Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v Chukchansi Economic					
Dev. Auth.					

2013 NY Slip Op 33125(U)

December 2, 2013

Supreme Court, New York County

Docket Number: 652140/13

Judge: Melvin L. Schweitzer

Cases posted with a "30000" identifier, i.e., 2013 NY Slip Op <u>30001(U)</u>, are republished from various state and local government websites. These include the New York State Unified Court System's E-Courts Service, and the Bronx County Clerk's office.

This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official publication.

	FILED:	NEW	YORK	COUNTY	CLERK	12,	/12	/2013
--	--------	-----	------	--------	-------	-----	-----	-------

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 358

INDEX NO. 652140/2013

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 12/12/2013

# SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK NEW YORK COUNTY

PRESENT:	Melvin L Schnetzer	PART 45
FRESENT	Justice	
WELLS F vs. CHUKCHA	nber : 652140/2013 ARGO BANK, N.A., AS ANSI ECONOMIC CE NUMBER : 016	INDEX NO. <u>652140/1</u> 3 MOTION DATE MOTION SEQ. NO. <u>016</u>
The following pape	rs, numbered 1 to, were read on this motion to/f	or disonisi
Notice of Motion/O	rder to Show Cause — Affidavits — Exhibits	
Answering Affidavi	ts — Exhibits	
		No(s)
Upon the foregoir	with the attached D	ded in accordance
	with the attached D	Eusion and Order.
		$\frown$
_	mly 2, 2013	Muh R. Achm, s.c.
		I NON-FINAL DISPOSITION
		DENIED GRANTED IN PART OTHER
ECK IF APPROPRIATE		

DO NOT POST

FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT

## SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NEW YORK : PART 45

## WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., AS TRUSTEE,

\_\_\_\_\_

Plaintiff,

-against- 🗈

[\* 2]

CHUKCHANSI ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, THE BOARD OF THE CHUKCHANSI ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, THE TRIBE OF PICAYUNE RANCHERIA OF THE CHUKCHANSI INDIANS, THE TRIBAL COUNCIL OF THE TRIBE OF PICAYUNE RANCHERIA OF THE CHUKCHANSI INDIANS, THE PICAYUNE RANCHERIA TRIBAL GAMING COMMISSION, RABOBANK, N.A., GLOBAL CASH ACCESS, INC., NANCY AYALA, TRACEY BRECHBUEHL, KAREN WYNN, CHARLES SARGOSA, REGGIE LEWIS, CHANCE ALBERTA, CARL BUSHMAN, and BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.,

Defendants.

Index No. 652140/13

# DECISION AND ORDER

Motion Sequence Nos. 006, 009, 011, 013, 015 and 016

MELVIN L. SCHWEITZER, J.:

Currently pending before the court are the following motions: by the Lewis Faction, to modify the court's July 2, 2013 Decision and Order, and for other relief (seq. no. 006); by the Ayala Faction, cross-motion to dismiss cross-claims against co-defendants Nancy Ayala, Dr. Karen Wynn, Charles Sargosa and Tracey Brechbuehl (seq. no. 009); by the Ayala Faction, to file documents under seal (seq. no. 011); by the Lewis Faction to further modify the court's July 2, 2013 Decision and Order (seq. No. 013); by the Lewis Faction, to clarify the September 27, 2013 order appointing a referee (seq. no. 015); and by Wells Fargo, to dismiss the Lewis Faction's counterclaim (seq. no. 016). These motions are joined for disposition. As the parties are familiar with the facts, the court will forego a detailed recitation.

### Discussion

#### Lack of Jurisdiction

Wells Fargo's motion to dismiss (seq. no. 016) is granted. The court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over the counterclaim against Wells Fargo. The counterclaim requires the court to determine which faction is the legitimate CEDA and Issuer of the Indenture, which is an internal tribal dispute. The Lewis Faction acknowledges that resolution of the tribal dispute would require the court to interpret tribal laws and by-laws. *See* Counterclaim ¶ 56. This "fall[s] within the exclusive jurisdiction of tribal institutions." *Attorney's Process & Investigation Servs.* v Sac & Fox Tribe, 609 F3d 927, 943 (8th Cir 2010). Because the cross-claims are based on the same internal tribal dispute as the counterclaim, the court dismisses them *sua sponte* for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

The Ayala Faction's cross-motion to dismiss defendants Nancy Ayala, Dr. Karen Wynn, Charles Sargosa and Tracey Brechbuehl (individual Ayala defendants) (seq. no. 009) is granted. The court lacks personal jurisdiction over the individual Ayala defendants. *See* CPLR 301, 302. Wells Fargo's Complaint asserts breaches of the Indenture and related agreements, to which the individual Ayala defendants are not parties. Thus, they are not bound by the consent to jurisdiction in the courts of New York State contained in the agreements. Additionally, the individual Ayala defendants have no other contacts with New York State. They are dismissed. The court lacks personal jurisdiction as to defendants Reggie Lewis, Chance Alberta and Tracey Brechbuehl for the exact same reasons, and dismisses these individual defendants *sug sponte*.

For the reasons discussed *ante*, the court lacks subject matter jurisdiction to determine whether individual Ayala (or Lewis) defendants are legitimate tribal officials with sovereign

2

[\* 3]

immunity. See United States v Oregon, 657 F2d 1009, 1012 n.8 (9th Cir 1981) ("Tribal sovereign immunity extends to tribal officials acting within their representative capacity and within the scope of their authority."); see also Puyallup Tribe, Inc. v Department of Game of Washington, 433 US 165, 173 (1977); Chayon v Chao, 355 F3d 141, 143 (2d Cir 2004).

#### **Additional Motions**

\* 4]

The Lewis Faction's motion to modify the court's July 2, 2013 Decision and Order, and for other relief (seq. no. 006) is denied, except to the extent of the court's prior orders addressing the submission and production of financial information and appointment of a referee. The Ayala Faction's motion to file documents under seal (seq. no. 011) is now moot in light of the parties' execution of a confidentiality stipulation. The Lewis Faction's motion to further modify the court's July 2, 2013 Decision and Order (seq. no. 013) is denied for lack of jurisdiction because it is also based on the internal tribal dispute. Finally, for the same reasons, the Lewis Faction's motion to clarify the court's order appointing a referee (seq. no. 015) is denied. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that motion sequence nos. 009 and 016 are granted, the cross-claims and the counterclaim are dismissed, and thus the individual defendants named herein are likewise dismissed, and the dismissed claims and parties are severed from the remaining action; and it is further

ORDERED that motion sequence no. 011 is moot; and it is further

ORDERED that motion sequence nos. 013 and 015 are denied; and it is further ORDERED that motion sequence no. 006 is denied except as set forth above; and it is further

3

ORDERED that no party is entitled to attorney's fees and costs related to these motions.

Dated: December2, 2013

[\* 5]

ENTER: Chmi 20 J.S.C. MELVIN L. SCHWEITZE

4