

HONORABLE DAVID G. ESTUDILLO

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

MAVERICK GAMING LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 22-cv-05325-DGE

**LIMITED INTERVENOR  
SHOALWATER BAY TRIBE'S MOTION  
TO DISMISS**

**Note on Motion Calendar: October 28,  
2022**

**ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED**

Motion to Dismiss  
Case No. 22-cv-05325-DGE

Scott D. Crowell  
Crowell Law Office-Tribal Advocacy Group  
1487 W. State Route 89A, Suite 8  
Sedona, AZ 86336  
Tel: (425) 802-5369

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction .....	1
II.	Background and Context .....	2
A.	Statutory Context: The Tribal-State Gaming Compact. ....	2
i.	Federal Law: The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act .....	2
ii.	State Law: Statutory Structure for Negotiation and Ratification of Tribal-State Gaming Compacts .....	4
B.	Historical Context: The Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe .....	5
C.	The Instant Litigation.....	9
III.	Argument .....	10
A.	Legal Standards for Dismissal Per Rule 12(b) 7 and Rule 19. ....	10
B.	The Shoalwater Bay Tribe is a Required or Necessary Party. ....	13
C.	The Shoalwater Bay Tribe Cannot Be Joined Because It Has Not Waived its Sovereign Immunity. ....	15
D.	All Four Factors Considered under Rule 19(b) weigh in the Tribe’s favor; The Tribe’s Interest in Maintaining Sovereign Immunity Leaves Very Little Room in Balancing the Four Factors of Rule 19(b). ....	16
E.	The Federal and State Defendants Are Not Able to Adequately Represent the Tribe’s Protectable Interests. ....	18
F.	The Narrow Public Rights Exception Does Not Apply Where the Claims Threaten an Absent Party Tribe’s Legal Entitlement and Sovereignty. ....	23
IV.	Conclusion .....	24

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Aguayo v. Jewell</i> ,	
827 F.3d 1213 (9th Cir. 2016) .....	14
<i>Alto v. Black</i> ,	
738 F.3d 1111 (9th Cir. 2013) .....	18
<i>American Greyhound Racing, Inc. v. Hull</i> ,	
305 F.3d 1015 (9th Cir. 2002) .....	passim
<i>Backcountry Against Dumps v. United States Bureau of Indian Affairs</i> ,	
2021 WL 2433942 (S.D. Cal. 2021) .....	21
<i>Behrens v. Donnelly</i> ,	
236 F.R.D. 509 (D. Hawaii 2006) .....	12
<i>Cachil Dehe Band of Wintun Indians of the Colusa Indian Community v. California</i> ,	
547 F.3d 962 (9th Cir. 2008) .....	2, 12
<i>California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians</i> ,	
480 U.S. 202 (1987) .....	2
<i>Chicken Ranch Rancheria of Me-wuk Indians v. California</i> ,	
42 F.4th 1024 (9th Cir. July 28, 2022) .....	3, 4
<i>Clinton v. Babbitt</i> ,	
180 F.3d 1081 (9th Cir. 1999) .....	14
<i>Comenout v. Whitener</i> ,	
2015 WL 917631 (W.D. Wash. 2015) .....	18
<i>Confed. Tribes of Chehalis Indian Reservation v. Washington</i> ,	
96 F.3d 334 (9th Cir. 1996) .....	5
<i>Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians v. Oregon</i> ,	
143 F.3d 481 (9th Cir.1998) .....	13

1	<i>Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Indian Reservation v. Lujan,</i>	
2	928 F.2d 1496 (9th Cir. 1991).....	11
3	<i>Conner v. Burford,</i>	
4	848 F.2d 1441 (9th Cir. 1988).....	23
5	<i>Crow Tribe of Indians v. Racicot,</i>	
6	87 F.3d 1039 (9th Cir. 1996).....	13
7	<i>Dawavendewa v. Salt River Project Agric. Improvement &amp; Power Dist.,</i>	
8	276 F.3d 1150 (9th Cir. 2002).....	11, 13, 14, 16, 17
9	<i>Diné Citizens Against Ruining Our Env't v. Bureau of Indian Affairs,</i>	
10	932 F.3d 843 (9th Cir. 2019).....	passim
11	<i>E.E.O.C. v. Peabody Western Coal Co.,</i>	
12	400 F.3d 774 (9th Cir. 2005).....	11, 12
13	<i>Enterprise Management Consultants, Inc. v. United States ex rel. Hodel,</i>	
14	883 F.2d 890 (10th Cir. 1989).....	17
15	<i>Friends of Amador County v. Salazar,</i>	
16	554 Fed. Appx. 562 (9th Cir. 2014).....	10
17	<i>Harris v. Lake of the Torches Resort,</i>	
18	2015 WL 1014778 (Wisc. App. March 10, 2015).....	16
19	<i>Jamul Action Comm. v. Simermeyer,</i>	
20	974 F.3d 984 (9th Cir. 2020).....	21
21	<i>Kennedy v. United States Dept. of the Interior,</i>	
22	282 F.R.D. 588 (E.D. Cal. 2012).....	24
23	<i>Kescoli v. Babbitt,</i>	
24	101 F.3d 1304 (9th Cir. 1996).....	11, 12, 16, 23
25	<i>Kickapoo Tribe of Indians of Kickapoo Reservation in Kan. v. Babbitt,</i>	
26	43 F.3d 1491 (D.C. Cir. 1995).....	13

1	<i>Kiowa Tribe of Okla. v. Mfg. Techs., Inc.</i> ,	
2	523 U.S. 751 (1998). .....	15
3	<i>Klamath Irrigation District et. al. v. United States Bureau of Reclamation et. al.</i> ,	
4	____4th____, 2022 WL 4101175 (9th Cir. Sept. 8, 2022).....	passim
5	<i>Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians v. Norton</i> ,	
6	327 F. Supp. 2d 995 (W.D. Wis. 2004) .....	2
7	<i>Makah Indian Tribe v. Verity</i> ,	
8	910 F.2d 555 (9th Cir. 1990) .....	11, 12, 24
9	<i>McShan v. Sherrill</i> ,	
10	283 F.2d 462 (9th Cir. 1960) .....	12
11	<i>Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Cmty.</i> ,	
12	572 U.S. 782 (2014) .....	1, 15
13	<i>Milligan v. Anderson</i> ,	
14	522 F.2d 1202 (10th Cir. 1975) .....	10
15	<i>MM&amp;A Productions v. Yavapai Apache Nation</i> ,	
16	234 Ariz. 60, 316 P.3d 1248 (Ariz. App. 2014) .....	16
17	<i>Naartex Consulting Corp. v. Watt</i> ,	
18	722 F.2d 779 (D.C. Cir.1983).....	15
19	<i>National Licorice Co. v. N.L.R.B.</i> ,	
20	309 U.S. 350 (1940) .....	23
21	<i>No Casino in Plymouth v. National Indian Gaming Comm’n</i> ,	
22	2022 WL 1489498 (E.D. Cal. 2022) .....	21
23	<i>Northern Alaska Env’tl. Ctr. v. Hodel</i> ,	
24	803 F.2d 466 (9th Cir. 1986) .....	12
25	<i>Northern Arapahoe Tribe v. Harnsberger</i> ,	
26	660 F. Supp. 2d 1264 (D. Wyo. 2009) .....	18

