# Case 1:13-cv-01774 Document 1-1 Filed 11/08/13 Page 1 of 2

# **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

JS-44 (Rev.1/05 DC)							
I (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS			
Suquamish Indian Tribe				United States of America, Kathleen Sebelius (in her official capacity as Secretary, HHS); Yvette Roubideaux (in her official capacity as Director, IHS)			
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENC (EXCEPT IN U. (c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM N Caroline P. Mayhe 2120 L. St. NW, Su Washington, DC 2 Phone: (202) 822-1	s. PLAINTIFF CASES AME, ADDRESS, AND w; Hobbs, Stra uite 700 20037	LAINTIFF TELEPHONE NUMBER		COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX ONLY)			III CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT) FOR DIVERSITY CASES ONLY!				
I U.S. Government     Plaintiff     (U.S. Government Not a Party)		· ·			PTF DFT corporated or Principal Place O 4 O 4 Business in This State		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	(Indicat	e Citizenship of n item III)	Citizen of Anor Citizen or Subj Foreign Countr	ther State O 2 O 2 In	accorporated and Principal PlaceO5O5F Business in Another Stateoreign NationO6O6		
(Place a X in				AND NATURE OF S cause of action and <u>one</u> in a	UIT corresponding Nature of Suit)		
O A. Antitrust	O B. Perso Malpra	nal Injury/	0 C. <i>R</i>	Administrative Agency eview	O D. Temporary Restraining Order/Preliminary Injunction		
410 Antitrust       310 Airplane         315 Airplane Product Liability       320 Assault, Libel & Slander         330 Federal Employers Liability       340 Marine         345 Marine Product Liability       350 Motor Vehicle         355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability       360 Other Personal Injury         362 Medical Malpractice       365 Product Liability         368 Asbestos Product Liability       368 Asbestos Product Liability		151 Medicare Act         Social Security:         861 HIA ((1395ff)         862 Black Lung (923)         863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)         864 SSID Title XVI         865 RSI (405(g)         Other Statutes         891 Agricultural Acts         892 Economic Stabilization Act         893 Environmental Matters         894 Energy Allocation Act         890 Other Statutory Actions (If         Administrative Agency is Involved)		Any nature of suit from any category may be selected for this category of case assignment. *(If Antitrust, then A governs)*			
O E. General	Civil (Other)	OR	C	F. Pro Se General C	ivil		
Real Property         210 Land Condemnation         220 Foreclosure         230 Rent, Lease & Ejectment         240 Torts to Land         245 Tort Product Liability         290 All Other Real Property         370 Other Fraud         371 Truth in Lending         380 Other Personal Property Damage         385 Property Damage Product Liability		Bankruptcy         422 Appeal 28 USC 158         423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157         Prisoner Petitions         535 Death Penalty         540 Mandamus & Other         550 Civil Rights         555 Prison Condition         Property Rights         820 Copyrights         830 Patent         840 Trademark         Federal Tax Suits         870 Taxes (US plaintiff or defendant         871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609		Forfeiture/Penalty         610       Agriculture         620       Other Food &Drug         625       Drug Related Seizur         of Property 21       USC         630       Llquor Laws         640       RR & Truck         650       Alrine Regs         660       Occupational         Safety/Health       690         400       State Reapportionm         430       Banks & Banking         450       Commerce/ICC         Rates/etc.       460         460       Deportation	re 480 Consumer Credit 881 490 Cable/Satellite TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 900 Appeal of fee determination under equal access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		

Case 1:13-cv-01774 Document 1-1 Filed 11/08/13 Page 2 of 2

<ul> <li>C. Habeas Corpus/ 2255</li> <li>☐ 530 Habeas Corpus-General</li> <li>☐ 510 Motion/Vacate Sentence</li> </ul>	• H. Employment Discrimination 442 Civil Rights-Employment (criteria: race, gender/sex, national origin, discrimination, disability age, religion, retaliation)	<ul> <li>■ I. FOIA/PRIVACY ACT</li> <li>■ 895 Freedom of Information Act</li> <li>■ 890 Other Statutory Actions (if Privacy Act)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>J. Student Loan</li> <li>152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (excluding veterans)</li> </ul>				
	*(If pro se, select this deck)*	*(If pro se, select this deck)*					
<ul> <li>K. Labor/ERISA (non-employment)</li> <li>710 Fair Labor Standards Act</li> <li>720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations</li> <li>730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting &amp; Disclosure Act</li> <li>740 Labor Railway Act</li> <li>790 Other Labor Litigation</li> <li>791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>L. Other Civil Right (non-employment)</li> <li>441 Voting (if not Voting Righ Act)</li> <li>443 Housing/Accommodations</li> <li>444 Welfare</li> <li>440 Other Civil Rights</li> <li>445 American w/Disabilities- Employment</li> <li>446 Americans w/Disabilities- Other</li> </ul>	110 Insurance         120 Marine         130 Miller Act         140 Negotiable Instrument         s       150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment         153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits         160 Stockholder's Suits					
V. ORIGIN © 1 Original O 2 Removed from Appellate Court O 4 Reinstated or Reopened O 5 Transferred from another district Litigation District Judge from Mag. Judge VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (CITE THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE A BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE.)							
		contract supports costs owed Tribal contra					
VII. REQUESTED IN       CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS       DEMAND \$ 266,776       Check YES only if demanded in complaint         COMPLAINT       ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23       JURY DEMAND:       YES       NO							
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY	(See instruction) YES	NO If yes, please comp	lete related case form.				
date <u>Nov. 8, 2013</u> s	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECO	ORD <u>Caroline Mayh</u>	u)				
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET JS-44							

