <p>9 were DVDs that were created in nine different languages.</p> <p>10 There were 8,000 of those DVDs that were sent out to members</p> <p>11 of the class who requested them, and to Indian</p> <p>12 organizations, and tribal organizations.</p> <p>13 So there was an outreach effort here -- of course</p> <p>14 in Ms. Kinsella's terms she is the best of the best as you</p> <p>15 know with respect to these kinds of matters -- that it was</p> <p>16 far beyond what is required by law.</p> <p>17 Again, I just do not see that there is any</p> <p>18 evidence to the notion that the notice was not sufficient</p> <p>19 and that the people were not informed of their rights. And</p> <p>20 those individuals that were informed of those rights, 99.98</p> <p>21 percent of them decided to remain in the class. A handful</p> <p>22 objected. 92. Only a few people have presented themselves</p> <p>23 here today.</p> <p>24 So what we are dealing with here is that we have a</p> <p>25 super majority out Indian Country that are looking to</p>	<p>1 briefs. We have extensively briefed these issues. We are</p> <p>2 not going to outline all of the issues that we have set</p> <p>3 forth in our papers. We largely will rest on those</p> <p>4 responses.</p> <p>5 Of course if the court has any specific questions,</p> <p>6 we will address those. Otherwise, we will just emphasize</p> <p>7 some of those salient imports.</p> <p>8 We have divided this on our legal team into two</p> <p>9 individuals. Mr. Adam Charnes will step forward initially</p> <p>10 and address some of the Constitutional issues, including</p> <p>11 addressing the Supreme Court's decision in Wal-Mart, and</p> <p>12 then I will address some of the other objections, Your</p> <p>13 Honor, after that.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: Thank you.</p> <p>15 MR. CHARNES: May it please the court. Your</p> <p>16 Honor, I'm going to address three separate constitutional</p> <p>17 issues and talk about the Wal-Mart case at the end.</p> <p>18 THE COURT: All right.</p> <p>19 MR. CHARNES: The first constitutional issue is</p> <p>20 the argument that we heard this morning that there is a</p> <p>21 separation of powers problems with respect to the Claims</p> <p>22 Resolution Act.</p> <p>23 To be clear, the plaintiffs' position is that</p> <p>24 Congress, in the statute, does not handcuff this court in</p> <p>25 anyway. This court retains discretion to approve or</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p> <p>1 disapprove the settlement fully. Therefore, there is no 2 constitutional or separation of powers violation as has been 3 suggested this morning. 4 To be sure, we think that the court should 5 exercise that discretion in light of the Claims Resolution 6 Act. In particular, Congress's unprecedented approval of 7 the settlement in this case, and in light of the plenary 8 power doctrine which governs the United States' relationship 9 and Congress's relation with respect to Indians in general, 10 but the court retains discretion to approve or disapprove 11 the settlement as it sees fit, and therefore there is no 12 constitutional issue presented by the statute. 13 Second, with respect to the trust administration 14 class, some objectors have suggested that the class is 15 insufficiently cohesive, or there is insufficient common 16 interest in order for it to be certified and approved -- or 17 for the settlement to be approved. 18 I think it is important to start with first 19 principles. As the court knows, Congress in the statute 20 said that the trust administration class could be certified, 21 notwithstanding Rule 23. So the specific requirements of 22 Rule 23, as they have been laid out by the courts -- 23 expounded by the courts over many, many years, are not 24 relevant. What is relevant is what the due process clause 25 requires.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p> <p>1 constitutional requirement that the class be predominantly 2 cohesive, and our basic point, Your Honor, with respect to 3 that is that that standard appears nowhere in the law. 4 The Supreme Court in Shutts and in the Hansberry 5 versus Lee case on which Shutts relied, does not have a 6 standard of predominant cohesiveness. In fact, what the 7 courts have held, and this is confirmed by the Wal-Mart 8 case to a certain extent, is that there needs to be one and 9 only one common issue, and that is what due process 10 requires. 11 And one way we know that is by looking at general 12 class action Rule 23 law. The fact of the matter is that 13 the law has been, for a long time, in (b)(1) and (b)(2) 14 classes, there need be only one common issue. 15 If this objector were correct that the class must 16 be predominantly cohesive, then all of those class actions 17 under (b)(1) and (b)(2) where courts found one common issue 18 all of those class actions would have been unconstitutional 19 -- or the application of the rule to them would have been 20 unconstitutional. 21 So we believe that all that the due process clause 22 requires is that there be a common interest, a single common 23 interest that applies in every -- to every class member and 24 the claims that that class member is asserting, and that is 25 certainly satisfied here.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p> <p>1 The due process requirement is set forth in a case 2 that has been mentioned this morning several times, Phillips 3 petroleum versus Shutts. And Shutts states, as the 4 government explained, four requirements: 5 Notice to class members. 6 Class members have an opportunity to be heard. 7 There would be a right to opt out, at least when 8 monetary relief is involved. 9 And that the named plaintiffs at all times 10 adequately represent the interests of the absent class 11 members. 12 As we explained in our briefing, and as the 13 government has as well, we believe that all four criteria 14 are satisfied here. 15 Mr. Harper has already talked about the notice 16 aspect and why that is sufficient. Clearly, all class 17 members have had the opportunity to be heard, either in 18 written objections or here this morning if they so choose. 19 There is a fulsome opportunity to opt out with respect to 20 the trust administration class. 21 So the only remaining issue, therefore, is 22 adequacy of representation, and the argument that has been 23 made, really the main argument that has been made is that 24 the class is insufficiently cohesive. 25 As one objectors said, in her view there is a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 149</p> <p>1 As our paper show, the class members are all 2 trust beneficiaries of the IIM Trust. The trust corpus is 3 held in common. Income from the trust is commingled and 4 held in common, and the breaches of trust found by this 5 court and affirmed by the D. C. Circuit are systemically 6 breaches that apply across the board to all beneficiaries of 7 the trust. 8 And that is all that the due process clause 9 requires is that one common issue. There are many other 10 common issues as well, but that is enough for the due 11 process clause. 12 The third issue -- the third constitutional issue 13 I would like to address is the argument that several 14 objectors have made, including this morning, with respect to 15 an allegation that the settlement violates the equal 16 protection clause, or equal protection principles and the 17 Fifth Amendment's due process clauses I should say because 18 Congress made an exception to the Federal Rules of Civil 19 Procedure in street Claim's resolution act. 20 We believe that that objection is also not well 21 taken. To begin with, the Supreme Court held many years ago 22 that in order for there to be an equal protection violation, 23 the plaintiff must prove racial discriminatory intent or 24 purpose. That racially discriminatory effect is not 25 sufficient. Intent and purpose must be proved.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 150</p> <p>1 That is clearly lacking here. None of the 2 objectors have pointed to any racial animus. In fact I 3 think the only fair reading of the events of the settlement 4 and congressional approval of it are that they are meant to 5 benefit American Indians, not to penalize them. 6 Moreover, the settlement does not treat Indians 7 differently based on race. What it does is it addresses the 8 beneficiaries of the IIM Trust. The Supreme Court in Morton 9 versus Mancanri case, the principles established there apply 10 here. 11 In that case, as Your Honor may recall, the 12 Bureau of Indian Affairs had a hiring preference for members 13 of a tribe living on reservations, and that was challenged 14 by a non-tribal member saying that that hiring practice 15 violated the equal protection principles, and the Supreme 16 Court rejected it. 17 In the course of doing so it said that the hiring 18 preference was not even based on race. It was based on 19 politics. It was meant to benefit Indian members of the 20 tribes living on reservations, and since that was the 21 categorization, it was not a racial classification. 22 Finally, Your Honor, the plenary power doctrine, 23 which I have alluded to, also applies here. The fact of the 24 matter is that the congressional legislation addressing 25 Indians and Indian tribes is not subject to strict scrutiny</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 152</p> <p>1 cannot be certified under (b)(2) if it seeks monetary relief 2 at least to the extent that the money being sought is not 3 incidental. 4 It says nothing about whether a properly 5 instituted (b)(2) class could sometime down the road be 6 settled, and that is, of course, because the Wal-Mart case 7 has not been settled. It is hotly contested litigation. 8 (b)(2) cases -- even (b)(2) two cases seeking only 9 injunctive relief are frequently settled. It would be an 10 odd legal regime to say that if a plaintiff class sues for 11 an injunction and the defendant offers a sufficient amount 12 of money to buy itself out of the injunctive belief that is 13 sought that settlement is somehow inappropriate or improper. 14 Wal-Mart has nothing to do with the settlement. 15 And the other aspect is, as we were reading the 16 opinion, at least over the lunch hour, what the Supreme 17 Court said was -- and the reason it disapproved the class 18 in Wal-Mart case in particular, it says under (b)(2) class 19 that you cannot have individualized awards of monetary 20 damages. 21 And that was really the Supreme Court's concern, 22 and that is not the case with respect to the historical 23 accounting class. Every member of the historical accounting 24 class is getting the same amount of money. They are being 25 treated exactly the same. There will be no individualized</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 151</p> <p>1 or any heightened level of review. 2 The Supreme Court has held over and over again, as 3 recently as this term, that Congress has plenary authority 4 to regulate and legislate with respect to Indians and 5 tribes, and that congressional legislation will only be 6 overturned if it lacks a rational basis. 7 And whatever criticisms you could make of the 8 settlement, I think that it is fair to say that there is no 9 rational -- that Congress had a rational basis for approving 10 it. 11 Finally, just a word about Wal-Mart, which we 12 studied over lunch. We don't believe Wal-Mart presents any 13 difficulties whatsoever with respect to your approval of the 14 settlement. 15 With respect to the historical accounting class, 16 that class was certified under Rule 23(b)(1) as well as 17 23(b)(2). I don't think there is a problem with Wal-Mart 18 applying even to the 23(b)(2) aspect, but even if there 19 were, the 23(b)(1) certification is sufficient. Nothing in 20 Wal-Mart addresses Rule 23(b)(1) at all. 21 I will note that I don't think Wal-Mart undermines 22 the 23(b)(2) aspect of the settlement, either, for a couple 23 of reasons. 24 First of all, the Wal-Mart case did not involve a 25 settlement. What the court said is that a class-action</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 153</p> <p>1 determinations. So the concerns that animated the Supreme 2 Court's decision in Wal-Mart we do not believe are present 3 here. 4 With respect to the 23(a) aspect of Wal-Mart, 5 again, all that required was one common issue. The Supreme 6 Court confirmed -- Justice Scalia, that only one common 7 issue is required, and that is satisfied here for the 8 reasons that I explained. 9 THE COURT: How about the other class? Instead of 10 the historical class where the damages will be different, 11 the awards would be different? 12 MR. CHARNES: That is right. 13 Well, congress in that -- in the statute said that 14 the class did not have to satisfy Rule 23, and Wal-Mart is a 15 Rule 23 case. So we think that disposes of it, even to the 16 extent that Rule 23(a) applies, all the Supreme Court 17 required was one common issue, which as we talked about a 18 minute ago was all that the due process clause requires. So 19 I think that the analysis is the same. 20 THE COURT: All right. 21 MR. CHARNES: And then with respect to the 22 Concepcion case, AT&T versus Concepcion, I am a little 23 puzzled as to what that decision has to do with this. All 24 it did was reaffirm that adequacy must exist throughout a 25 class action, and we certainly have no dispute about that</p>

Page 154	Page 156
<p>1 fact.</p> <p>2 THE COURT: Thank you very much.</p> <p>3 MR. CHARNES: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>4 MR. HARPER: Your Honor, I'm going to turn to some</p> <p>5 of the objections that we heard from a number of different</p> <p>6 people first, and then there were some narrower specific</p> <p>7 ones that I will address at the conclusion.</p> <p>8 First, with respect to the settlement amount,</p> <p>9 there seems to be a number of objectors who have claimed</p> <p>10 that, in essence, the settlement amount is not enough. Of</p> <p>11 course we have a \$3.4 billion amount. It is, as far as our</p> <p>12 research indicates, the largest class action settlement</p> <p>13 against the United States.</p> <p>14 Another way to look at it is this, Your Honor. If</p> <p>15 you look at all of the cases that have been litigated by</p> <p>16 tribes or individual Indians against the United States, and</p> <p>17 you added all of them together, their judgments and</p> <p>18 settlements, you know, for the taking of land under the</p> <p>19 Indian Claims Commission Act, for trust breaches, all of</p> <p>20 those claims in the aggregate, this single settlement is</p> <p>21 larger than all of the others. So that gives you another</p> <p>22 sense of how significant a resolution this is.</p> <p>23 Your Honor, class counsel always wishes -- always</p> <p>24 wishes that they would get more for their class. But that</p> <p>25 is not the test here. The test here is whether the proposed</p>	<p>1 claims. But there are aspects of what has been termed asset</p> <p>2 or land management that were not a part of the initial</p> <p>3 lawsuit to a certain degree.</p> <p>4 Of course, Your Honor, this case was as much about</p> <p>5 the breaches of trust involved as well as trust reform, and</p> <p>6 trust reform always included these other aspects of the</p> <p>7 management of the trust, the asset management as well.</p> <p>8 Your Honor, one other point on that. We've had</p> <p>9 eight separate settlement negotiations, and from the very</p> <p>10 first one in 1998, the government made absolutely crystal</p> <p>11 clear that they would not resolve this case without what</p> <p>12 they termed, quote, unquote, total peace.</p> <p>13 What that meant is that all individual claims</p> <p>14 needed to be resolved for a settlement. And so from the</p> <p>15 very inception of the negotiations back more than a decade,</p> <p>16 we had assessed time and time again the value of those asset</p> <p>17 mismanagement claims, because we knew that if we were to</p> <p>18 settle those claims that they would be included.</p> <p>19 In fact when Senator McCain introduced his bill --</p> <p>20 Senate Bill 1439 in 2004, 2005 before Congress, he included</p> <p>21 both asset mismanagement claims and fund mismanagement</p> <p>22 claims.</p> <p>23 All of that was included, because again, it was</p> <p>24 well understood that the administration would not support</p> <p>25 anything that did not include both kind of claims, and that</p>
Page 155	Page 157
<p>1 settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate under the</p> <p>2 circumstances, and whether the interest of the class as a</p> <p>3 whole are better served in this litigation or resolved by</p> <p>4 the settlement.</p> <p>5 The comparative, Your Honor, is between what the</p> <p>6 claims are worth if fully litigated as compared to what the</p> <p>7 settlement provides to the class. It is not the theoretical</p> <p>8 injury that class members may have suffered. It is about</p> <p>9 what is cognizable in the lawsuit, and what is before the</p> <p>10 court here is that the settlement clearly is one that is</p> <p>11 fair under that standard.</p> <p>12 There is one aspect of this that I would like to</p> <p>13 spend a moment upon, Your Honor, because there has been an</p> <p>14 objection made that somehow the asset mismanagement claims</p> <p>15 were kind of thrown in at the last minute and included</p> <p>16 without any evaluation.</p> <p>17 Your Honor, that is simply --</p> <p>18 THE COURT: Yes, you should add that, because the</p> <p>19 original lawsuit did not have that claim. It only asked for</p> <p>20 an accounting, not damages.</p> <p>21 MR. HARPER: That is accurate, Your Honor.</p> <p>22 There have been many fund aspects mismanagement --</p> <p>23 mismanagement claims regarding funds have been included, and</p> <p>24 we made requests for disgorgement, requests for equitable</p> <p>25 restitution that included some of the fund management</p>	<p>1 had always been the case.</p> <p>2 Now in that instance there was no opt out, and</p> <p>3 that was one of the objections that the people raised at</p> <p>4 that time. But the notion that the asset mismanagement</p> <p>5 claims have not been fully investigated and assessed when it</p> <p>6 was certain that they would need to be included if we were</p> <p>7 ever to get to a resolution is just not true.</p> <p>8 And so for many years class counsel have</p> <p>9 investigated those claims. We have researched those in</p> <p>10 detail, and so has the federal government, and we have a</p> <p>11 sense, a good sense of what they are worth.</p> <p>12 A similar objection, Your Honor, is with respect</p> <p>13 to the distribution and whether or not it is fair. Your</p> <p>14 Honor, first we will take the historical accounting class.</p> <p>15 We think that issue is essentially disposed of with your</p> <p>16 recent decision regarding the Quapaw tribe, docket 3828.</p> <p>17 Quote in that decision:</p> <p>18 "The monies awarded the</p> <p>19 historical accounting class are</p> <p>20 not damages. Rather defendants</p> <p>21 award an identical amount to each</p> <p>22 historical accounting class</p> <p>23 member essentially in consideration</p> <p>24 for being released from the</p> <p>25 obligation to perform an historical</p>

