Case 2:13-cv-00408-KJM-EFB Document 1 Filed 03/01/13 Page 1 of 12 HOBBS, STRAUS, DEAN, & WALKER LLP A Limited Liability Partnership

GEOFFREY D. STROMMER, pro hac vice pending gstrommer@hobbsstraus.com

STEPHEN D. OSBORNE, pro hac vice pending sosborne@hobbsstraus.com

4 806 S.W. Broadway, Suite 900

Portland, Oregon 97205

1

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

Telephone: 503-242-1745 Facsimile: 503-242-1072

ADAM P. BAILEY, Cal. Bar No. 278208, counsel for service abailey@hobbsstraus.com
1903 21st St., 3rd Floor

Sacramento, California 95811 Telephone: 916-442-9444

10 Facsimile: 916-442-8344

Attorneys for Plaintiff SUSANVILLE INDIAN RANCHERIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SUSANVILLE INDIAN RANCHERIA

Case No.

Plaintiff

COMPLAINT

20 v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, KATHLEEN SEBELIUS, in her official capacity as Secretary, U.S. Department of Health & Human Services

YVETTE ROUBIDEAUX, in her official capacity as Director, Indian Health Service

Defendants.

26

27

28

COMPLAINT

COMPLAINT

The Plaintiff, for its cause of action against the Defendants named above, alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

- 1. This is a suit against the United States for breach of contract and statute by the Indian Health Service ("IHS"), an agency in the Department of Health and Human Services ("HHS"). Plaintiff, the Susanville Indian Rancheria ("Tribe"), seeks money damages under the Contract Disputes Act, 41 U.S.C. § 7101 et seq. ("CDA"), based on the Secretary's repeated violations of the Tribe's contractual and statutory right to the payment of full funding of contract support costs ("CSC") for contracts entered under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act ("ISDEAA"), Pub. L. No. 93-638, as amended, 25 U.S.C. § 450 et seq.
- 2. Defendants breached the Tribe's contract by failing to pay the full CSC owed to the Tribe under the ISDEAA and the Tribe's contract and annual funding agreements ("AFAs") for calendar years 2005-2008.
- 3. Defendants paid only a portion of the CSC owed under the Tribe's contracts, due to Defendants' misapplication of federal contracting and appropriations law. In the appropriations acts each year, Congress imposed "caps" on aggregate CSC spending, which Defendants believed allowed them to underfund the Tribe's contracts. This resulted in CSC "shortfalls," which the IHS calculated for each of the years from 2005 to 2008 and reported to Congress.
- 4. The Supreme Court found Defendants' practice unlawful, holding that the IHS is responsible for fully funding ISDEAA contracts—including all of the required CSC—without regard to congressionally instituted caps on CSC funding as a whole. *Salazar v. Ramah Navajo Chapter*, 567 U.S. ____, 132 S. Ct. 2181 (2012). As long as there are sufficient appropriations to cover an individual contract's costs—even if there is not enough to fully fund all contracts—the Government's obligation to fully pay each individual contract remains. In the Court's words, "The agency's allocation choices do not affect the Government's liability in the event of an

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

underpayment." Ramah, 132 S. Ct. at 2192, citing Cherokee Nation of Okla. v. Leavitt, 543 U.S. 631, 641 (2005).

5. The Tribe's claims are indistinguishable from those in *Ramah*. The IHS received sufficient funds in each year at issue to fully pay the Tribe's CSC, although Congress limited the aggregate amount of funding for all CSC at the agency. The shortfall in CSC owed to the Tribe is a result of the agency's allocation choices, but the Government remains liable for payment of the full amount.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. This controversy arises under agreements between the United States and the Tribe for operation of Indian health programs carried out pursuant to ISDEAA contracts and funding agreements. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under the Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a), and the Indian Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1505, as well the ISDEAA and the CDA. See 25 U.S.C. § 450m-1(a) (providing original jurisdiction to United States district courts, concurrent with the Court of Federal Claims, over civil actions for money damages arising under ISDEAA contracts).
- 7. On September 16, 2011, the Tribe requested an IHS contracting officer's decision on claims for underpaid CSC for the calendar years 2005 and 2006. In two letters dated March 1, 2012, a contracting officer denied the Tribe's claims for 2005 and 2006. Thus, the Tribe has exhausted its administrative remedies for the 2005 and 2006 claims, and filed this action within twelve months of receiving the decisions, as required by the CDA. 41 U.S.C. § 7104(b).
- 8. Also on September 16, 2011 the Tribe requested an IHS contracting officer's decision on claims for underpaid CSC for calendar years 2007 and 2008. On September 19, 2012, the Tribe also filed a supplemental claim for further unpaid CSC and expectancy damages from lost third-party revenue. The Tribe has received no response from the IHS to any of these three letters. The IHS has not issued a decision on these claims within a reasonable time, so they are deemed denied. 41 U.S.C. § 7103(f)(5).

