

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA,
MISSOULA DIVISION

Ryne Mathias v. Jamie Baldwin

No. CV 25-217-M-KLD, United States District Court for the District of Montana, Missoula Division (April 29, 2026)

SUMMARY

The court denies Jamie Baldwin’s motion for relief under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59(e) and 60(b) from an order remanding the case to the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes Tribal Court. The court holds that the magistrate judge had authority to enter the remand order under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), because the parties had consented to magistrate-judge jurisdiction. The court concludes that Baldwin failed to establish grounds for altering or vacating the remand order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Montana, Missoula Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Kathleen L. DeSoto
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Montana, Missoula Division
DECIDED	April 29, 2026
DOCKET	CV 25-217-M-KLD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant Jamie Baldwin moved under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59(e) and 60(b)(4) for relief from the order remanding the action to the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes Tribal Court. The court denied the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Rule 59(e) relief is extraordinary and generally requires newly discovered evidence, clear error, or an intervening change in controlling law. Rule 60(b) relief is available only on the grounds specified in the rule, including when a judgment is void.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Jamie Baldwin v. Ryne Mathias

TOPICS

motion for reconsideration

subject matter jurisdiction

tribal jurisdiction

child custody

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

federal jurisdiction

tribal jurisdiction

family law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Baldwin was entitled to relief under Rule 59(e) from the order remanding the case to CSKT Tribal Court.
2. Whether the remand order was void under Rule 60(b)(4) because a magistrate judge allegedly lacked authority to enter it.
3. Whether a magistrate judge exercising civil jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) may issue an order remanding a case for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. When the parties consent to a magistrate judge's exercise of civil jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), the limitations applicable to magistrate judges handling pretrial matters under § 636(b) do not apply, and the magistrate judge was authorized to issue the remand order.
2. The remand order was not void because the magistrate judge had authority to issue it under § 636(c); therefore, Baldwin was not entitled to relief under Rule 60(b)(4).
3. Baldwin did not demonstrate newly discovered evidence, clear error, an intervening change in controlling law, or other grounds warranting alteration or amendment of the remand order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Section 636(b)’s limitations on magistrate authority are therefore inapplicable to the order of remand.” (5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Mathias and Baldwin are parents of a minor child. Mathias filed a petition in CSKT Tribal Court seeking a parenting plan, allocation of parental decision-making responsibilities and parenting time, child support, and other orders concerning the child's best interests. Baldwin removed the matter to federal court, but the federal court determined that the purported removal did not establish federal subject-matter jurisdiction and remanded the action to tribal court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Mathias commenced a parenting-plan and child-support proceeding in the CSKT Tribal Court. Baldwin removed the matter to the federal district court, and Mathias moved to remand. After the parties consented to magistrate-judge jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), the court remanded the case for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. Baldwin then sought alteration of the remand order under Rule 59(e) and relief under Rule 60(b), arguing that the magistrate judge lacked authority to enter the remand order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Akhtar v. Mesa, 698 F.3d 1202, 1212 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Kona Enterprises, Inc. v. Estate of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Banister v. Davis, 590 U.S. 504, 507-08 (2020)
- White v. New Hampshire Department of Employment Security, 455 U.S. 445, 450 (1982)
- 389 Orange Street Partners v. Arnold, 179 F.3d 656, 665 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Flam v. Flam, 788 F.3d 1043, 1048 (9th Cir. 2015)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-montana-mis/2026/ryne-mathias-v-jamie-baldwin-152sfs59>