Page 158	Page 160
<p>1 accounting."</p> <p>2 That is exactly how we see it, and that is why a</p> <p>3 single per capita payment of \$1,000, no matter what the</p> <p>4 value of your trust assets, is the fairest way to make that</p> <p>5 distribution, because the individuals -- the government owes</p> <p>6 each individual a duty to account. They are not providing</p> <p>7 that, and in lieu thereof they are providing the \$1,000</p> <p>8 payment. That is the fairest way to do so.</p> <p>9 THE COURT: To make clear, there may have been</p> <p>10 some confusion. The objections, or at least I understood</p> <p>11 one objection, maybe, that the historical accounting class</p> <p>12 is \$1,000 per person qualified to receive the monies in that</p> <p>13 class.</p> <p>14 The second class, the second matter there will be</p> <p>15 differences of what is awarded on the payments stemming --</p> <p>16 one said \$500 and one said \$800, up to -- and they have</p> <p>17 determined that one of them may be a million dollars,</p> <p>18 although some people claim that they are going to get a lot</p> <p>19 less than they should.</p> <p>20 But the \$1,000 per person does not change</p> <p>21 regardless of the amount of money that you had in your IIM</p> <p>22 account, et cetera. That is a set fee. I thought there was</p> <p>23 some confusion with some of the objectors as to that.</p> <p>24 MR. HARPER: Yes, Your Honor.</p> <p>25 And turning then to the trust administration class</p>	<p>1 There have been a couple, Your Honor, objections</p> <p>2 regarding the land consolidation program. A couple deal</p> <p>3 with alleged concerns regarding tribal sovereignty and</p> <p>4 whether or not these undermine individual rights, and just a</p> <p>5 quick moment on that.</p> <p>6 There is nothing in this settlement, nothing in</p> <p>7 that that would in any way negatively affect tribal</p> <p>8 sovereignty. If anything, tribes are indirect</p> <p>9 beneficiaries, because they will ultimately get the lands</p> <p>10 back that are purchased through the consolidation program.</p> <p>11 With respect to individually Indians, again, all</p> <p>12 of the sales are voluntary, and so they will then be able to</p> <p>13 decide.</p> <p>14 There has also been the notion that there may not</p> <p>15 be fair market value paid. Well, Your Honor, the settlement</p> <p>16 itself expressly states that payments will be made for fair</p> <p>17 market value.</p> <p>18 In addition, this program will be -- this part of</p> <p>19 the settlement will be operated under the Indian Land</p> <p>20 Consolidation Act. There is a provision in the Indian Land</p> <p>21 Consolidation Act requiring fair market value, requiring an</p> <p>22 appraisal, and requiring that that appraisal be presented to</p> <p>23 the beneficiary who is being made an offer under the Indian</p> <p>24 Land Consolidation Act.</p> <p>25 So we think that there is the legal coverage that</p>
Page 159	Page 161
<p>1 as Your Honor just mentioned, there is an \$800 minimum</p> <p>2 payment, and then payments will go up from there depending</p> <p>3 on what was produced in your property from 1985 to 2009.</p> <p>4 In essence, Your Honor, this is a balanced</p> <p>5 approach. On the one hand it recognizes that class members</p> <p>6 have all suffered some damages and that the government has</p> <p>7 unlawfully obtained some benefit from its failure to</p> <p>8 distribute these trust funds.</p> <p>9 At the same time for those beneficiaries who have</p> <p>10 more valuable assets, the likelihood of damages is greater.</p> <p>11 Therefore, their payments are greater.</p> <p>12 Your Honor, this is fair to the class as a whole.</p> <p>13 There is no better way to do a distribution of this nature.</p> <p>14 What we wanted to avoid -- what the parties wanted to avoid</p> <p>15 was to spend literally tens or hundreds of millions of</p> <p>16 dollars trying to figure out who gets what rather than</p> <p>17 getting that money to the beneficiary class.</p> <p>18 There was no possible way to do that in light of</p> <p>19 the documents that are extant better than this -- this way</p> <p>20 of distributing would do so.</p> <p>21 In addition, Your Honor, for any individuals of</p> <p>22 the trust administration class that believed they were owed</p> <p>23 more, they always have the option of opting out, not</p> <p>24 participating in the settlement, and proceeding in their own</p> <p>25 subsequent action.</p>	<p>1 some of the class members are seeking, Your Honor.</p> <p>2 THE COURT: There was some technical objections</p> <p>3 just raised as to the land consolidation concerning probate</p> <p>4 and estate records, land records, et cetera.</p> <p>5 MR. HARPER: Sure. And, Your Honor, we are not in</p> <p>6 any way saying that there are not continuing issues with the</p> <p>7 management of the trust. Our understanding is that the</p> <p>8 Department of Interior is going to have extensive</p> <p>9 consultations with tribes and individual landowners to</p> <p>10 figure out and identify some of these problems and seek to</p> <p>11 address them.</p> <p>12 But Your Honor, that does not in any way say that</p> <p>13 the setting forth of the \$1.9 billion fund in order to</p> <p>14 consolidate land is in any way deficient, or not fair, or</p> <p>15 not adequate.</p> <p>16 There have been a couple of mentions of the</p> <p>17 scholarship fund. Quickly on that. I think that there is</p> <p>18 some misunderstanding there.</p> <p>19 With respect to the scholarship funds, the</p> <p>20 payments are going to be made to individuals that are at</p> <p>21 fair market value. In addition to that, above and beyond</p> <p>22 that, there will be money set aside for the scholarship</p> <p>23 fund.</p> <p>24 The reason that is is because we have heard from</p> <p>25 many beneficiaries out in Indian Country -- if there is one</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 162</p> <p>1 theme that we hear time and time again is the importance of</p> <p>2 the next generation.</p> <p>3 We think that it will be a great incentive for</p> <p>4 folks to participate in the consolidation program if they</p> <p>5 know about that ad on that will ultimately create a</p> <p>6 scholarship fund. That was the intent behind it, and it has</p> <p>7 the additional benefit of creating this scholarship fund.</p> <p>8 In no way does that set aside any of the existing treaty</p> <p>9 rights or funds available under the Bureau of Indian</p> <p>10 Education.</p> <p>11 The one notion that has been voiced about how the</p> <p>12 funds will revert back to the federal government after ten</p> <p>13 years. Of course our position on that is that that is</p> <p>14 nowhere close to what is called the reverter clause, because</p> <p>15 reverter clause, the claims are extinguished and then the</p> <p>16 defendant still keeps the money.</p> <p>17 Here, if the land is not purchased the individual</p> <p>18 keeps its land, and those funds do not get paid to him, but</p> <p>19 then he does not lose his land either. So it is</p> <p>20 fundamentally different than the traditional reverter</p> <p>21 clause.</p> <p>22 A couple of issues related to incentive fee</p> <p>23 awards. First, Your Honor, of course this court has broad</p> <p>24 authority to make an incentive fee award that it deems fair</p> <p>25 and just under the circumstances.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 164</p> <p>1 testify in Congress, she stood up. She took the brunt of</p> <p>2 the criticism for doing so. When this case needed</p> <p>3 additional funds, she took \$390,000 of her own money that</p> <p>4 she had won in a McArthur Genius Foundation Award, and she</p> <p>5 utilized it for experts in this case.</p> <p>6 Those are extraordinary contributions. Ms. Cobell</p> <p>7 has answered the call. This case, this settlement is a</p> <p>8 testament to her strength, courage and perseverance. We</p> <p>9 think that the request is extraordinary, but we also think</p> <p>10 that it is well worth it for her contribution.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: There was some challenge to her by Mr.</p> <p>12 Frank as to the \$7 billion offer that she testified to, et</p> <p>13 cetera.</p> <p>14 MR. HARPER: Yes. With respect to the \$7 billion</p> <p>15 offer, again, we presented this in detail in our papers.</p> <p>16 There has never been a \$7 billion offer for settlement of</p> <p>17 this case. The \$7 billion number came from the Bush</p> <p>18 administration, Your Honor.</p> <p>19 It included the settlement of all tribal trust</p> <p>20 cases, the reform of the entirety of the trust, the dealing</p> <p>21 with IT security issues, with fractionation, with not only</p> <p>22 individual claims from the past but in the future, and the</p> <p>23 termination of the trust.</p> <p>24 That is what the settlement offer was for \$7</p> <p>25 billion. It was considered widely a poison pill. It is not</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 163</p> <p>1 We have sought incentive fee awards from \$150 to</p> <p>2 \$200,000 for three of the named plaintiffs, and \$2 million</p> <p>3 for Ms. Eloise Cobell.</p> <p>4 All of these named plaintiffs have made important</p> <p>5 contributions to the success of this case. A handful of</p> <p>6 individuals have objected to the incentive fee awards, and</p> <p>7 most have targeted Ms. Cobell's -- the request made for Ms.</p> <p>8 Cobell.</p> <p>9 Let's be clear, Your Honor. The request for Ms.</p> <p>10 Cobell is extraordinary. It is not unprecedented, but it is</p> <p>11 extraordinary. The Alkatal case awarded, as Your Honor is</p> <p>12 aware, \$1.6 million to each of eight named plaintiffs. So</p> <p>13 this is not unprecedented.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: The one in Florida?</p> <p>15 MR. HARPER: This is the one in Florida, Your</p> <p>16 Honor.</p> <p>17 What I would submit to you today, Your Honor, is</p> <p>18 Ms. Cobell's contributions in this matter have been far</p> <p>19 greater than the ones made in other matters. She has</p> <p>20 devoted her life to righting this wrong. She has had day-</p> <p>21 to-day contact with counsel. She's been involved in every</p> <p>22 important decision.</p> <p>23 When this case needed a spokesperson, she was</p> <p>24 there. When this person -- this case needed somebody to</p> <p>25 raise funds, she was there. When we needed somebody to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 165</p> <p>1 being resolved here.</p> <p>2 You take alone the tribal trust cases, which at</p> <p>3 one point the Attorney General, Alberto Gonzales, testified</p> <p>4 in Congress that those were worth potentially up to \$200</p> <p>5 million. I am not attesting one way or the other to it.</p> <p>6 That was his testimony.</p> <p>7 And you say -- and that is included in the \$7</p> <p>8 billion offer. Obviously, that is not the resolution of</p> <p>9 what was we are resolving here. That includes so much more,</p> <p>10 and when you are talking about including future claims, then</p> <p>11 there is a grave concern.</p> <p>12 There is another aspect of that which is that Mr.</p> <p>13 Frank has posed that this somehow makes Ms. Cobell have some</p> <p>14 kind of a conflict of interest.</p> <p>15 Well, Your Honor, the answer to that -- and a</p> <p>16 similar objection is made regarding attorney fees -- is that</p> <p>17 you get to decide, Your Honor, exercising discretion,</p> <p>18 whether or not to make an award for an incentive award, and</p> <p>19 because of that there is no conflict of interest. Otherwise</p> <p>20 there would always be a conflict of interest whenever an</p> <p>21 incentive fee -- an incentive award was asked for and</p> <p>22 determined by a court.</p> <p>23 Your Honor, with respect to attorneys' fees. We</p> <p>24 heard today a number of people -- a couple of objectors talk</p> <p>25 about attorneys' fees awards. I want to say this, Your</p>

Page 166	Page 168
<p>1 Honor, with respect to that.</p> <p>2 I am very proud to be a member of this litigation</p> <p>3 team, because I know the work that this litigation team has</p> <p>4 put into this case for over 15 years, and what I can tell</p> <p>5 you is that when we do go out to Indian Country, when we</p> <p>6 have gone to those 50 reservations, we are not hearing</p> <p>7 extensive complaints about attorneys' fees.</p> <p>8 What we are hearing is people lining up after our</p> <p>9 remarks, after we brief them on the settlement, to thank us</p> <p>10 for the work that we have done. And it is humbling that</p> <p>11 folks do that, and we are very grateful to them for stating</p> <p>12 their appreciation. That is the reality that we see when we</p> <p>13 go out to Indian Country.</p> <p>14 We understand that there are a couple of people</p> <p>15 who do not see it that way, but the vast majority of the</p> <p>16 class we feel are comfortable with the request that has been</p> <p>17 made.</p> <p>18 And Your Honor, I do want to emphasize the point</p> <p>19 that Ms. Cobell made earlier today, and that is with respect</p> <p>20 to attorneys' fees. The question is that if the attorneys'</p> <p>21 fees are not fair, what is that going mean the next time an</p> <p>22 individual Indian seeks representation for a case of this</p> <p>23 nature, or other kind of case?</p> <p>24 A couple of other points that were raised by</p> <p>25 individuals with respect to the five tribes and the concerns</p>	<p>1 about the settlement. They know they can self identify, and</p> <p>2 we have had a reasonable -- it is well past reasonable the</p> <p>3 efforts that have been made to ensure that these individuals</p> <p>4 can have the opportunity to include themselves, and those</p> <p>5 efforts will continue to identify those individuals as I</p> <p>6 understand it.</p> <p>7 Your Honor, none of the objections that we have</p> <p>8 heard today should change the basic fact that this</p> <p>9 settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate. Unless the</p> <p>10 court has any further questions, I would ask that you</p> <p>11 overrule the objections and that you finally approve the</p> <p>12 settlement.</p> <p>13 THE COURT: Let me go through some of the</p> <p>14 questions with you, and then you will have a further</p> <p>15 chance, I think, after the government responds to the</p> <p>16 objections and to give a summary. I intended the final</p> <p>17 chance to talk a little more about attorneys' fees, because</p> <p>18 I think that that is somewhat separate from the underlying</p> <p>19 claims.</p> <p>20 The relief now under the settlement differs</p> <p>21 somewhat from the original initiation of the case where you</p> <p>22 asked for an accounting. Implied with that, I take it, was</p> <p>23 an accounting plus equitable relief, whatever could be</p> <p>24 granted beyond that.</p> <p>25 MR. HARPER: That is correct.</p>
Page 167	Page 169
<p>1 there.</p> <p>2 First, my understanding is that the Interior</p> <p>3 Department is undertaking an effort to identify the members</p> <p>4 of the class -- the trust administration class that have</p> <p>5 what is called restricted fee lands that are recorded in</p> <p>6 state rather than the federal government systems.</p> <p>7 That effort I understand it is ongoing. I would</p> <p>8 also say that these individuals are allowed under the</p> <p>9 settlement agreement to self identify if they believe that</p> <p>10 they are included in the trust administration class.</p> <p>11 We have also had, as part of our overall effort</p> <p>12 regarding notice, we have made -- paid a substantial amount</p> <p>13 of attention to Oklahoma, in part, because of these issues.</p> <p>14 We made five bases throughout Oklahoma from</p> <p>15 Anandarko, to Lawton, to Durant, Muscogee and Tulsa. We</p> <p>16 met with thousands of individuals during those visits, many</p> <p>17 from the five tribes. We have had robust efforts in</p> <p>18 newspapers, on radio and television, and through that many</p> <p>19 individuals have self-identified themselves through phone</p> <p>20 calls.</p> <p>21 There have been 23,000 flyers that have been sent</p> <p>22 over to Oklahoma by the notice contractor, and 600 DVDs in</p> <p>23 languages such as my tribe's language, Cherokee, and others</p> <p>24 relevant to the beneficiaries in that area.</p> <p>25 There has been this robust effort. People know</p>	<p>1 THE COURT: It wasn't a money damages claim.</p> <p>2 And then as you said you had trust reform, and</p> <p>3 then at some point you came into this trust administration</p> <p>4 class suggestion.</p> <p>5 Was that created as greatest part of the</p> <p>6 settlement discussions, this actual class? Is that how that</p> <p>7 came about? How did that come about to be created?</p> <p>8 MR. HARPER: Yes. In essence, Your Honor, the</p> <p>9 trust administration class, as now articulated in its full</p> <p>10 form, was part of the resolution of the claims. It had</p> <p>11 been, though, part of the discussions for many years, and</p> <p>12 because of that had been widely investigated.</p> <p>13 THE COURT: And this was the vehicle to settle</p> <p>14 these claims, that is how you came up with this trust</p> <p>15 administration class?</p> <p>16 MR. HARPER: Yes, Your Honor. They included</p> <p>17 certain land management claims that were not originally</p> <p>18 included as damages claims in this action.</p> <p>19 THE COURT: In the trust administration claim, if</p> <p>20 there is an opt out, they preserve their claim for an</p> <p>21 historical accounting?</p> <p>22 MR. HARPER: Well, what they preserve is called an</p> <p>23 accounting in aid of judgment, Your Honor. Now the</p> <p>24 historical accounting that we brought here to District Court</p> <p>25 is different from what is called an accounting in aid of</p>