5

4

6 7

9

8

11

10

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

- This court has jurisdiction to review IHS's decisions, and deemed decisions, 9. denying the Tribe's claims for FYs 2005-2008 under the CDA and Section 110 of the ISDEAA. 41 U.S.C. § 7104(b); 25 U.S.C. § 450m-1(a).
- Venue is proper because the IHS California Area Office, which serves the Tribe 10. and other tribes in California, is located in Sacramento, California, and IHS CSC policy, as applied to the Tribe, was carried out by the IHS California Area Office.

PARTIES

- Plaintiff Susanville Indian Rancheria is a federally recognized Indian tribe located 11. in Susanville, California. The Tribe operates the Lassen Indian Health Center, a health facility that provides health care services to tribal members and other beneficiaries pursuant to its agreements with the IHS under the ISDEAA.
- 12. Defendant United States is a party to every ISDEAA agreement entered into by the Tribe. See 25 U.S.C. § 450l(c) (Model Agreement § 1(a)(1)).
- 13. Defendant Kathleen Sebelius is the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and is charged by law with the responsibility for implementing the ISDEAA, and other health laws benefiting Indians, on behalf of the United States. 25 U.S.C. § 450f(a)(1); id. § 450b(i); 42 U.S.C. § 2001. Defendant Sebelius is sued in her official capacity.
- 14. Defendant Yvette Roubideaux is the Director of the IHS, the primary agency that carries out HHS's responsibility for implementing the ISDEAA, and other health laws benefiting Indians, on behalf of the United States. Defendant Roubideaux is sued in her official capacity

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The ISDEAA

15. During calendar years 2005 and 2006, the Tribe provided health services to eligible Indians and other eligible beneficiaries tribes pursuant to agreements entered into with the Secretary of the HHS and the IHS under Title I of the ISDEAA, 25 U.S.C. § 450 et seq. In 2007 and 2008, the Tribe provided health care services pursuant to a Self-Governance Compact and Funding Agreements authorized by Title V of the ISDEAA. See 25 U.S.C. § 458aaa et seq. For

Case 2:13-cv-00408-KJM-EFB Document 1 Filed 03/01/13 Page 5 of 12

the purposes of this action, there is no relevant difference between Title I and Title V agreements. See 25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(a) (Title I provision governing funding, including for CSC); id. § 458aaa-15(a) (Title V provision stating that "[a]ll provisions of sections . . . 450j-1(a) through (k) . . . of this title . . . shall apply to compacts and funding agreements authorized by this part").

- 16. The ISDEAA authorizes the Tribe and other tribal organizations to assume responsibility to provide programs, functions, services and activities ("PFSAs") that the Secretary would otherwise be obligated to provide. In return, the Secretary must provide the Tribe two types of funding under Section 106(a) of the ISDEAA: (1) "program" funds, the amount the Secretary would have provided for the PFSAs had the IHS retained responsibility for them, *see* 25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(a)(1), sometimes called the "Secretarial amount" or the "106(a)(1) amount"; and (2) "contract support costs," the reasonable administrative and overhead costs associated with carrying out the PFSAs, *see id.* § 450j-1(a)(2) and (3). **See also id. § 450l(c), Model Agreement § 1(b)(4) (funding amount "shall not be less than the applicable amount determined pursuant to section 106(a) of the [ISDEAA]").
- 17. There are three types of CSC: (1) start-up costs, which are one-time costs to plan, prepare for and assume operation of a new or expanded PFSA, see 25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(a)(5) & (6); (2) indirect costs ("IDC"), costs incurred for a common or joint purpose benefiting more than one PFSA, such as administrative and overhead costs, see id. § 450j-1(a)(2); and (3) direct CSC ("DCSC"), expenses directly attributable to a certain PFSA but not captured in either the IDC pool

21 Section 106(a)(2) of the ISDEAA mandates as follows:

25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(a)(2).

