ROBERT E. KOVACEVICH, P.L.L.C.
A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
818 WEST RIVERSIDE
SUITE 525
SPOKANE, WASHINGTON 99201-0995
509/747-2104
FAX 509/625-1914

Case 3:16-cv-05464-RJB Document 46 Filed 02/13/17 Page 2 of 6

1	Liquor Board Officer P A I)
2	Liquor Board Officer RAJ VELUPPILLAI, BOYD GOODPASTER,))
3	Acting State Agent, TOM WALSH,)
3	Acting State Liquor Board Agent,)
4	DOUGLAS SMYTHE, Employee of the Quinault Indian Nation, Pro Tem,)
5	THOMAS J. FELNAGLE, Judge Pro))
	Tem Pierce County Superior Court,	Ć
6	DENNIS O'BRIAN, Pierce County)
7	Probation Officer in charge of Plaintiffs)
8	Robert Reginald Comenout Sr., Robert Reginald Comenout Jr., Marlene))
	Comenout and Lee A. Comenout Sr.,	<i>,</i>
9	Administrative Law Judge TERRY A.)
10	SCHUH, Administrative Law Judge of the State of Washington Office of)
11	Administrative Hearings now presiding))
1	over State of Washington Office of	<u> </u>
12	Administrative Hearings Forfeiture)
13	Proceedings on Property owned by Plaintiffs and seized from the public)
14	domain allotment, JOHN AND JANE	,
14	DOES, 1-10, fictitious names of)
15	employees of the Washington State)
16	Liquor and Cannabis Board who participated in raids on Plaintiffs')
17	Allotment and property at 908/920 River	<i>)</i>
1/	Road, Puyallup, Washington, and who)
18	may participate in the future, JOHN AND)
19	JANE DOES 11 and 12, Post Falls, Idaho Police Officers who acted as Agents of) }
	the Washington State Liquor Control)
20	Board in raids on Plaintiffs' Allotment)
21	and property at 908/920 River Road,)
22	Puyallup, Washington, or who may participate in the future,))
	participate in the factive,)
23	Defendants.)
24)
25		- ⁾
26		
27	Motion for Leave to File Third	
28	Amended Complaint for Violation	

Motion for Leave to File Third Amended Complaint for Violation of Preliminary and Permanent Injunction, etc. -2

COMES NOW Plaintiffs Robert Reginald Comenout Sr., Edward Amos Comenout III, Robert Reginald Comenout Jr., Marlene Comenout and Lee A. Comenout Sr., through their undersigned counsel, and hereby request leave of the Court to file a Third Amended Complaint in this action. The Third Amended Complaint is lodged with this Motion.

The reason Plaintiffs seek to file the Third Amended Complaint is that the Court, by Order filed January 3, 2017, (Dkt. 42), granted Defendants' Motion to Strike the First Amended Complaint on procedural grounds. Plaintiffs' Counter Motion to file the First Amended Complaint was denied without prejudice. The Court cautioned Plaintiffs to be prudent in filing the amended pleadings and also reminded Plaintiffs' Counsel that Fed.R.Civ.P. 8 requires "The Complaint to be a short and plain statement." Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Complaint but later withdrew the Second Amended Complaint. The proposed Third Amended Complaint is substantially reduced.

ARGUMENT

The Plaintiffs' Motion satisfies the liberal standards for amending a pleading under Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(a). No Discovery has yet taken place and the case is not set for trial.

A. Amendment of the Complaint is Appropriate in this Case

Rule 15(a) provides that a Court should grant leave to amend a pleading "freely" and "when justice so requires." Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(a)(2). The grant or denial of an opportunity to amend is within the discretion of the trial court. *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182, 83 S.Ct. 227, 9 L.Ed.2d 222 (1962). The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has emphasized that, "this policy is to be applied with extreme liberality." *C.F. ex rel. Farnan v. Capistrano Unified School District*, 654 F.3d 975, 985 (9th Cir. 2011); *Owens v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc.*,

Motion for Leave to File Third Amended Complaint for Violation of Preliminary and Permanent Injunction, etc. -3

26

27

28

244 F.3d 708, 712 (9th Cir. 2001); *Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003); and *DCD Programs, Ltd. v. Leighton*, 833 F.2d 183, 186 (9th Cir. 1987).

The Ninth Circuit has stated that leave to amend a party's pleading pursuant to Rule 15(a) "generally shall be denied only upon showing of bad faith, undue delay, futility, or undue prejudice to the opposing party." *Chudacoff v. Univ. Med.Ctr.*, 649 F.3d 1143, 1152 (9th Cir. 2011).