Page 170	Page 172
<p>1 judgment.</p> <p>2 What they do importantly preserve if they opt out</p> <p>3 of the trust administration class is all of the evidentiary</p> <p>4 and discovery abilities that you would normally have in an</p> <p>5 action.</p> <p>6 And because the accounting is used in aid of</p> <p>7 judgment, we felt it necessary to confirm specifically in</p> <p>8 writing and the settlement agreement that that was -- that</p> <p>9 kind of an accounting was still available for those seeking</p> <p>10 damages actions in a subsequent law suit under the Tucker</p> <p>11 Act, and for that reason --</p> <p>12 THE COURT: Would it go to the Court of Claims?</p> <p>13 MR. HARPER: Those are generally performed in</p> <p>14 Court of Claims.</p> <p>15 Importantly, Your Honor, those are what is called</p> <p>16 a post liability accounting. A liability must be</p> <p>17 established, and to the extent that there is a breach of</p> <p>18 trust of a money mandating statute, then the United States</p> <p>19 will perform an accounting in aid of judgment in aid of</p> <p>20 determination of the damages that should be awarded.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: In the information that is going to be</p> <p>22 relied upon, and maybe Interior wants to answer this</p> <p>23 question, but the operation of the trust administration</p> <p>24 class awards you make up a formula, and that information</p> <p>25 there were some objections raised that that information may</p>	<p>1 individuals.</p> <p>2 THE COURT: Let me -- just a couple of other</p> <p>3 matters. As I said, I will wait on attorneys' fees for</p> <p>4 miniature to question you later.</p> <p>5 The scholarship fund. As I understand it that</p> <p>6 has, I think, three sources to it, the scholarship fund?</p> <p>7 MR. HARPER: Yes.</p> <p>8 THE COURT: And has it been determined yet -- I</p> <p>9 think someone has a cell phone on -- has it been determined</p> <p>10 yet who is eligible to receive the monies from the</p> <p>11 scholarship fund and regulations set up on it?</p> <p>12 MR. HARPER: There hasn't been, Your Honor. Under</p> <p>13 the settlement agreement, of course, the plaintiffs by -- I</p> <p>14 think that it was two months after initial approval that</p> <p>15 this court granted in December provided to the Department of</p> <p>16 Interior -- nominated two entities that would be the manager</p> <p>17 -- the administrators of that.</p> <p>18 We did take that action, and the government may</p> <p>19 have a better understanding of where they are in the process</p> <p>20 of selecting the right organization.</p> <p>21 There will be a five-member Board of Trustees,</p> <p>22 uncompensated board, that will then decide the policies with</p> <p>23 respect to the scholarship. So the short answer to your</p> <p>24 question, Your Honor, is that that has not been specifically</p> <p>25 determined yet.</p>
Page 171	Page 173
<p>1 not be complete or misleading, et cetera.</p> <p>2 Do you know how that -- where information is</p> <p>3 coming from, and what is relied upon in order to get this</p> <p>4 relief formula? Apparently, some people have already been</p> <p>5 offered some money they are saying.</p> <p>6 MR. HARPER: Your Honor, it is not clear to me. I</p> <p>7 heard those objections as well. It was not clear to me</p> <p>8 exactly what they meant by that. I think that the formula</p> <p>9 is intended to include all funds that were actually</p> <p>10 deposited and held in trust at the department within an IIM</p> <p>11 account, which was the focus of the resolution here</p> <p>12 involved.</p> <p>13 I think that there are allegations that there may</p> <p>14 be something incorrect there, but we just have not seen the</p> <p>15 establishment of those allegations, and certainly the</p> <p>16 government can respond in more detail.</p> <p>17 What I will say is that there is an ability for</p> <p>18 individuals who believe that they should be included but for</p> <p>19 one reason or another are not on the available systems, to</p> <p>20 make a claim to be included, and we have received thousands</p> <p>21 of claims forms from our administrator -- from individuals</p> <p>22 who want to be included that believe they have not -- have</p> <p>23 been improperly excluded from the class.</p> <p>24 So again, that ties into the robust notice</p> <p>25 process. But there has been an effort to identify those</p>	<p>1 THE COURT: One of the reasons I asked was I did</p> <p>2 receive a very interesting letter from a Native American</p> <p>3 asking whether or not this would cover pre-existing</p> <p>4 educational debt? Got out of college with a big debt. That</p> <p>5 will be up to, I take it, the managers of the fund and the</p> <p>6 trustees of the fund.</p> <p>7 If there is a future -- in the event that some</p> <p>8 members of the class believe there are future IIM trust</p> <p>9 mismanagement, have they waived that right if there are</p> <p>10 future mismanagement issues?</p> <p>11 MR. HARPER: No, Your Honor. The settlement</p> <p>12 agreement clarifies that any breaches of trust that occur</p> <p>13 after the record date are breaches that can be brought in a</p> <p>14 subsequent lawsuit. So this does not affect in any way</p> <p>15 future claims.</p> <p>16 Any potential mismanagement that occurs after that</p> <p>17 record date in 2009 would be a matter that you could --</p> <p>18 irrespective of whether or not you opted out of the class or</p> <p>19 didn't opt out, you could bring that action.</p> <p>20 THE COURT: And some of the argument that goes to</p> <p>21 legal fees, and as I said, I am going to reserve that for a</p> <p>22 minute, but one of the issues I thought about was what is</p> <p>23 the future of reform in the IIM trust? You mentioned that</p> <p>24 one of the purposes of this lawsuit was trust reform.</p> <p>25 MR. HARPER: Yes.</p>

Page 174	Page 176
<p>1 THE COURT: What have you agreed to in this</p> <p>2 settlement? What is enforceable, in other words, to have</p> <p>3 reform accomplished?</p> <p>4 MR. HARPER: Sure, Your Honor. A couple of things</p> <p>5 on that point.</p> <p>6 First, Your Honor, by the government's own</p> <p>7 admission, they have spent nearly \$5 billion on trust reform</p> <p>8 during the course of this litigation.</p> <p>9 THE COURT: 5 billion?</p> <p>10 MR. HARPER: 5 billion, and we would submit a lot</p> <p>11 due to the efforts of the team here involved. So that is</p> <p>12 point number one.</p> <p>13 Point number two is that we did want to have</p> <p>14 provisions in the settlement of agreement that addressed</p> <p>15 trust reform. One of those provisions is the \$1.9 billion</p> <p>16 for fractionation. The government has long submitted that</p> <p>17 fractionation is one of the principal reasons why they have</p> <p>18 not had sound management of the individual Indian money</p> <p>19 trusts.</p> <p>20 In this settlement, \$1.9 billion is set aside in</p> <p>21 order to consolidate land and deal with fractionation in an</p> <p>22 effective way. That, too, is about future management.</p> <p>23 That, too, is about trust reform.</p> <p>24 Third, Your Honor, the same day that this</p> <p>25 settlement was announced, Secretary of Interior Ken Salazar</p>	<p>1 What is the rough numbers of the American Indians</p> <p>2 in each class, and how many do you think, in total, will</p> <p>3 receive monetary benefits from the settlement in both</p> <p>4 classes?</p> <p>5 MR. HARPER: Your Honor, if I could have just a</p> <p>6 moment?</p> <p>7 THE COURT: And the reason I ask is I have seen</p> <p>8 about 300,000 banded about in a couple of instances for</p> <p>9 each class, and then I have seen a total of 450,000, perhaps</p> <p>10 500,000 total. It just wasn't clear to me.</p> <p>11 MR. HARPER: Sure.</p> <p>12 Your Honor, our understanding is that there are</p> <p>13 about 360,000 who are members of the historical accounting</p> <p>14 class. 360,000, and there are an additional 400 -- or I</p> <p>15 shouldn't say additional. Some of those are crossover --</p> <p>16 most of those are crossover.</p> <p>17 But there are 450,000 who are members of the trust</p> <p>18 administration class. In part that is because that class</p> <p>19 includes individuals who may have an allotment interest or</p> <p>20 an interest in restricted fee land but do not have an IIM</p> <p>21 account, and they will all -- members of both of those</p> <p>22 classes will receive a minimum benefit depending on whether</p> <p>23 they are members of the class.</p> <p>24 THE COURT: And I just recall. There was one</p> <p>25 objection that I forgot to ask you about. There seems to me</p>
Page 175	Page 177
<p>1 entered into a secretarial order that establishes a</p> <p>2 commission that will further study trust reform and what</p> <p>3 efforts are necessary to sustain additional trust reform.</p> <p>4 We agree that there are additional problems that</p> <p>5 need to be resolved, and that that is another aspect of the</p> <p>6 future looking aspects of this resolution.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: And you mentioned the \$7 billion</p> <p>8 figure, that the tribes have their own separate suits, and</p> <p>9 there are some 20 to 30 as I recall, maybe more than that.</p> <p>10 MR. HARPER: About 100.</p> <p>11 THE COURT: Following on after this one. I know I</p> <p>12 had a few behind me to do -- that have not resolved as a</p> <p>13 result of this case?</p> <p>14 MR. HARPER: That is right.</p> <p>15 And the point there was that the \$7 billion</p> <p>16 figure, the government made clear that that \$7 billion had</p> <p>17 to pay for the resolution of all of those tribal trust law</p> <p>18 suits, all of the individual lawsuits, all future claims,</p> <p>19 trust reforms and other matters. So it just was not an</p> <p>20 offer for settling this case, and it was not an offer for</p> <p>21 settling individual Indian claims.</p> <p>22 THE COURT: Let me just -- final-round up question</p> <p>23 on the overall settlement, then I'll get to the government,</p> <p>24 and then I'll get back to you on the individual attorneys</p> <p>25 fees a little more.</p>	<p>1 a person who was knowledgeable -- a person who spoke towards</p> <p>2 the last concerning the 'whereabouts unknown' and locating</p> <p>3 people, and that there is a provision, I believe, that</p> <p>4 parts of land could be sold by default if the parties -- if</p> <p>5 the 'whereabouts unknown' category remained after five</p> <p>6 years?</p> <p>7 MR. HARPER: Yes.</p> <p>8 Your Honor, it has been referred to as the deemed</p> <p>9 consent provision. Specifically, what that entails is when</p> <p>10 an individual has not been located for an extensive period</p> <p>11 of time, and there are provisions for Interior -- the</p> <p>12 Interior Department having to make efforts to find that</p> <p>13 person, if in the event that they are unable to, then there</p> <p>14 is a deemed consent provision for the land consolidation.</p> <p>15 My understanding is that funds are then deposited</p> <p>16 in an IIM account, and they will still have the funds</p> <p>17 available.</p> <p>18 THE COURT: Thank you for the work.</p> <p>19 MR. HARPER: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>20 THE COURT: I will hear from the government at</p> <p>21 this point on the response to the objections, and at the</p> <p>22 same time the government finishes its response to objections</p> <p>23 discussion, I will have some questions on the attorneys'</p> <p>24 fees, and then we will finish with response from the</p> <p>25 plaintiffs in that area.</p>

Page 178	Page 180
<p>1 MR. QUINN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michael</p> <p>2 Quinn for the defendants.</p> <p>3 We also spent part of our lunch looking over the</p> <p>4 Wal-Mart decision. It was a good accompaniment to a salad.</p> <p>5 Having looked at it and read through it, we also had an</p> <p>6 opportunity to kind of search the terminology there to see</p> <p>7 if it refers to anything in the way of due process or</p> <p>8 constitutional issues, because our case here, the settlement</p> <p>9 here as specified by Congress in the Claims Resolution Act</p> <p>10 of 2010 is that this is not a case to be determined for a</p> <p>11 class based on Rule 23, at least as to the certification of</p> <p>12 the trust administration class.</p> <p>13 Having looked briefly at the Wal-Mart decision as</p> <p>14 issued as this morning, there are only two references to the</p> <p>15 due process clause that we could find in the decision, and</p> <p>16 no references to the constitution at all.</p> <p>17 It appears to be specifically geared to addressing</p> <p>18 in the first part of the decision Rule 23(a) and commonality</p> <p>19 as it particularly applies in the case of a class to be</p> <p>20 certified under 23 (b)(2) as a mandatory class. That is not</p> <p>21 the trust administration class here. This trust</p> <p>22 administration class is to be -- was certified as a 23(b)(3)</p> <p>23 class for purposes of the settlement.</p> <p>24 But I think it is informative that the court</p> <p>25 discusses it in two places slip opinion. Due process is</p>	<p>1 to voluntarily waive trial and come to settlement in a</p> <p>2 voluntary agreement with those parties, we believe that</p> <p>3 those due process concerns are no longer an issue for the</p> <p>4 court.</p> <p>5 In that respect, even to the extent that those due</p> <p>6 process considerations amount to beyond a rule issue to a</p> <p>7 constitutional dimension, they don't really apply in the</p> <p>8 context of the settlement here where the defendant has</p> <p>9 protected itself by bargaining at the table to come to a</p> <p>10 settlement.</p> <p>11 The other aspect of Wal-Mart addresses the Rule</p> <p>12 23(b)(2) certification in that case. It focuses primarily</p> <p>13 on the issue of seeking money damages in a mandatory class</p> <p>14 action.</p> <p>15 We agree with the view of plaintiffs as Mr.</p> <p>16 Charnes articulated then that the Wal-Mart decision is</p> <p>17 distinguishable from this case and does not apply here as to</p> <p>18 the 23(b)(2) historical accounting class, but I think for a</p> <p>19 slightly different reason.</p> <p>20 It has always been the government's position</p> <p>21 throughout this litigation that the court's jurisdiction</p> <p>22 being founded on the Administrative Procedure Act for the</p> <p>23 failure and the delay of the defendants to provide the</p> <p>24 implied accounting duty under the 1994 Reform Act was the</p> <p>25 only thing at issue.</p>
Page 179	Page 181
<p>1 mentioned at page 23. In noting that the court has always</p> <p>2 required -- and citing Phillips Petroleum versus Shutts that</p> <p>3 notice and opt out opportunity always be afforded in the</p> <p>4 instance where money damages are to be awarded.</p> <p>5 That is nothing new with respect to the structure</p> <p>6 of the case here.</p> <p>7 Due process also turns up again at page 26 of the</p> <p>8 slip opinion, Your Honor. And there I think it brings to</p> <p>9 the fore a key distinction between this case and the</p> <p>10 settlement here before the court today and the litigation</p> <p>11 going on in the Wal-Mart case, and that is the court says:</p> <p>12 "Contrary to the 9th Circuit's view --"</p> <p>13 And I'm quoting the decision, that slip opinion 26:</p> <p>14 "-- Wal-Mart is entitled to</p> <p>15 Individualized determination</p> <p>16 of each employee's eligibility</p> <p>17 for back pay."</p> <p>18 That is the -- and other courts have recognized</p> <p>19 this as well. The commonality test is not all about</p> <p>20 protecting the absent class members. It is often primarily</p> <p>21 about affording a defendant the right to due process at</p> <p>22 trial. That is to face their accuser and to try each claim</p> <p>23 before a jury at least to the extent it significantly</p> <p>24 differs.</p> <p>25 Here in settlement where a defendant comes forward</p>	<p>1 That is what the plaintiffs could obtain by matter</p> <p>2 of relief was an accounting statement, not money damages.</p> <p>3 To that extent, under even the Wal-Mart decision announced</p> <p>4 today, that holds true.</p> <p>5 As the court recognized in the order that it</p> <p>6 issued last week, the thousand dollar settlement payment is</p> <p>7 not damages. It does not attempt to resolve, or address, or</p> <p>8 release anyone's claim that they had funds mismanaged, or</p> <p>9 that they lost funds in the system. It is merely a payment</p> <p>10 in recognition of the stipulation in the settlement that</p> <p>11 the class is willing to forgo the claim's statutory</p> <p>12 accounting statement for a stipulated agreement as to what</p> <p>13 their balance was as of the record date being September 30,</p> <p>14 2009.</p> <p>15 So in that respect this case, from the</p> <p>16 government's perspective, has never been about money</p> <p>17 damages. It was to result in a statement issued to the</p> <p>18 class members, and then those class members would</p> <p>19 individually determine whether it indicated they were</p> <p>20 missing money. And in that case they could bring a Tucker</p> <p>21 Act claim either in the Court of Federal claims or within</p> <p>22 the jurisdictional limits of the District Court -- in their</p> <p>23 local District Court.</p> <p>24 THE COURT: So the restitution, or payment, or</p> <p>25 whatever you call it, was incidental to the equitable</p>