-5-

⁽²⁾ There shall be added [to the 106(a)(1) amount] contract support costs which shall consist of an amount for the reasonable costs for activities which must be carried on by a tribal organization as a contractor to ensure compliance with the terms of the contract and prudent management, but which—

⁽A) normally are not carried on by the respective Secretary in his direct operation of the program; or

⁽B) are provided by the Secretary in support of the contracted program from resources other than those under contract.

Case 2:13-cv-00408-KJM-EFB Document 1 Filed 03/01/13 Page 6 of 12

or the 106(a)(1) amount, such as workers compensation insurance or other expenses the Secretary would not have incurred because, for example, the Government is self-insured, *see id.* § 450j-1(a)(3)(A).

- 18. The ISDEAA requires that, upon approval of the contract, "the Secretary shall add the full amount of funds to which the contractor is entitled [under section 106(a) of the ISDEAA]," including CSC. 25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(g) (emphasis added); see also Cherokee Nation, 543 U.S. at 634 ("The [ISDEAA] specifies that the Government must pay a tribe's costs, including administrative expenses."). As noted above, one component of the required CSC under section 106(a) is indirect cost funding, which covers administrative and overhead costs, allowing all program funds to be used to provide health care PFSAs for tribal members and other beneficiaries.
- 19. For the Tribe, the "full amount" of indirect costs was (and is) determined by multiplying a negotiated indirect cost rate by the amount of the direct cost base. The Tribe's indirect cost rate, direct cost base, resulting indirect cost requirement, and any shortfall in funding was memorialized in the CSC "shortfall reports" IHS submitted to Congress each year in accordance with the ISDEAA, as discussed further below. *See* 25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(c).

The CSC Shortfalls and the Ramah Case

- 20. Despite the ISDEAA's requirements that the Secretary shall pay the full amount of CSC, the IHS has not done so. Since at least fiscal year 1993, IHS has underpaid the vast majority of ISDEAA contractors, as documented in the agency's annual CSC "shortfall reports" to Congress. IHS prepares the shortfall reports in compliance with ISDEAA section 106(c), which requires that the agency submit to Congress an annual report on the implementation of the ISDEAA, including:
 - (1) an accounting of the total amounts of funds provided for each program and the budget activity for direct program costs and contract support costs of tribal organizations under self-determination;
 - (2) an accounting of any deficiency in funds needed to provide required contract support costs to all contractors for the fiscal year for which the report is being submitted

25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(c). Each IHS Area Office, including the California Area, prepares a shortfall report that shows how much each tribe and tribal organization in the Area was paid in CSC for the fiscal year, how much IHS would have paid had Congress appropriated sufficient CSC funding to pay every ISDEAA contractor in full, and the resulting shortfall, if any. The reports reflect the data in the contracts, funding agreements, and indirect cost rate agreements of tribal contractors.

- 21. Though the form of the shortfall reports has varied somewhat over the years, the essential information in the reports used to calculate the shortfalls has remained the same: the total CSC requirement minus the actual CSC paid by the IHS equals the CSC shortfall, which is reported to Congress.
- 22. Prior to fiscal year 1998, Congress imposed no statutory restriction on availability of CSC, but IHS limited its payment to the amounts recommended in congressional committee reports. In 2005, the U.S. Supreme Court held this practice unlawful, ruling that the appropriations available to pay tribes the full CSC due under section 106(a) and their contracts included the IHS's entire unrestricted lump-sum appropriation. *Cherokee Nation*, 543 U.S. at 642-43 (2005). The Court held that IHS should have reprogrammed funds to pay the Cherokee the full CSC due under its contracts.
- Despite the *Cherokee* ruling, Defendants continued their practice of paying less than full CSC to ISDEAA contractors. Defendants justified the systematic underpayment of CSC by pointing to the CSC spending "caps" Congress has placed in the appropriations acts each year beginning in fiscal year 1998. *See, e.g.*, Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, Pub. L. No. 105-277, 112 Stat. 2681, 2681–279 (1998) ("not to exceed \$203,781,000 shall be for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract or grant support costs associated with [ISDEAA] contracts").
- 24. In 2012, the U.S. Supreme Court considered the Government's responsibility to fully fund CSC after Congress placed a cap on the amount of funding available for CSC. Echoing its reasoning in *Cherokee*, the Court held that—even if Congress appropriates insufficient funds to cover the aggregate amount due to every contractor, but enough to pay any individual contractor's