1	<i>Okla. Tax Comm’n v. Citizen Band Potawatomi Tribe of Okla.</i> ,	
2	498 U.S. 505 (1991) .....	15
3	<i>Pit River Home &amp; Agric. Coop. Ass’n v. United States</i> ,	
4	30 F.3d 1088 (9th Cir. 1994) .....	2, 10, 21
5	<i>Puyallup Tribe, Inc. v. Dep’t of Game</i> ,	
6	433 U.S. 165 (1977) .....	19
7	<i>Quileute Indian Tribe v. Babbitt</i> ,	
8	18 F.3d 1456 (9th Cir. 1994) .....	17
9	<i>Republic of Philippines v. Pimental</i> ,	
10	553 U.S. 851 (2008) .....	2, 11
11	<i>Safe Air v. Meyer</i> ,	
12	373 F.3d 1035 (9th Cir. 2004) .....	12
13	<i>Salt River Project Agric. Improvement &amp; Power Dist. v. Lee</i> ,	
14	672 F.3d 1176 (9th Cir. 2012) .....	11, 13
15	<i>Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez</i> ,	
16	436 U.S. 49 (1978) .....	15
17	<i>Shermoen v. United States</i> ,	
18	982 F.2d 1312 (9th Cir. 1992) .....	11, 23
19	<i>Shields v. Barrow</i> ,	
20	58 U.S. 130 (1855) .....	12
21	<i>Southwest Center for Biological Diversity v. Babbitt</i> ,	
22	150 F.3d 1152 (9th Cir. 1998) .....	14
23	<i>Tulalip Tribes of Wash. v. Washington</i> ,	
24	783 F.3d 1151 (9th Cir. 2015) .....	2
25	<i>Union Pacific Railroad Co. v. Runyan</i> ,	
26	320 F.R.D. 245 (D. Ore. 2017) .....	23

1	<i>United States v. USF&amp;G,</i>	
2	309 U.S. 506 (1940) .....	16
3	<i>United States v. Bowen,</i>	
4	172 F.3d 682 (9th Cir. 1999) .....	11
5	<i>United States v. Kagama,</i>	
6	118 U.S. 375 (1886) .....	19
7	<i>United States v. Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe,</i>	
8	205 F.3d 1353, 1999 WL 1269343 (9th Cir. 1999).....	5
9	<i>United States v. Spokane Tribe,</i>	
10	139 F.3d 1297 (9th Cir. 1998) .....	5, 19, 22
11	<i>United States v. Washington,</i>	
12	853 F.3d 946, 954–64 (9th Cir. 2017), <i>aff’d by an equally divided Court</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1832	
13	(2018) .....	19
14	<i>United States v. Wheeler,</i>	
15	435 U.S. 313 (1978) .....	15
16	<i>Ward v. Apple, Inc.,</i>	
17	791 F.3d 1041 (9th Cir. 2015) .....	11
18	<i>Wash. State Dep’t of Licensing v. Cougar Den, Inc.,</i>	
19	139 S. Ct. 1000 (2019) .....	19
20	<i>Washington v. Confed. Tribes of Colville Indian Reservation,</i>	
21	447 U.S. 134 (1980) .....	19
22	<i>White v. Univ. of Cal.,</i>	
23	765 F.3d 1010 (9th Cir. 2014) .....	passim

## Statutes

26	18 U.S.C. §§ 1165 .....	3
----	-------------------------	---

1	18 U.S.C. §§ 1955 .....	3
2	25 U.S.C. § 2702(1).....	3
3	25 U.S.C. § 2710(a).....	3
4	25 U.S.C. § 2710(d)(3)(A) .....	3, 10
5	25 U.S.C. §§ 2705(a) .....	3
6	25 U.S.C. §§ 2713.....	3
7	25 U.S.C. §§ 2710(d)(7)(A)(ii).....	3
8	Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, 25 U.S.C. §§ 2701-2721 (“IGRA”) .....	passim
9	RCW § 9.46.360 .....	4
10	RCW §§ 39.34.020, 39.34.030 .....	4
11	<b>Other Authorities</b>	
12	Charles A. Wright, Arthur R. Miller and Mary Kay Kane, <i>Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil</i>	
13	3d. § 1359 at 68 (2004).....	12
14	Office of Indian Gaming within the Department of the Interior. <a href="http://www.bia.gov/as-ia/oig">www.bia.gov/as-ia/oig</a> .....	6
15	<b>Rules</b>	
16	Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(7) .....	passim
17	Fed. R. Civ. P. 19 .....	passim
18	Fed. R. Civ. P. 19(a).....	11, 12
19	Fed. R. Civ. P. 19(b).....	12, 16, 17
20		
21	<b>Public Notices</b>	
22	67 Fed. Reg. 68152.....	6
23	72 Fed. Reg. 30392.....	7
24	80 Fed. Reg. 31918.....	7
25	86 Fed. Reg. 51373.....	7
26	87 Fed. Reg. 4636, 4639 (2022) .....	5

**Constitutional Provisions**

House Bill Report H.B. 2638 at 6.....	8
Laws of 2020, Chapter 127 § 1 .....	4
U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 3 .....	15

Limited Intervenor the Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe of the Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation (“Shoalwater Bay Tribe” or “Tribe”) moves pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(7) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 19 to dismiss this lawsuit filed by Plaintiff Maverick Gaming LLC (“Maverick”).

## **I. Introduction**

In this lawsuit, Maverick seeks to invalidate the compacts between the State of Washington (the “State”) and twenty-nine Indian tribes (“Washington Tribes”) entered into under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, 25 U.S.C. §§ 2701-2721 (“IGRA”). The Washington Tribes are the true target of Maverick’s suit as the requested relief is intended to shutter tribally owned and operated casinos across the State of Washington and deprive the Tribes of critical sources of funding for governmental programs. Yet, Maverick has not brought this action against any of the Washington Tribes, each of which possesses Indian lands within the boundaries of the State of Washington. Instead, Maverick sues the United States, various federal officials (collectively, “Federal Defendants”), and various officials of the State of Washington (collectively, “State Defendants”).

There is a reason for the Tribes’ absence from Maverick’s corrected First Amended Complaint, Dkt. 66 (“FAC”): the Tribes are immune from suit. *See, e.g., Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Community*, 572 U.S. 782 (2014). Maverick cannot sue the Washington Tribes directly seeking a declaration that their gaming is illegal. So, Maverick tries to circumvent the Washington Tribes’ immunity by suing other defendants instead. This type of gamesmanship is precisely the circumstance that Rule 19 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure prevents – having a suit proceed in the absence of a necessary and required party.

The stated purpose of Maverick’s lawsuit is to void the Tribal-State gaming compacts entered into by the non-party Washington Tribes and the State of Washington. The Tribe has not waived its sovereign immunity from the lawsuit. As a required party that cannot be joined to the

1 FAC, the case cannot in equity and good conscience proceed in the Tribe's absence. Accordingly,  
 2 the FAC in its entirety should be dismissed. With its substantial rights at stake, the Tribe specially  
 3 appears for the limited purpose of moving to dismiss under Rules 12(b)(7) and 19. For avoidance  
 4 of doubt, by intervening in this action for the limited purpose of filing the instant Motion, the Tribe  
 5 does not waive, and fully reserves, its sovereign immunity. *See, e.g., Pit River Home & Agric.*  
 6 *Coop. Ass'n v. United States*, 30 F.3d 1088, 1100 (9th Cir. 1994)<sup>1</sup>; *Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake*  
 7 *Superior Chippewa Indians v. Norton*, 327 F. Supp. 2d 995, 1000 (W.D. Wis. 2004). Nothing  
 8 herein shall be construed as a waiver, in whole or in part, of the Tribe's immunity, or as the Tribe's  
 9 consent to be sued, and the undersigned legal counsel for the Tribe lack any authority to waive the  
 10 Tribe's immunity or to consent to the jurisdiction of this Court.

## 11 **II. Background and Context**

### 12 **A. Statutory Context: The Tribal-State Gaming Compact.**

13 "In Washington, the process for entering into tribal gaming compacts is governed by both  
 14 federal and state law." *Tulalip Tribes of Wash. v. Washington*, 783 F.3d 1151, 1153 (9th Cir. 2015).

#### 15 **i. Federal Law: The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act**

16 In 1987, the Supreme Court ruled that due to "traditional notions of Indian sovereignty and  
 17 the congressional goal of Indian self-government," states may not regulate tribal gaming on tribal  
 18 land absent congressional authorization. *California v. Cabazon Band of Mission Indians*, 480 U.S.  
 19 202, 216, 221–22 (1987). The following year, Congress enacted IGRA with the purpose of

---

20 <sup>1</sup> Many of the cases cited in support of the Tribe's Motion were issued prior to 2007. When Rule 19 was amended in  
 21 2007, the word 'necessary' was replaced by the word 'required' and the word 'indispensable' was removed. The  
 22 changes were intended to be 'stylistic only' and "the substance and operation of the Rule both pre- and post-2007 are  
 23 unchanged." *Republic of Philippines v. Pimental*, 553 U.S. 853, 855-56; *Cachil Dehe Band of Wintun Indians of the*  
 24 *Colusa Indian Community v. California*, 547 F.3d 962, 969 n.6 (9th Cir. 2008).

