

1 Chunk Nation, filed a *Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Defendants'*
2 *Counterclaim for Lack Of Subject Matter Jurisdiction* with attached *Memorandum in Support of*
3 *Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss Defendants' Counterclaim for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction*
4 (hereinafter "*Motion*"). MCA filed its *Defendants' Response in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion*
5 *to Dismiss Defendants' Counterclaim for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction* (hereinafter
6 "*Response*") on August 19, 2013. The Nation filed a *Plaintiff's Reply in Support of Its Motion to*
7 *Dismiss Defendants' Counterclaim for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction* (hereinafter
8 "*Plaintiff's Reply*") on August 22, 2013.

9
10 The Court convened a *Motion Hearing* on August 12, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. CDT. The *Pre-*
11 *Trial Conference* was held on August 27, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. CDT. The following parties
12 appeared at the *Hearing*: Attorney Christianna L. Finnern and Attorney Michael A. Rosow on
13 behalf of the plaintiff, and Attorney James L. Beausoleil and Attorney Harry M. Byrne on behalf
14 of the defendants.
15

16 17 **APPLICABLE LAW**

18 19 **CONSTITUTION OF THE HO-CHUNK NATION**

20 21 **Art. V - Legislature**

22 **Sec. 2. Powers of the Legislature.** The Legislature shall have the power:

23 (a) To make laws, including codes, ordinances, resolutions, and statutes;

24 (i) To negotiate and enter into treaties, compacts, contracts, and agreements with other
25 governments, organizations, or individuals;

26 **Art. VI - Executive**

27 **Sec. 1. Composition of the Executive.**
28

1 (b) The Executive Branch shall be composed of any administrative Departments created by
2 the Legislature, including a Department of the Treasury, Justice, Administration, Housing,
3 Business, Health and Social Services, Education, Labor, and Personnel, and other Departments
4 deemed necessary by the Legislature. Each Department shall include an Executive Director, a
5 Board of Directors, and necessary employees. The Executive Director of the Department of
6 Justice shall be called the Attorney General of the Ho-Chunk Nation. The Executive Director of
7 the Department of Treasury shall be called the Treasurer of the Ho-Chunk Nation.

8 Sec. 2. Powers of the President. The President shall have the power:

9 (a) To execute and administer the laws of the Ho-Chunk Nation;

10 (k) To represent the Ho-Chunk Nation on all matters that concern its interests and welfare;

11 (l) To execute, administer, and enforce the laws of the Ho-Chunk Nation necessary to
12 exercise all powers delegated by the General Council and the Legislature, including but not
13 limited to the foregoing list of powers.

14 Art. VII - Judiciary

15 Sec. 4. Powers of the Judiciary. The judicial power of the Ho-Chunk Nation shall be
16 vested in the Judiciary. The Judiciary shall have the power to interpret and apply the
17 Constitution and laws of the Ho-Chunk Nation.

18 Sec. 5. Jurisdiction of the Judiciary.

19 (a) The Trial Court shall have original jurisdiction over all cases and controversies,
20 both criminal and civil, in law or in equity, arising under the Constitution, laws, customs and
21 traditions of the Ho-Chunk Nation, including cases in which the Ho-Chunk Nation, or its
22 officials and employees, shall be a party. Any such case or controversy arising within the
23 jurisdiction of the Ho-Chunk Nation shall be filed in the Trial Court before it is filed in any other
24 court. This grant of jurisdiction by the General Council shall not be construed to be a waiver of
25 the Nation's sovereign immunity.

26 Art. XII - Sovereign Immunity

27 Sec. 1. Immunity of Nation from Suit. The Ho-Chunk Nation shall be immune from suit except
28 to the extent that the Legislature expressly waives its sovereign immunity, and officials or
employees of the Ho-Chunk Nation acting within the scope of their duties or authority shall be
immune from suit, except suits brought in Article IV Section 3(a).

HO-CHUNK NATION LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 06-03-08 C

...NOW THEREFORE BE RESOLVED, that the Legislature authorizes the President or his
designee to negotiate and execute an Agreement for both cash access and its casinos and training

1 in the cash access business for long term development of an economic enterprise with Money
2 Center of America.

3 HO-CHUNK NATION RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

4 Rule 7. Defenses and Counterclaims.

5 A defense that alleges new facts excusing the conduct of the defendant if statements in the
6 *Complaint* are true must be affirmatively stated. *Counterclaims* arising from the same facts or
7 circumstances as alleged in the *Complaint* shall be raised in the *Answer*. If a party fails to raise
8 such *Counterclaims*, he/she shall be forever barred from bringing them to the Court in a future
9 action. Other claims against parties in the action may also be raised in the *Answer*. A party may
10 file a response to counterclaims raised in the *Answer*, but is not required to do so.

11 Rule 18. Types of Motions.

12 *Motions* are requests directed to the Court and must be in writing except those made in Court.
13 *Motions* based on factual matters shall be supported by affidavits, references to other documents,
14 testimony, exhibits or other material already in the Court record. *Motions* based on legal matters
15 shall contain or be supported by a legal memorandum, which states the issues and legal basis
16 relied on by the moving party. The *Motions* referenced within these rules shall not be considered
17 exhaustive of the *Motions* available to litigants.

18 Rule 58. Amendment to or Relief from Judgment or Order.

19 (A) Relief from Judgment. A *Motion to Amend* or for relief from judgment, including a request
20 for a new trial shall be made within ten (10) calendar days of the filing of judgment. The *Motion*
21 must be based on an error or irregularity that prevented a party from receiving a fair trial or a
22 substantial legal error that affected the outcome of the action.

23 (B) Motion for Reconsideration. Upon motion of the Court or by motion of a party made not
24 later than ten (10) calendar days after entry of judgment, the Court may amend its findings or
25 conclusions or make additional findings or conclusions, amending the judgment accordingly.
26 The motion may be made with a motion for a new trial. If the Court amends the judgment, the
27 time for initiating an appeal commences upon entry of the amended judgment. If the Court
28 denies a motion filed under this Rule, the time for initiating appeal from the judgment
commences when the Court denies the motion on the record or when an order denying the
motion is entered, whichever occurs first. If within thirty (30) days after the filing of such
motion, and the Court does not decide a motion under this Rule or the judge does not sign an
order denying the motion, the motion is considered denied. The time for initiating the appeal
from judgment commences in accordance with the *Rules of Appellate Procedure*.

(C) Motion to Modify. After the time period in which to file a *Motion to Amend* or a *Motion for*
Reconsideration has elapsed, a party may file a *Motion to Modify* with the Court. The *Motion*
must be based upon new information that has come to the party's attention that, if true, could
have the effect of altering or modifying the judgment. Upon such motion, the Court may modify

1 the judgment accordingly. If the Court modifies the judgment, the time for initiating an appeal
2 commences upon entry of the modified judgment. If the Court denies a motion filed under this
3 Rule, the time for initiating an appeal from the judgment commences when the Court denies the
4 motion on the record or when an order denying the motion is entered, whichever occurs first. If
5 within thirty (30) calendar days after the filing of such motion, and the Court does not decide the
6 motion or the judge does not sign an order denying the motion, the motion is considered denied.
7 The time for initiating an appeal from judgment commences in accordance with the *Rules of
8 Appellate Procedure*.

9 (D) Erratum Order or Re-issuance of Judgment. Clerical errors in a Court record, including the
10 *Judgment* or *Order*, may be corrected by the Court at any time.

11 (E) Grounds for Relief. The Court may grant relief from judgments or orders on motion of a
12 party made within a reasonable time for the following reasons: (1) newly discovered evidence
13 which could not reasonably have been discovered in time to request a new trial; (2) fraud,
14 misrepresentation or serious misconduct of another party to the action; (3) good cause if the
15 requesting party was not personally served in accordance with Rule 5(c)(1)(a)(i) or (ii), did not
16 have proper service and did not appear in the action; or (4) the judgment has been satisfied,
17 released, discharged or is without effect due to a judgment earlier in time.

18 Rule 61. Appeals.

19 Any final *Judgment* or *Order* of the Trial Court may be appealed to the Supreme Court. The
20 *Appeal* must comply with the *Rules of Appellate Procedure*, specifically *Rules of Appellate
21 Procedure*, Rule 7, Right of Appeal. All subsequent actions of a final *Judgment* or Trial Court
22 *Order* must follow the *Rules of Appellate Procedure*.

23
24
25
26
27
28
FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The parties were properly served briefs on this issue.

2. The plaintiff, Ho-Chunk Nation, is a federally recognized Indian Tribe with principal
offices located on trust lands at HCN Headquarters, W9814 Airport Road, P.O. Box 667, Black
River Falls, WI. *See* 70 Fed. Reg. 71194 (Nov. 25, 2005).

3. The defendant, Money Centers of America, Inc., is a Delaware corporation that maintains
its principal office at 700 South Henderson Road, Suite 325, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania,
19406. *Compl.* at 1, *Defendants' Answer* at 1.

1 4. The defendant, MCA of Wisconsin, Inc., is a Wisconsin corporation that maintains its
2 principal office at 700 South Henderson Road, Suite 325, King of Prussia, Pennsylvania, 19406.

3 *Compl.* at 1, *Defendants' Answer* at 1.

4
5 5. The Legislature duly passed *Ho-Chunk Nation Legislature Authorizing the Execution of a*
6 *Contract with Money Centers of America for Cash Access and Training to Create a Cash Access*
7 *Business Resolution 6-03-08 C* (hereinafter *Resolution 6-03-08 C*) on June 8, 2008.

8 6. In the summer of 2008, MCA and the Nation entered into a contract, *Financial*
9 *Services/Onswitch Agreement* (hereinafter *FSA*).

10
11
12 **DECISION**

13
14 In this motion, the Court must address a provision of the CONSTITUTION OF THE HO-
15 CHUNK NATION (hereinafter CONSTITUTION) that safeguards the independence of the Nation.
16 Specifically, the Court must determine whether the Legislature expressly waived its sovereign
17 immunity as required by ART. XII, § 1 of the CONSTITUTION when it “authorized the President or
18 his designee to negotiate and execute” a contract with the defendant, MCA. *Resolution 6-03-08*
19 *C*). For the following reasons, the Court holds that it did not.

20
21 No party in this case denies that a provision purporting to be a limited waiver of
22 sovereign immunity was included in the contract negotiated between MCA and representatives
23 of the Executive Branch. *FSA* at 8. In its August 9, 2013 *Motion*, however, the Nation argues
24 that this waiver was ineffective. The Nation argues that the language of the CONSTITUTION
25 requires a clear and unequivocal waiver from the Legislature, specifically an express waiver, and
26 that while the Legislature clearly authorized the negotiation of the contract, the lack of any
27 language within *Resolution 6-03-08 C* pertaining to sovereign immunity means that the
28

1 legislative branch retained this immunity. The Executive branch, therefore, had no ability,
2 delegated or otherwise,¹ to include a provision within the contract waiving sovereign immunity.
3 The provision that purports to, according to the Nation's motion, is void, and as a result the
4 Nation is immune from defendants' counterclaims.
5

6 Although the Nation's motion is primarily based on the constitutional text ARTICLE XII, §
7 1, it also supplies a number of Ho-Chunk and foreign court cases standing for general principles
8 in interpreting sovereign immunity. See *Mot.* at 4. Although none of the cited cases address
9 circumstances directly analogous to the ones in this case, they do provide a background of strict
10 construction for any potential waiver of immunity.
11

12 It is against this background that the defendants attempt to rebut the plaintiff's motion.
13 The defendant offers two separate theories. First, it argues that the Nation has not properly
14 raised the issue, as it did so too late in the proceedings and as an attachment to a scheduling
15 order. *Response* at 2. Secondly, it argues that the execution of the contract, and in particular its
16 waiver provision, serve as a clear and valid waiver of sovereign immunity. *Id.* at 3.
17

18 On the first argument, the plaintiff's response is persuasive to the Court. It points to
19 foreign case law wherein sovereign immunity was raised after trial, and Ho-Chunk case law
20 wherein it was raised at appeal. The defendants argue that the latter case, *HCN Legislature v.*
21 *George Lewis*, stands only for the proposition that sovereign immunity can be raised for the first
22 time at appeal, and can be distinguished in that *Lewis* involved a significant constitutional issue
23
24

25 ¹The Legislature retains the ability to enact statutes that serve to indefinitely waive sovereign immunity in certain
26 situations. See, e.g., EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 2004, 6 HCC § 5.35. If the Legislature were to micromanage
27 the day-to-day operations of the Nation, then it could essentially halt day-to-day operations of the Nation. The
28 Court believes that the Legislature could similarly waive sovereign immunity through a resolution process, similar
to the resolution process that allows the delegation of power to the Executive Branch to enter into contracts. If the
Legislature chose to delegate its power or a portion of its power to the Executive Branch, then it could have created
a resolution, which indicates that the Nation, for contracting purposes, allows a limited waiver of sovereign
immunity. However, the record does not reflect that any such resolution exists.

1 and that this case does not. *HCN Legislature v. Lewis*, SU 07-02 (HCN S. Ct., June 29, 2007).
2 However, given the centrality of sovereign immunity to both the sovereignty of the Nation and
3 the fact that the question turns directly on a constitutional provision, the Court declines to make
4 the distinction on significance that the defendant desires. Furthermore, this Court can see no
5 reason to bar the claim as untimely now, and then proceed to go through the time and expense of
6 adjudicating the merits of the defendants' counterclaims at trial only to finally allow the plaintiff
7 to raise the question of sovereign immunity before the Ho-Chunk Nation Supreme Court. If the
8 plaintiff may raise the issue *after* a trial here, as *Lewis* seems to permit,² then it would be
9 senseless to bar it from doing so *before* a trial here.
10

11
12 As for defendants' second argument, the Court also agrees with the plaintiff. Were it not
13 for that fatal footnote, *Lonnie Simplot v. Ho-Chunk Nation Department of Health* would seem to
14 allow for the clear contractual language of the *FSA* to serve as a waiver of sovereign immunity.
15 *See Simplot v. HCN Dep't of Health*, CV 95-26-27, 96-05 (HCN Tr. Ct., Aug. 13, 1999) (citing
16 *Sokaogan Gaming Enter. Corp. v. Tushie-Montgomery Associates, Inc.*, 86 F.3d 656 (7th Cir.
17 1996), "[t]his Court has not adopted this standard and disclaims any reliance on *Sokaogan's*
18 rationale"). With the footnote, however, the Court indicates that *Sokaogan's* rule is merely a
19 survey of how foreign jurisdictions have approached the question of sovereign immunity
20 waivers. Although the defendants rely on the argument, the Court does not find it persuasive.
21

22
23 The defendants are not and do not claim to be unsophisticated parties. The scale of this
24 case alone, both in terms of money damages alleged by both sides and the size of the case file
25 documenting it, are sufficient to demonstrate as much. Other materials imply that the defendants
26

27
28 ² There is some uncertainty as to whether *Lewis* does grant such an open-ended right, as the majority was clearly
reluctant and the concurrence argued that the failure to raise the issue at trial acted as a waiver. However, that
concurrence must be read in the light of *Lewis's* extremely unusual circumstances. There, the Legislature itself was
a party to the litigation being decided. Since, as the CONSTITUTION reads and the Nation argues here, only the

1 routinely deal with gaming operations.⁴ The inclusion of a sovereign immunity waiver within
2 the FSA, even if it was ultimately ineffective, shows that MCA was aware of the existence and
3 importance of that doctrine. Similarly, the constitutional requirements for a valid waiver of
4 sovereign immunity are longstanding and prominent, written under their own clearly labeled
5 Article.
6

7 Given these circumstances, the Court cannot and will not ignore the clear constitutional
8 language of ART. XII, § 1. Even though MCA is correct that this argument has been raised much
9 further into the case than would be ideal, and has the feel of a “last minute attempt to avoid
10 liability,”⁵ the Court is bound by the simple and clear black letter law.
11

12 **BASED UPON THE FOREGOING**, the Court grants the plaintiff’s request for relief,
13 and dismisses the defendants’ counterclaim for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The Court
14 finds that the Legislature did not expressly waive sovereign immunity pursuant to the
15 CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE XII, § 1. The parties retain the right to file a timely post-judgment
16 motion with this Court in accordance with *HCN R. Civ. P. 58*, Amendment to or Relief from
17 Judgment or Order. Otherwise, “[t]he time for taking an appeal shall begin from the date the
18 judgment is filed with the [Trial Court] Clerk [of Court].” *HCN R. Civ. P. 57*. Since this
19 decision represents a non-final judgment, “[a]n appeal from [this] interlocutory order maybe [*sic*]
20 sought by filing a petition for permission to appeal with the Supreme Court Clerk within ten (10)
21 calendar days after the entry of such order with proof of service on all other parties to an action.”
22 *Ho-Chunk Nation Rules of Appellate Procedure*, Rule 8.⁶
23
24
25

26 Legislature may waive sovereign immunity, the Nation’s indisputably late raising of the issue here is not comparable
27 to the logic of the *Lewis* concurrence.

28 ⁴ For example, the “Background” section in the FSA contract, at 1.

⁵ *Reply* at 3.

⁶ Parties can obtain a copy of the applicable rules by contacting the Ho-Chunk Nation Judiciary at (715) 284-2722 or (800) 434-4070 or visiting the judicial website at www.ho-chunknation.com.

Ho-Chunk Nation Court System
P.O. Box 70
Black River Falls, WI 54615
(715) 284-2722 or 800-434-4070



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

IT IS SO ORDERED this 6th day of September 2013, by the Ho-Chunk Nation Trial Court located in Black River Falls, WI within the sovereign lands of the Ho-Chunk Nation.

SgPlus1
Amanda L. Rockman

Honorable Amanda L. Rockman
Associate Trial Court Judge