9

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

21

22

20

23

24

25 26

28

27

CSC—the government is obligated to pay each contractor's CSC in full, Ramah, 132 S. Ct. at $2186.^{2}$

- 25. The Court explicitly rejected arguments that the Government is not liable for full CSC because Congress did not appropriate sufficient funding for all CSC, and that the ISDEAA states that the Secretary "is not required to reduce funding for programs, projects, or activities serving a tribe to make funds available to another tribe." Ramah, 132 S. Ct. at 2192, quoting 25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(b). The Court found this idea was "inconsistent with ordinary principles of Government contracting law," and that the "agency's allocation choices do not affect the Government's liability in the event of an underpayment." Id.³
- 26. The Tribe was one of the tribal contractors underpaid in 2005-2008 as a result of IHS's allocation choices. According to the agency's own CSC shortfall reports, the Tribe suffered significant CSC underpayments in 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008. The shortfalls documented in the reports for those years are summarized in the following table:

Table 1: Shortfall Summary

		<i></i>	
Year	Total Requirement (\$)	Total Paid (\$)	Shortfall (\$)
2005	550,050	440,233	109,817
2006	721,072	496,948	224,124
2007	744,952	498,040	246,912
2008	769,447	499,756	269,692
TOTAL			850,545

² "Once Congress has appropriated sufficient legally unrestricted funds to pay the contracts at issue, the Government normally cannot back out of a promise to pay on grounds of 'insufficient appropriations,' even if the contract uses language such as 'subject to the availability of appropriations,' and even if an agency's total lump-sum appropriations is insufficient to pay all the contracts the agency has made." Ramah, 132 S. Ct. at 2190 (internal quotations omitted) (emphasis in the original).

³ The Ramah decision concerned CSC from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but after that decision, the Court vacated a Federal Circuit case involving the IHS that had reached a contrary conclusion. On remand, the Federal Circuit followed Ramah, noting the IHS appropriations were limited by identical language as the BIA appropriations in Ramah, and held the Secretary was obligated to pay all of the tribal contractor's CSC. Arctic Slope Native Ass'n, Ltd. v. Sebelius, 2012 WL 3599217, No. 2010-1013 (Fed. Cir. Aug 22, 2012) on remand from Arctic Slope Native Ass'n, Ltd. v. Sebelius, 133 S. Ct. 22 (2012), vacating 629 F.3d 1296 (Fed. Cir. 2010).

Case 2:13-cv-00408-KJM-EFB Document 1 Filed 03/01/13 Page 9 of 12

1 27. The Tribe presented claims based on the breaches of contract described above in 2 letters to the IHS dated September 16, 2011. The IHS denied the claims for 2005 and 2006 in 3 letters dated March 1, 2012. The IHS has failed to issue a decision on the claims for 2007 and 4 2008, so they are deemed denied. See 41 U.S.C. § 7103(f)(5). 5 Indirect Costs on Unpaid Direct CSC 6 28. The IHS CSC shortfall reports discussed above break out the shortfalls into 7 underpayments of direct CSC and, in a separate column, indirect CSC. As discussed above, direct 8 CSC is comprised of expenses directly attributable to a certain program or activity but not captured in either the indirect cost pool or the program amount due under section 106(a)(1).4 10 Direct CSC is part of the direct cost base, and thus generates indirect cost funding through 11 application of the "rate-times-base" method described in paragraph 19 above. See IHS, INDIAN 12 HEALTH MANUAL § 6-3.4.E (2007) ("The DCSC, along with other Section 106(a)(1) funds, will be 13 considered part of the recurring base of the award."). 14 29. Underpayments of direct CSC, therefore, lower the Tribe's indirect cost funding as 15 well. The IHS shortfall reports, however, do not capture this additional indirect cost shortfall, 16 because the agency added to the direct cost base column only the amount of direct CSC paid, not 17 the amount from the "DCSC Negotiated" column. 18 30. The damages caused by the breaches of contract described above therefore include 19 indirect costs on unpaid direct CSC. This amount can be determined each year by multiplying the 20 negotiated indirect cost rate by the direct CSC shortfall memorialized in that year's CSC shortfall 21 report. 22 23

27

24

25

26

28

⁴ See 25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(a)(3)(A).