1 creating a regulatory framework for Indian gaming that would allow for “gaming by Indian tribes  
2 as a means of promoting tribal economic development, self-sufficiency, and strong tribal  
3 governments.” 25 U.S.C. § 2702(1).

4 Consistent with its purpose, IGRA broadly protects Indian tribes’ right to conduct and  
5 regulate gaming activities within a three-tier framework. *See, e.g., Chicken Ranch Rancheria of*  
6 *Me-wuk Indians v. California*, 42 F.4th 1024, 1032 (9th Cir. 2022). Class I gaming (traditional  
7 and ceremonial games) and Class II gaming (bingo and non-banked card games) are regulated  
8 principally by tribes. 25 U.S.C. § 2710(a). But Class III gaming (including casino games and  
9 sports betting) is regulated differently because IGRA provides an opportunity for states to be  
10 involved in the regulatory oversight of tribal gaming by negotiating compacts that will “govern[]  
11 the conduct of [Class III] gaming activities” on Indian land. 25 U.S.C. § 2710(d)(3)(A).

14 Congress vested the National Indian Gaming Commission (“NIGC”) and the Department  
15 of Justice (“DOJ”) with authority to take action against illegal gaming on Indian lands. 25 U.S.C.  
16 §§ 2705(a) and 2713; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1166 and 1955. Congress identified allocation of criminal  
17 jurisdiction as a proper subject of negotiation between states and Indian tribes. Congress vested  
18 the federal courts with jurisdiction over an action by a state against a tribe for breach of compact.  
19 25 U.S.C. § 2710(d)(7)(A)(ii). Maverick has remedies available to redress its perceived grievances.  
20 It sought and failed to secure a sports betting entitlement in the Washington legislature. Maverick  
21 could ask Congress to amend IGRA. Maverick could plead its case to the NIGC, DOJ or the State  
22 and request that they take enforcement action against the Washington Tribes. But Maverick filing  
23 its own federal litigation to shutter the Washington Tribes’ gaming facilities is not among the  
24 remedies available to it.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1                    **ii. State Law: Statutory Structure for Negotiation and Ratification of**  
 2                    **Tribal-State Gaming Compacts**

3                    Congress provided states an opportunity to have a role in the regulation of tribal gaming,  
 4 if they “engage in compact negotiations in good faith.” *Chicken Ranch*, 42 F.4th at 1032. To  
 5 capture this opportunity, Washington state law directs the State’s Gambling Commission to  
 6 “negotiate compacts for class III gaming on behalf of the state with federally recognized Indian  
 7 tribes in the state of Washington.” RCW § 9.46.360. Moreover, Washington statutes authorize  
 8 intergovernmental joint powers agreements between tribes and local government agencies  
 9 regarding provision of services to tribal casinos and reimbursement to local government for the  
 10 costs of such services. RCW §§ 39.34.020, 39.34.030.

11                    The State’s approach to embracing the opportunities allowed by IGRA was most recently  
 12 exemplified by the Washington legislature’s approval of sports wagering in Indian country  
 13 pursuant to IGRA compacts, which the legislature passed over Maverick’s objection. The  
 14 legislature found:  
 15

16                    It has long been the policy of this state to prohibit all forms and means of gambling  
 17 except where carefully and specifically authorized and regulated. The legislature  
 18 intends to further this policy by authorizing sports wagering on a very limited basis  
 19 by restricting it to tribal casinos in the state of Washington. Tribes have more than  
 20 twenty years’ experience with, and a proven track record of, successfully operating  
 21 and regulating gaming facilities in accordance with tribal gaming compacts. Tribal  
 22 casinos can operate sports wagering pursuant to these tribal gaming compacts,  
 23 offering the benefits of the same highly regulated environment to sports wagering.

24                    Laws of 2020, Chapter 127 § 1.

25                    **B. Historical Context: The Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe**

26                    The Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe is a federally recognized tribe, 87 Fed. Reg. 4636, 4639  
 27 (2022), located in rural western Washington State. The Shoalwater Bay people descend from the  
 28 Lower Chinook and Lower Chehalis peoples who for centuries populated the villages that dotted

1 Washington's coastal waterways. Despite severe population loss and cultural displacement that  
 2 European settlement brought to the region, the Tribe steadfastly resisted outside pressure to  
 3 relinquish its lands. *Confed. Tribes of Chehalis Indian Reservation v. Washington*, 96 F.3d 334,  
 4 338 (9th Cir. 1996). Ultimately, the federal government relented, and in 1866 President Andrew  
 5 Johnson set aside the Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation within the Tribe's ancestral lands. *Id.*  
 6

7 In the 1990s, seeking a source of employment and revenue to fund crucial tribal  
 8 government operations, the Tribe exercised its rights under IGRA and approached Washington  
 9 State to negotiate a gaming compact. The State, however, insisted that the gambling machines the  
 10 tribes sought to operate gaming activities were illegal, while refusing to waive its Eleventh  
 11 Amendment immunity or otherwise consent to IGRA's negotiation/mediation remedial process.  
 12 *See United States v. Spokane Tribe*, 139 F.3d 1297, 1298 (9th Cir. 1998). After years of  
 13 unsuccessful negotiations, in 1998, the Tribe opened a gaming facility on the Shoalwater Bay  
 14 Indian Reservation, over the objections of the State and without a compact. Specifically, the Tribe  
 15 installed 108 gambling devices wherein random number generators ("RNGs") contained within  
 16 the machines determined the outcome. *See United States v. Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe*, 205 F.3d  
 17 1353, 1999 WL 1269343 at \*1 n.3 (9th Cir. 1999) (unpublished decision).  
 18  
 19

20 The United States Attorney inserted itself in the dispute on the side of the State, filed an  
 21 *in rem* action against the 108 machines, and deploying federal officers, halted the Tribe's gaming  
 22 operation by seizing and carrying away the gaming machines from tribal property. *See generally*  
 23 Arthur Santana & Jack Broom, *Shoalwater Tribe, Marshals Face Off—Agents Start to Confiscate*  
 24 *Slot Machines*, SEATTLE TIMES, Sept. 23, 1998 (article attached to the Declaration of Chairperson  
 25 Charlene Nelson ("Nelson Declaration") as Ex. B-1)). The gaming operation was the Tribe's most  
 26  
 27  
 28

1 significant source of employment and the primary source of discretionary governmental revenue,  
 2 and the seizure resulted in the loss of sixty much-needed reservation jobs. *Id.*

3        Shortly after the seizure of the Tribe's gaming machines by the United States marshals, the  
 4 Tribe installed a different type of gaming machine with a pre-determined win/loss percentage  
 5 resembling the compacted class III games in operation today within the State. That development  
 6 resulted in further enforcement action, but instead of United States marshals raiding the reservation  
 7 and seizing machines, the NIGC, in 1999, issued a Notice of Violation, NOV-99-10, and an Order  
 8 of Closure, OC-99-10. In the Tribe's subsequent administrative appeal to the United States  
 9 Department of the Interior Office of Hearings and Appeals, Docket No. NIGC 99-2, the Tribe was  
 10 successful in securing an Order enjoining the NIGC from taking further enforcement action until  
 11 the United States demonstrated that it was seeking to provide an effective remedy for the Tribe's  
 12 injuries resulting from Washington State's refusal to negotiate a gaming compact. *See* Order  
 13 Deferring Decision and Staying Proceedings on Reconsideration Motion, August 23, 2001  
 14 (Attached to Nelson Declaration as Ex. B-2). While that injunction was pending, the Tribe and the  
 15 State successfully reached agreement on a Tribal-State Compact, which became effective on  
 16 November 8, 2002. 67 Fed. Reg. 68152.<sup>2</sup> Despite the coordinated and parallel efforts of both the  
 17 United States and the State of Washington to prevent the Tribe from conducting gaming, the  
 18 Tribe's gaming operation never closed, except for the few weeks between the seizure of the 108  
 19 gambling devices with RNGs and the installation of machines without RNGs.  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26

---

27        <sup>2</sup> The complete text of the Compact and the several amendments thereto are available for public viewing at  
 28 the official web page of the Office of Indian Gaming within the Department of the Interior. [www.bia.gov/as-ia/oig](http://www.bia.gov/as-ia/oig)

1 That Compact marked a turning-point in the relationship between the three governments:  
 2 the Tribe, the State and the United States, ending years of contentious and often confrontational  
 3 disputes over gaming on the Tribe's lands. The Tribe and the State have subsequently reached  
 4 agreement on three amendments to the Compact, all approved by the Department of the Interior,  
 5 in 2007, 72 Fed. Reg. 30392; in 2015, 80 Fed. Reg. 31918; and most recently in 2021, 86 Fed.  
 6 Reg. 51373. The Third Amendment in 2021, authorizing sports wagering, is the focus of  
 7 Maverick's FAC, but notably, it seeks also to invalidate the initial Compact and the three  
 8 amendments thereto in their entirety.

10 In stark contrast to the contentious and tumultuous non-compacted environment of the  
 11 1990s, today, the Tribe operates a small gaming facility free of disputes with the State and United  
 12 States. The casino provides an anchor for the Tribe's economy and the economies of the  
 13 surrounding rural communities. Willapa Bay Enterprises, the Tribally-owned entity which  
 14 operates the casino along with the restaurant, small lodge and other businesses, employs 120  
 15 people, approximately 30% of whom are Tribal members, their spouses or direct family members.  
 16 See Nelson Declaration at 2, ¶ 7. The casino purchases goods and services from local vendors, and  
 17 creates a gathering place for the Tribe and the surrounding community. Importantly, the small  
 18 gaming facility is a source of pride for the Tribe and self-esteem for the Tribe's members. *Id.* at 2-  
 19 3, ¶¶ 8-9.

22 The Tribe and the State have replaced the adversity of the 1990s with a constructive,  
 23 working relationship for more than twenty years. Today's relationship is an example of the  
 24 successful relationship between all Washington Tribes and the State, a key factor in the  
 25 Washington legislature's decision to authorize sports betting at tribal casinos:  
 26  
 27  
 28

1 Tribes and the state have an excellent working partnership already as sovereign-to-  
 2 sovereign governments, including work done related to problem gambling, and so  
 3 it makes sense to continue that partnership and add sports wagering as an additional  
 4 offering at tribal casinos. The state has a history of acting conservatively in terms  
 5 of expanding gambling. Tribal gaming is a structured regulatory environment and  
 6 there are significant internal controls. Because tribes are located throughout the  
 state, there will be access for consumers to sports betting no matter where they live.  
 It is best to start slowly by authorizing sports wagering at existing tribal facilities,  
 without adding mobile sports betting, and then to evaluate how it works.

7 House Bill Report H.B. 2638<sup>3</sup> at 6.

8 These facts are brought to this Court's attention in the context of the current motion as they  
 9 highlight that the Compact, in effect as amended, is the vehicle that ended the adversity of the pre-  
 10 compact relationship between the Tribe, the State and the United States. These facts are also  
 11 relevant here because they highlight, as discussed in greater detail below in Section III(D), the  
 12 adversarial environment which Maverick intends to recreate between the three respective  
 13 governments if Maverick's requested relief, invalidation of the Compact, is ordered by this Court.

15 Maverick's owner, Eric Persson, boasts that he is a "proud" enrolled member of the Tribe  
 16 and that his acquisition of commercial card rooms allows him "to come home again" to work with  
 17 his "tribal brothers." *See* Maverick Gaming Press Releases of June 14, 2019; June 27, 2019; August  
 18 19, 2019; and October 1, 2019 (included as Ex. B-3 to Nelson Declaration). As a tribal member,  
 20 Mr. Persson has access to the Tribe's governance and dispute mechanisms (voting, running for  
 21 office, litigating in tribal court, etc.) to air his grievances. Mr. Persson has not had to use or rely  
 22 upon the employment opportunities provided by, and/or the tribal programs funded by, the Tribe's  
 23 gaming operation, because he left the reservation and relocated to the State of Nevada, where he  
 24 amassed his own wealth with a very successful gaming company comprised of five casinos in  
 25

26  
 27 <sup>3</sup> <https://lawfilesexternal.leg.wa.gov/biennium/2019-20/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/House/2638%20HBR%20APP%2020.pdf?q=20220519085734>.

1 northern Nevada, four casinos in Colorado, and eighteen<sup>4</sup> commercial card rooms in Washington  
 2 State. *See* official webpage of Maverick Gaming LLC, [www.maverickgaming.com](http://www.maverickgaming.com). Rather than  
 3 returning to Washington State to assist his own Tribe, he returned to Washington State to purchase  
 4 a majority of the State's commercial card rooms, and he now seeks to destroy, through his  
 5 requested prayer for relief in the instant litigation, the major source of employment and  
 6 discretionary revenue for his own Tribe.  
 7

8 The irony of Eric Persson boasting of his proud membership in the Tribe, while filing an  
 9 action to destroy the Tribe's gaming facility and the governmental revenues, programs and jobs it  
 10 supports, while not even attempting to join the Tribe as a party to the litigation, is not lost on the  
 11 Tribe. Accordingly, the Tribe is compelled to seek dismissal of this case and bring an end to his  
 12 efforts to undermine his own Tribe's efforts to achieve economic self-sufficiency and provide  
 13 adequate governmental services to its membership.  
 14

### 15 **C. The Instant Litigation**

16 On July 5, 2022, Maverick filed the FAC in this Court, making a sweeping request for  
 17 declaratory and injunctive relief to prohibit Class III gaming on Shoalwater Bay Indian lands.  
 18 More specifically, Maverick's FAC seeks, *inter alia*:  
 19

- 20 (1) a declaration that the Tribe's compact and its amendments (and all such compacts and  
 21 amendments between the State and the Washington Tribes) are "void, were not validly  
 22 entered into, and are not in effect." FAC, Dkt. 66 at 40, prayer for relief at ¶ 207(1);
- 23 (2) a declaration that the "Tribes' class III gaming activities violate IGRA." FAC, Dkt.  
 24 66 at 40, prayer for relief at ¶ 207(4); and  
 25

---

26 <sup>4</sup> Recent press reports indicate Maverick has sold one of the eighteen commercial card rooms listed on its  
 27 web page as of October 1, 2022. The Tribe will defer to Maverick to clarify in its response brief.  
 28

(3) an order “enjoining the continued administration of the Compacts and Compact Amendments by the members of the Washington State Gambling Commission.” FAC, Dkt. 66 at 40, prayer for relief at ¶ 207(6).

Despite seeking relief that is unmistakably directed against the Tribe, and despite the fact that federal law expressly recognizes the Tribe’s direct interest in its Compact, *see* 25 U.S.C. § 2710(d)(3)(A), Maverick did not name the Tribe—or any other Washington Tribe—as a defendant. Thus, to protect its substantial interests in this matter, the Tribe now moves to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(7) and Rule 19. *See Diné Citizens Against Ruining Our Env’t v. Bureau of Indian Affairs*, 932 F.3d 843, 850 (9th Cir. 2019); *Klamath Irrigation District et. al. v. United States Bureau of Reclamation et. al.*, \_\_\_ 4th \_\_\_, 2022 WL 4101175 (9th Cir. Sept. 8, 2022). Because the Tribe is a necessary party, and because the Tribe is protected by sovereign immunity and cannot be joined, this action must be dismissed. *See, e.g., Pit River Home and Agric. Coop. Ass’n v. United States*, 30 F.3d 1088, 1103 (9th Cir. 1994).

### III. Argument

#### A. Legal Standards for Dismissal Per Rule 12(b) 7 and Rule 19.

The Tribe seeks an order dismissing the lawsuit in its entirety pursuant to Rule 12(b)(7) because the Tribe is a required party that cannot be joined, and accordingly, pursuant to Rule 19, the Court cannot in equity and good conscience proceed with the case without the Tribe.