Page 182	Page 184
<p>1 relief?</p> <p>2 MR. QUINN: Absolutely, Your Honor.</p> <p>3 THE COURT: All right.</p> <p>4 MR. QUINN: And it was part of the claim. The</p> <p>5 claim plaintiffs initially included -- if you go back to the</p> <p>6 original early stages of this case, going back all the way</p> <p>7 back to 1998, Judge Lamberth struck allegations that even</p> <p>8 hinted of damages to perfect a pure Administrative</p> <p>9 Procedures Act claim.</p> <p>10 So in that respect the 23(b)(2) certification here</p> <p>11 continues to be proper even under the Wal-Mart decision,</p> <p>12 having just had a few hours to digest it.</p> <p>13 With respect to that, I think it is important to</p> <p>14 keep in mind that since Congress has exempted the trust</p> <p>15 administration class from the rigors of Rule 23(a) and</p> <p>16 23(b)(3) in terms of certification, the court must look back</p> <p>17 to other authority to determine how to protect absent class</p> <p>18 members' rights and interests in determining whether the</p> <p>19 settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate.</p> <p>20 We have suggested in our briefs, and plaintiffs</p> <p>21 have as well, that the best benchmark for that is the</p> <p>22 Philip's Petroleum versus Shutts decision. That is</p> <p>23 referenced again in -- it is still good law, and it is</p> <p>24 referenced again in today's Wal-Mart decision and in another</p> <p>25 context.</p>	<p>1 plaintiffs fighting against members of their own class.</p> <p>2 Where it was clear that the parties on both sides</p> <p>3 were members of the same class, you obviously have a</p> <p>4 conflict among class members.</p> <p>5 Subsequent decisional authority following</p> <p>6 Hansberry has been to the effect that it cannot be just mere</p> <p>7 speculation or conjecture about a conflict. There has to be</p> <p>8 some proof of an actual conflict.</p> <p>9 And nothing that has been presented either in</p> <p>10 writing, Your Honor, I would submit, or today orally before</p> <p>11 the court in the objections presents any direct evidence of</p> <p>12 an actual conflict that prevents the court from finding</p> <p>13 adequacy of representation.</p> <p>14 The objectors, at least one this morning,</p> <p>15 suggested that the plaintiffs cannot be adequate</p> <p>16 representatives because the named class representatives got</p> <p>17 an individual accounting.</p> <p>18 Your Honor, might be wondering how that came</p> <p>19 about. There was not an accounting in the sense that the</p> <p>20 individual named plaintiffs receiving the formal statements</p> <p>21 that everyone else would do. It is part of the original</p> <p>22 work on discovery in the case.</p> <p>23 Several accounting firms investigated, per an</p> <p>24 agreement of the parties, the named plaintiffs and their</p> <p>25 ancestors' records to try to determine if, in fact, an</p>
Page 183	Page 185
<p>1 But that case identifies -- and a subsequent</p> <p>2 opinion in the Supreme Court and a concurring opinion by</p> <p>3 Judge Ginsburg in the Matsushita Electric Industries case</p> <p>4 versus Epstein, 516 U.S. 367 at page 396 decided a few years</p> <p>5 after Shutts, mentions and describes the Shutts decision as</p> <p>6 saying that this court, quote:</p> <p>7 "Listed minimal procedural</p> <p>8 due process requirements a</p> <p>9 class action money damage --</p> <p>10 a class action money</p> <p>11 judgment must meet."</p> <p>12 It is to bind absentees, and those requirements</p> <p>13 include notice, an opportunity to be heard, a right to opt</p> <p>14 out, and adequate representation. Those are the</p> <p>15 requirements.</p> <p>16 Commonality is not stated among them. The only</p> <p>17 place where it comes into play in this context, in this</p> <p>18 unusual circumstance where Rule 23 does not apply, is to the</p> <p>19 adequacy of the representation.</p> <p>20 We have submitted that if you look at the case</p> <p>21 law on adequacy of representation, the standard requires an</p> <p>22 actual conflict going to the heart of the representation.</p> <p>23 In the Hansberry versus Lee, which I believe Ms. Cravens</p> <p>24 counsel cited, 311 U.S. 32, in 1940, the conflict there</p> <p>25 among the class was that the earlier lawsuit had a class of</p>	<p>1 accounting could even be done.</p> <p>2 So there was a thorough accounting work done, but</p> <p>3 nothing that anyone had ever agreed was tantamount to the</p> <p>4 receipt of the historical statement of account, which was</p> <p>5 the ultimate aim of the historical accounting class</p> <p>6 litigation.</p> <p>7 And even if by chance -- and we don't agree that</p> <p>8 it does -- but if such an accounting work for a named</p> <p>9 plaintiff had, in effect, mooted their claim, which we don't</p> <p>10 believe that it did, there is -- it is well-established that</p> <p>11 a class representative, once in a certified class, can</p> <p>12 continue to represent that class even if their claim winds</p> <p>13 up being mooted.</p> <p>14 There is extensive Supreme Court authority in that regard.</p> <p>15 With respect to the claims that are compromised,</p> <p>16 Your Honor, there are a couple of things that have come</p> <p>17 through in the favor of the objections today. Those that</p> <p>18 argued that their claims are being undervalued, or that they</p> <p>19 will be under compensated as a result of the settlement,</p> <p>20 that is one of the reasons why you have the safeguard for an</p> <p>21 opt out.</p> <p>22 Someone giving notice -- receiving notice of the</p> <p>23 action who disagrees or is concerned for any reason that</p> <p>24 they might not get their money's worth out of the</p> <p>25 settlement, was free to submit an opt out. And several -- a</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 186</p> <p>1 couple of thousand -- close to a couple of thousand people 2 did that. That is the safeguard. 3 This case has also been in settlement mode for 4 well over a year, even before the actual notice period 5 began. The settlement was in front of Congress, and the 6 information about the settlement agreement was available on 7 the Internet, and anyone could look at the principle 8 agreement and see what those terms were. 9 The trust administration class, by definition, 10 excludes anyone who filed a claim prior to the complaint in 11 the trust administration class. So anyone who was 12 concerned that they might be swallowed up in the trust 13 administration class and did not want to deal with it also 14 had the option of, in a sense, jumping ahead in line and 15 filing suit so that they would be outside the definition of 16 class. 17 I think one of the objectors, and I think it was 18 Mr. Carnes this morning, spoke of all of the other issues 19 that lie before people in Indian Country. He talked about 20 health care, educational concerns and economic development. 21 And that is one of the main reasons why the government and 22 the Secretary of Interior, in particular, had pushed to try 23 to resolve all of these claims so that the government could 24 turn the page and establishing a new relationship between 25 the government and the American Indians.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 188</p> <p>1 basis. 2 THE COURT: I had allowed the government some 3 opportunity to communicate with the class members regarding 4 the settlement, particularly the funds. 5 Do you have any feedback on that? That was over 6 objection of the plaintiff at the time I did it. 7 MR. QUINN: I don't know that I have any specifics 8 to relate to Your Honor this morning. I know that one of 9 the reasons why we requested that relief is that the 10 consultation -- the main for asking for the ability to 11 communicate on a broader basis was because the statute -- 12 Congress asked the Department of Interior to consult with 13 Indian tribes on the land consolidation aspects of the 14 settlement going forward, and that means setting up formal 15 conferences with those tribes. 16 I understand that the first ones are scheduled 17 for July 14. These take time to set up. But they will be 18 going on, and there will be further conferences and 19 consultations with tribes and other dates and other 20 locations as the schedule can be arranged. But it has been 21 a more formalized process, and that takes some time to get 22 underway. 23 The other thing about land consolidation, 24 addressing some of the objections that you heard this 25 morning, is that it is voluntary. No one needs to sell land</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 187</p> <p>1 That does not mean that trust reform was done. It 2 does not mean that claims that people have today -- and 3 there were some objectors here arguing about -- mentioning 4 problems that they have today. 5 This lawsuit settlement, and even the approval by 6 the court of the settlement, does not take away those 7 individuals' rights to redress a current grievance. The 8 settlement only releases claims going as far current as 9 September 30, 2009. 10 So if a person knows something is being stolen 11 from their account, or knows something -- is certain that 12 someone is doing something improper, those could still be 13 addressed by a lawsuit going forward. 14 The Department of the Interior and the Secretary's 15 announced a Secretarial Commission on Trust Reform will have 16 an evaluation of the Interior's administration with input by 17 trust beneficiaries, and they hope to hold reasonable 18 listening sessions, and examine the trust duties and what 19 further reforms are necessary. 20 One of the benefits out of the approval of this 21 settlement is that the agreement provides -- and the statute 22 provides that the Land Consolidation Fund allows a certain 23 modest amount of money to go to support -- to fund that 24 commission on an ongoing basis as it continues to identify 25 areas of improvement in trust reform on a going forward</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 189</p> <p>1 that they do not want to sell. 2 The land consolidation process is intended to be 3 put forward to identify smaller fractions of land where it 4 is very difficult to administer and may be meaningless to 5 some owners. If a particular track is meaningful to 6 someone, it is not going to be taken from them. They might 7 be offered some money for it, but they do not have to take 8 it. 9 The other thing with respect to the 'whereabouts 10 unknown' is -- as I read the settlement agreement, the 11 consent on land consolidation will only apply to those class 12 members who are bound by the settlement agreement. And in 13 fact by being in the settlement agreement by contract you 14 are agreeing to those terms going forward. 15 But the money will not just disappear. If after 16 trying for five years to locate the person, identify a tract 17 for sale under that program, the money would then go into a 18 'whereabouts unknown' account and be held for that 19 individual. 20 THE COURT: Tell me now if you are ready to move 21 forward, or is someone else going to address the attorneys' 22 fees issue. 23 MR. QUINN: Let me see, Your Honor, if -- oh, if I 24 could just for a moment address Ms. Works comments about the 25 land issue and the notice issue.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 190</p> <p>1 I think it is important to go back to the very 2 comprehensive notice effort that was undertaken here. In 3 addition to direct notice that was sent out you had posters 4 like this where people were asked to post them in 5 convenience stores, and clinics, government offices, tribal 6 offices, telling people that if you want to get payment you 7 did not have to do anything if you're a current account 8 holder. 9 Your rights -- you could call for further 10 information. This was distributed all over reservations in 11 Indian Country where class members were likely to reside. 12 You had radio advertisements. 13 If you go back and look at Ms. Kinsella's 14 declaration, her declaration at exhibit 6 lists several 15 Cherokee publications where full-page ads were taken out. 16 She has got a Cherokee One Feather Weekly, February 3, full- 17 page ad. Cherokee Feather Weekly, February 17, March 10. 18 Another monthly publication, the Cherokee Phoenix Monthly, 19 two different half page ads in two different issues. 20 So there is outreach, and it doesn't stop there. 21 The settlement agreement provides after approval by this 22 Court of the settlement for further notice efforts to 23 identify people who are in the class who stand to receive 24 payments. 25 I would refer Your Honor to section E of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 192</p> <p>1 THE COURT: Thank you. 2 Mr. Kirschman, are you going to address the legal 3 fee issue at this time? 4 MR. KIRSCHMAN: I am sorry? 5 THE COURT: Are you going to address the legal 6 fees at this time? 7 MR. KIRSCHMAN: Yes, Your Honor, and I will be 8 brief. 9 We have fully addressed the issue of legal fees 10 in our brief, and we stand by that filing. We think that it 11 is important that the court consider what it has heard 12 today, and what it has seen it written objections that have 13 been presented by people who have not appeared today. 14 The government believes that a \$50 million award 15 for all attorney fees, including the inclusion of expenses, 16 is a reasonable amount based on the percentage of funds, a 17 method used in this circuit. 18 There has been no reason why the court should feel 19 compelled to find awards, as I mentioned before, of \$99.9 20 million somehow appropriate just because plaintiffs, in 21 their filing, or class counsel in their filing, have sought 22 a total of \$224 million. We just caution against any 23 weighing in that manner. 24 The settlement agreement leaves it to the court's 25 sound discretion, and we ask that the court exercise that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 191</p> <p>1 settlement agreement. Section E-1 calls for the 2 identification of a special master who would aid in those 3 tasks. Section E-4 provides in part A that there be no 4 payment -- no payout to the trust administration class until 5 class members are substantially identified. 6 4-E -- section E, 4 little E one, speaks to a 7 supplementary notice program to potential class members 8 encouraging them to register. 9 4-E-2 requires the Garden City group to develop a 10 procedure for verifying class members. 11 4-E-3 sets a self-identification period that Mr. 12 Harper spoke to where people can submit information, say, 13 I'm a member of the class. I may not have an IIM account, 14 but I have restricted land. 15 And that is just a fact of the historical record 16 here. There are certain tribes where the records are not 17 with the federal government, and we will probably have to 18 rely to a large extent on self identification from people 19 who can submit information indicating that they are a member 20 of the class. 21 So I would suggest, Your Honor, in closing that 22 the settlement has been thoughtfully approached to be as 23 comprehensive and inclusive as possible and give every class 24 member every opportunity to receive the payments and 25 distributions that they are due under the settlement.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 193</p> <p>1 discretion in determining an appropriate amount. That 2 discretion should, of course, as I mentioned earlier, be 3 guided by the fact that Congress has asked that you consider 4 that the plaintiff classes here are beneficiaries of a 5 federal trust, and that the purpose of this settlement is to 6 provide funds for these beneficiaries. So that is an added 7 consideration. 8 It makes it somewhat unique for the court, but it 9 is an important one, and so we again bring that to your 10 attention and ask that you find a total attorneys' fees of 11 \$50 million is appropriate here. 12 THE COURT: I appreciate that. And I have looked 13 through the materials that have been supplied on attorneys' 14 fees for both sides. Thank you. 15 Counsel for the plaintiffs want to respond to the 16 attorneys' fees issue at all? 17 MR. HARPER: Your Honor, Mr. Gingold is going to 18 address the attorneys' fees as part of his closing, if he 19 could do that at this point. 20 THE COURT: Do you want to summarize anything else 21 first? 22 MR. HARPER: Unless Your Honor has any further 23 questions of me on any of the other objections, we did not 24 have any specific other objections to address. 25 THE COURT: I went through my questions that I had</p>

Page 194	Page 196
<p>1 on this, and I went through all of the objections and most</p> <p>2 of the generic issues. I did not ask specific questions on</p> <p>3 some of the specific objections because they are covered</p> <p>4 otherwise in the concerns that we have discussed.</p> <p>5 Thank you.</p> <p>6 MR. HARPER: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>7 THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, you are going to address</p> <p>8 attorneys' fees?</p> <p>9 MR. GINGOLD: Yes, Your Honor.</p> <p>10 THE COURT: All right.</p> <p>11 MR. GINGOLD: With respect to the attorneys' fees,</p> <p>12 plaintiffs asserted in their petition for class counsel fees</p> <p>13 50 to 99.9 million dollars, expressly in accordance with the</p> <p>14 terms of settlement.</p> <p>15 During the year that it took to negotiate with</p> <p>16 Congress to pass the Claims Resolution Act of 2010, the</p> <p>17 Senate required additional language be added to what had</p> <p>18 been the originally proposed legislation in support of the</p> <p>19 settlement, and that That legislation provided that 50 to</p> <p>20 99.9 million dollars in accordance with controlling law.</p> <p>21 Congress and the Senate unanimously passed this</p> <p>22 and expressly stated that it is this court's determination</p> <p>23 as to what is appropriate and what isn't in accordance with</p> <p>24 controlling law. The 50 to 99.9 million dollar number does</p> <p>25 not establish a ceiling and does not establish a floor.</p>	<p>1 THE COURT: If that is not a binding contract --</p> <p>2 assume for a second that that is not a binding contract that</p> <p>3 binds the court and I can set a reasonable fee under the</p> <p>4 law, is there some evidence of what counsel considers to be</p> <p>5 a reasonable fee in any event?</p> <p>6 MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, there is some evidence</p> <p>7 of what counsel believed they would be -- this is important.</p> <p>8 The terms of settlement were negotiated with regard to the</p> <p>9 plaintiffs prior to any discussion of legal fees during the</p> <p>10 settlement process, which is required in accordance with the</p> <p>11 rules of the D.C. Bar, ethical rules, and I think with</p> <p>12 regard to most judicial decisions.</p> <p>13 The government indicated that it would not appeal</p> <p>14 an amount that this court would award if it was \$99.9</p> <p>15 million or less.</p> <p>16 By that acknowledgment, which is explicit in the</p> <p>17 December 7, 2009 settlement agreement, the government itself</p> <p>18 acknowledged that this court had the authority to award an</p> <p>19 amount more than that and, Your Honor, less than \$50 million</p> <p>20 as well.</p> <p>21 And Your Honor, unlike the black farmers'</p> <p>22 settlement, and the Indian farmers' settlement, those were</p> <p>23 capped fees, and there were floors.</p> <p>24 In the Indian farmers' settlement, which is a</p> <p>25 taxable settlement, and I believe the actual net</p>
Page 195	Page 197
<p>1 THE COURT: How do you get around the agreement as</p> <p>2 part of the class-action settlement agreement -- your fee</p> <p>3 agreement? You call that a clear sailing provision, but it</p> <p>4 seems to me that attorneys may submit a motion for class</p> <p>5 actions counsel's attorneys' fees, expenses and cost</p> <p>6 incurred through December 7, 2009. Such motion shall not</p> <p>7 assert class counsel be paid more than \$99.9 million above</p> <p>8 the previous amounts paid, and then you filed a motion that</p> <p>9 included more than that.</p> <p>10 MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. I think we</p> <p>11 explicitly stated -- or plaintiffs explicitly stated that</p> <p>12 they asserted a fee request of \$99.9 million for class</p> <p>13 counsel subject to controlling law.</p> <p>14 As I tried to explain, subsequent to the agreement</p> <p>15 the Senate required an amendment of the proposed</p> <p>16 legislation, and that amendment was accepted by both the</p> <p>17 defendants and the plaintiff, adding the additional</p> <p>18 provision, subject to controlling law, or words to that</p> <p>19 effect.</p> <p>20 That was not in the original December 7, 2009</p> <p>21 agreement. It was added in the implementing legislation,</p> <p>22 the Claims Resolution Act, because it was explained to us</p> <p>23 that they wanted to be sure that whatever this court does is</p> <p>24 in accordance with controlling law.</p> <p>25 And Your Honor --</p>	<p>1 distribution is something in the nature of \$600 million or</p> <p>2 less, what was approved by the court was \$60.8 million.</p> <p>3 In the black farmers' settlement the ceiling is, I</p> <p>4 think, something like \$92 million. There was no litigation</p> <p>5 surrounding the black farmers' settlement. The black</p> <p>6 farmers' settlement was solely a negotiated agreement</p> <p>7 between the United States and representatives of the black</p> <p>8 farmers.</p> <p>9 There had been litigation 10 years before that had</p> <p>10 been settled which was not perfect, but the settlement that</p> <p>11 was negotiated with a ceiling of about \$92 million, Your</p> <p>12 Honor, was just solely as a result of the negotiations,</p> <p>13 whether they were a few months or longer.</p> <p>14 Your Honor, it was always our understanding when</p> <p>15 neither we nor the government agreed to a ceiling or a floor</p> <p>16 that this court had the authority the award what it decided</p> <p>17 was appropriate and in accordance with the law of this</p> <p>18 circuit.</p> <p>19 The only concession made by the government in that</p> <p>20 regard was that if the ward was in excess of \$99.9 million</p> <p>21 it retained the right to appeal. If it was below \$99.9</p> <p>22 million or below, it waived its right to appeal. That is a</p> <p>23 difference, Your Honor.</p> <p>24 THE COURT: The way you all approach the fee</p> <p>25 request in your pleadings, it is a common funds approach.</p>

