

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
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

-----oo0oo-----

CACHIL DEHE BAND OF WINTUN
INDIANS OF THE COLUSA INDIAN
COMMUNITY, a federally
recognized Indian Tribe,

Plaintiff,

v.

NO. CIV. S-04-2265 FCD KJM

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

STATE OF CALIFORNIA;
CALIFORNIA GAMBLING CONTROL
COMMISSION, an agency of the
State of California; and
ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER,
Governor of the State of
California,

Defendants.

_____ /

-----oo0oo-----

This matter is before the court on defendants' motion
for judgment on the pleadings.¹ Plaintiff opposes defendants'

¹ Plaintiff also moves for a modification of the Pretrial
Scheduling Order ("PSO") for the court to hear its motion for
summary judgment on its first four claims for relief. However,
for the reasons set forth herein, plaintiff's motion to modify
the PSO is DENIED as moot.

1 motion. For the reason's set forth below, defendants' motion is
2 GRANTED.

3 **BACKGROUND**

4 Plaintiff, Cachil Dehe Band of Wintun Indians of the Colusa
5 Indian Community (the "Tribe"), is an American Indian Tribe with
6 a governing body duly recognized by the Secretary of the
7 Interior. (Pl.s' Compl., filed Oct. 25, 2004, ¶ 2). The Tribe
8 entered into a Class III Gaming Compact (the "Compact") with the
9 State of California (the "State") in 1999. (Id. ¶ 24). At the
10 same time, 56 other tribes (the "Compact Tribes") also executed
11 virtually identical compacts with the State. (Id.; see Artichoke
12 Joe's California Grand Casino v. Norton, 353 F.3d 712, 717-18
13 (9th Cir. 2003); Artichoke Joe's California Grand Casino, 216 F.
14 Supp. 2d 1084, 1094 (E.D. Cal. 2002)).

15 The Compact sets forth various provisions relating to the
16 operation of Class III Gaming Devices. The Compact sets the
17 limit of the amount of Gaming Devices operated by each individual
18 tribe at 2,000. (Compl. ¶ 14; Tribal-State Compact between the
19 State of California and the Colusa Indian Community ("Compact"),
20 attached as Ex. 1 to Defs.' Request for Judicial Notice, §
21 4.3.2.2).² The Compact also sets a statewide maximum on the

22
23 Plaintiff also submitted three declarations in support of
24 its opposition to defendants' Rule 12(c) motion. Because this
25 matter is before the court on a motion for judgment on the
26 pleadings, consideration of material outside the pleadings,
27 except for those properly considered pursuant to judicial notice,
is not appropriate. See Hal Roach Studios, Inc. v. Richard
Feiner & Co., Inc., 896 F.2d 1549, 1550 (9th Cir. 1990). The
court will not consider this motion as a motion for summary
judgment.

28 ² The court takes judicial notice of the Compact. Fed.
R. Civ. Proc. 201; Cal. Gov't Code § 12012.25 (ratifying the 1999
Compacts).

1 number of Gaming Devices that all Compact Tribes may license in
2 the aggregate.³ (Id.) Gaming Device licenses are distributed
3 among all the 1999 Compact Tribes pursuant to the license draw
4 process provided by the Compact. (Compact § 4.3.2.2). Tribes
5 are awarded licenses based upon the tribe's placement in one of
6 five priority tiers. (Id.) Placement in a particular tier is
7 based upon the number of Gaming Devices operated by the tribe.
8 (Id.) On or about March 31, 2001, then-Governor Gray Davis
9 issued Executive Order D-31-01 in which he declared that the
10 California Gambling Control Commission ("CGCC") shall control
11 gaming device licensing. (Compl. ¶ 18). Prior to that date, a
12 tribal draw administrator conducted gaming device license draws.
13 (Id. ¶ 16). In June 2002, the CGCC declared that the licenses
14 issued in those draws were invalid and that they would be
15 replaced by licenses issued by the CGCC. (Id. ¶ 21).

