## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ELOISE COBELL, ET AL, . DOCKET NUMBER: CA 96-1285

.

Plaintiffs,

vs. . Washington, D.C.

. October 15, 2010

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, . 10:00 a.m.

.

Defendant.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . .

TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CALL
BEFORE THE HONORABLE THOMAS F. HOGAN
A UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF: DENNIS M. GINGOLD, ESQUIRE

607 14th Street, NW

9th Floor

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 824-1448

(202) 318-2372 (fax) dennismgingold@aol.com

FOR THE DEFENDANT: ROBERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQUIRE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

1100 L Street, NW

Suite 10008

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 616-0328

robert.kirschman@usdoj.gov

2 THE COURT REPORTER: SUSAN PAGE TYNER, CVR-CM Official Court Reporter United States District Court 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Room 6523 Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3267 Computer aided transcript prepared with the aid of SpeechCAT.

## 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. This Honorable Court is now in session. The Honorable Judge Thomas F. 3 Hogan presiding. Please be seated and come to order. 4 5 THE COURT: Call the case. THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Civil action 96-1285, 6 7 Eloise Cobell, et al, versus the United States. 8 Counsel, please approach the lectern stating your 9 names and who you represent for the record? 10 MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, Robert Kirschman 11 representing the defendants. 12 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kirschman. 13 Mr. Gingold? 14 MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, Dennis Gingold for the 15 Cobell plaintiffs. 16 THE COURT: Thank you. From your status call this 17 morning, having had a chance to talk with counsel, and the 18 representatives of the government, and of Ms. Cobell in the 19 class in my chambers concerning the efforts to effectuate 20 the settlement that was approved last year by the parties 21 after some dealings with the Senate, the House having 22 approved this settlement and having extended the authority 23 for it, the Senate had not done so, and through the efforts 24 of the plaintiffs and the support of the administration, it 25 is hoped that the concerns that have been evidenced about

settlement in the Senate would be alleviated and be approved.

It was not reached prior to their recess for the fall. It was reported to me the hope that the lame duck session would consider this settlement, and that may be the last opportunity that is presented to approve this before we would have to go back into litigation.

It is concerning to the court that the Senate did not complete the settlement that had been negotiated at arm's length for over many years of litigation, and I won't repeat the history -- the extensive history of this litigation. The case number alone shows the history of it -- it is a 1996 case number, and the tremendous work that was done by counsel in the case.

Judge Lamberth and Judge Robertson both have expended tremendous efforts in an attempt to get this matter resolved, and Judge Robertson had been particularly concerned about the settlement being finalized before he retired, and he had hoped to, in fact, eventually convene a session if the members of Congress would be so kind to attend to explain to him, and to the Indian country and the American people why the approval required by the settlement agreement had not been given.

The settlement I believe was announced last December, and has -- will reach its year's deadline this December without yet -- if not approved in the lame duck.

It is hopeful that in the lame duck session that the Senate would seriously consider taking up the Cobell settlement on its own merits, independent of any other issues and consider it.

My review of all of the decisions that have been rendered, and I think that there are nine appeals at least, eight and a half reversals of the District Court, but multiple appeals, multiple litigation.

But underlying that, the merits are very clear as to the need for restitution of the funds lost through the mismanagement of the Indian Trust Royalty funds, and I am not sure of the concern.

If the budgetary issues are satisfied, the rationale for not approving what has been called the Cobell settlement, named for Ms. Cobell, the lead plaintiff, the Cobell settlement -- by the Senate, separate and apart from any other matters.

It is the court's hope that the Congress will, and the Senate particularly, act after November 15th before they close to effectuate the settlement.

I have been assured, and I accept the assurances given the good faith, and present today is Under Secretary -

DEPUTY SECRETARY HAYES: Deputy.

THE COURT: Deputy Secretary Hayes from the Department of Interior. He has been very influential in helping to move this matter foreword to fruition, and at this status conference in chambers, as well as the first one I had, I have been assured that the administration from -- the Secretary of Interior has personally been involved through the Justice Department and from the highest levels of the White House, desire this settlement to be completed as has been agreed to.