Authority for Civil Cover Sheet

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings 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. Consequently a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. Listed below are tips for completing the civil cover sheet. These tips coincide with the Roman Numerals on the Cover Sheet.

- I. COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF/DEFENDANT (b) County of residence: Use 11001 to indicate plaintiff is resident of Washington, D.C.; 88888 if plaintiff is resident of the United States but not of Washington, D.C., and 99999 if plaintiff is outside the United States.
- III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES: This section is completed <u>only</u> if diversity of citizenship was selected as the Basis of Jurisdiction under Section II.
- IV. CASE ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF SUIT: The assignment of a judge to your case will depend on the category you select that best represents the <u>primary</u> cause of action found in your complaint. You may select only <u>one</u> category. You <u>must</u> also select <u>one</u> corresponding nature of suit found under the category of case.
- VI. CAUSE OF ACTION: Cite the US Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of the primary cause.
- VIII. RELATED CASES, IF ANY: If you indicated that there is a related case, you must complete a related case form, which may be obtained from the Clerk's Office.

Because of the need for accurate and complete information, you should ensure the accuracy of the information provided prior to signing the form.

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SUQUAMISH INDIAN TRIBE	)
18490 Suquamish Way	)
(P.O. Box 498)	)
Suquamish, WA 98392	)
-	)
PLAINTIFF,	)
	)
v.	)
	)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;	)
	)
KATHLEEN SEBELIUS, in her official capacity	)
as Secretary,	)
U.S. Department of Health & Human Services	)
200 Independence Ave, S.W.	)
Washington, DC 20201	)
	)
YVETTE ROUBIDEAUX, in her official capacity	y )
as Director,	) Civil Action No
Indian Health Service	)
801 Thompson Avenue, Ste. 400	)
Rockville, MD 20852-1627	) COMPLAINT
	)
DEFENDANTS.	)
	)

Served: The Honorable Eric H. Holder, Jr. Attorney General of the United States U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

> The Honorable Ronald C. Machen, Jr. United States Attorney for the District of Columbia Judiciary Center Building 555 Fourth Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20530

### **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 Suquamish Indian Tribe ("the 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 contracts by failing to pay the full CSC owed to the Tribe under the ISDEAA and the Tribe's Compact and funding agreements ("FA") for fiscal years 2005–2008.

3. Defendants paid only a portion of the CSC owed under the Tribe's contracts, due to their 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 fiscal years 2005–2008 and reported to Congress.

4. The Supreme Court found the same practice unlawful as carried out by the Bureau of Indian Affairs ("BIA"), holding that the agency 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

### COMPLAINT

## Case 1:13-cv-01774 Document 1 Filed 11/08/13 Page 3 of 12

(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, "[t]he agency's allocation choices do not affect the Government's liability in the event of an underpayment." *Ramah*, 132 S. Ct. at 2192, quoting *Cherokee Nation of Okla. v. Leavitt*, 543 U.S. 631, 641 (2005). The *Ramah* decision applies equally to IHS. *Arctic Slope Native Ass'n v. Sebelius*, 501 F. App'x 957 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

5. The Tribe's claims are indistinguishable from those in *Ramah*. The IHS received sufficient funds in fiscal years 2005–2008 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, plus additional damages arising from the failure to pay 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 the ISDEAA. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under the CDA, 41 U.S.C. § 7104(b), and the ISDEAA. *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 19, 2011, the Tribe requested an IHS contracting officer's decision on claims for underpaid CSC for fiscal years 2005–2008. The Tribe has received no further response and no decision from the IHS on its requests. Since the IHS has not issued a decision on these claims within a reasonable time, they are deemed denied. 41 U.S.C. §§ 7103(f)(3) &

### COMPLAINT

## Case 1:13-cv-01774 Document 1 Filed 11/08/13 Page 4 of 12

(5). Accordingly, the Tribe has exhausted its administrative remedies, as required by the CDA.41 U.S.C. § 7104(b).