16 The Compact also provides for revenue sharing with non-
17 gaming tribes. The Compact sets forth that a tribe may acquire
18 and maintain additional Gaming Device licenses by paying annual
19 fees in accordance with a fee schedule and by paying, for each
20 Gaming Device license, "a non-refundable one-time pre-payment
21 fee" in the amount of \$1,250 for each Gaming Device being
22 licensed. (Id. ¶ 14). The monies are to be received, deposited,
23 and distributed from the Revenue Sharing Trust Fund ("RSTF"), a
24 fund created by the Legislature and administered by the CGCC as
25 trustee. (Compact § 4.3.2). For purposes of revenue sharing,
26 the Compact defines a Compact Tribe as a tribe having a compact

27
28 ³ The statewide cap is calculated pursuant to a formula
provided in § 4.3.2.2 of the Compact.

1 with the State authorizing Class III Gaming; Non-Compact Tribes
2 are defined as federally-recognized tribes that are operating
3 fewer than 350 Gaming Devices, whether or not such a tribe has a
4 Compact with the State. (Compl. ¶ 10; Compact § 4.3.2(a)(1)).
5 The revenue sharing provisions of the Compact provide that Non-
6 Compact Tribes shall receive \$1.1 million per year, unless there
7 are insufficient funds, in which case, the available monies in
8 the RSTF shall be distributed in equal shares to the Non-Compact
9 Tribes (the "RSTF-eligible Tribes"). (Compact § 4.3.2.1). The
10 CGCC interpreted that the non-refundable, one-time pre-payment
11 fee could be used as a credit toward annual license fees and that
12 no annual fees would be required for the first 350 licenses
13 issued to a tribe. (Compl. ¶ 21).

14 Section 9 of the Compact also establishes a procedure to be
15 followed in the event of a dispute relating to the Compact. The
16 parties are to meet and confer in good faith not later than 10
17 days after one party gives the other party notice of the
18 existence of a dispute. (Id. ¶ 33). If the dispute is not
19 resolved within 30 days after the first meeting, either party may
20 seek to have the dispute resolved by an arbitrator or a federal
21 district court, or if the district court declines jurisdiction,
22 any State court of competent jurisdiction. (Id.)

23 In 2002, the CGCC notified plaintiff and other Compact
24 Tribes that the CGCC would conduct a round of Gaming Device
25 license draws in September 2002. (Id. ¶ 22). Prior to the draw,
26 and as of September 1, 1999, the Tribe was operating 523 Gaming
27 Devices. (Id. ¶ 28). The Tribe notified the CGCC of its intent
28 to draw 250 licenses and tendered a check in the amount of

1 \$312,500 as the non-refundable one-time pre-payment fee. (Id. ¶
2 22). The Tribe was placed in the third priority tier and
3 received 250 licenses. (Id. ¶ 28). In November 2003, the CGCC
4 notified the Tribe that another round of draws, in which 750
5 licenses would be available to be drawn, would be conducted on
6 December 19, 2003. (Id. ¶ 27). Plaintiff requested 377 licenses
7 and submitted a pre-payment of \$471,250. (Id. ¶ 32). The Tribe
8 was assigned to the fourth priority tier and received no
9 licenses. (Id. ¶¶ 31-32). The CGCC refunded the pre-payment of
10 \$471,250 in full. (Id. ¶ 32). On October 21, 2004, the CGCC
11 conducted another draw, in which the Tribe, placed in the fourth
12 priority tier, pre-paid fees for 341 licenses and received only
13 73. (Id. ¶ 31). The Tribe anticipates receiving a refund of the
14 pre-payment on the licenses that it did not receive in the draw.
15 (Id. ¶ 32).