Expectancy Damages: Lost Third-Party Revenues

- 31. The damages caused by the breaches of contract described above include lost third-party revenues. The Tribe generates significant revenue from billing Medicaid, Medicare, and private insurance for health care services provided with IHS funding under the Tribe's ISDEAA agreements.
- 32. As a result of IHS's underfunding of CSC in each year, the Tribe was forced to divert program funds to cover fixed administrative and overhead expenses, reducing the amounts available to provide health care services, some of which could have been billed to third parties.
- 33. The Tribe's third-party collection rate for each year can be determined by dividing the amounts collected—which can be determined from the annual audit—by the total IHS program funding for that year. For example, in FY 2006, for every dollar of IHS funding spent, the Tribe recovered 61 cents in third-party billings—revenue used to provide further health care services to members of the Tribe and other eligible beneficiaries. The amount of lost third-party revenues for each year can be estimated by multiplying that year's collection rate by the CSC shortfall.
- 34. Diversion of program money, and the resulting loss of third-party revenue, was a foreseeable consequence of the CSC underpayments. IHS has long known that CSC shortfalls force tribes to divert program funds.⁵

CAUSE OF ACTION – Breach of Contract

- 35. All prior allegations are adopted by reference.
- 36. The Tribe's contracts incorporate the statutory duty to fully fund CSC. 25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(a) & (g); see also, e.g., Contract, art. V § 5(G); 2007 AFA § 5. This duty was affirmed by the Supreme Court in *Ramah*, which other courts have followed. Despite this statutory and contractual duty, during the years in question, the IHS failed to provide the full funding due under the Contract.

⁵ See, e.g., U.S. GOV'T ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE, GAO-99-150, INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION ACT: SHORTFALLS IN INDIAN CONTRACT SUPPORT COSTS NEED TO BE ADDRESSED 40-41 (1999) (describing use of medical program resources to cover CSC shortfalls).

Case 2:13-cv-00408-KJM-EFB Document 1 Filed 03/01/13 Page 11 of 12

37. Instead, the IHS paid significantly less than its full CSC requirement in fiscal years 2005-2008, as acknowledged in IHS's own shortfall reports. In doing so, the IHS violated the ISDEAA's requirement of full payment from available appropriations without regard to total appropriations or any congressionally imposed aggregate caps, as affirmed by the Supreme Court in Ramah, and breached its agreements with the Tribe, which incorporate the full-funding requirement of section 106(a).

Claim 1: 2005

38. As indicated in the IHS's own shortfall report, the Tribe's indirect CSC requirement for 2005 was \$550,050, yet the IHS paid only \$440,233. Therefore, the Tribe asserts a claim under the ISDEAA and the Contract in the amount of \$109,817, plus indirect costs on unpaid direct CSC, plus expectancy and other damages in an amount to be established by the evidence.

Claim 2: 2006

39. As indicated in the IHS's own shortfall report, the Tribe's indirect CSC requirement for 2006 was \$721,072, yet the IHS paid only \$496,948. Therefore, the Tribe asserts a claim under the ISDEAA and the Contract in the amount of \$224,124, plus indirect costs on unpaid direct CSC, plus expectancy and other damages in an amount to be established by the evidence.

Claim 3: 2007

40. As indicated in the IHS's own shortfall report, the Tribe's CSC requirement for 2007 was \$744,942, yet the IHS paid only \$498,040. Therefore, the Tribe asserts a claim under the ISDEAA and the Contract in the amount of \$246,912, plus indirect costs on unpaid direct CSC, plus expectancy and other damages in an amount to be established by the evidence.

Claim 4: 2008

41. As indicated in the IHS's own shortfall report, the Tribe's CSC requirement for 2008 was \$769,447, yet the IHS paid only \$499,756. Therefore, the Tribe asserts a claim under the ISDEAA and the Contract in the amount of \$269,692, plus indirect costs on unpaid direct CSC, plus expectancy and other damages in an amount to be established by the evidence.