This Court has jurisdiction to review the IHS's decision denying the Tribe's claims for fiscal years 2005–2008 under the CDA and Section 110 of the ISDEAA. 41 U.S.C. § 7104(b); 25 U.S.C. § 450m-1(a); 25 U.S.C. § 450m-1(d).

9. Venue is proper because Defendant Kathleen Sebelius in her official capacity as Secretary of HHS is located in the District of Columbia.

### PARTIES

10. Plaintiff Suquamish Indian Tribe is a federally recognized Indian tribe located in Washington. The Tribe operates a Wellness Center which provides various health care services including community health nursing services, transportation, health education, mental health services, and substance abuse services. The Tribe has contracted with the IHS under the ISDEAA to carry out these functions.

11. Defendant United States is a party to every ISDEAA agreement, including the Tribe's. See 25 U.S.C. § 450*l*(c), Model Agreement § 1(a)(1); Compact of Self-Governance Between the Suquamish Tribe and the United States of America (Amended and Restated, June 15, 2003) ("Compact").

12. 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); 25 U.S.C. § 450b(i); 42 U.S.C. § 2001. Defendant Sebelius is sued in her official capacity.

13. 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. *See* 25 U.S.C. § 1661. Defendant Roubideaux is sued in her official capacity.

## STATEMENT OF FACTS

### The ISDEAA

14. During the years at issue in this complaint, fiscal years 2005–2008, the Tribe provided health care services to eligible Indians and other eligible beneficiaries pursuant to agreements entered into with the Secretary of the HHS and the IHS under Title V of the ISDEAA, 25 U.S.C. § 458aaa *et seq*.

15. The ISDEAA authorizes the Tribe, other tribes, and 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* 25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(a)(2) and (3). *See also* 25 U.S.C. § 458aaa-15(a) (Title V provision stating that "[a]ll provisions of sections . . . 450j-1(a) through (k) . . . of [Title 25 U.S.C.] . . . shall apply to compacts and funding agreements authorized by this part").

16. 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, costs incurred for a common or joint purpose benefiting more than one PFSA, such as administrative and overhead costs, *see* 25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(a)(2); and (3) direct

### COMPLAINT

## Case 1:13-cv-01774 Document 1 Filed 11/08/13 Page 6 of 12

CSC ("DCSC"), expenses directly attributable to a certain PFSA but not captured in either the indirect cost pool 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.* 25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(a)(3)(A).

17. During the years at issue, IHS used an agency policy circular, later incorporated as Part 6, Chapter 3 of the Indian Health Manual (the "IHS Manual") to determine how CSC are calculated, and employed this manual to determine CSC for the Tribe in its FY 2005-2008 funding agreements under the Compact.<sup>1</sup>

18. The IHS Manual states that it will determine a contractor's CSC <u>prior</u> to the contract award by calculating the sum of indirect and direct CSCs, then setting the amount due to the contractor as that contractor's requirement. *See* IHS § 6-3.1E(5). This requirement is the amount owed to the contractor that the IHS is obligated to pay under contract, and is the amount that would be paid if IHS opted to fully fund needed CSC to tribal contractors.

19. The Manual's procedure reflects a statutory mandate. The ISDEAA requires that, upon approval of the contract, "the Secretary <u>shall add to the contract the full amount of funds</u> 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The IHS CSC policy was incorporated into the Manual on April 6, 2007. Prior to that, the agency employed Indian Health Circular No. 2004-03, "Contract Support Costs" (Sept. 1, 2004), which was substantially identical in all relevant ways to the CSC policy in the Manual.

## Case 1:13-cv-01774 Document 1 Filed 11/08/13 Page 7 of 12

20. 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. *See* IHS Manual § 6-3.2E(1) (indirect cost funding to be determined "by applying the negotiated [indirect cost] rate(s) to the appropriate direct cost base"). The Tribe's indirect cost rate, direct cost base, resulting indirect cost requirement, and any shortfall in funding were memorialized in the CSC "shortfall reports" IHS prepared for 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

21. 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 Portland Area (where the Tribe is located), 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. The reports reflect the data in the contracts, funding agreements, and indirect cost rate agreements of tribal contractors as described above.

COMPLAINT

## Case 1:13-cv-01774 Document 1 Filed 11/08/13 Page 8 of 12

22. 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.

23. 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 Nation the full CSC due under its contracts.

24. 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 beginning in fiscal year 1998. *See, e.g.*, Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2006, Pub. L. No. 109-54, 119 Stat. 499, 513–14 (2005) ("not to exceed \$134,609,000 shall be available for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract support costs associated with ongoing [ISDEAA] contracts").