16 On December 30, 2003, the Tribe wrote to Governor
17 Schwarzenegger to request that the State meet and confer with the
18 Tribe about (1) the assignment of the Tribe to the fourth
19 priority tier in the December 19, 2003 round of draws; (2) the
20 CGCC's determination of the number of licenses available for
21 issuance; (3) the CGCC's role and authority in the draw process;
22 and (4) the CGCC's retention of the \$312,500 tendered by the
23 Tribe in connection with its draw of 250 Gaming Device licenses
24 in September 2002. (Id. ¶ 34). A meeting took place on February
25 3, 2004. (Id. ¶ 35). No agreement was reached on any of the
26 issues the Tribe raised. (Id. ¶ 36). By letter dated February
27 23, 2004, the State formally rejected each of the Tribe's
28 positions. (Id.)

1 On October 25, 2004, plaintiff filed a complaint in this
2 court, alleging violations of the Compact. Plaintiff asserts
3 that defendants violated the Compact by: (1) excluding the Tribe
4 from participating in the third priority tier in the December 19,
5 2003 round of draws; (2) unilaterally determining the number of
6 Gaming Device licenses authorized by § 4.3.2.2(a) (1) of the
7 Compact; (3) failing to refund money paid pursuant to the non-
8 refundable one-time pre-payment fee set forth in § 4.3.2.2(e) of
9 the Compact; (4) CGCC conducting rounds of draws of Gaming Device
10 licenses without authority; and (5) failing to negotiate in good
11 faith.⁴ On March 28, 2006, defendants filed this motion for
12 judgment on the pleadings, seeking to dismiss plaintiff's first
13 second, third, and fourth claims for relief for failure to join
14 necessary and indispensable parties and plaintiff's fifth claim
15 for relief for failure to exhaust non-judicial remedies.

16 **STANDARD**

17 Rule 12(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides
18 in relevant part:

19 After the pleadings are closed but within such time as
20 not to delay the trial, any party may move for judgment
on the pleadings.

21 In considering a motion for judgment on the pleadings, the
22 standard applied by the court is virtually identical to the
23 standard for dismissal for failure to state a claim upon which
24 relief can be granted pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6). Fajardo v. City
25 of Los Angeles, 179 F.3d 698, 699 (9th Cir. 1999).

26
27
28 ⁴ Plaintiff also asserts that the State is violating its
obligations under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988
("IGRA") by failing to negotiate in good faith. (Compl. ¶ 58).

1 A claim will not be dismissed "unless it appears beyond
2 doubt that plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his
3 [or her] claim that would entitle him [or her] to relief."
4 Yamaguchi v. Dep't of the Air Force, 109 F.3d 1475, 1480 (9th
5 Cir. 1997) (quoting Lewis v. Tel. Employees Credit Union, 87 F.3d
6 1537, 1545 (9th Cir. 1996)). "All allegations of material fact
7 are taken as true and construed in the light most favorable to
8 the nonmoving party." Cahill v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co., 80 F.3d
9 336, 337-38 (9th Cir. 1996).

10 Given that the complaint is construed favorably to the
11 pleader, the court may not dismiss the claim unless it appears
12 beyond a doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in
13 support of the claim which would entitle him or her to relief.
14 Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 45 (1957); NL Indus., Inc. v.
15 Kaplan, 792 F.2d 896, 898 (9th Cir. 1986).

16 Nevertheless, it is inappropriate to assume that plaintiff
17 "can prove facts which it has not alleged or that the defendants
18 have violated the . . . laws in ways that have not been alleged."
19 Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. California State
20 Council of Carpenters, 459 U.S. 519, 526 (1983). Moreover, the
21 court "need not assume the truth of legal conclusions cast in the
22 form of factual allegations." United States ex rel. Chunie v.
23 Ringrose, 788 F.2d 638, 643 n.2 (9th Cir. 1986).