Page 198	Page 200
<p>1 What is a common fund? The government has some \$300</p> <p>2 million. You claim all 3.4 billion, and what the trust</p> <p>3 reform will cost, or has cost in the past, as fair</p> <p>4 consideration.</p> <p>5 Can we consider the land consolidation fund as</p> <p>6 part of the common fund for the purpose of attorneys' fees?</p> <p>7 I mean that is a fund that is going to revert back to the</p> <p>8 government if it is not expended.</p> <p>9 MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, our understanding of the</p> <p>10 law as we provided in our briefs is that this court</p> <p>11 ordinarily considers the direct monetary benefits received</p> <p>12 in a settlement or judgment and the tangible benefits that</p> <p>13 are in addition to that that the court can assess in</p> <p>14 deciding what is appropriate.</p> <p>15 Your Honor, what we pointed out in that regard is</p> <p>16 direct monetary benefits are in the nature of about \$1.5</p> <p>17 billion. There are indirect benefits, but there are</p> <p>18 tangible benefits to the class of \$5 billion in trust</p> <p>19 reform.</p> <p>20 When you are reviewing the case law in this</p> <p>21 regard, it is appropriate in this circuit and elsewhere to</p> <p>22 consider tangible benefits that are not direct monetary</p> <p>23 benefits to the class members.</p> <p>24 So we believe they don't necessarily -- or are</p> <p>25 determined on the basis of 15 percent, or 20 percent, or 25</p>	<p>1 Eloise Cobell, we would not have done this, and we did it</p> <p>2 because she approached us and said -- and, Your Honor, Mr.</p> <p>3 Harper and Mr. Pearl are Indians. Mr. Harper as he said is</p> <p>4 a Cherokee. Mr. Pearl as a Chickasaw.</p> <p>5 They are important members of the litigation</p> <p>6 team. Everybody on the litigation team is important, Your</p> <p>7 Honor, but they are very important. They bring a</p> <p>8 perspective that those of us who are not Indian would never</p> <p>9 have understood.</p> <p>10 But she asked them to do it because she said,</p> <p>11 nobody will do it. We have an abuse that has gone on for</p> <p>12 generations. She saw her parents and grandparents suffer.</p> <p>13 She saw children and others suffer. And she said, if you</p> <p>14 don't do it, who is going to do it?</p> <p>15 And she made one request of us when we do this.</p> <p>16 She said, I don't know if we are going to have any money to</p> <p>17 pay you, but you have to promise me that if we start this</p> <p>18 you are going to finish it, because we cannot afford to have</p> <p>19 you walk out of our litigation. We have to win because it</p> <p>20 is so important, symbolically and otherwise, to individual</p> <p>21 Indians.</p> <p>22 Those of us who are on the team -- and these are</p> <p>23 some of the most extraordinary people, Your Honor. I have</p> <p>24 been practicing law for 37 years. I was a partner in major</p> <p>25 law firms. These are some of the most extraordinary people</p>
Page 199	Page 201
<p>1 percent, which is often determined in class-action cases,</p> <p>2 but some value is associated with those benefits.</p> <p>3 Your Honor, the \$1.9 billion -- it is possible</p> <p>4 that no money out of the \$1.9 billion will be paid to an</p> <p>5 individual Indian, because individual Indians may refuse to</p> <p>6 sell. That is possible. We don't believe it is likely, but</p> <p>7 it is possible, Your Honor, and therefore all of that money</p> <p>8 would revert.</p> <p>9 In addition, Your Honor, of that \$1.9 billion, 15</p> <p>10 percent of that is available for the government to pay its</p> <p>11 fees and expenses. That's 15 percent of just the</p> <p>12 distribution of \$1.9 billion, which it apparently believed</p> <p>13 was reasonable to pay for its contractors, and at the time</p> <p>14 associated just with the purchase of fractionated interest</p> <p>15 from individuals who would receive the benefit of the funds</p> <p>16 once the purchase is consummated.</p> <p>17 Your Honor, we have been in this litigation for 15</p> <p>18 years -- well, more than 15 years now. The litigation has</p> <p>19 been some of the most difficult and intense litigation in</p> <p>20 the history of this circuit.</p> <p>21 We have done whatever needed to be done whether or</p> <p>22 not we would be paid, and Your Honor, some of us have not</p> <p>23 been paid since 1998, and we have done it. And this is</p> <p>24 important.</p> <p>25 I would say, Your Honor, that if it was not for</p>	<p>1 I have worked with.</p> <p>2 It does not make any difference if anyone was</p> <p>3 being paid. It would not stop someone from working all</p> <p>4 night. It would not stop whatever was necessary to be</p> <p>5 done. But, Your Honor, what Judge Lamberth said, and what</p> <p>6 this court has said, Your Honor, has said himself, in other</p> <p>7 class action cases, first of all it is the results that</p> <p>8 counts.</p> <p>9 Secondly, you look at the effort.</p> <p>10 Thirdly you look at the difficulty.</p> <p>11 Fourthly you look at the risk.</p> <p>12 Fifthly, you look at the sacrifice.</p> <p>13 And then you look, Your Honor, generally at how</p> <p>14 the case was litigated and what the obstacles were. Your</p> <p>15 Honor, I think it is fair to say there is no case in the</p> <p>16 history of this circuit that has been more intensely</p> <p>17 litigated against a more formidable opponent.</p> <p>18 We do not have to go through what was done, why</p> <p>19 things were done over the 15 years, but I think it's fair to</p> <p>20 say that the government vigorously litigated and defended</p> <p>21 the positions of the United States.</p> <p>22 Whether we agreed with them on how they did it,</p> <p>23 they did it vigorously, and Your Honor, at one point in time</p> <p>24 our litigation team faced the Civil Division of the</p> <p>25 Department of Justice, the Environment and Natural Resources</p>

Page 202	Page 204
<p>1 Division of the Department of Justice, the U.S. Attorney's 2 Office in Washington, the Solicitors Office of the Interior, 3 Treasury General counsel, White House counsel, and 54 law 4 firms. 5 This is what we have done, and we did this 6 knowing fully well we may never get paid. We did this 7 knowing fully well that some of us were not being paid. But 8 we did it. 9 What we want is something that this court 10 determines is fair. We will accept this court's decision. 11 But Ms. Cobell -- everything that Ms. Cobell says is 12 meaningful. This is not lip service. This is not a 13 political speech. 14 It is important to her -- and it is so important 15 to her that whatever she is dealing with right now she is 16 paying attention to this case. She is convinced, and at 17 from those of us who have gone to Indian Country, and I have 18 traveled thousands of miles in Indian Country and met with 19 thousands of individual Indians, including one particular 20 session where more than 1,000 Navajo at one meeting attended 21 the session on this settlement. 22 Your Honor, contrary to what you may have heard 23 today, individual Indians understand how important these 24 issues are to them. They do not throw away what they 25 receive in the mail with regard to Cobell, and they pay</p>	<p>1 Based on those percentages of the 99.9 million, 2 they would have paid us \$27 a year. If it was more -- or 3 no, I think it was less than that. It was about \$14 a year, 4 and then I think 123 which was the number on 14.75 percent, 5 not 15, it was like \$27 year. 6 Your Honor, I can tell you that that covers a 7 couple of car washes a year in the Dakotas. It covers one 8 here in Washington. And Your Honor, there are not a lot of 9 lawyers who would do it for the price of a car wash, but 10 that's what we're talking about here. 11 And let me say one other thing. There is nothing 12 I think you can identify that can properly quantify the 13 importance of the settlement. This is the first time in 14 history where an individual Indian was able to stand up on 15 the same podium as a person of equal stature with the 16 President of the United States, the Attorney General and the 17 Secretary of Interior. 18 Eloise Cabell and other class representatives were 19 not CEOs of major companies. They were not chairman of 20 major tribes. This was important. Individual Indians did 21 this for themselves, and the lawyers who represented the 22 individual Indians did it for them. Not for tribes, not for 23 personal -- any personal benefit, because Your Honor, I will 24 assure you there were no personal benefits that have come 25 out of this representation.</p>
Page 203	Page 205
<p>1 attention. They listen. They discuss with us what the 2 issues are. 3 These issues -- and Your Honor, we are talking 4 about millions of dollars. It may seem high in Washington, 5 but it's extraordinary in Indian Country. Whether you go 6 to the Dakotas where people need \$20 to fill a propane tank 7 in order to have heat in the winter, or if you go to the 8 Navajo, where most of the people we met with did not speak 9 English and we needed a Navajo translator with us all the 10 time, they understand what millions of dollars mean in legal 11 fees. 12 But I will tell you what they told me, and I will 13 tell you what they told my colleagues. For years people 14 have come from Washington and told them that they were 15 going to do things, and told them don't worry about it, and 16 this is the first time anyone has ever done anything for 17 them. 18 Whatever the fee was, because they could not get 19 lawyers, Your Honor. It is not -- one of the things we 20 pointed out, let's say that it is an \$1,800 payment to 21 someone in South Dakota because that person may have an 22 account, but the land doesn't generate income other than a 23 few dollars a year, whether it's 76 or 25. So they would be 24 getting \$1,800, which is the expected minimum, not 15, and 25 it is tax-free.</p>	<p>1 So Your Honor, we will abide by whatever this 2 court believes is fair, and we understand why the government 3 is arguing for the minimum, because this government made the 4 same argument, by the way, in Indian farmers, and Judge 5 Sullivan awarded the maximum in Indian farmers. I 6 guarantee you this case has been more intensely litigated 7 than Indian farmers. 8 And Your Honor, I cannot imagine a more difficult 9 assignment than what we have had. People have been away 10 from families. We not only have seen members of our class 11 die and become ill, we have seen our own families going 12 through the same process. 13 But at no time did anybody on the litigation team 14 waiver and say, I cannot do it anymore. The people who are 15 class counsel have done something I don't believe this court 16 will ever see done again. I hope it will be, and I hope 17 people are encouraged to do it again. But it's going to be 18 very difficult. 19 I think if the fees are unreasonable and do not 20 represent what has been achieved and the effort has been 21 made, everything that Eloise was trying to do will be lost, 22 because this is the first step in ensuring the relationship 23 between the United States and individuals goes forward on a 24 footing where people are equal, where people are not 25 patronize, where people are viewed as human beings who have</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 206</p> <p>1 the same rights as everyone else.</p> <p>2 And Your Honor, as Mr. Harper says, that is</p> <p>3 important. He believes that people are entitled to it. Our</p> <p>4 clients are entitled to it, and Your Honor, that is why we</p> <p>5 have been in this case.</p> <p>6 If this court believes that based on whatever has</p> <p>7 been done in accordance with controlling law, we haven't met</p> <p>8 it, we can accept that. If this court believes that</p> <p>9 whatever it awards the fee to be is fair, Your Honor, I</p> <p>10 guarantee we will accept that.</p> <p>11 Your Honor, I trust that was responsive.</p> <p>12 THE COURT: Fully.</p> <p>13 MR. GINGOLD: Thank you.</p> <p>14 THE COURT: Mr. Kirschman, do you want to say</p> <p>15 something? I am going to take a short recess.</p> <p>16 MR. KIRSCHMAN: Yes, Your Honor.</p> <p>17 A few points on the attorneys' fees issue. Class</p> <p>18 counsel seems -- first, I believe Mr. Gingold indicated that</p> <p>19 in their initial petition for fees that they did not request</p> <p>20 \$224 million. They in fact only requested 99.9. All you</p> <p>21 have to do is look at the proposed order that accompanied</p> <p>22 their filing, Your Honor, and you will see that it clearly</p> <p>23 requested \$224 million, as did the last page of their</p> <p>24 petition. So there should be no question what was going on</p> <p>25 here.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 208</p> <p>1 case, Your Honor, the fee should be limited to that amount</p> <p>2 that counsel contributed to, that counsel worked towards</p> <p>3 achieving for the plaintiff.</p> <p>4 And here, Your Honor, that amount is approximately</p> <p>5 \$360 million. As you heard today and as we discussed in our</p> <p>6 briefs, there are approximately 360,000 class -- historical</p> <p>7 accounting class members, each who will receive \$1,000. The</p> <p>8 trust administration claim, as you know, was never</p> <p>9 litigated, and therefore that should not be a part of the</p> <p>10 award.</p> <p>11 Finally, again, Mr. Gingold speaks passionately</p> <p>12 about the benefits of the settlement for the class, and we</p> <p>13 certainly join in the request that the settlement be</p> <p>14 approved as fair, reasonable and adequate.</p> <p>15 But -- but, there is \$50 million or more riding on</p> <p>16 the issue of attorneys' fees, and that \$50 billion would</p> <p>17 directly affect the amount that these class members receive.</p> <p>18 So we think that is an important issue tied to this whole</p> <p>19 discussion today.</p> <p>20 Again, we only ask that you make note of those</p> <p>21 objections as you received them.</p> <p>22 THE COURT: Thank you very much.</p> <p>23 Robert O'Brian, Esquire, had filed a motion to</p> <p>24 intervene on behalf of Mark Brown, one of the attorneys who</p> <p>25 is claiming monies. The plaintiff had opposed the other</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 207</p> <p>1 Second, class counsel treat the 2010 Act as some</p> <p>2 kind of intervening event that changed the status of the</p> <p>3 attorney fee issue subsequent to our good faith</p> <p>4 negotiations.</p> <p>5 Your Honor, that just is not true, and I want to</p> <p>6 point your attention, if I may, to section 101(g)(3) of the</p> <p>7 2010 Act. Section (g) addresses the incentive awards and</p> <p>8 the award of attorneys' fees, expenses and costs under the</p> <p>9 settlement agreement, but (g)(3), subsection (g)(3) state</p> <p>10 specifically under a heading, affect on agreement, it states</p> <p>11 specifically:</p> <p>12 "Nothing in this subsection limits</p> <p>13 or otherwise affects the</p> <p>14 enforceability of the agreement</p> <p>15 on attorneys' fees, expenses and</p> <p>16 costs."</p> <p>17 The 2010 Act did not change or modify anything</p> <p>18 related to the attorney fee agreement the parties have</p> <p>19 reached, and that subsection makes it clear.</p> <p>20 Counsel also mention the \$5 billion in trust</p> <p>21 reform action. That action was paid for and taken by the</p> <p>22 United States. There should be no benefit to class counsel</p> <p>23 for actions taken as part of the Department of Interior's</p> <p>24 trust responsibilities and policy actions.</p> <p>25 Under Swedish Hospital, which is precedent in this</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 209</p> <p>1 applicant, who had also applied for attorneys' fees to</p> <p>2 intervene. I allowed that person. I will allow Mr. Brown</p> <p>3 to intervene with Mr. O'Brian to represent him in this</p> <p>4 matter.</p> <p>5 I'm going to do as follows. I am going to take a</p> <p>6 short recess for about 10 minutes, and then because of the</p> <p>7 individual plaintiffs, class representatives, the individual</p> <p>8 objectors who have come from all over the country, who I'm</p> <p>9 sure it's very difficult to travel for them and an expense,</p> <p>10 I'm going to make an oral ruling on the matters pending</p> <p>11 before me that will then be followed by a written ruling on</p> <p>12 the record.</p> <p>13 But it is important I think today to have some of</p> <p>14 these matters resolved for the parties, particularly for all</p> <p>15 of those who have traveled so far to be here and to hear the</p> <p>16 ruling of the court and understand what I'm saying and why</p> <p>17 at this time.</p> <p>18 So I will take about a ten minute recess and be</p> <p>19 back to finish the case.</p> <p>20 (Recess.)</p> <p>21 THE COURT: The parties today have appeared before</p> <p>22 me, together with the objectors and interested parties. The</p> <p>23 record should note that there has been standing room only in</p> <p>24 the courtroom throughout these proceedings.</p> <p>25 On this fairness hearing as to whether or not to</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 210</p> <p>1 approve the plaintiffs' and defendants' joint motion for 2 final approval of the settlement and enter of final 3 judgment. 4 I am going to make some remarks, a bench opinion - 5 - that means an oral opinion. I will do it at this time. 6 As I mentioned earlier, it will be followed by a written 7 opinion for the record. 8 We've heard somewhat about the background of this 9 case and the history which really resulted and lie, I think, 10 in 19th century American politics, and the western movement 11 that resulted in the seizing of the Indian lands, and as the 12 wealth in those lands became apparent, the continued 13 expansion of the government into the Indian lands. 14 The policies are well known which resulted where 15 we are today. They are very complex, and it would not help 16 to review all of those at this time, but there is no 17 question as to the legitimate concerns that were raised by 18 the American Indians in this litigation. 19 It really stems from the General Allocation Act of 20 1887, or the Dawes Act. These allotments which were given 21 to Indians to be held in trust by the government. 22 Modification over years as we have heard from some of the 23 people who appeared before me today resulted in less lands, 24 and eventually the government holds millions of acres of 25 Indian lands in trust.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 212</p> <p>1 accounting of all monies held in the IIM Trust. 2 The Court of Appeals affirmed as to the liability 3 issue. That was in 1999. Here we are in 2011. What 4 followed was major litigation warfare. There were some 10 5 appeals, seven trials, 250 days of court hearings to reach 6 this stage. And as was pointed out by one of the counsel 7 today, the Court of Appeals stated in their last opinion, 8 which we call Cobell 22 from the Circuit Court, quote: 9 "Our precedence do not clearly 10 point to any exit from this 11 complicated legal morass." 12 So it looked upon the last remand from Judge 13 Robertson who had the case and found restitution due for the 14 failure to do an accounting of about \$455 million. That was 15 reversed, and we were back here a couple of years ago to 16 start over in the litigation in some ways. 17 The comment about the judge that handled this 18 case, Judge Lamberth took this on and handled it 19 extraordinarily, dedicated to his work, handled the bulk of 20 this litigation for many many years. And I indicated it was 21 a legal warfare. That is a fair description of it. 22 It engaged attorneys legally fighting with each 23 other constantly. It engaged multiple law firms and lawyers 24 at the Justice Department and outside of the Justice 25 Department. It engaged various subsidiary proceedings</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 211</p> <p>1 The government had promised it would fulfill its 2 obligations as trustee when it took these lands, and what 3 happened was the government mismanaged these resources on a 4 staggering scale. 5 That was established through this litigation 6 perhaps more openly than in the past. It is not new, these 7 claims of trust mismanagement. They have been around for 8 100 years. 9 Our Congress has done a study. There have been 10 hearings starting in the early 1900s until rather recently 11 decrying the state of the Indian Trust affairs, but 12 nothing substantively really happened until this litigation 13 began. 14 Finally, just over 15 years ago on June 10 of 15 1996, the class of Native American beneficiaries of the 16 individual Indian money trust accounts filed this class 17 action here in the federal court in Washington D. C. to 18 address the claims of alleged breaches of fiduciary duties 19 relating to those accounts by the government, really asking 20 for an equitable accounting. Attached to that was basically 21 claims of trust mismanagement. 22 Judge Lamberth certified the class back in 1997, 23 and in 1999 the court found that they were in breach -- that 24 the government was in breach of its statutory trust duties, 25 and ordered the defendants to provide plaintiffs an accurate</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 213</p> <p>1 involving violation of court orders and discovery issues 2 that subsumed the main litigation for a time. 3 Judge Lamberth's patience over many years of hard 4 work night and day on this case eventually resulted in some 5 very strong opinions decrying the government's actions, and 6 the Circuit Court suggested that he should step aside, that 7 he had lost his objectivity. 8 And so despite his heroic efforts, the case was 9 reassigned. I was Chief Judge at the time when this was 10 made, and I was assigned the task of finding a judge who 11 had the time and talent to handle this on our court, and 12 Judge Robertson appeared on the scene, and he took the case 13 over. 14 He handled it until his retirement. He was 15 distressed that he had to retire before he could finish the 16 case. He also was very interested in seeing this through 17 and seeing that justice be done eventually. 18 Any good deed that you do comes back to haunt you. 19 After I finished being Chief Judge and took senior status I 20 got the case. So I assumed control of the case. 21 The parties were trying to find out where to go 22 next. Because of the status of the last reversal from the 23 circuit and the prospects, I think, of years of litigation 24 facing them on both sides, with rather dubious chances of 25 ultimate success, frankly, if you read the law carefully as</p>