25. In 2012, the U.S. Supreme Court considered the Government's responsibility to fully fund CSC during years when 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

#### COMPLAINT

## Case 1:13-cv-01774 Document 1 Filed 11/08/13 Page 9 of 12

individual contractor's CSC—the Government is obligated to pay each contractor's CSC in full. *Ramah*, 132 S. Ct. at 2186.

26. 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*.

27. The Tribe was one of the tribal contractors underpaid in fiscal years 2005–2008 as a result of IHS's allocation choices. According to the agency's own CSC shortfall report, the Tribe suffered a significant CSC underpayment in fiscal years 2005–2008. The shortfalls documented in the reports for those years are summarized in the following table:

Year	Total Requirement (s)	Total Paid (\$)	Shortfall (\$)
2005	676,322	629,032	47,290
2005	070,322	029,032	+7,290
2006	701,386	629,578	71,808
2007	698,932	632,055	66,877
2007	098,952	052,055	00,877
2008	708,263	627,463	80,801
TOTAL			<b>*****</b>
TOTAL			\$266,776

**Table 1: Shortfall Summary** 

## Case 1:13-cv-01774 Document 1 Filed 11/08/13 Page 10 of 12

28. The Tribe has presented claims based on the breaches of contract described above in letters to the IHS dated September 19, 2011. The IHS has failed to issue a decision on the claims, so they are deemed denied. *See* 41 U.S.C. § 7103(f)(5).

## **CAUSE OF ACTION – Breach of Contract**

29. All prior allegations are adopted by reference.

30. The Tribe's Compact and FA incorporate the statutory duty to fully fund CSC. 25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(a) & (g); *id.* § 458aaa-7(c) (section 508(c) of Title V, incorporating payment provisions of § 450j-1(a)); *see also* Compact, Art. II § 3 (promising payment in accordance with section 508). 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.

31. 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), 25 U.S.C. § 450j-1(a).

### Claim 1: 2005

32. As indicated in the IHS's own shortfall report, the Tribe's CSC requirement for 2005 was \$676,322, yet the IHS paid only \$629,032. Therefore, the Tribe asserts a claim under the ISDEAA and the Contract in the amount of **\$47,290**, plus any other damages in an amount to be established by the evidence.

### COMPLAINT

### <u>Claim 2: 2006</u>

33. As indicated in the IHS's own shortfall report, the Tribe's CSC requirement for 2006 was \$701,386, yet the IHS paid only \$629,578. Therefore, the Tribe asserts a claim under the ISDEAA and the Contract in the amount of **\$71,808**, plus any other damages in an amount to be established by the evidence.

## Claim 3: 2007

34. As indicated in the IHS's own shortfall report, the Tribe's CSC requirement for 2007 was \$698,932, yet the IHS paid only \$632,055. Therefore, the Tribe asserts a claim under the ISDEAA and the Contract in the amount of **\$66,877**, plus any other damages in an amount to be established by the evidence.

## Claim 4: 2008

35. As indicated in the IHS's own shortfall report, the Tribe's CSC requirement for 2008 was \$708,263, yet the IHS paid only \$627,463. Therefore, the Tribe asserts a claim under the ISDEAA and the Contract in the amount of **\$80,801**, any other damages in an amount to be established by the evidence.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

- 36. The Tribe therefore respectfully requests the Court grant relief as follows:
  - A. Award the Tribe \$266,776 in damages for unpaid CSC, as detailed in the IHS
     CSC shortfall reports, Table 1, and paragraphs 32-35 above;
  - B. Award such other damages as may be proven in this action;
  - C. Order the payment of interest on these claims pursuant to the CDA, 41 U.S.C.
    § 7109, and the Prompt Payment Act, Chapter 39 of Title 31, United States
    Code;

COMPLAINT

- D. Award the Tribe its attorney fees and expenses pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412 and 25 U.S.C. § 450m-1(c), and other applicable law; and
- E. Grant the Tribe such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate.

Respectfully Submitted,

s/ Caroline Mayhew Caroline P. Mayhew (DC Bar No. 1011766) Hobbs, Straus, Dean, & Walker LLP 2120 L St. NW, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20037 202-822-8282 (Tel.) 202-296-8834 (Fax)

Geoffrey D. Strommer, *pro hac vice pending* Stephen D. Osborne, *pro hac vice pending* Hobbs, Straus, Dean & Walker, LLP 806 SW Broadway, Suite 900 Portland, OR 97205 503-242-1745 (Tel.) 503-242-1072 (Fax)

Attorneys for the Suquamish Indian Tribe.

DATED: November 8, 2013.