

Robert A. Rosette, Esq. SBN 224437

ROSETTE & ASSOCIATES

193 Blue Ravine Road, Suite 255
Folsom, California 95630

Tel: (916) 353-1084

Fax: (916) 353-1085

Email: rosette@rosettela.com

Manuel Corrales, Jr., Esq. SBN 117647

Attorney at Law

17140 Bernardo Center Drive, Suite 370
San Diego, California 92128

Tel: (858) 521-0634

Fax: (858) 521-0633

Email: mannycorrales@yahoo.com

Terry Singleton, Esq. SBN 58316

SINGLETON & ASSOCIATES

1950 Fifth Avenue, Suite 200
San Diego, California 92101

Tel: (619) 239-3225

Fax: (619) 702-5592

Email: terry@terrysingleton.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
CALIFORNIA VALLEY MIWOK TRIBE

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO - CENTRAL DISTRICT**

CALIFORNIA VALLEY MIWOK TRIBE Case No. 37-2008-00075326-CU-CO-CTL

Plaintiff,

vs.

**CALIFORNIA GAMBLING CONTROL
COMMISSION,**

Defendant.

**PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSES TO
REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION
PROPOUNDED BY INTERVENORS,
SET ONE**

Dept: 62
Judge: Hon. Ronald Styn
Trial Date: June 4, 2013

1 PROPOUNDING PARTY: INTERVENORS

2 RESPONDING PARTY: PLAINTIFF CALIFORNIA VALLEY MIWOK TRIBE

3 SET NO: ONE

4
5 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1:**

6 Admit that the COMMISSION serves as a trustee for
7 disbursement of Revenue Sharing Trust Fund money to
8 eligible NON-COMPACT tribes. [As used herein, the term
9 "COMMISSION" shall mean defendant California Gambling
10 Control Commission.] [As used herein, the term "NON-
11 COMPACT" shall mean a federally recognized Indian tribe
12 operating fewer than 350 Gaming Devices, as defined in the
13 COMPACT.] [As used herein, the term "COMPACT" shall mean
14 the substantially identical Tribal-State Gambling Compacts
15 entered into by and between the State of California, on one
16 hand, and various Indian tribes within the State, on the
17 other hand, which enabled the tribes to conduct gambling
18 operations.]

19 **RESPONSE:**

20 Objection: The written discovery is irrelevant,
21 improper and propounded without a prior court order, based
22 upon the following grounds:

23 On March 11, 2011, the trial court granted the
24 Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the court's
25 previous order granting intervention and denied
26 intervention. The ruling was based in part on a December
27 22, 2010 decision from the Assistant Secretary of Interior
28 ("ASI"), which had concluded that the Miwok Tribe is a

1 federally-recognized tribe consisting of five members with
2 a recognized governing body established under a 1998 Tribal
3 Resolution. The ASI further ruled that the U.S. Bureau of
4 Indian Affairs ("BIA") could not require the Tribe to
5 expand its membership against its will.

6 After the March 11, 2011 order denying intervention,
7 the ASI set aside its decision to allow for further
8 briefing on the issues, which prompted the trial court in
9 this case to enter an April 20, 2011 ex parte order staying
10 the "effect" of the court's March 11, 2011 order denying
11 intervention. When the ASI issued its final decision on
12 August 31, 2011, affirming its December 22, 2010, decision,
13 this court stayed all further proceedings in this case,
14 except for discovery, pending resolution of a challenge to
15 the ASI's August 31, 2011 decision by the Intervenors in
16 this case, Yakima Dixie ("Dixie") and his followers.

17 The Court of Appeal decision granting Plaintiff's
18 petition directing the trial court to lift its stay applies
19 with equal force to the trial court's April 20, 2011 ex
20 parte order staying the effect of its March 11, 2011 order.
21 Accordingly, the Intervenors have been dismissed by virtue
22 of the Court of Appeal decision directing the trial court
23 to lift its stay of these proceedings, which stay is based
24 on the trial court's April 20, 2011 order staying the
25 effect of its March 11, 2011 order granting reconsideration
26 and denying intervention. Since the Intervenors have been
27 dismissed from this case, they have no authority to conduct
28

1 discovery, and the written discovery just propounded is
2 improper.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2:**

4 Admit that the COMMISSION has a fiduciary duty to
5 ensure that it disburses the Revenue Sharing Trust Fund
6 money only to an eligible NON-COMPACT tribe or an
7 authorized official or agency thereof.

8 **RESPONSE:**

9 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.

10
11 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3:**

12 Admit that Intervenor dispute that Silvia Burley is an
13 authorized official or agency of the TRIBE. [As used
14 herein, the term "TRIBE" shall mean the federally
15 recognized Indian tribe listed in the Federal Register as
16 the California Valley Miwok Tribe and formerly known as the
17 Sheep Ranch Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians of California.]

18 **RESPONSE:**

19 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.

20
21 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4:**

22 Admit that the COMMISSION has no authority to resolve
23 the dispute between Intervenor and Plaintiff regarding
24 whether Silvia Burley is an authorized official or agency
25 of the TRIBE.

26 **RESPONSE:**

27 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.

1 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5:**

2 Admit that only the governing body of the TRIBE can
3 decide who is an authorized official or agency of the TRIBE.

4 **RESPONSE:**

5 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
6

7 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6:**

8 Admit that YOU contend that the governing body of the
9 TRIBE is a "general council." [As used herein, the term
10 "YOU" or "YOUR" shall mean plaintiff California Valley
11 Miwok Tribe, including an employee, member, attorney, or
12 agent of plaintiff California Valley Miwok Tribe.]

13 **RESPONSE:**

14 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
15

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 7:**

17 Admit that YOU contend that the TRIBE's "general
18 council" governing body consists of Silvia Burley, Yakima
19 Dixie, Rashel Reznor, Anjelica Paulk and Tristian Wallace.

20 **RESPONSE:**

21 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
22

23 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 8:**

24 Admit that Intervenorors contend that the governing body
25 of the TRIBE is Intervenor Tribal Council.

26 **RESPONSE:**

27 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
28

1 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:**

2 Admit that the COMMISSION has no authority to decide
3 who is the governing body of the TRIBE.

4 **RESPONSE:**

5 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
6

7 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10:**

8 Admit that the United States Department of the Interior
9 has the exclusive authority to acknowledge a governing body
10 of a federally recognized Indian tribe.

11 **RESPONSE:**

12 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
13

14 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

15 Admit that the COMMISSION has a policy of releasing
16 Revenue Sharing Trust Fund money only to a NON-COMPACT
17 tribe's tribal governing body acknowledged by the United
18 States Department of the Interior, or an authorized
19 official or agency selected by such a governing body.

20 **RESPONSE:**

21 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
22

23 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

24 Admit that the COMMISSION's policy of releasing Revenue
25 Sharing Trust Fund money only to a NON-COMPACT tribe's
26 governing body acknowledged by the United States Department
27 of the Interior, or to an authorized official or agency
28

1 selected by such a governing body, is within its legal
2 authority.

3 **RESPONSE:**

4 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
5

6 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

7 Admit that, at the time YOU filed YOUR First Amended
8 Complaint in this action, the United States Department of
9 the Interior did not acknowledge a governing body of the
10 TRIBE.

11 **RESPONSE:**

12 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
13

14 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

15 Admit that the United States Department of the Interior
16 does not currently recognize a governing body of the TRIBE.

17 **RESPONSE:**

18 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
19

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:**

21 Admit that the document attached as **Exhibit A** is a true
22 and correct copy of a letter from the United States Bureau
23 of Indian Affairs to Silvia Burley dated December 14, 2007.

24 **RESPONSE:**

25 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
26

26 ///

27 ///

1 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:**

2 Admit that the document attached as **Exhibit B** is a true
3 and correct copy of a decision issued by the Assistant
4 Secretary of Indian Affairs, United States Department of
5 the Interior, on August 31, 2011.

6 **RESPONSE:**

7 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
8

9 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17:**

10 Admit that a "general council" is a form of tribal
11 government consisting of all of a tribe's adult members.

12 **RESPONSE:**

13 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
14

15 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:**

16 Admit that YOU contend that the current adult
17 membership of the TRIBE is limited to Silvia Burley, Rashel
18 Reznor, Anjelica Paulk, Tristian Wallace and Yakima Dixie.

19 **RESPONSE:**

20 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.
21

22 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:**

23 Admit that **Exhibit C** is a true and correct copy of the
24 First Amended Complaint filed by Intervenor in *California*
25 *Valley Miwok Tribe v. Salazar*, No. 1:11-cv-00160-RWR
26 (D.D.C.)

27 ///

1 **RESPONSE:**

2 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.

3
4 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 20:**

5 Admit that in Exhibit C Intervenor's contend that there
6 are 242 adult members of the TRIBE.

7 **RESPONSE:**

8 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.


9
10 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 21:**

11 Admit that the COMMISSION has no authority to decide
12 who are the members of the TRIBE.

13 **RESPONSE:**

14 See response to Request for Admission No. 1 above.

15
16
17 Dated: March 7, 2013

18 
19 Manuel Corrales, Jr., Esq.
20 Attorney for Plaintiff
21 CALIFORNIA VALLEY MIWOK
22 TRIBE
23
24
25
26
27
28