24 In ruling upon a motion for judgment on the pleadings, the
25 court may consider only the complaint, any exhibits thereto, the
26 responsive pleading, and matters which may be judicially noticed
27 pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201. See Mir v. Little Co.
28 Of Mary Hosp., 844 F.2d 646, 649 (9th Cir. 1988); Isuzu Motors

1 Ltd. v. Consumers Union of United States, Inc., 12 F. Supp. 2d
2 1035, 1042 (C.D. Cal. 1998).

3 **ANALYSIS**

4 **I. Rule 19 Joinder**

5 Defendants assert that plaintiff's first four claims should
6 be dismissed for failure to join necessary and indispensable
7 parties. Rule 19(a) provides for joinder of necessary and
8 indispensable parties. To determine if a party is necessary and
9 indispensable to a suit, the court must (1) determine whether the
10 absent party is a "necessary" party, and (2) if the absent party
11 is necessary, but joinder is not feasible, whether the party is
12 "indispensable." Kescoli v. Babbit, 101 F.3d 1304, 1309 (9th
13 Cir. 1996). The moving party bears the burden of persuasion.
14 See Makah Indian Tribe v. Verity, 910 F.2d 555, 558 (9th Cir.
15 1990).

16 **A. Necessary Party**

17 To determine whether a party is necessary to an action, the
18 court must undertake another two-part analysis. Makah, 910 F.2d
19 at 558. Rule 19(a) (1) provides that a person is a necessary
20 party where "in the person's absence complete relief cannot be
21 accorded among those already parties. Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 19(a).
22 Rule 19(a) (2) provides that a person is also a necessary party
23 where

24 the person claims an interest relating to the subject
25 of the action and is so situated that the disposition
26 of the action in the person's absence may (i) as a
27 practical matter impair or impede the person's ability
28 to protect that interest or (ii) leave any of the
persons already parties subject to a substantial risk
of incurring, double, multiple, or otherwise
inconsistent obligations by reason of the claimed
interest.

1 Id. The interest referenced in Rule 19(a)(2) must be a legally
2 protectable interest in the suit, more than a financial stake and
3 more than speculation about a future event. Makah, 910 F.2d at
4 558. However, a fixed fund or a finite amount of resources which
5 a court is asked to allocate may create a protectable interest in
6 beneficiaries of the fund. Id. (citing Wichita & Affiliated
7 Tribes of Oklahoma v. Hodel, 788 F.2d 765, 774 (D.C. Cir. 1986).
8 Interests arising from terms in bargained contracts are also
9 legally protectable. Am. Greyhound Racing, Inc. v. Hull, 305
10 F.3d 1015, 1023 (9th Cir. 2002).

11 Defendants argue that all 1999 Compact Tribes and RSTF-
12 eligible Tribes, which have not been joined, are necessary
13 parties to the current suit. Defendants assert that these tribes
14 have a legally protectable interest in the litigation that will
15 be practically impaired by a favorable judgment to plaintiff and
16 that the disposition of this matter would subject the State to
17 inconsistent obligations.

18 At issue in plaintiff's first and second claims for relief
19 is the validity of the State and CGCC's interpretation of the
20 clauses set forth in § 4.3.2.2 of the Compact, addressing
21 participation in Gaming Device license draws and the authorized
22 number of Gaming Device licenses. As relief for its first and
23 second claims, plaintiff asks the court to grant various forms of
24 declaratory relief and to order the CGCC to issue 377 Gaming
25 Device licences to the Tribe.⁵ (Compl., Prayer for Relief at 17-
26

27 ⁵ Specifically, plaintiff asks the court to declare that
28 CGCC has a ministerial duty immediately to issue 377 licenses and
to enjoin the State from declining immediately to issue 377
licenses.

1 18). There is a statewide limit on the number of gaming licenses
2 that all Compact Tribes in the aggregate may receive. (Compl. ¶
3 14). As such, plaintiff requests the court allocate licenses
4 from a finite number of available licenses. An order to issue
5 any additional licenses to plaintiff would necessarily and
6 practically impair the rights of the other Compact Tribes who
7 would be deprived of those licenses or the opportunity to obtain
8 those licenses. Accordingly, all Compact Tribes are necessary
9 parties to plaintiff's first and second claims for relief. See
10 Makah, 910 F.2d at 558-59.