The plaintiffs' counsel have been working overtime in attempts to satisfy issues Congress may have had, and by that I mean the legislative generally have had, and trying to explain the importance of this settlement.

It is just not to the Indian country, but it is also the entire country, for something that is owed and due by the United States to its citizens.

I have asked the parties to extend the settlement briefly in an attempt -- the settlement agreement terms rather than having a deadline where it will end and we will be back in litigation, because litigation will be -- again, multiple years of litigation will be facing the parties on each side with an uncertain results.

In any event, I have requested that they extend the settlement for another several weeks so that Congress would be given perhaps the one last chance, particularly the

Senate, to approve the settlement.

I need to ask plaintiff's' counsel, have you had an opportunity to discuss the final date that we could work out as to the extension?

MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I briefed Ms. Cobell on the issues, and she concurs with Your Honor's request to extend it to the 7th.

THE COURT: I appreciate that very much.

I had requested the plaintiffs' counsel and the plaintiffs lead individual, Ms. Cobell, to extend the settlement time to beyond what perhaps they considered was reasonable after waiting almost a year to get this completed, and in an effort to get this done they have now agreed with that.

The government has also agreed to extend the time of the settlement to January 7, 2011, the date I felt was appropriate, because if the Congress approves the settlement in November or December, there are going to be matters to resolve to make sure it can be all accomplished. If they don't, it gives a little time to see if there are any alternative mechanisms that are available to solve this matter.

I can only urge the responsible parties to this, and not just the plaintiffs and the defendants who are the representatives, but that the Senate and the Congress, but

particularly the Senate, to take up the settlement over the lame duck session.

It is -- if you read the history of this
litigation, the findings by the District judges uniformly
as to the liability that the government has in this matter,
and the findings of the mismanagement that occurred over the
hundred years or so, it is clear that there should be a
negotiated settlement as has been affected between the
parties to compensate for the losses incurred.

The settlement, despite its size, is only reflective of some of the damages that are claimed by the plaintiffs that have occurred over the years, and the additional part of the settlement as to the land consolidation fund is absolutely necessary for the agency to be able to carry out its statutory duties and to satisfactorily and adequately handle the lands that are under their management as trustee.

So the court, I would urge in the strongest terms, for the Legislative Branch to take up these matters. The Executive and the Judicial Branch have spent a phenomenal amount of efforts on these matters, and it is time that the Legislature resolve them as soon as possible.

That being said, I will agree to extend the settlement until the close of business on January 7, 2011. Additionally, I will set up a status call at this time so

that the parties can come back and advise the court as to the situation at that time. If anything occurs between now and then, the parties are obviously free to call the court and schedule an earlier hearing.

Is January 7 available for the parties?

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I gave you till the close of business, because things could still happen until then, but I think we should do a status call January 7 to see where we are. So January 7 at 10:00 a.m. we will do a status call. I will be in town then.

Again, I appreciate the efforts of both sides, the Department of the Interior and the Administration, and all of the efforts of Mr. Gingold and Kilpatrick and Stockton in an attempt to resolve these matters, and Ms. Cobell.

The efforts should not go in vain. It is my hope that the Legislative Branch will take up this matter, and I think it is essential that they do so during the lame duck session. Otherwise, I think the settlement could not go forward, and we would be in, again, years over very expensive, time-consuming litigation with uncertain results for both sides.

I only can urge in the utmost terms for the consideration of Cobell on its own merits the Cobell

1	settlement after all of this litigation to move forward with
2	the settlement.
3	Thank you all for coming in. There is nothing
4	else. I appreciate it.
5	(Whereupon, the proceedings were adjourned.)
6	
7	CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER
8	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of
9	the proceedings in the above-captioned case.
10	
11	
12	SUSAN PAGE TYNER, CVR-CM
13	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	