West Bank Homeowners Association

P. O. Box 970 Blythe, California 92226 TEL: (949) 697-3246 email: westbank@cox.net

PRESS RELEASE – October 11, 2017

The United States Supreme Court has denied Certiorari in French v. Starr:

The United States Supreme Court Orders issued Tuesday, October 10, 2017, included *French v. Starr* in the listing of Certiorari Denied by the Court. The Court granted certiorari in 1 case while denying certiorari in 217 others. Previously on October 2, 2017, the Court granted certiorari for 7 cases and denied 1,394 cases. As expected and demonstrated by the ratio of cases granted against denied, the odds were long that the Court would hear our case on whether the Colorado River Indian Tribes (CRIT) had tribal jurisdiction over Roger French, a non-Indian. With this action by the U.S. Supreme Court, federal district court Judge John Tuchi's ruling of CRIT tribal jurisdiction will stand, regardless of the congressional statute, PL88-302, that prevents tribal jurisdiction within the disputed area, regardless of the judge's finding that nullifies the 1969 Secretarial Order with "the location of the Reservation's boundary remains unresolved", regardless of the State of California's challenge to tribal jurisdiction in the disputed area, regardless of CRIT's lack of regulatory jurisdiction, and regardless of federal Indian law under *Montana v. United States*, 450 U.S. 544 (1981).

This lawsuit started in 2010 with CRIT's action in tribal court against Roger French for eviction and damages. After CRIT's judge awarded the Tribes possession of the property and damages of $300,000, French filed an appeal with the CRIT Tribal Appellate Court, with a subsequent ruling in February, 2013. That ruling ridiculed the State of California's evidence of the boundary dispute, and French's assertions that the Tribal court did not provide U.S. constitutional rights, nor due process of law. The tribal courts' ruling on tribal jurisdiction was challenged before the federal district court in September, 2013, and decided in February 2015. Judge Tuchi's Order was appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and fully briefed by September 2015. Unfortunately, two of the three Ninth Circuit judges were previously involved in disputed area litigation, *Water Wheel v. La Rance*, and the Paradise Point case, *Turley v. Eddy*. In July, 2017, the Ninth Circuit rubber stamped Judge Tuchi's ruling in a 1 page memorandum. A Petition for a Writ of Certiorari was filed in the U.S. Supreme Court in August, 2017, with Opposition by CRIT filed in September, 2017. The denial of Certiorari by the U.S. Supreme Court on October 10, 2017, thus ends this case.

We are very disappointed that the Supreme Court will not hear our case. But realistically, the deck was stacked against us when we drew a district court judge who was motivated more by his own notions of social justice, and when we were faced with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, not only friendly to Indians in general as evidenced in *Water Wheel*, but in this case with 2 of its 3 judges having a self-serving interest in preserving their previous rulings in cases involving disputed area residents. An example of Judge Tuchi's social justice notion taking precedence over federal law:

> "*the equitable considerations --- most notably, the policy of promoting tribal self-government and the development of tribal courts, and the recognition of the government's role as trustee of reservation land on behalf of the tribes – weight in favor of the Tribal Court's jurisdiction in this matter*."

For those that have familiarity with federal Indian law, Judge Tuchi's reasoning contradicts legal principles laid out by the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Montana* progeny, the foundation for determining tribal jurisdiction over non-members. For those who believe in constitutional rights or with any sense of fairness, Judge Tuchi's reasoning is pure nonsense.

It is a very sad day for America when the rule of law is hijacked by a district court judge and 3 appellate court judges who believe that one ethnic group of Americans should have the right to take homes and constitutional rights from other Americans outside their ethnic group. Here, these judges refused to uphold Congressional authority prohibiting the Secretary of Interior from exercising authority on behalf of the Reservation under PL88-302, and the United States Supreme Court in its rulings against tribal jurisdiction under *Montana v. United States*, 450 U.S. 544 (1981). Instead, the judges ignored both the law and the facts in order to make their own law to accomplish a goal contrary to the very founding principles of this great nation.

Although our time spent on the legal work here is in the thousands of hours, we have garnered some measure of success by these efforts. For one, we now have the backing of the State of California in asserting that the disputed area is NOT within the CRIT Reservation. Two, we have recognition by the federal courts that the boundary dispute has not been resolved. Three, with the rulings here by the federal courts, the '69 Secretarial Order, the only document that CRIT relies upon for its claim of jurisdiction over disputed area residents, is null and void in accordance with a congressional statute, PL88-302.

There have been many in the community that have contributed to this legal effort, and we appreciate your support. For those who may be concerned that CRIT will attempt to collect its tribal court damages in this matter, rest assured that CRIT has no authority to do so. (The CRIT court can only attach asserts on the Reservation). Theoretically, CRIT could file a claim in a California court, but considering California's stated position and state law, CRIT would have little chance of a positive outcome.

CRIT has demonstrated in dozens of illegal actions over the years that it has no regard for law and property rights, and the finality of this lawsuit does present some additional risk for all who have property in the disputed area. Since the Supreme Court turned a deaf ear to our plight presented in West Bank's *Amicus Curiae* objecting to the proposed *AZ v. CA* settlement agreement in 2000, it is no surprise that the courts continue to refuse to address the legal abomination that exists on the west bank of the Colorado River.

But the federal courts are not the only recourse for residents. As West Bank has encouraged for the last 20 years, we must also engage our elected representatives. And it is our intention to put further emphasis on those efforts, especially now that the courts have fully nullified the '69 Secretarial Order, yet refused to acknowledge the very Congressional Act that prevents CRIT jurisdiction in the disputed area.

With the support of our membership and our friends, we intend to develop the next step in a comprehensive plan to get our elected representatives informed and involved. The courts have betrayed us, but we are not defeated!