There is no undue delay in this case as no Discovery is calendared, no status report is due and the case is not set for trial. There is no bad faith as Plaintiffs have diligently sought to remedy any pleading defects. The allegations are not futile as facts and legal authority support the allegations. Plaintiffs have not filed similar complaints, causes or action and parties have been removed. New Defendants and new causes of action have been added. The issues in the Complaint cannot be litigated in state court as owners of allotments are entitled to federal court jurisdiction on any action involving their right to the allotment, 25 U.S.C. § 345, 28 U.S.C. § 1353. "Indian rights to a Congressional allotment are governed by federal - not state - law." *Nahno-Lopez v. Houser*, 625 F.3d 1279, 1282 (10th Cir. 2010). These include the rights of the Indian allottee on his allotment. U.S. v. Mottaz, 476 U.S. 834. 845, 106 S.Ct. 2224, 90 L.Ed.2d 841 (1986). This also includes income rights. U.S. v. Pierce, 235 F.2d 885, 890 (9th Cir. 1956); Loring v. U.S., 610 F.2d 649, 650 (9th Cir. 1979); Scholder v. U.S., 428 F.2d 1123, 1126 (9th Cir. 1970). In addition to a specific grant of federal jurisdiction, a line of cases grant federal courts jurisdiction to quash state search warrants investigating Indian crime on allotments. Ross v. Neff, 905 F.2d 1349, 1352 (10th Cir. 1990); U.S. v. Peltier, 344 F.Supp.2d 539, 547 (D.C. Mich. 2004). The federal courts

Motion for Leave to File Third Amended Complaint for Violation of Preliminary and Permanent Injunction, etc. -4

FAX 509/625-1914

Case 3:16-cv-05464-RJB Document 46 Filed 02/13/17 Page 5 of 6

1 also have jurisdiction to enjoin state courts prosecuting Indians on crimes that occur on 2 allotments. Magnan v. Trammell, 719 F.3d 1159, 1176 (10th Cir. 2013); U.S. v. Stands, 105 3 F.3d 1565, 1574 (8th Cir. 1997); Dickson v. Carmen, 270 F.2d 809 (9th Cir. 1959); and 4 Armstrong v. Maple Leaf Apartments, Ltd., 508 F.2d 518, 524 (10th Cir. 1974) allows federal 5 6 courts preemption over state courts where allotments are the jurisdictional issue. 7 An Amendment is futile "only if no set of facts can be proved under the amendment 8 to the pleadings that would constitute a valid and sufficient claim or defense." The Third 9 Amended Complaint alleges sufficient facts and violations to obtain prospective and 10 Declaratory relief. 11 Accordingly, the Plaintiffs move that the Third Amended Complaint be allowed to 12 13 be filed in this case. 14 DATED this 13th day of February, 2017. 15 16 s/ Robert E. Kovacevich 17 ROBERT E. KOVACEVICH, #2723 Attorney for Plaintiffs 18 19 20 s/ Aaron L. Lowe AARON L. LOWE, #15120 21 Attorney for Plaintiffs 22 <u>s/ Randal B. Brown</u> 23 RANDAL B. BROWN, #24181 Attorney for Plaintiffs 24 25 26 27 Motion for Leave to File Third 28 Amended Complaint for Violation

of Preliminary and Permanent Injunction, etc. -5

ROBERT E. KOVACEVICH, P.L.L.C.
A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
818 WEST RIVERSIDE
SUITE 525
SPOKANE, WASHINGTON 99201-0995
509/747-2104
FAX 509/625-1914

	Case 3:16-cv-05464-RJB Document 46 Filed 02/13/17 Page 6 of 6
1	
2	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
3	I hereby certify that on the 13 th day of February, 2017, I electronically filed
4	the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System.
5	the folegoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CW/ECF System.
6	
7	<u>s/Robert E. Kovacevich</u> ROBERT E. KOVACEVICH
8	Attorney for Plaintiffs
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	Motion for Leave to File Third
28	Amended Complete Control

Motion for Leave to File Third Amended Complaint for Violation of Preliminary and Permanent Injunction, etc. -6

ROBERT E. KOVACEVICH, P.L.L.C.
A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
818 WEST RIVERSIDE
SUITE 525
SPOKANE, WASHINGTON 99201-0995
509/747-2104

FAX 509/625-1914