Page 214	Page 216
<p>1 developed by our Circuit. Rightfully or wrongfully, that is</p> <p>2 the final word basically.</p> <p>3 So they entered into negotiations, and the</p> <p>4 administrations changed, and the parties found a way out of</p> <p>5 the morass that the Court of Appeals said they saw no easy</p> <p>6 exit from, and after 15 years of bitter litigation, and that</p> <p>7 is the only way to say it, the parties entered into a</p> <p>8 settlement agreement to resolve the issues in this case, and</p> <p>9 just the issues in this case, not to resolve every single</p> <p>10 claim that the Native Americans may have against the</p> <p>11 government.</p> <p>12 And as a result of that settlement there were some</p> <p>13 amended orders defining the historical accounting class and</p> <p>14 creating the trust administration class to facilitate the</p> <p>15 appropriate remedies for the IIM account holders so they</p> <p>16 could be resolved as well.</p> <p>17 Remarkably, I think, Congress, which seems not to</p> <p>18 be able to get along and do anything these days, remarkably</p> <p>19 Congress approved and passed a law approving this settlement</p> <p>20 and approving the trust administration class creation in a</p> <p>21 way.</p> <p>22 Under what we call the Claims Resolution Act of</p> <p>23 2010, it requires the entire Senate's agreement. They</p> <p>24 ratified this settlement, and appropriating the funds, which</p> <p>25 is the most important part of that, to resolve these claims.</p>	<p>1 litigation, personal litigation on some levels between the</p> <p>2 parties, and resolve this matter, and the plaintiffs managed</p> <p>3 to do the same after having been, they felt, badly treated</p> <p>4 for 15 years by the government, not only their clients but</p> <p>5 the lawyers themselves as well.</p> <p>6 It is, I think, a testament to the better</p> <p>7 functioning, and I'm glad to see the legal system that these</p> <p>8 parties could do that -- these counsel could do that.</p> <p>9 Now what has come about as a result of this</p> <p>10 settlement is the historical agreement to resolve some of</p> <p>11 the past mistakes and wrongs that have occurred. Obviously</p> <p>12 not all. It is not meant to solve all problems.</p> <p>13 We heard today telling, sometimes tragic stories,</p> <p>14 and deep concerns evidenced by some who are affected by the</p> <p>15 settlement, have been affected by the mismanagement over the</p> <p>16 years.</p> <p>17 One of the concerns the court obviously had was</p> <p>18 this -- in a way that this litigation could have terminated</p> <p>19 successfully. Well, many of the documents simply do not</p> <p>20 exist in the government records any longer. They were</p> <p>21 either destroyed as old and unneeded when they should have</p> <p>22 been kept perhaps, or allowed to be destroyed because of bad</p> <p>23 storage practice, or lost over hundreds of years, or simply</p> <p>24 not created when they should have been.</p> <p>25 On the plaintiffs' side, many of their</p>
Page 215	Page 217
<p>1 Now a few months later it is hard to realize that that has</p> <p>2 been accomplished, and that was through the efforts of both</p> <p>3 sides.</p> <p>4 I don't think today's world, with the deficit we</p> <p>5 are facing, and the issues they are debating in Congress,</p> <p>6 that this would ever pass. It was very fortuitous, and hard</p> <p>7 work by the parties, to get this through when they did.</p> <p>8 I think that the Executive Branch acted extremely</p> <p>9 well in doing this. Both the Attorney General and the</p> <p>10 Associate Attorney General, the Department of Interior,</p> <p>11 Secretary Salazar, David Hayes, the Deputy Secretary was</p> <p>12 ultimately involved.</p> <p>13 All contributed to get this settlement through,</p> <p>14 and it could not have been accomplished without the</p> <p>15 approval of the President, who could have denied it at any</p> <p>16 time he wished, particularly on the grounds of the deficit</p> <p>17 today. But he executed the agreement and signed the</p> <p>18 legislation into order. Just a remarkable accomplishment by</p> <p>19 all sides.</p> <p>20 The Justice Department, who had hard fought this</p> <p>21 for 15 years, and the legal issues involved -- legitimately</p> <p>22 fought it legally, and it was not improper that they did so.</p> <p>23 They represent their client, the United States, and felt</p> <p>24 that they had defenses to these claims, was willing to</p> <p>25 resolve the claims, put aside very bitter, unfortunate</p>	<p>1 documentations are lacking as well. It makes it very</p> <p>2 difficult for them, and they have expressed some of their</p> <p>3 concerns here. So it made it difficult as to determine, I</p> <p>4 think, for any court that there could ever be an accurate</p> <p>5 accounting done.</p> <p>6 Despite Judge Lamberth's many orders, the circuit</p> <p>7 really, I think, determined that there could never be an</p> <p>8 accurate historical accounting done. There might have been</p> <p>9 some type of generic accounting, but where we would that get</p> <p>10 you?</p> <p>11 This settlement at least now provides some measure</p> <p>12 of certainty for most class members. The vast majority of</p> <p>13 class members are entitled to automatic recovery under the</p> <p>14 historical accounting, and then those under the trust</p> <p>15 accounting would provide other monies that they can show</p> <p>16 they are due.</p> <p>17 It may not be that the results are as fortuitous</p> <p>18 as some wished and don't provide redress for their wrongs,</p> <p>19 and I'm sympathetic to the reasons the various class members</p> <p>20 would have wanted class counsel to have struck a better</p> <p>21 balance or struck it differently in negotiations, or made</p> <p>22 sure whether items could be covered, but I'm certainly not</p> <p>23 persuaded that striking a different balance would have been</p> <p>24 either achievable in the negotiating process or more</p> <p>25 favorable to more members of the class.</p>

Page 218	Page 220
<p>1 I'm certainly not convinced that a better result</p> <p>2 would have been achieved by taking this case to trial. Some</p> <p>3 people said, let's take it all the way. Let's go all the</p> <p>4 way this case. That is easy to say, but to deal with the</p> <p>5 substantial issues legal issues after 10 appeals, and nine</p> <p>6 basically outright reversals of those appeals with lower</p> <p>7 court victories.</p> <p>8 It is hard to see how there would be a better</p> <p>9 result if there had been eventually an accounting ordered</p> <p>10 that could ever be done and was ever accomplished in the</p> <p>11 years that that may have taken to do some type of an</p> <p>12 accounting, then each individual plaintiff would have to</p> <p>13 sue in the Court of Claims to try to claim the amount that</p> <p>14 they were due under the accounting if they disagreed with</p> <p>15 it.</p> <p>16 We have lost too many members of the class already</p> <p>17 in waiting the 15 years that this has been going on. Ms.</p> <p>18 Cobell probably started this 20 years ago trying to get this</p> <p>19 going, and to prolong this through litigation simply to say</p> <p>20 we could have won something at the end, whatever it may be,</p> <p>21 seems to me shortsighted.</p> <p>22 Obviously, each member of the class wants a</p> <p>23 settlement to provide the greatest possible compensation to</p> <p>24 each individual in the class and to them personally. I</p> <p>25 cannot conclude in the final balance that what has been</p>	<p>1 whether or not I should approve the final certification of</p> <p>2 the classes and enter judgment in accordance with the</p> <p>3 agreement, approve it as fair, reasonable, adequate and</p> <p>4 binding on the class members who have not timely opted out,</p> <p>5 and approve what I would award as reasonable, fees, expenses</p> <p>6 and costs, as well as incentive awards, and to pay the valid</p> <p>7 claims once we finalize the judgment.</p> <p>8 What is the settlement about? What are the</p> <p>9 amounts? We discussed at length here today. This historic</p> <p>10 -- I think it is truly the historic largest settlement in</p> <p>11 the history of the United States in any case that has ever</p> <p>12 been brought against the United States.</p> <p>13 One counsel indicated that if you add up all of</p> <p>14 the Indian claims cases in history and the amounts that have</p> <p>15 been paid, this eclipses them.</p> <p>16 So it will operate by having a historic accounting</p> <p>17 class where each member is paid thousand dollars, and</p> <p>18 release the government's obligation to perform the</p> <p>19 historical accounting for that -- to their IIM account.</p> <p>20 If the member opts out of the trust administration</p> <p>21 class, they are entitled to an accounting, and entitled to</p> <p>22 the appropriate methods of proof to do that.</p> <p>23 The other class created was a trust administration</p> <p>24 class. Once you identify the members and their pro rata</p> <p>25 share, by their calculations they each receive a base amount</p>
Page 219	Page 221
<p>1 agreed to by counsel on behalf of the class, after notice to</p> <p>2 the class, and explanations given, and reviewing the</p> <p>3 objections is anything but fair.</p> <p>4 Not having perhaps some draconian enough</p> <p>5 punishment for this mismanagement and this neglect to fit</p> <p>6 what they feel the crime is, and based upon them I can</p> <p>7 understand their are outrage and sense umbrage they have</p> <p>8 felt over the years.</p> <p>9 It does not take a person who is familiar with the</p> <p>10 history of the American Indian to understand their concerns.</p> <p>11 You can read Chief Joseph's statement and get a pretty good</p> <p>12 feeling for their concern.</p> <p>13 But that is not possible to resolve in this case.</p> <p>14 This case is trying to resolve the accounting issue, and by</p> <p>15 doing that you will receive a payment of thousand dollars in</p> <p>16 lieu of having an individual accounting, and secondly to</p> <p>17 resolve the trust claims.</p> <p>18 If you wish to stay a member of the class you can</p> <p>19 do so and resolve it that way, or you can withdraw from that</p> <p>20 and try to do the accounting and then try to collect what</p> <p>21 you think you are due for the mismanagement, and perhaps do</p> <p>22 better.</p> <p>23 But the process has gone on long enough. The</p> <p>24 court has the litigation resolved with the Claims Resolution</p> <p>25 Act and the settlement agreement, and I have to consider</p>	<p>1 that has been estimated at an \$800 base amount according to</p> <p>2 a formula that is outlined in the agreement, and then some</p> <p>3 Indians who are qualified under that account generate large</p> <p>4 amounts of revenue and could have funds generated in excess</p> <p>5 of \$1 million. Again, they will be released as to that.</p> <p>6 And then there is created very cleverly an Indian</p> <p>7 education scholarship fund. I think that was added late in</p> <p>8 initiate negotiations. It went through Congress. That's an</p> <p>9 important factor for the resolution of these claims.</p> <p>10 Again, as indicated in my questioning of counsel,</p> <p>11 that will result in a fund that will be created for the</p> <p>12 education -- for higher education of the Indian populations,</p> <p>13 and that will be done under independent trustees apart from</p> <p>14 the Department of Interior, to issue appropriate rules and</p> <p>15 regulations to awarding of scholarships to the qualified</p> <p>16 Indian children, which will not affect any other rights they</p> <p>17 have to other educational funds.</p> <p>18 Additionally, the settlement and the law that</p> <p>19 passed, the Claims Resolution Act, formed a \$1.9 billion</p> <p>20 land consolidation program that we discussed at length. It</p> <p>21 goes on for 10 years.</p> <p>22 Moneys not spent in that program to purchase</p> <p>23 fractionalized shares -- trust land from willing sellers --</p> <p>24 the land would go back to tribal supervision. It does not</p> <p>25 go back to be controlled by the government directly, and</p>

Page 222	Page 224
<p>1 that will go for 10 years, and then the funds will be</p> <p>2 reverted back to the Treasury. That, again, is a program</p> <p>3 that would help in this trust reform effort. The government</p> <p>4 has indicated they have already spent \$5 billion on</p> <p>5 attempting to straighten out the situation, separate from</p> <p>6 this case.</p> <p>7 Now the Indian educational scholarship fund, as I</p> <p>8 understand it, is funded by three sources. The balance of</p> <p>9 the accounting trust administration fund, once that is</p> <p>10 completed; certain payments made to class members whose</p> <p>11 whereabouts are unknown and do not claim payments after five</p> <p>12 years; and contributions of the land consolidation fund for</p> <p>13 the purchases made there under as indicated by counsel.</p> <p>14 That is a sweetener to help sell the land back to</p> <p>15 consolidate the fractionated shares so it can be a better</p> <p>16 program run in the future.</p> <p>17 Now consideration of the factors that the court</p> <p>18 has been asked to consider have been listed by counsel</p> <p>19 several times under the Phillips Petroleum case, whether or</p> <p>20 not I would approve the accuracy and fairness of this</p> <p>21 settlement.</p> <p>22 I hope you're not holding your breath. I will</p> <p>23 find my cite here in a minute.</p> <p>24 Looking under the Rule 23 that you have heard</p> <p>25 discussions about here today, this seems fair, and adequate,</p>	<p>1 I have never seen, and I handled the largest</p> <p>2 price-fixing case in the history of the United States, the</p> <p>3 In re: Vitamins case, notice to the extent sent out in this</p> <p>4 case, and some have reflected monies and costs, which are</p> <p>5 millions of dollars, which I was kind of taken aback when</p> <p>6 counsel approached me to spend that much money.</p> <p>7 But I became convinced to try to alert the Indian</p> <p>8 Nation to this settlement that they should know what the</p> <p>9 terms are and what it is about, and I allowed them to</p> <p>10 provide notice in every possible way, including personally</p> <p>11 going out and visiting all of the affected tribal areas.</p> <p>12 It is just not a letter from Washington. It is a</p> <p>13 tremendous effort that was undergone, both by the plaintiffs</p> <p>14 principally and some by the government, to not only give</p> <p>15 notice but to explain what happened.</p> <p>16 And not only are we using modern technology to do</p> <p>17 that, but such things as posting notice at the local 7-11,</p> <p>18 putting the town meetings together, and personally going out</p> <p>19 there to be seen and talked to. Word-of-mouth. There is</p> <p>20 just no question that this was covered in all of the local</p> <p>21 papers constantly. It was covered in all of the local</p> <p>22 advertising outlets. It was hard to miss.</p> <p>23 As a side note, I go to Montana two or three times</p> <p>24 a year, and you could not miss the advertisements if you are</p> <p>25 out there about this. So I'm satisfied that there was</p>
Page 223	Page 225
<p>1 and appropriate as to the approval of this settlement, and</p> <p>2 that is essentially what the basis of the request that is</p> <p>3 before me today by both counsel with the joint motion that</p> <p>4 they have filed as I indicated previously.</p> <p>5 The court is going to order approval of the</p> <p>6 settlement. I am going to find that it is fair, reasonable,</p> <p>7 adequate, and it is appropriately binding on the class</p> <p>8 members who have not timely opted out of the trust</p> <p>9 administration class, and I do so for not only the reasons I</p> <p>10 have articulated, but there is just no question in looking</p> <p>11 at whether the objectives of the law and the Constitution</p> <p>12 have been satisfied in these areas.</p> <p>13 Sufficient notice and an opportunity to appear,</p> <p>14 and object, and be heard, and to opt out if you wish.</p> <p>15 Adequate representation has been made, and those factors</p> <p>16 apply to both classes, the historical accounting class as</p> <p>17 well as the trust administration class.</p> <p>18 So I'm going to address the generic provisions</p> <p>19 first. I just mentioned under the case law, I don't know</p> <p>20 whether it is considered essential, before I get to the Rule</p> <p>21 23 issues as to notice.</p> <p>22 There has been one claim that the Indian culture</p> <p>23 that they would not respond and getting a piece of mail from</p> <p>24 the federal government, but there've been multiple</p> <p>25 alternative notices sent out.</p>	<p>1 adequate notice, sufficient notice given, despite some</p> <p>2 cultural concerns about how the notice would be perceived, I</p> <p>3 don't know of any other way it could have been done better</p> <p>4 in this case.</p> <p>5 There have been opportunities to object and</p> <p>6 appear. That was clearly, I hope, communicated -- it seems</p> <p>7 to me it was from the notices I reviewed, and we did have</p> <p>8 people who traveled long distances, and I'm sure under some</p> <p>9 great difficulties.</p> <p>10 There are some people here today who came before</p> <p>11 the court and spoke in the finest tradition of our court,</p> <p>12 to be able to have the court hear them personally and</p> <p>13 directly. It is much more meaningful than just reading it</p> <p>14 on the cold paper, to see these people, look them in the</p> <p>15 eye, and hear their concerns, and try to understand their</p> <p>16 concerns, and to make a judgment that is appropriate in this</p> <p>17 case.</p> <p>18 I was greatly helpful to the court. I took all of</p> <p>19 the comments and kept them in mind as I reviewed this and</p> <p>20 consider the approval or not.</p> <p>21 There is an opt-out provision for the class, the</p> <p>22 trust administration class, under the rule, and that was</p> <p>23 allowed to be done. People did exercise themselves of that</p> <p>24 right and can continue their litigation in that regard if</p> <p>25 they wish to do so.</p>

Page 226	Page 228
<p>1 As to the historical accounting class, and I will</p> <p>2 discuss that in a minute, that was certified under 23 that</p> <p>3 allowed us to continue the provision with the opting out</p> <p>4 and not directly allowed unless there is some historical</p> <p>5 reason brought to my attention as to why it had to be done.</p> <p>6 The adequate representation -- after 250 days in</p> <p>7 court, and literally thousands of court docket entries,</p> <p>8 after seven trials and 10 appeals, I don't know how anyone</p> <p>9 can say that there was not adequate representation.</p> <p>10 This was litigated fully without large</p> <p>11 compensation. There was one interim smaller fee award for</p> <p>12 various issues that had arisen in case and they had to</p> <p>13 defend, but without any true compensation given to counsel</p> <p>14 over these years, and they still stayed with it, even though</p> <p>15 at times it looked bleak as to whether there would ever be</p> <p>16 any recovery and they would ever have any monies.</p> <p>17 Their representation was consistent and with no</p> <p>18 hesitations, doing whatever they felt they had to do to try</p> <p>19 to push this litigation forward against heavy odds. No</p> <p>20 question about that.</p> <p>21 Now as to the particular classes and approving</p> <p>22 those or not as being appropriate. In the historical</p> <p>23 accounting class it clearly has been -- it was certified by</p> <p>24 the court back in 1907 by Judge Lamberth, and it satisfies</p> <p>25 the requirements under what we call the Federal Rules of</p>	<p>1 And then again the actual representation referred</p> <p>2 about.</p> <p>3 First of all, there is no antagonism between the</p> <p>4 plaintiffs and the class members, that is the named</p> <p>5 plaintiffs. They all wanted an accounting. That is what</p> <p>6 they suited for. One member doesn't succeed and all of the</p> <p>7 others lose, or some of the others lose because one</p> <p>8 succeeds. There is no clash between the representation of</p> <p>9 the named plaintiffs and the whole class.</p> <p>10 It was obviously vigorously litigated by them, the</p> <p>11 named plaintiffs and their counsel, and qualified counsel,</p> <p>12 obviously, were handling this very complex, difficult</p> <p>13 litigation.</p> <p>14 It seems to the court that the named plaintiffs</p> <p>15 displayed a real commitment to stick with the case for 15</p> <p>16 years in light of many defeats. They had a knowledge of</p> <p>17 the case. They worked on the case, and they had great</p> <p>18 interest in the litigation. They are not simply names put</p> <p>19 up there. They were intimately involved in the case and</p> <p>20 worked hard.</p> <p>21 If you look at the filings on their behalf and</p> <p>22 their fees and request for awards, you can realize the work</p> <p>23 that they were engaged in.</p> <p>24 There's really no individual damages here that</p> <p>25 would cause any difficulties in this award under the rules</p>
Page 227	Page 229
<p>1 Civil Procedure, 23. That is the class-action rule.</p> <p>2 You heard me ask the lawyers right after lunch</p> <p>3 about the Wal-Mart case. That was the largest class-action</p> <p>4 case ever brought by individuals, and it went to the Supreme</p> <p>5 Court, one and a half million women suing for back pay,</p> <p>6 among other issues, suing Wal-Mart, former employees, and</p> <p>7 the Supreme Court unanimously reversed the certification of</p> <p>8 the class in that case as not being appropriate under Rule</p> <p>9 23.</p> <p>10 So the court has to be satisfied that the rule is</p> <p>11 met to approve this settlement and historical accounting</p> <p>12 class as properly put before the court.</p> <p>13 First there has to be numerosity they call it.</p> <p>14 The numbers have to be worthwhile. Here there were over</p> <p>15 300,000 members of the historical accounting class. The</p> <p>16 estimate given to me is at least that or more today.</p> <p>17 Commonality, the common issue. Actually the only</p> <p>18 issue before that class was whether there could be an</p> <p>19 historical accounting done, and now in lieu of that there</p> <p>20 would be a restitution type payment. Not a damage claim,</p> <p>21 but restitution to make up for not getting the accountant.</p> <p>22 Typicality. That is the same actions in this type</p> <p>23 of claim. It is identical legal arguments in all cases.</p> <p>24 It's an identical situation of a pattern of fraud, or abuse,</p> <p>25 or mismanagement in the trust account.</p>	<p>1 or inconsistent judgments.</p> <p>2 Here it is clear that the original relief, the</p> <p>3 predominant relief, was an equitable claim, but the case was</p> <p>4 then settled, and something that is akin to restitution, and</p> <p>5 as I discussed with counsel, it seems to be appropriate, and</p> <p>6 if you can't -- you have to be able to settle a (b)(2) case,</p> <p>7 and the only way to settle is through money if you don't get</p> <p>8 the injunction.</p> <p>9 So here that is appropriate and does not</p> <p>10 disqualify the case from being properly certified under</p> <p>11 23(b)(1)(A) and (b)(2), and I'm going to find that the</p> <p>12 historical accounting class was probably certified as</p> <p>13 properly engaged as a class and can be salient for the terms</p> <p>14 suggested in the settlement agreement.</p> <p>15 The trust administration class is a little more</p> <p>16 complicated. The court in this past December requested the</p> <p>17 parties certify under 23(b)(3) that their questions of law</p> <p>18 are, in fact, common to the class members, and they</p> <p>19 predominate over other questions affecting individual</p> <p>20 members, and the class action is superior to any other</p> <p>21 available method to fairly and efficiently adjudicating the</p> <p>22 controversy.</p> <p>23 That is taken in conjunction with the Claims</p> <p>24 Resolution Act which held that notwithstanding the</p> <p>25 requirements to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the</p>

Page 230	Page 232
<p>1 court in this litigation may certify the trust</p> <p>2 administration class, and if that is certified under</p> <p>3 subsection (a), which I just referred to and did, the trust</p> <p>4 administration class will be treated as a class certified</p> <p>5 under 23(b)(3) for the purpose of settlement.</p> <p>6 So technically I'm freed from the strictures of 23</p> <p>7 -- Rule 23, and therefore it has to have -- the</p> <p>8 constitutional standards still have to be made under</p> <p>9 Phillips Petroleum that had been referred to by counsel.</p> <p>10 Under Phillips Petroleum, again, I have already</p> <p>11 reviewed the features. The best practical notice. I have</p> <p>12 already found that there is extensive and extraordinary</p> <p>13 notice here. We even had a notice expert retained in how to</p> <p>14 do it properly.</p> <p>15 There was an opportunity to opt out under this</p> <p>16 class -- I am sorry, there is no opt out under this class</p> <p>17 certified under 23(b)(1), and there is nothing to indicate</p> <p>18 to the court that any member could make an argument that</p> <p>19 they should have a discretionary opt out of the historical</p> <p>20 class.</p> <p>21 I have issued a ruling just recently in that</p> <p>22 regard. As part of the ruling it is necessary to discuss</p> <p>23 the right to opt out, and that is in the order of June 17,</p> <p>24 Cobell versus Salazar.</p> <p>25 That order was as to the Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma</p>	<p>1 thought that was appropriate -- that the tribe had conflated</p> <p>2 the historical accounting class with the trust</p> <p>3 administration class, and their objections were not well</p> <p>4 taken.</p> <p>5 There is just no compelling reason shown to the</p> <p>6 court why granting the motion is necessary to have fair and</p> <p>7 efficient results in this case. So I denied their request.</p> <p>8 It simply cannot provide the tribe asking the court to</p> <p>9 exercise discretion to allow members opt out of the</p> <p>10 historical accounting class as certified.</p> <p>11 There is no right, but I could allow in my</p> <p>12 discretion, I assume, to amend that and try to say, okay,</p> <p>13 you can opt out if there is some justified rationale that</p> <p>14 you could show, or if there is some unique and distinct</p> <p>15 claim, but whether or not permitting the opt out is</p> <p>16 necessary to have a fair and efficient conduct of the</p> <p>17 action, it would be impossible to do this action if we had</p> <p>18 that. So I did not consider that as appropriate --</p> <p>19 opportunity.</p> <p>20 The opt outs were provided for in the trust</p> <p>21 administration class, and the notice detailed that right.</p> <p>22 The representation by the named plaintiffs, I have</p> <p>23 already discussed.</p> <p>24 Even if you look at the trust administration</p> <p>25 class, which did have the opt outs, so it qualifies in</p>
Page 231	Page 233
<p>1 attempting to file materials here, and I indicated that the</p> <p>2 tribe contends that the awards should be individualized, and</p> <p>3 they cannot do that, and that the members wish to opt out to</p> <p>4 seek and complete an accurate damage arising in the</p> <p>5 government's breach of trust claims related to the IIM</p> <p>6 account, along with other corresponding monetary relief,</p> <p>7 because they think that the relief, under the historical</p> <p>8 accounting class, improperly estimates the amounts, and that</p> <p>9 it attempts to allocate damages on individual injuries.</p> <p>10 I indicated that that was not the proper</p> <p>11 description of the historical accounting class, that they</p> <p>12 are not damages, but they are considerations for being</p> <p>13 released from further accounting obligations at this time;</p> <p>14 that to avoid hundreds of thousands of individual actions --</p> <p>15 that is what would happen if there was an historical</p> <p>16 accounting class.</p> <p>17 Each potentially establishing standards providing</p> <p>18 an historical accounting, each would could come out</p> <p>19 differently for the government, where the government acted --</p> <p>20 - it could be a concern that the assets that are invested in</p> <p>21 common, and that the claim is that they were improperly</p> <p>22 handled.</p> <p>23 It really flows -- the equitable relief of \$1,000</p> <p>24 from the -- the relief of \$1,000 from the equitable relief</p> <p>25 originally requested. I said it was like restitution, and I</p>	<p>1 contrast to the historical accounting class under the</p> <p>2 Phillips formula, even if I assume for a minute that 23(a)</p> <p>3 applied to the trust administration class, arguably it seems</p> <p>4 to me that it could fit there.</p> <p>5 You have got numerosity. Some 400,000 plus</p> <p>6 members.</p> <p>7 Commonality. The same question. The same overall</p> <p>8 trust mismanagement.</p> <p>9 Typicality. The same reasons that I discussed</p> <p>10 before, the same basic course of events, the same legal</p> <p>11 theories.</p> <p>12 There are questions of law that are common to the</p> <p>13 class members over other questions affecting on the</p> <p>14 individual members. and certainly this is a class action</p> <p>15 superior to other available methods to adjudicate the</p> <p>16 controversy, and to have 400,000 individual claims brought</p> <p>17 and litigated through the court would not take 15 years, it</p> <p>18 would take a millennium.</p> <p>19 So the trust administration class I find is</p> <p>20 properly certified under the Claims Resolution Act and under</p> <p>21 Rule 23(B)(3).</p> <p>22 Now about the settlement. I went through the</p> <p>23 factors you considered whether or not -- the bottom line</p> <p>24 though is, is it fair? Is it really fair to the parties</p> <p>25 involved, to all of the Indians, almost half a million</p>

Page 234	Page 236
<p>1 Indians?</p> <p>2 Is it reasonable and adequate? I have to evaluate</p> <p>3 that in relation to the strength of the plaintiffs' case. I</p> <p>4 have to evaluate that in light of some of the individual</p> <p>5 class members' complaints. They would receive more. I have</p> <p>6 to evaluate that -- whether it is an arms length</p> <p>7 negotiation, or it's a sweet deal between the parties.</p> <p>8 The relationship, as I said, to the plaintiffs'</p> <p>9 case, status of the litigation when it is settled, and the</p> <p>10 reaction of the class, which we heard today from some</p> <p>11 members and not others, and the opinion of experienced</p> <p>12 counsel.</p> <p>13 Arms length negotiation. I reviewed -- on purpose</p> <p>14 I gave you the beginning history of this case of 15 years of</p> <p>15 hostile litigation. Hostile, not friendly litigation. A</p> <p>16 legion of contested motions and issues fought again and</p> <p>17 again in this court.</p> <p>18 Numerous trials. Numerous appeals, most of which</p> <p>19 the plaintiffs lost, not won, in the Court of Appeals.</p> <p>20 Congressional examination and hearings on a</p> <p>21 settlement, which is very unusual, and a review by Congress,</p> <p>22 and approval by Congress. The Senate and the United States</p> <p>23 unanimously approved the settlement after making suggested</p> <p>24 changes.</p> <p>25 Approval by the Executive Branch, obviously who</p>	<p>1 was no such offer outstanding.</p> <p>2 The success in obtaining Congressional approval.</p> <p>3 As I indicated, I'm amazed that it got approved, and that is</p> <p>4 to the benefit of the parties that that was done through</p> <p>5 terribly hard work by plaintiffs' counsel, and the strong</p> <p>6 support of the administration, and an excellent</p> <p>7 Congressional work as well, both by Senators and Congressmen</p> <p>8 involved in this.</p> <p>9 Potential interminable litigation. As I said,</p> <p>10 this case would have been another 15 years easily if this</p> <p>11 settlement fails. Accurate historic accountings are almost</p> <p>12 impossible, if not frankly impossible, and I don't know</p> <p>13 where the case would have gone.</p> <p>14 There is a famous case in literature by Dickens</p> <p>15 called the future called Jarndyce versus Jarndyce in the</p> <p>16 Bleak House. If you read that where he took on the legal</p> <p>17 establishment a couple hundred years ago. We still see the</p> <p>18 same today unfortunately, where the lawyers fought over an</p> <p>19 estate for a family for 20 years, and when they finally</p> <p>20 finished it, not only was there no money left for the</p> <p>21 heirs, because the lawyers got it all, but all the heirs had</p> <p>22 died.</p> <p>23 So we don't want that here. Here we have lost</p> <p>24 enough people who are entitled to monies. This will make an</p> <p>25 end to the litigation so they can get the monies.</p>
Page 235	Page 237
<p>1 are represented here by the Department of Justice, and at</p> <p>2 the highest level by the President signing the legislation.</p> <p>3 He could have vetoed it if he did not think it was</p> <p>4 appropriate.</p> <p>5 Settlement in relation to the strength of the</p> <p>6 plaintiffs' case. It affords substantial benefits. We have</p> <p>7 a total settlement of \$3.4 billion -- more than ever before</p> <p>8 awarded in an Indian case. If you put every Indian case in</p> <p>9 the past together it is more than that.</p> <p>10 For its substantial benefits -- two sets of</p> <p>11 monetary awards, land consolidation to make the trust run</p> <p>12 better, hopefully. A scholarship fund to be created for the</p> <p>13 Indians.</p> <p>14 I guarantee you that most lawyers who looked at</p> <p>15 this case five years ago, eight years ago, 10 years ago, 15</p> <p>16 years ago -- would consider such relief highly improbable</p> <p>17 and highly doubtful.</p> <p>18 There has been talk about a \$7 billion offer.</p> <p>19 That was an offer to forgive the government not only on</p> <p>20 everything in the past that has ever happened, but</p> <p>21 everything that will happen to the Indians in the future by</p> <p>22 the federal government.</p> <p>23 That is not a true offer. No one settles a case</p> <p>24 for their client saying, you can do anything you want to my</p> <p>25 client in the next 50 years and I won't sue you. So there</p>	<p>1 The enormous challenges for those individuals who</p> <p>2 wanted to go forward and continue the litigation. I've</p> <p>3 already gone through that. To try to prove individualized</p> <p>4 damages, bringing the complex claim against the government</p> <p>5 and try to recover -- I hope some of you who opted out can</p> <p>6 do that, but it is going to be difficult.</p> <p>7 The status of the litigation. The litigation had</p> <p>8 gone on, obviously, for 15 years. The strengths and</p> <p>9 weaknesses were not. Discovery had been done. The case had</p> <p>10 been tried multiple times, multiple appeals. It is not the</p> <p>11 type of litigation you see in class actions where there is</p> <p>12 no litigation.</p> <p>13 They come in with the consent decree, and the</p> <p>14 lawyers are going to get \$10 million, and everybody gets a</p> <p>15 coupon for \$5 to buy cereal, or whatever it is about. This</p> <p>16 is not like that. This is a true arm's-length hard-fought</p> <p>17 battle, hard-fought victory.</p> <p>18 Even if a significant portion of the class</p> <p>19 objected, and even if some of the named plaintiffs didn't</p> <p>20 want to settle I could still approve it if it's appropriate</p> <p>21 under the law, but we did not have that. We have 92</p> <p>22 objectors out of hundreds and hundreds of thousands of</p> <p>23 members.</p> <p>24 Even assuming some culturally did not read the</p> <p>25 papers, we still have hundreds of thousands, I am fairly</p>