11 Plaintiff's third claim for relief involves the Tribe's one-
12 time pre-payment of \$1,250 for each Gaming Device license that
13 the Tribe draws. Because the CGCC determined that this one-time
14 pre-payment is to be credited against the annual license fees due
15 on Gaming Device licenses, and because the Tribe does not owe any
16 annual license fees, plaintiff seeks a refund of the \$403,750 it
17 has paid. The funds collected through the one-time pre-payment
18 is deposited in the RSTF. (Compl. ¶ 16). The Compact provides
19 that each Non-Compact Tribe shall receive distribution from the
20 RSTF, either in the amount of \$1.1 million per year, or if there
21 are insufficient monies for this sum, any available monies in the
22 RSTF shall be distributed to Non-Compact Tribes in *equal shares*.
23 (Compact § 4.3.2.1(a)). Any excess monies left in the fund after
24 distribution remain in the RSTF for disbursement in future years.
25 Id. Therefore, an award of a refund to plaintiff will
26 practically impair the rights of Non-Compact, RSTF-eligible
27 Tribes because the return of any RSTF monies will lessen the
28 amount of money in the fund for reimbursement to those other

1 tribes. In other words, to the extent that there is insufficient
2 money to pay each non-Compact Tribe \$1.1 million, an award to
3 plaintiff will lessen the amount of money distributed to each
4 other tribe. To the extent that there is sufficient money to pay
5 each Non-Compact tribe \$1.1 million, an award to plaintiff
6 decreases the funds available for disbursement the following
7 year. Therefore, the interests of the Non-Compact, RSTF-eligible
8 Tribes will be practically impaired by the relief sought by
9 plaintiff. As such, the Non-Compact, RSTF-eligible Tribes are
10 necessary parties to plaintiff's third claim for relief.

11 Plaintiff's fourth claim for relief alleges that CGCC lacks
12 authority to conduct rounds of draws for Gaming Device licenses.
13 If the court were to grant plaintiff's requested relief and
14 declare that CGCC lacked authority to administer the Gaming
15 Device licence draws, the CGCC would be unable to conduct further
16 draws and all previously issued licenses would be invalidated.
17 As a result, other Compact Tribes would not be able to draw any
18 available licenses in the future. Further, the licenses
19 distributed to other Compact Tribes in previous draws would be
20 meaningless. Thus, the interests of other Compact Tribes would
21 be practically impaired by the relief sought by plaintiff. See
22 Am. Greyhound, 305 F.3d at 1024 (holding that all tribes were
23 necessary parties to declaratory judgment that gaming operations
24 were unlawful because the judicial determination would affect the
25 tribes' interest as a practical matter). Accordingly, all
26 Compact Tribes are necessary parties to plaintiff's first and
27 second claims for relief.

28 /////

1 Further, the relief sought by plaintiff, if granted, would
2 leave defendants subject to a substantial risk of inconsistent
3 obligations. While plaintiff asserts that the Compact between
4 the Tribe and defendants is a bilateral contract, it is, in
5 reality, one of many virtually identical Compacts. See Artichoke
6 Joe's, 353 F.3d at 717. To the extent that plaintiff asserts
7 that it seeks the court to rule only on the interpretation of its
8 "bilateral agreement" with defendants, any interpretation could
9 result in defendants requirement to perform in one manner under
10 plaintiff's contract and in a directly incongruous manner under
11 the other virtually identical contracts. For example, if
12 plaintiff prevailed on its fourth claim of relief, CGCC would not
13 have authority to administer Gaming Device license draws under
14 its contract, but would have authority to administer Gaming
15 Device license draws under the other Compacts. Accordingly, all
16 1999 Compact Tribes are necessary parties to plaintiff's first
17 four claims for relief.

18 **B. Indispensable Party**

19 Rule 19(b) sets forth the standard to apply when joinder of
20 necessary parties is not feasible. In this case, joinder of the
21 1999 Compact Tribes and RSTF-eligible Tribes is not feasible
22 because each of these tribes is immune from suit under the common
23 law doctrine of tribal sovereign immunity. Kiowa Tribe of
24 Oklahoma v. Mfg. Technologies, Inc., 523 U.S. 751, 754 (1998)
25 ("As a matter of federal law, an Indian tribe is subject to suit
26 only where Congress has authorized the suit or the tribe has
27 waived its immunity.").

28 /////

1 Rule 19(b) provides that if a necessary party cannot be
2 joined, "the court shall determine whether in equity and good
3 conscience the action should proceed among the parties before it,
4 or should be dismissed, the absent person being thus regarded as
5 indispensable." Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 19(b). In making this
6 determination, the court undertakes a four-part analysis, looking
7 at (1) the prejudice to any party resulting from a judgment; (2)
8 whether the court can shape relief to lessen prejudice to absent
9 parties; (3) if an adequate remedy, even if not complete, can be
10 awarded without the absent party; and (4) whether an alternative
11 forum is available to the plaintiff. Id.; Makah, 910 F.2d at
12 560.

13 Defendants assert that the absent tribes will be prejudiced
14 by plaintiff's requested relief. "Not surprisingly, the first
15 factor of prejudice, insofar as it focuses on the absent party,
16 largely duplicates the consideration that made a party necessary
17 under Rule 19(a)." Am. Greyhound, 305 F.3d at 1024-25 (citations
18 omitted). To the extent that plaintiff seeks the award of
19 additional gaming device licenses, that award would come at the
20 expense of the absent tribes because of the finite nature of the
21 gaming devices that all tribes may license. To the extent that
22 plaintiff seeks a refund of its pre-payment, the relief would
23 prejudice the RSTF-eligible Tribes because it would lessen the
24 amount of money in the fund to be distributed on an equal basis.
25 Finally, to the extent plaintiff asks the court to declare that
26 CGCC does not have authority to conduct the gaming license draws,
27 the relief would prejudice those Compact Tribes who would seek
28 licenses in a future draw as well as Compact Tribes who were

1 previously awarded licenses in the draw system. Plaintiff cannot
2 adequately represent the absent tribes because of the potential
3 intertribal conflicts over the rights to the limited number of
4 gaming devices and licenses. See Makah, 910 F.2d at 560. Thus,
5 the relief sought by plaintiff would prejudice the absent tribes.

6 Defendants argue that the prejudice cannot be lessened or
7 avoided through shaping the relief. Plaintiff argues that the
8 court lessen or avoid the prejudice through ordering the issuance
9 of an additional 24,800 licenses, such that the absent tribes
10 would also receive all licenses previously requested in the draw
11 process. This does not take into account the interests of
12 Compact Tribes that may be opposed to the state's award of more
13 gaming device licenses, specifically those in close geographical
14 proximity to plaintiff, whose market share of class III gaming
15 would be affected by the inundation of licenses. Therefore,
16 because any relief would be detrimental to either plaintiff or
17 the absent tribes, the court has no way to shape the relief to
18 lessen or avoid prejudice. See Makah, 910 F.2d at 560.

19 Similarly, the only "adequate" remedy would be at the cost of the
20 absent parties. See id.

21 Finally, defendants argue that plaintiff would have an
22 alternative forum in which to seek relief. Defendants assert
23 that the Compact provides that the terms and conditions of the
24 contract may be amended by the mutual and written agreement of
25 the parties, (Compact § 12.1), and that plaintiff is free to
26 request re-negotiation of its 1999 Compact with the State.
27 However, plaintiff is left without a judicial forum in which to
28 bring suit against defendants. The Ninth Circuit has held that

1 this factor is not one to be dispensed with lightly. Manybeads
2 v. United States, 209 F.3d 1164, 1166 (9th Cir. 2000). However,
3 the Ninth Circuit has also recognized the importance of tribal
4 sovereign immunity, which may leave a party with no forum for its
5 claim. See Wilbur v. Locke, 423 F.3d 1101, 1115 (9th Cir. 2005)
6 (finding the absent Indian tribe indispensable despite the lack
7 of an alternative forum); Manybeads, 209 F.3d at 1166 (same);
8 Makah, 910 F. 2dd at 560 (same). Therefore, a balance of the
9 four factor analysis supports the determination that the Compact
10 Tribes and the RSTF-eligible Tribes are indispensable parties
11 pursuant to Rule 19(b).

12 **C. Public Rights Exception**

13 Plaintiff contends that this case falls within the "public
14 rights" exception to joinder rules.⁶ "Under this exception, even
15 if the [t]ribes are necessary parties, they are not deemed
16 indispensable and, consequently, dismissal is not warranted."
17 Kescoli v. Babbitt, 101 F.3d 1304, 1311 (9th Cir. 1996); Makah,
18 910 F.2d at 559 n.6. Generally, to qualify for the public rights
19 exception, "the litigation must transcend the private interests
20 of the litigants and seek to vindicate a public right." Id.
21 (citing Kickapoo Tribe of Indians v. Babbitt, 43 F.3d 11491, 1500
22 (D.C. Cir. 1995). However, "although the litigation may
23 adversely affect the absent parties' interests, the litigation
24 must not 'destroy the legal entitlements of the absent parties.'" "

26
27 ⁶ Plaintiff's argument that the public rights exception
28 applies is somewhat disingenuous given that the majority of its
opposition argues that all 1999 Compact Tribes or RSTF-eligible
Tribes are not necessary parties to this action because plaintiff
seeks to enforce its own rights under a bilateral contract.

1 Id. (quoting Connor v. Burford, 848 F.2d 1441, 1459 (9th Cir.
2 1988)).

3 In its first and second claims for relief, plaintiff seeks
4 the reallocation of Gaming Device licenses such that the Tribe
5 will be awarded 377 additional licenses.⁷ In its first claim,
6 plaintiff seeks a determination that it should have been placed
7 in the third priority tier instead of the fourth priority tier.
8 This claim is a private one, focused on the merits of plaintiff's
9 dispute regarding its placement in a specific priority tier. In
10 its second claim, plaintiff seeks a determination that the
11 statewide cap determined by the State is void. This claim is
12 also a private one, seeking the court to determine that a larger
13 total of Gaming Device licences is allowed, such that plaintiff
14 may be awarded the licenses it seeks. Finally, plaintiff's third
15 claim of relief seeks a refund of moneys paid into the RSTF.
16 This claims seeks adjudication of plaintiff's right to specific
17 monetary relief, not a determination of a public right.

18 Therefore, plaintiff's first, second, and third claims for relief
19 do not seek to vindicate a public right, but rather to advance
20 plaintiff's private interests in receiving more Gaming Devices
21 and a refund of its pre-payment for licenses previously received.

22 Plaintiff's fourth claim of relief alleges that the CGCC is
23 not authorized to administer the Gaming Device license draws.
24 This claim may seek to vindicate a public right in ensuring that
25

26
27 ⁷ Although plaintiff relies heavily on Makah, in Makah
28 the Ninth Circuit found that the reallocation of finite
resources, in that case quotas on fishing rights, did not qualify
for the public rights exception.

1 a lawful procedure is followed in the future.⁸ As such, the
2 claim may be closer akin to the vindication of a public right
3 approved of in Makah, ensuring an agency's future compliance with
4 statutory procedures, than plaintiff's other challenged claims.
5 Makah, 910 F.2d at 559. However, if plaintiff prevailed, the
6 relief would deprive absent parties of their legal entitlements
7 to the licenses awarded pursuant to an invalid process. See
8 Kescoli, 101 F.3d at 1312. Because the process by which the
9 licenses were procured was invalid, the licenses could be
10 rendered meaningless.

11 In view of the *essentially* private nature of the present
12 litigation and the significant threat to the Compact Tribes'
13 interests, the application of the public rights exception is not
14 appropriate in this case. See id. Defendants' motion for
15 judgment on the pleadings regarding plaintiff's first, second,
16 third, and fourth claims for relief is GRANTED for failure to
17 join necessary and indispensable parties.

18 **II. Failure to Exhaust Non-Judicial Remedies**

19 Defendants contend that the Tribe's fifth claim for relief
20 is jurisdictionally deficient because the Tribe has not satisfied
21 two preconditions to its right to sue the State. First,
22 defendants assert that the Tribe has not exhausted the meet and
23 confer provision set forth in § 9.1 of the Compact. Second,
24 defendants contend that the Tribe has not given the State notice
25

26
27 ⁸ However, the court remains skeptical, given the tenor
28 of plaintiff's first three claims for relief, whether plaintiff's
challenge to CGCC's authority is merely a pretext for vindicating
its private grievance that it was not awarded the requested
licenses through CGCC's draw process.

1 and opportunity to cure any alleged breach as required by §
2 11.2.1 of the Compact.

3 Plaintiff's fifth claim for relief alleges that defendant
4 failed to negotiate in good faith after the state requested
5 renegotiation of §§ 4.3.1-4.3.2 of the Compact. (Compl. ¶ 60).
6 Section 9.1 of the Compact provides that "the parties
7 establishe[d] a threshold requirement that disputes between the
8 Tribe and the State first be subjected to a process of meeting
9 and conferring in good faith." (Compact § 9.1). Plaintiff's
10 complaint does not allege that the Tribe met and conferred with
11 the State in regards to its claim of failure to negotiate in good
12 faith. In its opposition, plaintiff admits that it did not meet
13 and confer, but argues that it did not exhaust the § 9.1 dispute
14 resolution process because exhaustion would be futile. However,
15 plaintiff did not allege in its complaint that the dispute
16 resolution process would be futile, nor did it allege facts that
17 would support this argument.⁹ Further, plaintiff asserts that
18 the Tribe has requested that the State meet and confer and that a
19 meeting was set for April 27, 2006.

20 Because plaintiff failed to exhaust the meet and confer
21 requirement set forth in § 9.1 of the Compact prior to filing
22 suit in this court and because plaintiff has not sufficiently
23 alleged that such exhaustion is futile, defendant's motion for
24 judgement on the pleadings regarding plaintiff's fifth claim for
25 relief is GRANTED.

26
27 ⁹ Plaintiff presented some related facts through a
28 declaration submitted with plaintiff's opposition. As stated
previously, the court will not consider documents outside of the
pleadings, except those judicially noticed, on defendants' Rule
12(c) motion.

1 In its opposition, plaintiff requests that the court allow
2 plaintiff to supplement its Complaint to allege exhaustion of the
3 meet and confer process under § 9.1 of the Compact. However,
4 plaintiff has not filed a motion to amend the Pretrial Scheduling
5 Order pursuant to Rule 16,¹⁰ nor has plaintiff filed a motion to
6 amend or supplement the pleadings pursuant to Rule 15. Further,
7 plaintiff has presented no evidence that the meet and confer
8 process has been exhausted. Rather, defendants assert that the
9 meet and confer process will not be exhausted until May 27, 2006.
10 As such, the court does not give plaintiff leave to amend or
11 supplement its complaint.

12 **CONCLUSION**

13 For the reasons stated above, defendants' motion for
14 judgment on the pleadings is GRANTED. Plaintiff's first, second,
15 third, and fourth claims for relief are dismissed for failure to
16 join necessary and indispensable parties. Plaintiff's fifth
17 claim for relief is dismissed for failure to exhaust non-judicial
18 remedies. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this file.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 DATED: May 16, 2006.

21 /s/ Frank C. Damrell Jr.
22 FRANK C. DAMRELL, JR.
23 United States District Judge
24
25
26

27 _____
28 ¹⁰ The Pretrial Scheduling Order, filed May 20, 2005,
provides that "No further . . . amendments to pleadings is
permitted without leave of court, good cause having been shown."