27

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

28

Case 2:13-cv-00408-KJM-EFB Document 1 Filed 03/01/13 Page 12 of 12

1		PRAYER FOR RELIEF
2	42. The T	ribe therefore requests that this Court:
3	A.	Award the Tribe \$850,545 in damages for unpaid CSC, as detailed in the
4		IHS CSC shortfall reports, Table 1, and paragraphs 38-41 above;
5	В.	Award damages for indirect costs on unpaid direct CSC in each year in an
6		amount to be determined by the proof;
7	C.	Award expectancy damages for lost third-party revenues resulting from the
8		CSC underpayments, in an amount to be determined by the proof;
9	D.	Award such other damages as may be proven in this action;
10	E.	Order the payment of interest on these claims pursuant to the CDA, 41
11		U.S.C. § 7109, and the Prompt Payment Act, Chapter 39 of Title 31, United
12		States Code;
13	F.	Award the Tribe its attorney fees and expenses pursuant to the Equal
14		Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412 and 25 U.S.C. § 450m-1(c) and
15		other applicable law; and
16	G.	Grant the Tribe such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate.
17		
18	Respectfully Submit	ted,
19	Dated: March 1, 201	13
20		HOBBS, STRAUS, DEAN & WALKER LLP
21		
22		By ADAMP, BAILEY
23		GEOFFREY D. STROMMER STEPHEN D. OSBORNE
24		Attorneys For Plaintiff
25		SUSANVILLE INDIAN RANCHERIA
26		
27		
28		-12-

The JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

Case 2:13-cv-00408-KJM-PB GOLLTR TF Filed 03/01/13 Page 1 of 1

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				U.S. Dep't of Health Secretary; Indian H States of America					United
				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Adam P. Bailey; Hobbs, S 1903 21st St., 3rd Floor; S Phone: (916) 442-9444	Straus, Dean, & Walke	r, LLP		Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in Or	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES			
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	lot a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State		Incorporated or Pri		PTF	DEF
■ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	p of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2 🗖 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		□ 5	5
				en or Subject of a oreign Country	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation		D 6	D 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ly) RTS	F	ODEELTIDEMENTALTY	I PAN	KRUPTCY	Стигр	RSTATUT	TE
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability Product Liability Personal Injury - Product Liability Personal Injury Product Liability Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEF 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIO Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition Conditions of Confinement	RTY	CASE TURE/PENALTY 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 90 Other LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 62 Naturalization Application 65 Other Immigration Actions	422 App 423 With	cal 28 USC 158 drawal ISC 157 RTY RIGHTS rrights at emark SECURITY (1395ff) k Lung (923) ("C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	375 False 0	Claims Act Reapportion ust and Bankir enerce tation teer Influen to Organizat mer Credit //Sat TV ities/Commange Statutory A ultural Acts commental M mom of Inforn ation nistrative Pr eview or Af ty Decision	nment mg nced and tions odities/ Actions fatters mation rocedure
	moved from 3	Remanded from Appellate Court		nstated or	er District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON 41 U.S.C. 7101 e	t seq Contract Di	sputes	Do not cite jurisdictional sta	tutes unless d	iversity):			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION		DEMAND \$ 850,545.00	(CHECK YES only			
VIII. RELATED CASS	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCK	ET NUMBER			
DATE 03/01/2013 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	.*	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	OFRECORD					
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JU	DGE		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for the

Eastern District of California Susanville Indian Rancheria *Plaintiff(s)* Civil Action No. Kathleen Sebelius, Yvette Roubideaux, and the United States of America Defendant(s) SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION The Honorable Benjamin B. Wagner To: (Defendant's name and address) United States Attorney for the Eastern District of California 501 "I" Street, Suite 10-100 Sacramento, CA 95814 A lawsuit has been filed against you. Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Adam P. Bailey Hobbs, Straus, Dean & Walker, LLP 1903 21st St., 3rd Floor Sacramento, CA 95811 Phone: (916) 442-9444 If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court. CLERK OF COURT Date:

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

	This summons for (n	ame of individual and title, if an	y)		
was rec	ceived by me on (date)		·		
	☐ I personally serve	ed the summons on the ind	ividual at (place)		
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I left the summon	s at the individual's reside	ence or usual place of abode with (name)		
		,	a person of suitable age and discretion who res	ides there,	
	on (date)	, and mailed a	copy to the individual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the sumn	nons on (name of individual)		, wł	no is
	designated by law to	accept service of process	on behalf of (name of organization)		
			On (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the sum	nmons unexecuted because	e		; or
	☐ Other (specify):				
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00	
	I declare under pena	lty of perjury that this info	rmation is true.		
Date:					
2		-	Server's signature		
		_	Printed name and title		
		_	Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for the