Page 238	Page 240
<p>1 convinced, who knew about this settlement and understood</p> <p>2 what they were getting into and approved it. Certainly a</p> <p>3 vast majority, well over 99 percent approved this</p> <p>4 settlement, not opted out or objected.</p> <p>5 Both sides have highly skilled and experienced</p> <p>6 attorneys who have agreed to the settlement as proper, and I</p> <p>7 guarantee you when they entered into this originally years</p> <p>8 ago, they got into a fight with each other over they years,</p> <p>9 and they were not agreeing to anything, including the time</p> <p>10 of day. But they agreed that this settlement was fair and</p> <p>11 proper, and they both are experienced, both sides, as to</p> <p>12 these cases and what they have worked out.</p> <p>13 So that is the rationale for approving the</p> <p>14 settlement as fair, adequate and appropriate.</p> <p>15 I have been asked to give incentive awards. That</p> <p>16 is part of the equitable powers of the court. They are</p> <p>17 routinely provided to compensate named plaintiffs for</p> <p>18 services they provide and the risks they incurred during the</p> <p>19 course of class-action litigation.</p> <p>20 That is a quote from a prior class-action case</p> <p>21 that I had. I am quoting myself. But there is no collusion</p> <p>22 here between the plaintiffs and the defendants. You know,</p> <p>23 in some of these class-action cases you get very suspicious.</p> <p>24 Everybody is selling out for money very quickly and not</p> <p>25 litigating the case. That is not true here.</p>	<p>1 hundreds and thousands of hours. She was part of every</p> <p>2 serious, strategic decision made. She dedicated up to 1,200</p> <p>3 hours per year. She put her reputation on the line, her</p> <p>4 health, and has unprecedented efforts by a named plaintiff I</p> <p>5 have not seen before in a class action case.</p> <p>6 I believe she is fully entitled to the award that</p> <p>7 she has requested in this matter. The best analogy is the</p> <p>8 Allapattah Services -- that is A-l-l-a-p-a-t-t-a-h -- versus</p> <p>9 Exxon, a Florida case in 2006, where nine plaintiffs each</p> <p>10 received \$1.76 million out of the fund, which is similar to</p> <p>11 this case and the length of litigation. Only two trials</p> <p>12 though, although they did get to the Supreme Court.</p> <p>13 But again, those plaintiffs showed unusual courage</p> <p>14 and commitment, participated in the decision-making,</p> <p>15 communicated with the class, gathered information,</p> <p>16 discovery, accepted liability of litigation costs, the</p> <p>17 theory of liability was untested, and there was no certain</p> <p>18 result with only themselves to receive modes personal</p> <p>19 damages. They did not get an extra big damage award, and</p> <p>20 they incurred retaliation risks from others connected with</p> <p>21 the case potentially.</p> <p>22 Those are the factors that the court in that case</p> <p>23 considered giving those very large rewards.</p> <p>24 In this case said I have considered those factors.</p> <p>25 I considered the plaintiffs were not figureheads. They</p>
Page 239	Page 241
<p>1 Here we have serious plaintiffs who have worked</p> <p>2 hard on the case when you review the files and material</p> <p>3 submitted. Plaintiffs admittedly asked for an</p> <p>4 extraordinary -- not extraordinary, rather a large sum for</p> <p>5 Eloise Cobell.</p> <p>6 I was distressed to hear Ms. Cobell attacked today</p> <p>7 by one of the objectors' representatives. I felt that was</p> <p>8 without foundation. There was no suggestion of any</p> <p>9 collusion by her part to get a fee, and then she would</p> <p>10 settle the case. There is nothing in the record to support</p> <p>11 that.</p> <p>12 All I have in the record for Ms. Cobell is</p> <p>13 starting this case maybe 20 years ago trying to get someone</p> <p>14 to take it, 15 years ago getting the suit filed, and</p> <p>15 forever thereafter being intimately involved and paying</p> <p>16 hundreds of thousands of dollars out of her own pocket to</p> <p>17 make sure that the case could continue when there was no</p> <p>18 money.</p> <p>19 How can it now be claimed that she would then,</p> <p>20 somehow, compromise easily, I don't understand that</p> <p>21 accusation. She has accomplished more for the individual, I</p> <p>22 think, Native Americans than any other person recently that</p> <p>23 I can think of in history.</p> <p>24 This is her case. She contributed hundreds of</p> <p>25 thousands of dollars. She helped fund raise. She spent</p>	<p>1 brought it to the lawyers' attention. They were intimately</p> <p>2 involved in it.</p> <p>3 An unprecedented case, untested theory of</p> <p>4 liability, high uncertainty of success, substantial benefits</p> <p>5 conferred on the class members \$3.4 billion ultimately,</p> <p>6 achieved Congressional recognition and approval,</p> <p>7 reputational risks were undertaken in their home</p> <p>8 territories, and as I said, Ms. Cobell, expended substantial</p> <p>9 personal sums of her money when she would really not be able</p> <p>10 to recover that much if she won the case.</p> <p>11 So I think Ms. Cobell should be congratulated for</p> <p>12 the work that she has been done on the case and not</p> <p>13 condemned. She communicated openly with all class members,</p> <p>14 discussed the cases -- all the class named plaintiffs did,</p> <p>15 and I know nothing else can be asked for them to do to earn</p> <p>16 these awards.</p> <p>17 Therefore, the court will consider as a fair and</p> <p>18 reasonable award the award of \$2 million to Ms. Cobell and</p> <p>19 approve that. However, the expenses she has requested will</p> <p>20 be deducted from that awarded. She will not get additional</p> <p>21 monies for her expenses. That will incorporate her expenses</p> <p>22 as well.</p> <p>23 Louise Larose will receive \$200,000. She was in</p> <p>24 the deposition. She coordinated the media efforts. She</p> <p>25 engaged political leaders, and as heavily involved in the</p>

Page 242	Page 244
<p>1 case as the others. An original plaintiff since the</p> <p>2 beginning.</p> <p>3 Thomas Maulson will receive \$150,000. An original</p> <p>4 plaintiff. He was deposed by the government; discussed key</p> <p>5 litigation issues; and helped with the continuation of the</p> <p>6 case; and again, put his reputation at risk.</p> <p>7 And Peggy Cleghorn, a \$150,000 award. She took</p> <p>8 her mother's spot as a plaintiff when her mother died in</p> <p>9 1997. Deposed by the government; attended court hearings;</p> <p>10 participated in the strategic decisions; and came forth to</p> <p>11 support the case at all times.</p> <p>12 The sum represents roughly .02 percent of the</p> <p>13 common fund of \$1.4 billion, and I believe is appropriate</p> <p>14 under the qualifications as I have reviewed them awarding</p> <p>15 those.</p> <p>16 There was a request for Mr. Earl Old Person for an</p> <p>17 award. Unfortunately, Mr. Earl Old Person, an original</p> <p>18 plaintiff, was removed in 2003, and the court found at that</p> <p>19 time he was unable to conclude that Mr. Old Person is</p> <p>20 satisfying his duties at class representative to adequately</p> <p>21 protect the interests of the class members; refused to</p> <p>22 respond regarding his obligations in connection with the</p> <p>23 case, including his deposition, refused to be taken; and he</p> <p>24 refused to comply with court discovery orders. Therefore, I</p> <p>25 cannot give him an award based on equity to a class</p>	<p>1 I rule upon those disputes which I have before me now. But</p> <p>2 I'm not ready to rule upon those.</p> <p>3 The issue for the court is the calculation I</p> <p>4 should use. The Circuit follows a percentage of funds</p> <p>5 method. There has been some argument and a lot of written</p> <p>6 material is already submitted to me, and the real issue came</p> <p>7 down to me, what is the common fund here?</p> <p>8 We have of common fund doctrine, and a percentage</p> <p>9 from the common fund is fair. That is based upon those</p> <p>10 benefiting from prosecution or unjustly enriched so they</p> <p>11 don't share in the costs in proportion to the benefit each</p> <p>12 one receives. So what is the common fund here?</p> <p>13 The plaintiffs' counsel, understandably, say it is</p> <p>14 \$3.4 billion of the class-action settlement. It could be</p> <p>15 also consider the \$5 billion the government says they are</p> <p>16 going to spend on the trust reform.</p> <p>17 I think that is reaching too far frankly. I think</p> <p>18 it is clear that the accounting trust administration fund,</p> <p>19 which will be paid by the defendants now upon final approval</p> <p>20 of this settlement as defined in this settlement agreement</p> <p>21 is 1.412 billion dollars, and the plaintiffs have created</p> <p>22 that fund -- the plaintiffs' counsel, through the</p> <p>23 litigation. It did not exist before.</p> <p>24 They have achieved that result for their clients.</p> <p>25 That is a fixed monetary amount. Nothing is subject to</p>
Page 243	Page 245
<p>1 representative who did not execute his fiduciary duties</p> <p>2 towards the class as the other named people did, so his</p> <p>3 motion for an incentive award is denied.</p> <p>4 Plaintiff asked for 10,500,000 plus, and expenses</p> <p>5 incurred by third persons connected with this litigation.</p> <p>6 There is no class representative that occurred those out-of-</p> <p>7 pocket expenses that I can see that they referred to</p> <p>8 separate from Ms. Cobell's, so I am not going to -- I don't</p> <p>9 believe there is authority to award those expenses separate,</p> <p>10 so the motion for those incentive awards -- that 10,500,000</p> <p>11 is denied.</p> <p>12 Ms. Cobell's personal expenses, out-of-pocket</p> <p>13 ones, was not included in that expense request as I</p> <p>14 understand it, so those moneys will come out of her sizable</p> <p>15 incentive award that I have already approved.</p> <p>16 Now finally what remains to be done is discuss</p> <p>17 the attorneys' fees, which I will do briefly at this time,</p> <p>18 and we can address it more in our written opinion. But I</p> <p>19 wanted to finish with the parties that are here so they</p> <p>20 understand what their rights are at this time and the</p> <p>21 expenses.</p> <p>22 I am going to decide the aggregate attorneys' fees</p> <p>23 at this time and expenses for the pre-settlement activities.</p> <p>24 A portion of the fund that is in dispute between the</p> <p>25 attorneys I'm going to withhold, pending distribution, until</p>	<p>1 reversion as some of the other funds are. It will be</p> <p>2 distributed to the individual Indians upon their approving</p> <p>3 the claim against the government. So it is a true common</p> <p>4 fund.</p> <p>5 Any leftovers go to the scholarship fund, because</p> <p>6 that is appropriate, and it doesn't get deducted for that</p> <p>7 reason from that. The scholarship fund is also benefiting</p> <p>8 their clients.</p> <p>9 But the land consolidation fund, I am not going to</p> <p>10 consider them as part of the common fund for the purpose of</p> <p>11 attorneys' fees, and I'm making this clear so the plaintiffs</p> <p>12 understand, and they have the right to appeal, the</p> <p>13 plaintiffs' counsel if they wish, but that is the basis.</p> <p>14 There is no guarantee that those funds are really</p> <p>15 going to be used to purchase a fractionated interest if the</p> <p>16 Indians refuse to do so. And any remaining funds revert</p> <p>17 back to the Treasury, not back to the Indians in any</p> <p>18 capacity.</p> <p>19 So even though it may be incidental, the</p> <p>20 plaintiffs' counsel claim, it should be counted -- it is</p> <p>21 highly uncertain to me what actual amount I could consider</p> <p>22 as a part of that. So the scholarship monies really come</p> <p>23 off from the other funds, so I cannot count them separately</p> <p>24 and additionally.</p> <p>25 The monies traceable to the litigation and the</p>

Page 246	Page 248
<p>1 common fund is really the trust administration fund and not 2 the other funds. 3 So really what the government says -- with that 4 then they only got 330 million, because they think that is 5 the only fair amount that they have got. 6 I disagree with that. There is no evidence that 7 the government made any of these other concessions in 8 settlement but for this litigation. 9 The plaintiffs are not piggybacking upon the 10 success of earlier cases where someone else has already 11 litigated these issues and they come in secondly to get a 12 fund. We don't have that here. It appears to me that 13 plaintiffs are entitled to have counsel -- their fees 14 based upon the one point four plus billion dollars 15 recovered. 16 What percentage should that be then? One of the 17 factors I look at is, is it must be reasonable in light of 18 the results obtained? I have to act like a fiduciary for 19 the beneficiaries who are paying the fee, because now the 20 Indians will pay this fee, and there has been somewhat of an 21 adversary process about the fees, but still I have to take a 22 close look at it. 23 I have to consider what is reasonable in the 24 circumstances? I do that by going over the various 25 factors -- I think we've spent too much time reviewing, but</p>	<p>1 The parties' agreements? I have not gone off and 2 held that the plaintiffs are bound by their agreements. I 3 am somewhat concerned. They came in asking for more than 4 there would seem to me an agreement, but I agree that it's 5 up to the court to set a reasonable fee. They did have an 6 agreement, and it concerns me that they seem to have backed 7 off from that, but they certainly agreed to be bound within 8 that range without an appeal. 9 That is a minimum I think. I think actually they 10 had an agreement, but beyond that it is up to the court to 11 determine what the size of the attorneys fees should award. 12 I could have felt they did should not get any of that, and 13 that they should get \$5 million. I don't think the 14 agreement bound the court either way. 15 However, it is somewhat persuasive that what they 16 considered to be reasonable when they were attempting to 17 settle this case and sell it to Congress and to their 18 clients. 19 Additionally, it seems to me more reasonable than 20 any contingency fee arrangements they may have had, because 21 this fee agreement postdates any contingency fee agreements. 22 In other words, they seem to have gone off and said, we will 23 accept these fees regardless of whatever we said we would do 24 originally. 25 And similar cases? There has been a mention of</p>
Page 247	Page 249
<p>1 again amount involved, the results obtained -- it's an 2 exceptional result, I have already indicated that, 3 substantial trust reform will also come about as a result of 4 this. 5 The awards are tax-free. The number of persons 6 benefiting, almost half a million perhaps -- at least 7 450,000 roughly. Future generations are going to benefit 8 from the trust reform that is coming. 9 Class member objections. I have reviewed the 10 objections about attorney fees, but the majority have lodged 11 no objection -- 99 percent -- and I have considered the 12 objections as what could be fair in taking into account what 13 I will award. 14 Obviously I have counted upon the skill and 15 efficiency of the attorneys involved in this hostile, 16 complex litigation with multiple appeals, the complexity and 17 the duration thereof. 18 The risk of nonpayment? Mr. Gingold indicated 19 they took a big risk, and they did. They could go home 20 empty-handed. 21 The amount of time involved? Enormous. The time 22 records are impressive. Even though there are some 23 objections to some of the time records, I think overall the 24 records reflect even a cursory glance a phenomenal number of 25 hours fairly put in.</p>	<p>1 looking at large cases, large awards. This case qualifies 2 as what we call a mega fund case. That is a gigantic 3 award. Not just an average couple million dollars 4 settlement case. 5 So how do you do a mega fund? Because they do not 6 normally get 30 percent of a mega fund case. That is not 7 awarded by the courts. That puts too high a premium on the 8 legal fees. 9 I did a survey here with my staff, nine cases, 10 what we call mega fund cases, all in the neighborhood -- all 11 more than 1 billion up to \$6 billion in class action funds, 12 and I looked at the legal fees attributed thereto from what 13 was considered then the common fund that was appropriate, 14 and the fees ranged from 4.8 percent to a high of 15 15 percent, depending upon various factors. Hours went to 16 200,000 or more. Phenomenal amounts of time spent on some 17 of these cases. 18 And there is a collection of those cases set forth 19 in a report of the 3rd Circuit task force on court awarded 20 attorney fees at 108 Fed. -- the decision is 237, and 21 another case 962 Fed. Supp. at 572 in In re: Prudential 22 Insurance Company case reviewing all of these mega fund 23 settlements, reviewing a percentage range there from 4 24 percent to 17 plus percent. 25 It seems to the court to award the attorneys' fees</p>

Page 250	Page 252
<p>1 -- in looking at an amount that is sufficient to encourage 2 lawyers to take on similar cases in the future -- that is 3 one of issues that concerns the court. 4 You cannot have cases like the original case that 5 Ms. Cobell wanted to bring where lawyers said, I won't do 6 it. I can never make money. It is a loser, and they would 7 never litigate, and a good case -- a good client cannot be 8 put forth before the court. 9 We have to make attorney fees commensurate so that 10 attorneys are encouraged to these cases and to help out the 11 less privileged who need the help, not just Indians, but 12 anyone in this country with similar type of situations where 13 they were deprived of their rights. You have to make that 14 worthwhile for lawyers to gamble to take these kinds of 15 cases. 16 They sorely need competent representation, and the 17 Indians desperately needed these monies to be adequately 18 handled, and now they will receive them from this 19 settlement, and many of them, I know, live in extreme 20 poverty; and they are special beneficiaries of a trust 21 created by the government, and they owe them these monies. 22 I have to look at the agreement between the 23 parties, and they did have an attorneys' fees agreement, 24 informative to the court, not binding upon the court. 25 So the court -- considering those factors that I</p>	<p>1 those claims which I hope to make in the near future. 2 So let me just sum up where we are at this point. 3 One, the historical accounting and class administration 4 class are properly certified as I ruled. 5 Two, I am going to order a judgment on behalf of 6 the plaintiffs in accordance with the terms of the 7 settlement agreement and the joint motion for final approval 8 of the settlement, and the entry of final judgment will be 9 granted. 10 Settlement agreement I have found is fair, 11 reasonable and adequate. IT is binding on the class members 12 who did not timely opt out. 13 Four, I am approving final payment of reasonable 14 attorneys' fees, expenses and costs for the class counsel in 15 the amount of \$99 million, subject to the terms of the 16 settlement agreement, and to the claims against those fees 17 by the two petitioners. That will be drawn from the common 18 fund established by this settlement. 19 For the incentive amounts approved and the awards 20 requested in the amounts requested as I've already ruled -- 21 the claims administrator will now possess and pay all valid 22 claims from the settlement account once the time frames have 23 run that are appropriate. 24 Defendants will be released from the class members 25 claims outlined in the settlement agreement under section 1,</p>
Page 251	Page 253
<p>1 have just reviewed, I'm going to make the following 2 attorneys' fees awards in this matter. I'm going to make an 3 award of \$99 million as reasonable and appropriate for the 4 aggregate attorneys' fees, expense and costs for pre- 5 settlement amounts. 6 That represents 7.1 percent, approximately, of the 7 common fund, the way I found it existed. That is a common 8 fund of \$1.4 billion -- consistent with the parties' 9 agreement, more than the government requested and other 10 people have requested, but at the same time it is within the 11 range of mega settlement attorneys fees. Maybe a percentage 12 or two below some of the others, but within that same range, 13 as reasonable and adequate for the attorneys for the work 14 they have done on this. 15 It does not denigrate their performance whatsoever 16 that I did not give them \$212 million. I have to make a 17 judgment based upon my review of the case, my consideration 18 of the factors that I have reviewed as to what is fair and 19 reasonable in accordance with the common fund that I found 20 existed that they created in this case. 21 From that will be withheld at this time a maximum 22 amount of \$13,616,250.48. That is if the allocation is not 23 resolved before the final approval of the settlement -- as 24 defined in the settlement agreement. That amount is going 25 to be withheld from the payment pending determination of</p>	<p>1 and the defendants will make their final payments in the 2 accounting trust administration found as is called for in 3 the agreement. 4 So that will be the order of court. 5 I want to congratulate counsel for both sides for 6 getting this result. It is an incredible result. I think 7 it does a great service to recognize the harm done to the 8 American Indians in the past by the government who is 9 supposed to be their protector and failed to do so in the 10 categories, at least before this court, as to the trust 11 funds and the land management, and the hope that this does 12 set a new tone for the government and a new course for 13 Interior to deal with the American Indians on a fair and 14 equitable basis as they indicated they will do so from now 15 on. 16 I want to congratulate counsel for the plaintiffs 17 for their work in this case, representing the highest 18 quality of work in the finest traditions of the Bar to 19 undertake a case like this and litigate it for 15 years with 20 no certain result, and getting what may be a disappointing 21 result in the attorneys' fees. But you all deserve the 22 highest praise for the work that you have done on these 23 cases. 24 With that the court will stand in recess, and if 25 the parties haven't submitted orders in accordance with my</p>

Page 254

1 rulings, you should do so as soon as possible.

2 (Whereupon, the proceedings were adjourned.)

3 -----

4 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

5 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of
6 the proceedings in the above-captioned case.

7 _____
8 SUSAN PAGE TYNER, CVR-CM
9 OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

10