A party may move to dismiss a complaint for “failure to join a party under Rule 19.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(7); *Greyhound Racing, Inc. v. Hull*, 305 F.3d 1015, 1022-25 (9th Cir. 2002). Similarly, non-parties that have not consented to the court’s jurisdiction may specially appear to seek dismissal pursuant to Rule 19. *See Friends of Amador County v. Salazar*, 554 Fed. Appx. 562, 564 (9th Cir. 2014); *Milligan v. Anderson*, 522 F.2d 1202, 1203-04 (10th Cir. 1975).

1 Furthermore, a court may address whether to dismiss a case under Rule 19 *sua sponte*. *Republic*  
 2 *of Philippines v. Pimental*, 553 U.S. 851, 861 (2008).

3 Rule 19 provides a three-step process for determining whether the court should dismiss an  
 4 action for failure to join a purportedly indispensable party. *E.E.O.C. v. Peabody Western Coal Co.*,  
 5 400 F.3d 774, 779 (9th Cir. 2005); *United States v. Bowen*, 172 F.3d 682, 688 (9th Cir. 1999); *see*  
 6 *also Pimental*, 553 U.S. at 855-57; *accord, Makah Indian Tribe v. Verity*, 910 F.2d 555, 558 (9th  
 7 Cir. 1990) (describes same process as a two-step process).

9 First, Rule 19 asks whether the absent party is “necessary (i.e., required to be joined if  
 10 feasible) under Rule 19(a).” *Salt River Project Agric. Improvement & Power Dist. v. Lee*, 672 F.3d  
 11 1176, 1179 (9th Cir. 2012); *White v. Univ. of Cal.*, 765 F.3d 1010, 1026 (9th Cir. 2014);  
 12 *Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Indian Reservation v. Lujan*, 928 F.2d 1496, 1498 (9th Cir.  
 13 1991). To make such a determination, the court “must consider whether ‘complete relief’ can be  
 14 accorded among the existing parties, and whether the absent party has a ‘legally protected interest’  
 15 in the subject of the suit.” *Shermoen v. United States*, 982 F.2d 1312, 1317 (9th Cir. 1992); *Ward*,  
 16 *v. Apple, Inc.*, 791 F.3d 1041, 1048 (9th Cir. 2015). If the court finds that a party is not “necessary,”  
 17 then the court need not consider the second step under Rule 19 and the case may continue without  
 18 the absent party. *Makah*, 910 F.2d at 559; *Kescoli v. Babbitt*, 101 F.3d 1304, 1310 (9th Cir. 1996).

21 If the party is “required” or “necessary,” the court must then determine whether that party  
 22 is “indispensable.” *Id.* To make such a determination, the court asks whether it is “feasible to order  
 23 that the absent party be joined.” *Id.* “A party is indispensable if in ‘equity and good conscience,’  
 24 the court should not allow the action to proceed in its absence.” *Dawavendewa v. Salt River Project*  
 25 *Agric. Improvement & Power Dist.*, 276 F.3d 1150, 1161 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P.  
 26 19(b)). To make this determination, the court balances four factors: (1) the prejudice to any party  
 27  
 28

1 or to the absent party; (2) whether relief can be shaped to lessen prejudice; (3) whether an adequate  
 2 remedy, even if not complete, can be awarded without the absent party; and (4) whether there  
 3 exists an alternative forum. *Id.* at 1161–62; *Kescoli*, 101 F.3d at 1310.

4 If it is not feasible to join the absent party, the court asks whether the case can proceed  
 5 without it — and if not, dismisses the action. *Peabody Western Coal*, 400 F.3d at 779, Fed. R. Civ.  
 6 P. 19(b). An indispensable party is one which “not only [has] an interest in the controversy, but  
 7 an interest of such a nature that a final decree cannot be made without either affecting that interest,  
 8 or leaving the controversy in such a condition that its final termination may be wholly inconsistent  
 9 with equity and good conscience.” *Peabody Western Coal*, 400 F.3d at 780 (quoting *Shields v.*  
 10 *Barrow*, 58 U.S 130, 139 (1855)).

11 The movant bears the burden of persuading the court that a party must be joined (or the  
 12 case dismissed). *Makah*, 910 F.2d at 558. There is no precise formula for determining whether a  
 13 particular nonparty should be joined under Rule 19(a). The determination is heavily influenced by  
 14 the facts and circumstances of each case. *Cachil Dehe Band*, 547 F.3d at 970; *Northern Alaska*  
 15 *Envtl. Ctr. v. Hodel*, 803 F.2d 466, 468 (9th Cir. 1986). To determine whether Rule 19 requires  
 16 the joinder of additional parties, the court may consider evidence outside the pleadings. *Safe Air*  
 17 *v. Meyer*, 373 F.3d 1035, 1039 (9th Cir. 2004); *McShan v. Sherrill*, 283 F.2d 462, 464 (9th Cir.  
 18 1960); *Behrens v. Donnelly*, 236 F.R.D. 509, 512 (D. Hawaii 2006) (citing Charles A. Wright,  
 19 Arthur R. Miller and Mary Kay Kane, *Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil 3d*. § 1359 at 68  
 20 (2004)).

21 Application of these standards to the FAC and the circumstances of the Tribe compels the  
 22 dismissal of Maverick’s lawsuit. Because the Tribe is immune and therefore cannot be joined  
 23 involuntarily, and because the Tribe is a necessary, indispensable party under Rule 19, the entire  
 24

1 case must be dismissed per Rule 12(b)(7). *Salt River Project*, 672 F.3d at 1179; *Greyhound Racing*,  
 2 305 F.3d at 1022-25.

3 **B. The Shoalwater Bay Tribe is a Required or Necessary Party.**

4 The Tribe is a required or necessary party because the Tribe's protectable interests in  
 5 continuing to offer gaming activities on its Indian lands are at stake, and Maverick cannot secure  
 6 complete relief without joining the Tribe. The Tribe's interests in this matter could not be more  
 7 clear. The Tribe has a federal right to conduct Class III gaming on its Reservation, rights in its  
 8 Compact with Washington State that federal law expressly recognizes, and the sovereign right to  
 9 immunity from unconsented suit. The relationship between those legally protected interests and  
 10 Maverick's claims could not be any more direct: Maverick brought this action to "void" the  
 11 Tribe's Compact in the Tribe's absence. FAC, Dkt. 66 at 40, ¶¶ 207(1), (4) and (6). "Clearly," a  
 12 sovereign "has an interest in the validity of a compact to which it is a party, and this interest would  
 13 be directly affected by . . . relief" that purports to affect the validity of the compact. *Kickapoo*  
 14 *Tribe of Indians of Kickapoo Reservation in Kan. v. Babbitt*, 43 F.3d 1491, 1495 (D.C. Cir. 1995).  
 15 The Ninth Circuit recognizes that IGRA "compacts are agreements . . . and are interpreted as  
 16 contracts." *Chehalis*, 958 P.2d at 750 (citing *Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians v. Oregon*, 143  
 17 F.3d 481, 485–486 (9th Cir.1998) and *Crow Tribe of Indians v. Racicot*, 87 F.3d 1039, 1045 (9th  
 18 Cir. 1996)); *see also Dawavendewa*, 276 F.3d at 1156-57 ("No procedural principle is more deeply  
 19 imbedded in the common law than that, in an action to set aside a lease or contract, all parties who  
 20 may be affected by the determination of the action are indispensable.") *Greyhound Racing*, 305  
 21 F.3d at 1022-23 (tribes had "substantial" interest sufficient for Rule 19 purposes in renewal of their  
 22 compacts). It is the Tribe, along with the twenty-eight other Washington Tribes, that are the real  
 23 parties in interest in this litigation. It is the Tribe that will be devastated by the loss of employment  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

1 and governmental revenue if Maverick succeeds. It is the Tribe that will be severely hampered  
 2 from achieving Congress' purpose in enacting IGRA: tribal economic development, self-  
 3 sufficiency and strengthened tribal governance through compacted gaming on its Indian lands.

4 Moreover, Maverick's efforts to make an "end run around tribal sovereign immunity"  
 5 would impair the Tribe's immunity. *Aguayo v. Jewell*, 827 F.3d 1213, 1222 (9th Cir. 2016). It is  
 6 well established that plaintiffs cannot "circumvent the barrier of sovereign immunity by merely  
 7 substituting" other parties or officials "in lieu of the Indian tribe." *Dawavendewa*, 276 F.3d at  
 8 1160. That is because sovereign immunity protects a tribe's ability to "govern [its] reservation,"  
 9 and suits that indirectly attack a Tribe's "ability to negotiate contracts" go to the heart of that core  
 10 sovereign right. *Id.* at 1157.

11 Moreover, complete relief is not available where the absent party is a tribe that is a  
 12 signatory to the agreement at issue because the judgment would not be binding on the tribe, which  
 13 could assert its rights under the agreement. *Friends of Amador County*, 554 Fed. Appx. at 564  
 14 (appellants seek to invalidate tribe's compact with state); *Greyhound Racing*, 305 F.3d at 1022-25  
 15 ("[t]he interests of the tribes in their compacts are being impaired and, not being parties, the tribes  
 16 cannot defend those interests."); *Southwest Center for Biological Diversity v. Babbitt*, 150 F.3d  
 17 1152 (9th Cir. 1998) (party to settlement agreement regarding water rights at issue in litigation);  
 18 *Dawavendewa*, 276 F.3d at 1161 (absent tribe was party to lease that provided for tribal preference  
 19 in hiring); *Clinton v. Babbitt*, 180 F.3d 1081, 1089 (9th Cir. 1999) (requested judgment would  
 20 preclude absent tribe from fulfilling its obligations under settlement agreement); *Pit River*, 30 F.3d  
 21 at 1099 ("[E]ven if the Association obtained its requested relief in [a dispute over which group of  
 22 Indians are beneficial owners of a certain piece of property], it would not have complete relief,  
 23 since judgment against the government would not bind the [other group of Indians], which could  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

1 assert its right to possess the [property].”); *Chehalis*, 928 F.2d at 1498 (noting that judgment  
 2 against federal officials in an action challenging an agreement between the United States and the  
 3 Quinault Nation would not bind the Nation); *Naartex Consulting Corp. v. Watt*, 722 F.2d 779, 788  
 4 (D.C. Cir.1983) (“an action seeking rescission of a contract must be dismissed unless all parties to  
 5 the contract, and others having a substantial interest in it, can be joined”). There can be no doubt  
 6 that the Tribe is a required or necessary party.  
 7

8 **C. The Shoalwater Bay Tribe Cannot Be Joined Because It Has Not**  
 9 **Waived its Sovereign Immunity.**

10 Indian tribes are “domestic dependent nations” that exercise “inherent sovereign  
 11 authority.” *Bay Mills Indian Cmty.*, 572 U.S. at 788 (quoting *Okla. Tax Comm’n v. Citizen Band*  
 12 *Potawatomi Tribe of Okla.*, 498 U.S. 505, 509 (1991)). “Thus, unless and ‘until Congress acts,  
 13 the tribes retain’ their historical sovereign authority.” *Id.* (quoting *United States v. Wheeler*, 435  
 14 U.S. 313, 323 (1978)); *see also* U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 3 (authorizing Congress to “regulate  
 15 Commerce . . . with the Indian Tribes”); *Kiowa Tribe of Okla. v. Mfg. Techs., Inc.*, 523 U.S. 751,  
 16 756 (1998). As “distinct, independent political communities” with sovereign powers that have  
 17 never been extinguished, “Indian tribes have long been recognized as possessing the common law  
 18 immunity from suit traditionally enjoyed by sovereign powers.” *Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez*,  
 19 436 U.S. 49, 58 (1978). *See also* *Bay Mills Indian Cmty.*, 572 U.S. at 789 (sovereign immunity  
 20 extends to bar suit whether on or off-reservation, whether or not the action concerns commercial  
 21 activity). As such, “[a]s a matter of federal law, an Indian tribe is subject to suit only where  
 22 Congress has authorized the suit or the tribe has waived its immunity.” *Kiowa Tribe*, 523 U.S. at  
 23 754. Further, any purported waiver must be duly authorized as a matter of tribal law. The person  
 24 or entity that allegedly waived the immunity must have the authority to waive that immunity.  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

1 *United States v. USF&G*, 309 U.S. 506, 513 (1940); *MM&A Productions v. Yavapai Apache*  
 2 *Nation*, 234 Ariz. 60, 316 P.3d 1248 (Ariz. App. 2014); *Harris v. Lake of the Torches Resort*, 2015  
 3 WL 1014778 (Wisc. App. March 10, 2015) (An attorney’s attestations in court are insufficient to  
 4 waive tribal immunity unless the attorney is duly authorized under tribal law to do so).

5       Maverick seeks sweeping relief that would cripple the Tribe’s economy, jeopardize  
 6 government services, and deprive the Tribe of its compact rights. But Maverick cannot sue the  
 7 Tribe due to the Tribe’s sovereign immunity. The Tribe has not waived its sovereign immunity  
 8 regarding this litigation. Nelson Declaration at 2, ¶ 5. The Tribe has not consented to this Court’s  
 9 jurisdiction to hear Maverick’s claims. *Id.* No Tribal officials, including its attorneys in this  
 10 litigation, are authorized under Tribal law to waive the Tribe’s sovereign immunity regarding this  
 11 litigation. *Id.* To sidestep this bar, Maverick seeks to proceed against *other* parties to indirectly  
 12 obtain the relief that it cannot obtain directly. Federal Rule 19 forbids this sleight of hand.  
 13  
 14

15               **D. All Four Factors Considered under Rule 19(b) weigh in the Tribe’s**  
 16               **favor; The Tribe’s Interest in Maintaining Sovereign Immunity**  
 17               **Leaves Very Little Room in Balancing the Four Factors of Rule 19(b).**

18       To make the determination under Fed. R. Civ. P. 19(b), the court asks whether it is “feasible  
 19 to order that the absent party be joined”, and balances four factors: (1) the prejudice to any party  
 20 or to the absent party; (2) whether relief can be shaped to lessen prejudice; (3) whether an adequate  
 21 remedy, even if not complete, can be awarded without the absent party; and (4) whether there  
 22 exists an alternative forum. *Dawavendewa*, 276 F.3d at 1161 (9th Cir. 2002); *Kescoli*, 101 F.3d at  
 23 1310. Here, the first factor, prejudice to the Tribe is overwhelming – Maverick seeks to “void” the  
 24 Tribe’s Compact through which tribal opportunities and benefits from tribal governmental gaming  
 25 directly flow. The second and third factors regarding the adequacy and form of relief also weigh  
 26 in favor of dismissal. Any relief in Maverick’s favor thrusts the Tribe into uncharted legal waters  
 27  
 28

1 that threaten to terminate its sovereign rights and to destroy the tribal economy. As discussed in  
2 Section II(A)(i) above, Congress afforded Maverick alternative forums to seek redress, but a  
3 private party's legal challenge to the legality of a Tribe's gaming facility is not among them. All  
4 four factors weigh heavily in favor of dismissal.

5 A tribe's interest in sovereign immunity so greatly outweighs a plaintiff's interest in  
6 litigating its claims that there is "very little room for balancing of other factors" under Rule 19(b)  
7 in such cases. *Greyhound Racing*, 305 F.3d at 1025. Virtually all the cases to consider the question  
8 have dismissed under Rule 19, regardless of whether an alternative remedy is available, if the  
9 absent parties are Indian tribes possessing sovereign immunity. *Dine Citizens*, 932 F.3d at 857;  
10 *Klamath Irrigation*, 2022 WL 4101175 at \*10; *White*, 765 F.3d at 1028; *Dawavendewa*, 276 F.3d  
11 at 1152; *Quileute Indian Tribe v. Babbitt*, 18 F.3d 1456, 1460 (9th Cir. 1994) ("Plaintiff's interest  
12 in litigating a claim may be outweighed by a tribe's interest in maintaining its sovereign  
13 immunity."); *Chehalis*, 928 F.2d at 1499; *Enterprise Management Consultants, Inc. v. United*  
14 *States ex rel. Hodel*, 883 F.2d 890, 894 (10th Cir. 1989) ("[w]hen, as here, a necessary party under  
15 Rule 19(a) is immune from suit, there is very little room for balancing of other factors set out in  
16 Rule 19(b), because immunity may be viewed as one of those interests compelling by  
17 themselves"). Federal courts acknowledge that plaintiffs may be left with no adequate remedy  
18 upon dismissal for non-joinder, "[b]ut this result is a common consequence of sovereign  
19 immunity, and [the Tribe's] interest in maintaining [its] sovereign immunity outweighs  
20 the [Appellants'] interest in litigating their claims." *White*, 765 F.3d at 1028; *Greyhound Racing*,  
21 305 F.3d at 1025; *Friends of Amador County*, 554 Fed. Appx. at 566. Thus, although the Rule  
22 19(b) factors still must be considered, the court's "discretion in balancing the equities ... is to a  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 great degree circumscribed, and the scale is already heavily tipped in favor of dismissal.” *Id.* See  
 2 also *Comenout v. Whitener*, 2015 WL 917631 at \*4 (W.D. Wash. 2015); *Northern Arapahoe Tribe*  
 3 *v. Harnsberger*, 660 F. Supp. 2d 1264, 1280 (D. Wyo. 2009).

4 **E. The Federal and State Defendants Are Not Able to Adequately Represent**  
 5 **the Tribe’s Protectable Interests.**

6 In evaluating whether an existing party adequately represents the interests of an absent  
 7 party, courts consider “whether the interest of a present party to the suit are such that it will  
 8 undoubtedly make all of the absent party’s arguments; whether the party is capable of and willing  
 9 to make such arguments; and whether the absent party would offer any necessary element to the  
 10 proceedings that the present parties would neglect.” *Dine Citizens*, 932 F.3d at 852 (quoting *Alto*  
 11 *v. Black*, 738 F.3d 1111, 1127 (9th Cir. 2013)). In evaluating these considerations, it is not enough  
 12 that the absent party and the existing defendants both currently wish to prevail in the suit. As the  
 13 Ninth Circuit has explained, an absent party is required (i) where the interests of the existing and  
 14 intervening defendants “might [later] diverge” or (ii) where, in cases involving absent tribal  
 15 parties, no existing defendant shares the absent tribe’s “sovereign interest in ensuring that [a tribal  
 16 business] continue[s] to operate and provide profits to the [Tribe].” *Dine Citizens*, 932 F.3d at  
 17 855; See also *Klamath Irrigation*, 2022 WL 4101175 at \*7 (citing *Dine Citizens* with approval).  
 18  
 19  
 20

21 No party can be expected to defend the Tribe’s interests in this matter. Maverick is opposed  
 22 to the Washington Tribes’ interests as it seeks to **shut down** all Class III gaming in the State. Nor  
 23 can the Federal Defendants or the State Defendants be counted upon to adequately represent the  
 24 protectable interests of the Tribe.

25 The State Defendants cannot adequately represent the protectable interests of the Tribe. It  
 26 is black letter law in this Circuit that the State Defendants cannot adequately represent the Tribe’s  
 27  
 28

1 interests. *American Greyhound Racing, Inc.*, 305 F.3d at 1023 n.5, is the controlling case in the  
 2 Ninth Circuit on the inability of a state to adequately represent the interest of absent tribes. In  
 3 *Greyhound Racing*, a commercial racetrack filed a lawsuit against then-Arizona Governor Hull  
 4 seeking to invalidate the gaming compacts Arizona had reached with several tribes. The Court  
 5 noted “the State and the tribes have often been adversaries in disputes over gaming, and the State  
 6 owes no trust duty to the tribes” and noted the “Governor’s and the tribes’ interests under the  
 7 compacts are potentially adverse.” *Id.* Those circumstances are also present here, hence, the State  
 8 Defendants are not able to adequately represent the interests of the Tribe.

10 Moreover, the historical animosity between tribal and state interests stemming from  
 11 competition over sovereign power prevents the State Defendants from adequately representing the  
 12 Tribe. *See, e.g., United States v. Kagama*, 118 U.S. 375, 384 (1886) (“These Indian tribes . . .  
 13 owe no allegiance to the states, and receive from them no protection. Because of the local ill  
 14 feeling, the people of the states where they are found are often their deadliest enemies.”). That is  
 15 why, unlike the Tribe’s desire to vigorously assert its immunity in this action, the State has  
 16 frequently sought to *undermine* tribal sovereignty in order to expand its *own* authority. *E.g., Wash.*  
 17 *State Dep’t of Licensing v. Cougar Den, Inc.*, 139 S. Ct. 1000 (2019); *United States v. Washington*,  
 18 853 F.3d 946, 954–64 (9th Cir. 2017), *aff’d by an equally divided Court*, 138 S. Ct. 1832 (2018)  
 19 (per curiam); *Washington v. Confed. Tribes of Colville Indian Reservation*, 447 U.S. 134, 152  
 20 (1980); *Puyallup Tribe, Inc. v. Dep’t of Game*, 433 U.S. 165, 167 (1977); *Spokane Tribe*, 139 F.3d  
 21 at 1301.

24 Nor can the Federal Defendants represent the Tribe’s interests here. As very recently  
 25 reaffirmed in *Klamath Irrigation*, 2022 WL 4101175 at \*7, *Dine Citizens* is the controlling case in  
 26 the Ninth Circuit on when the United States cannot adequately represent the interest of absent  
 27

1 tribes. In *Dine Citizens*, the Ninth Circuit held that Federal Defendants are unable to adequately  
 2 represent an absent tribe where their obligations to follow relevant laws are in tension with tribal  
 3 interests. 932 F.3d. at 855. In *Dine Citizens*, the absent tribal entity of the Navajo Nation intervened  
 4 in an APA action challenging the federal government’s compliance with federal laws requiring  
 5 review of the potential environmental impacts of federal approval for the operation of a tribal coal  
 6 mine and a power plant that relied on the coal mine. The Nation sought intervention for the limited  
 7 purpose of filing a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 19. *Id.* at 850. Finding the absent tribal  
 8 entity to be a required party, the court turned to whether another party could adequately represent  
 9 the absent tribal entity’s interests, and opined that neither the United States nor the tribal entity’s  
 10 business partners could do so. The court reasoned that while federal defendants “have an interest  
 11 in defending their own analyses,” they “do not share an interest in the *outcome* of the approvals—  
 12 the continued operation of” the tribe’s mine and associated powerplant. *Id.* at 855. Similarly, in  
 13 *Klamath Irrigation*, the absent Tribal entities, the Klamath Tribes and the Hoopa Valley Tribe,  
 14 intervened in an Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”) action challenging the federal Bureau of  
 15 Reclamation’s decisions to maintain specific lake levels and instream flows to comply with the  
 16 Endangered Species Act and to safeguard the federal reserved water and fishing rights of the  
 17 (absent) Tribes. 2022 WL 4101175 at \*2. Citing and applying *Dine Citizens*, the court reasoned  
 18 “[t]he Tribes’ primary interest is in ensuring the continued fulfillment of their reserved water and  
 19 fishing rights, while Reclamation’s primary interest is in defending its Amended Proposed Action  
 20 taken pursuant to the ESA [Endangered Species Act] and APA. While Reclamation and the Tribes  
 21 share an interest in the ultimate outcome of this case, our precedent underscores that such  
 22 alignment on the ultimate outcome is insufficient for us to hold that the government is an adequate  
 23 representative of the tribes. *Klamath Irrigation*, 2022 WL 4101175 at \*7.

1 *Dine Citizens* also noted that the Navajo Nation’s interest in being able to operate a mine  
 2 and benefit from an associated power plant to support its population was not merely pecuniary but  
 3 “sovereign” in nature, and the tribal entity’s business partners could not adequately represent these  
 4 sovereign interests. 932 F.3d. at 855. Similarly, *Klamath Irrigation* found the Bureau of  
 5 Reclamation’s “interest differs in a meaningful sense from [the tribe’s] sovereign interest in  
 6 ensuring [continued access to natural resources].” 2022 WL 4101175 at \*7; *see also Jamul Action*  
 7 *Comm. v. Simermeyer*, 974 F.3d 984 (9th Cir. 2020) (applying *Dine Citizens*); *Pit River*, 30 F.3d  
 8 at 1101 (“We have held that the United States cannot adequately represent an absent tribe, when  
 9 it may face competing interests.”); *No Casino in Plymouth v. National Indian Gaming Comm’n*,  
 10 2022 WL 1489498 at \*9-10 (E.D. Cal. 2022) (appeal pending); *Backcountry Against Dumps v.*  
 11 *United States Bureau of Indian Affairs*, 2021 WL 2433942 at \*2-3 (S.D. Cal. 2021) (appeal  
 12 pending). The same is true here. A “[d]eclar[ation] that the Tribe[’s] class III gaming activities”  
 13 are unlawful, FAC ¶ 207(4), would undermine the Tribe’s unique sovereign interests by  
 14 eviscerating the Tribe’s “very ability to govern itself, sustain itself financially, and make decisions  
 15 about its own” gaming operation. *Dine Citizens*, 932 F.3d at 856.

16  
 17  
 18  
 19 Indeed, this case is far clearer than *Dine Citizens*. There, one of the existing defendants  
 20 “share[d] at least some of [the absent tribal parties’] financial interest in the outcome of the case.”  
 21 *Id.* at 856. Here, by contrast, the federal government has no pecuniary interest in the Tribe’s  
 22 gaming operation. Quite the contrary: If the Court grants Maverick the requested relief, that likely  
 23 would result in conflict between the Shoalwater Bay Tribe and both the Federal Defendants and  
 24 the State Defendants over the Tribe’s operation of gaming. The history discussed above at Section  
 25 II(B) suggests a finding the Compact is void could lead to renewed disagreements about the Tribe’s  
 26 right to conduct gaming. For example, the United States may take enforcement action to stop the  
 27  
 28

1 Tribe's gaming following a court order granting such relief, while the Tribe would resist such an  
 2 effort. *See United States v. Spokane Tribe*, 139 F.3d 1297 (9th Cir. 1998) (vacating injunction of  
 3 tribal gaming and remanding for further proceedings in light of Supreme Court holding a portion  
 4 of IGRA unconstitutional). Applying *Dine Citizens*, the outcome of Maverick's lawsuit, if it were  
 5 successful, creates potentially competing interests between the Tribe and the United States.  
 6 Accordingly, the Federal Defendants are not able to adequately represent the interests of the Tribe.  
 7

8       Moreover, no Defendant has moved under Rule 12(b)(7) or 19 for failure to join the Tribe,  
 9 or otherwise raised the Tribe's sovereign immunity as an issue. No Defendant has indicated in  
 10 filings in this case, during the April 28, 2022 status conference, or in the scheduling order, that it  
 11 would make such a motion. And in conferring with the parties in advance of filing this Motion,  
 12 none of the parties—not the Federal Defendants, not the State Defendants, and certainly not  
 13 Maverick—stated that they would raise the Rule 19 issue if the Tribe did not. That factor itself  
 14 demonstrates that their interests diverge from those of the Tribe's. *Friends of Amador County*, 554  
 15 Fed. Appx. at 564.  
 16

17       Further, governmental entities are unable to adequately represent tribal interests where the  
 18 governmental entity (or other remaining parties) may pursue a settlement or litigation strategy that  
 19 diverges from the Tribe's. *Id.* (“[t]he government's response to the district court's questions on this  
 20 issue at a status conference caused the district court to suspect that the government favored judicial  
 21 resolution of the lawsuit as opposed to early dismissal, and would seek to avoid taking positions  
 22 contrary to its national Indian policy, even if contrary to the Tribe's interest”). Still further,  
 23 governmental entities such as Federal and State Defendants have a “broad obligation” to serve  
 24 many people, which may conflict with the governmental entities' obligations to a tribe. *White*, 765  
 25 F.3d at 1027 (finding that a state university could not adequately represent the interests of the  
 26  
 27  
 28

absent tribes because the university had a “broad obligation to serve the interests of the people of California, rather than any particular subset,” and therefore had different motivations); *Union Pacific Railroad Co. v. Runyan*, 320 F.R.D. 245, 252 (D. Ore. 2017) (County government has broad obligations and no trust responsibility to protect absent tribes’ treaty rights). Still further, even if the positions of the present parties are aligned with the absent tribe at a given point in time, they may diverge over the course of the litigation, including on appeal. *See, e.g., White* 765 F.3d at 1027 (“At present, their interests are aligned. There is some reason to believe that they will not necessarily remain aligned.”). Presently, the Tribe, the State and the United States appear poised to vigorously defend the compacts at issue, but they all have different and potentially competing interests which may diverge, or which may change over the course of the litigation.

For all of these reasons, this Court cannot conclude that the State Defendants or the Federal Defendants are able to adequately represent the protectable interests of the Tribe.

**F. The Narrow Public Rights Exception Does Not Apply Where the Claims Threaten an Absent Party Tribe’s Legal Entitlement and Sovereignty.**

The federal courts recognize a public rights exception to the joinder rules when the lawsuit is narrowly restricted to the protection and enforcement of public rights. *National Licorice Co. v. N.L.R.B.*, 309 U.S. 350, 363 (1940). In order for the public rights exception to apply, (1) “the litigation must transcend the private interests of the litigants and seek to vindicate a public right,” and (2) “although the litigation may adversely affect the absent parties’ interests, the litigation must not destroy the legal entitlements of the absent parties.” *White*, 765 F.3d at 1028; *Kescoli*, 101 F.3d at 1311; *Conner v. Burford*, 848 F.2d 1441, 1459 (9th Cir. 1988); *Union Pacific Railroad Co.*, 320 F.R.D. at 256-57. However, the public rights exception is generally precluded where the lawsuit seeks to extinguish a tribe’s substantial legal entitlements. *See Shermoen*, 982 F.2d at 1319

(“Because of the threat to the absent tribes’ legal entitlements, and indeed to their sovereignty, posed by the present litigation, application of the public rights exception to the joinder rules would be inappropriate.”); *see also Kennedy v. United States Dept. of the Interior*, 282 F.R.D. 588, 599 (E.D. Cal. 2012). The only circumstance of which the Tribe is aware in which the public rights exception arguably prevented dismissal of claims involving absent tribes under Rule 19 is *Makah*, 910 F.2d at 559 n.6. There, the Ninth Circuit affirmed the District Court’s dismissal on Rule 19 grounds in most respects, but allowed Makah’s claims seeking *future* compliance with administrative procedures to be heard on remand. *Id.* Given the broad relief requested in Maverick’s FAC, Dkt. 66 at 40, that extremely narrow exception is inapplicable to the circumstances here. *Id.* at 559 (“[T]he scope of the relief available to the Makah on their procedural claims is narrow.”).

#### IV. Conclusion

The Shoalwater Bay Tribe and the other Washington Tribes are the real parties in interests in this litigation, none of which have waived their immunity from Maverick’s lawsuit. Accordingly, the Tribe respectfully requests this Court to dismiss Maverick’s claims in their entirety pursuant to Rule 12(b)(7) and Rule 19.

Respectfully submitted this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of October, 2022.

s/ Scott D. Crowell  
 SCOTT CROWELL (WSBA No. 18868)  
 CROWELL LAW OFFICES-TRIBAL  
 ADVOCACY GROUP  
 1487 W. State Route 89A, Suite 8  
 Sedona, AZ 86336  
 Telephone: (425) 802-5369  
 Fax: (509) 290-6953  
 Email: [scottcrowell@hotmail.com](mailto:scottcrowell@hotmail.com)

1 LAEL ECHO-HAWK (WSBA No. 34525)  
2 MThirtySix, PLLC  
3 700 Pennsylvania Avenue SE  
4 The Yard – 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
5 Washington, D.C. 20003  
6 Telephone: (206) 271-0106  
7 Email: [Lael@MThirtySixPLLC.com](mailto:Lael@MThirtySixPLLC.com)

8 *Attorneys for Limited Intervenor Shoalwater*  
9 *Bay Tribe*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on October 3, 2022, I filed the foregoing MOTION TO DISMISS with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the parties of record in this matter.

DATED: October 3, 2022

s/ Scott Crowell  
SCOTT CROWELL (WSBA No. 18868)  
CROWELL LAW OFFICES-TRIBAL  
ADVOCACY GROUP  
1487 W. State Route 89A, Suite 8  
Sedona, AZ 86336  
Telephone: (425) 802-5369  
Fax: (509) 290-6953  
Email: scottcrowell@hotmail.com