Eastern District of California Susanville Indian Rancheria *Plaintiff(s)* Civil Action No. Kathleen Sebelius, Yvette Roubideaux, and the United States of America Defendant(s) SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION The Honorable Eric H. Holder, Jr. To: (Defendant's name and address) Attorney General of the United States Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20530-0001 A lawsuit has been filed against you. Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Adam P. Bailey Hobbs, Straus, Dean & Walker, LLP 1903 21st St., 3rd Floor Sacramento, CA 95811 Phone: (916) 442-9444 If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court. CLERK OF COURT Date:

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

	This summons for (n	ame of individual and title, if an	y)		
was rec	ceived by me on (date)		·		
	☐ I personally serve	ed the summons on the ind	ividual at (place)		
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I left the summon	s at the individual's reside	ence or usual place of abode with (name)		
		,	a person of suitable age and discretion who res	ides there,	
	on (date)	, and mailed a	copy to the individual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the sumn	nons on (name of individual)		, wł	no is
	designated by law to	accept service of process	on behalf of (name of organization)		
			On (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the sum	nmons unexecuted because	e		; or
	☐ Other (specify):				
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00	
	I declare under pena	lty of perjury that this info	rmation is true.		
Date:					
2		-	Server's signature		
		_	Printed name and title		
		_	Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

United States District Court

for the Eastern District of California Susanville Indian Rancheria *Plaintiff(s)* Civil Action No. Kathleen Sebelius, Yvette Roubideaux, and the United States of America Defendant(s) SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION William B. Schultz, General Counsel To: (Defendant's name and address) Department of Health and Human Services 200 Independence Ave., SW Room 713-F Washington, DC 20201 A lawsuit has been filed against you. Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Adam P. Bailey Hobbs, Straus, Dean & Walker, LLP 1903 21st St., 3rd Floor Sacramento, CA 95811 Phone: (916) 442-9444 If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court. CLERK OF COURT Date:

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

	This summons for (n	ame of individual and title, if an	y)		
was rec	ceived by me on (date)		·		
	☐ I personally serve	ed the summons on the ind	ividual at (place)		
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I left the summon	s at the individual's reside	ence or usual place of abode with (name)		
		,	a person of suitable age and discretion who res	ides there,	
	on (date)	, and mailed a	copy to the individual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the sumn	nons on (name of individual)		, wł	no is
	designated by law to	accept service of process	on behalf of (name of organization)		
			On (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the sum	nmons unexecuted because	e		; or
	☐ Other (specify):				
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00	
	I declare under pena	lty of perjury that this info	rmation is true.		
Date:					
2		-	Server's signature		
		_	Printed name and title		
		_	Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

United States District Court

for the Eastern District of California Susanville Indian Rancheria *Plaintiff(s)* Civil Action No. Kathleen Sebelius, Yvette Roubideaux, and the United States of America Defendant(s) SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION Dr. Yvette Roubideaux To: (Defendant's name and address) Director, Indian Health Service 801 Thompson Ave. Suite 400 Rockville, MD 20852-1627 A lawsuit has been filed against you. Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Adam P. Bailey Hobbs, Straus, Dean & Walker, LLP 1903 21st St., 3rd Floor Sacramento, CA 95811 Phone: (916) 442-9444 If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court. CLERK OF COURT Date:

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

	This summons for (n	ame of individual and title, if an	y)		
was rec	ceived by me on (date)		·		
	☐ I personally serve	ed the summons on the ind	ividual at (place)		
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I left the summon	s at the individual's reside	ence or usual place of abode with (name)		
		,	a person of suitable age and discretion who res	ides there,	
	on (date)	, and mailed a	copy to the individual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the sumn	nons on (name of individual)		, wł	no is
	designated by law to	accept service of process	on behalf of (name of organization)		
			On (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the sum	nmons unexecuted because	e		; or
	☐ Other (specify):				
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00	
	I declare under pena	lty of perjury that this info	rmation is true.		
Date:					
2		-	Server's signature		
		_	Printed name and title		
		_	Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc: