

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

MARGRETTY RABANG, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ROBERT KELLY, JR., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-CV-00088-JCC

**PLAINTIFFS’ SUPPLEMENTAL  
BRIEFING RE: JUDICIAL  
IMMUNITY**

In response to this Court’s April 4, 2017, request for supplemental briefing, Dkt. # 55, Defendant Dodge contends that he is categorically entitled to judicial immunity because Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs (“AS-IA”) Lawrence Roberts’ Decision to invalidate all decisions of the holdover Nooksack Tribal Counsel constitute “neither a statute nor case law.” Dkt. # 58 at 2. In so arguing, Defendant Dodge inappropriately elevates form over substance. Clearly, AS-IA Roberts’ Decision is not, strictly speaking, a statute or case law. The Court’s order, however, unambiguously instructed the Parties to address whether AS-IA Roberts’ October 17, 2016 Decision “*rises to the level of a statute or case law.*” Dkt. # 55 at 2 (emphasis added).

Contrary to Defendant Dodge’s scarecrow argument, AS-IA Roberts’ Decision does indeed rise to the level of a statute or case law, for at least two reasons. First, AS-IA Roberts’ Decision is a final agency action with “legally binding consequences.” *Nat’l Wildlife Fed’n v.*

1 U.S. *E.P.A.*, 945 F. Supp. 2d 39, 46 (D.D.C. 2013). Second, the decision carries the force of a  
2 federal statute, particularly 25 U.S.C. § 2, which vests AS-IA Roberts with exclusive authority to  
3 manage “all Indian affairs and of all matters arising out of Indian relations” with the Nooksack  
4 Tribe and its Judiciary. Defendant Dodge is not entitled to the cloak of judicial immunity.

5  
6 **A. AS-IA Roberts’ Decision Is A Final Agency Action Of Binding Consequence.**

7 Decisions of the AS-IA constitute “final” agency action for the Department of the Interior.  
8 25 C.F.R. § 2.6(c); *Comanche Nation, Okla. v. United States*, 393 F. Supp. 2d 1196, 1206 (W.D.  
9 Okla. 2005). “A final agency action is one that marks the consummation of the agency’s  
10 decisionmaking process and that establishes rights and obligations or creates binding legal  
11 consequences.” *Nat. Res. Def. Council v. E.P.A.*, 706 F.3d 428, 432 (D.C. Cir. 2013) (quoting  
12 *Natural Res. Def. Council v. E.P.A.*, 559 F.3d 561, 564 (D.C. Cir. 2009); citing *Bennett v. Spear*,  
13 520 U.S. 154, 177-78 (1997))). Thus, final agency actions are the functional equivalent to  
14 generally binding statutes, except where the agency has surpassed the authority granted to it in  
15 promulgating said action. *Wiener v. E. Ark. Planting Co.*, 975 F.2d 1350, 1355 (8th Cir. 1992)  
16 (citing *Chevron U.S.A. v. Nat. Res. Def. Council*, 467 U.S. 837, 842-43 (1984)).

17  
18 Here, as discussed below, there can be no question that in promulgating 25 U.S.C. § 2,  
19 Congress clearly granted AS-IA Roberts the authority to issue decisions such as his October 17,  
20 2016 Decision; and that decision “establishes rights and obligations [and] creates binding legal  
21 consequences” for Defendant Dodge. *Nat. Res. Def. Council*, 706 F.3d at 432. In that first of  
22 AS-IA Roberts’ three determinations—all of which address the Nooksack Tribal Court’s defunct  
23 status—AS-IA Roberts explained that the United States would only “recognize judicial decisions  
24 issued by the [Northwest Intertribal Court System],” operating as the Nooksack Court of Appeals.  
25 AS-IA Roberts thereby clearly disclaimed the authority of Defendant Dodge as “Chief Judge,”

1 and did so in a final agency Decision with “binding legal consequences.” *Nat. Res. Def. Council*,  
2 706 F.3d at 432.

3 **B. AS-IA Roberts’ Carries The Force Of A Clearly Valid Federal Statute.**

4 Indian tribes are “domestic dependent nations” subject to plenary control by Congress.  
5 *Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Cmty.*, 134 S. Ct. 2024, 2030 (2014). In 1832, Congress  
6 specifically vested the Secretary of Indian Affairs with the authority to manage “*all* Indian affairs  
7 and of *all* matters arising out of Indian relations.” 25 U.S.C. § 2 (emphasis added); *see also*  
8 *Seminole Nation of Okla. v. Norton*, 223 F.Supp.2d 122, 139 (D.D.C. 2002). This exclusive  
9 Congressional grant of authority furnishes the AS-IA with broad power to carry out the Federal  
10 Government’s unique responsibilities with respect to Indians tribes. *United States v. Eberhardt*,  
11 789 F.2d 1354, 1359-60 (9th Cir. 1986); *Udall v. Littell*, 366 F.2d 668 (D.C. Cir. 1966); *Stuart v.*  
12 *United States ex rel. Dep’t of Interior*, 109 F.3d 1380, 1387 (9th Cir. 1997).

13  
14  
15 Recognizing Congress’ plenary legislative power over Indian affairs and the discretionary  
16 authority delegated by Congress to the AS-IA relating to Indian affairs, “[c]ourts cannot substitute  
17 their judgment for that of those working with Indians, empowered to exercise discretion.”  
18 *Sohappy v. Hodel*, 911 F.2d 1312, 1329 (9th Cir. 1990) (quotation omitted). “In no event should  
19 a court direct the manner in which discretionary arts are to be performed, nor may it direct or  
20 influence the exercise of discretion in making that decision.” *Nat’l Indian Youth Council*,  
21 *Intermountain Indian Sch. Chapter*, 485 F.2d 97, 100 (10th Cir. 1973).

22  
23 Here, AS-IA Roberts acted in his official capacity as manager of *all* Indian affairs and  
24 relations under 25 U.S.C. § 2. Considering his clear, exclusive authority pursuant to that federal  
25 statute, AS-IA Roberts’ October 17, 2016 Decision regarding the United States’ relationship with  
the Tribe and defunct trial court *risers to the level of* clearly valid federal statute or case law—

1 depriving Defendant Dodge of any purported judicial immunity.

2 **C. Defendant Dodge Knew AS-IA Roberts’ Decision Divested Him Of Jurisdiction.**

3 Judicial immunity also is lost where a judge knows he lacks jurisdiction. *Rankin v.*  
 4 *Howard*, 633 F.2d 844, 849 (9th Cir. 1980), *overruled on other grounds by Ashelman v. Pope*,  
 5 793 F.2d 1072 (9th Cir. 1986). Here, Defendant Dodge maintained a very close relationship with  
 6 the Holdover Tribal Council as their immediate past in-house attorney. Dkt. # 7 at ¶ 17. The  
 7 Holdover Council unlawfully appointed Defendant Dodge as “Chief Judge” on or about June 13,  
 8 2016. *Id.* at ¶ 39. Plaintiffs allege that Defendant Dodge willfully prepared court papers he knew  
 9 were fraudulent because his appointment was invalid and unlawful. *Id.* at ¶ 91. Whether or not  
 10 Defendant Dodge actually possessed this knowledge is ultimately a jury question,<sup>1</sup> but Plaintiff is  
 11 confident that the usual discovery tools, including deposition testimony, will clearly establish  
 12 Defendant Dodge’s subjective knowledge of AS-IA Roberts’ October 17, 2016 Decision.  
 13

14  
 15 When deciding a dismissal motion for lack of subject matter jurisdiction per Rule  
 16 12(b)(1), the Court may permit and limit discovery to determine whether it possesses jurisdiction.

17  
 18 <sup>1</sup> On October 18, 2016, Plaintiffs provided AS-IA Roberts’ October 17, 2016 Decision to Defendant Dodge via his  
 19 “Court Clerk.” Brief Re: State of Nooksack Tribal Judiciary And Emergency Motion For Misc., Relief, at Appendix  
 20 A, *Belmont v. Kelly*, No. 2014-CI-CL-007; *Tageant v. Kelly*, No. 2016-CI-CL-003; *Alexander v. Kelly*, No. 2016-CI-  
 21 CL-004; *Rabang v. Romero*, No. 2016-CI-CL-007, available at Michigan State University College of Law’s Turtle  
 22 Talk Blog, <https://turtletalk.files.wordpress.com/2016/10/belmont-v-kelly-etc-brief-re-state-of-nooksack-tribal-judiciary-and-emergency-motion-for-misc-relief.pdf>. Plaintiffs plainly wrote:

23 Interior’s decision—**which operates as binding, non-IBIA appealable federal law** . . . —also  
 24 invalidates the Holdover Council’s actions after March 24, 2016 to:

- 25 1. Terminate Tribal Court Chief Judge Susan Alexander on March 28, 2016 [and]
2. Appoint Ray Dodge to replace her as ‘Chief Judge’ by June 13, 2016 . . . .

Mr. Dodge . . . lack[s] authority to serve as Nooksack Tribal Court Judge, having not been  
 appointed by a legal quorum of the Tribal Council.

*Id.* at 3 (emphasis added). Defendant Dodge was on *actual* notice of AS-IA Roberts’ October 17, 2016 Decision, and  
 his lack of jurisdiction under said federal law, by the very next day, October 18, 2017. *Id.* But nonetheless he  
 continued to masquerade as a “judge,” in order to facilitate Defendants’ fraudulent scheme. Dkt. #7 at ¶¶ 53, 67-68.  
 In addition to issuing the eviction orders in dispute in this case, as the United States has explained to this Court, on  
 Defendant Dodge’s watch “the Nooksack Tribal Court began refusing to act on complaints challenging the legality of  
 the Kelly Faction’s actions.” *Nooksack Tribe v. Zinke*, No. 17-219, Dkt. # 26 at 7 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 3, 2017).

1 *Data Disc, Inc. v. Sys. Tech. Assoc., Inc.*, 557 F.2d 1280, 1285 (9th Cir. 1977). Discovery is  
 2 necessary where it is possible that the plaintiff can demonstrate the requisite jurisdictional facts if  
 3 afforded that opportunity. *St. Clair v. City of Chico*, 880 F.2d 199, 201 (9th Cir. 1989).

4 Here, the alleged facts indicate that Defendant Dodge, based on his immediate past  
 5 relationship with the Holdover Tribal Council as Tribal Attorney and his intimate involvement in  
 6 the alleged scheme to defraud Plaintiffs as both lawyer and “Chief Judge,”<sup>2</sup> certainly knew about  
 7 AS-IA Roberts’ October 17, 2016 Decision depriving him of jurisdiction. Plaintiffs therefore  
 8 request that this Court grant limited discovery on that subject.  
 9

10 DATED this 19th day of April, 2017.

11 GALANDA BROADMAN PLLC

12 /s/ Bree R. Black Horse

13 Gabriel S. Galanda, WSBA #30331

14 Anthony S. Broadman, WSBA #39508

15 Ryan D. Dreveskracht, WSBA #42593

16 Bree R. Black Horse, WSBA #47803

17 P.O. Box 15416

18 8606 35th Avenue NE, Suite L1

19 Seattle, WA 98115

20 PH: 206-557-7509

21 FX: 206-299-7690

22 [gabe@galandabroadman.com](mailto:gabe@galandabroadman.com)

23 [anthony@galandabroadman.com](mailto:anthony@galandabroadman.com)

24 [ryan@galandabroadman.com](mailto:ryan@galandabroadman.com)

25 [bree@galandabroadman.com](mailto:bree@galandabroadman.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

21 <sup>2</sup> Defendant Dodge arrived to Nooksack as counsel in the fall 2015, at which time: (a) Plaintiffs’ disenrollment was  
 22 stayed by operation of federal and tribal law, *Belmont v. Kelly*, No. 2014-CI-CL-007 (Nooksack Tribal Ct. Feb. 26,  
 23 2015) (per 25 C.F.R. § 2.6, enjoining Defendants from initiating disenrollment proceedings until a decision in *St.*  
 24 *Germain v. Acting N.W. Reg’l Dir.*, IBIA No.16-022); (b) Plaintiffs were represented by undersigned counsel and  
 25 secure in their homes and other properties and benefits; (c) Chief Judge Alexander presided over the Tribal Court;  
 and (d) Tribal Council elections were set to commence in December 2015, with a view towards the seating of a new  
 Council by March 24, 2016. *See generally Nooksack Tribe v. Zinke*, No. 17-219, Dkt. # 26 at 7. It is no coincidence  
 that within weeks of his arrival, starting in December 2015: (a) the Tribal Council election was cancelled; (b)  
 undersigned counsel was disbarred; (c) the Chief Judge was fired and replaced by him; and in turn (d) Plaintiffs were  
 purportedly disenrolled, evicted from their homes, and denied benefits of monetary value. *See generally id.*; Dkt. #7  
 at ¶ 2 (“RICO Defendants’ acts and omissions were deliberate and part of a scheme that began by December 2015 to  
 defraud Plaintiffs of money, property, and benefits of monetary value by depriving them of Tribal citizenship through  
 false pretenses and representations.”).

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

MARGRETTY RABANG, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ROBERT KELLY, JR., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-00088-JCC

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

On April 19, 2017, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF System, which will send electronic notification of such filing to the following parties:

Connie Sue Martin  
Christopher H. Howard  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.  
1420 5<sup>th</sup> Ave., Ste. 3400  
Seattle, WA 98101  
[csmartin@schwabe.com](mailto:csmartin@schwabe.com)  
[choward@schwabe.com](mailto:choward@schwabe.com)

Attorneys for Defendants Robert Kelly, Jr., Rick D. George, Agripina Smith, Bob Solomon, Lona Johnson, Katherine Canete, Elizabeth K. George, Katrice Romero, Donia Edwards, and Rickie Armstrong

And to,

Rob Roy Smith  
Rachel B. Saimons

KILPATRICK, TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP  
1420 Fifth Ave., Ste. 3700  
Seattle, WA 98101  
[RRSmith@kilpatricktownsend.com](mailto:RRSmith@kilpatricktownsend.com)  
[RSaimons@kilpatricktownsend.com](mailto:RSaimons@kilpatricktownsend.com)

Attorneys for Defendant Raymond Dodge

Signed under penalty of perjury and under the laws of the United States this 19th day of  
April, 2017.



Bree R. Black Horse

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