

SUPREME COURT OF OKLAHOMA

Treat v. Stitt

2020 OK 64 · No. 118829 · Decided July 21, 2020

SUMMARY

The Oklahoma Supreme Court held that Governor J. Kevin Stitt lacked authority to bind Oklahoma to tribal gaming compacts with the Comanche Nation and Otoe-Missouria Tribes because the compacts authorized forms of Class III gaming prohibited by the State-Tribal Gaming Act. The court granted declaratory relief and concluded that the State was not legally bound by the compacts unless the Legislature enacted laws permitting the specified gaming.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of Oklahoma
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Gurich, C.J.; Darby, V.C.J.; Kauger, J.; Winchester, J.; Combs, J.; Rowe, J.; Reif, S.J.; Kane, J.
JURISDICTION	Oklahoma
DECIDED	July 21, 2020
DOCKET	118829
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioners invoked the Oklahoma Supreme Court's original jurisdiction and sought declaratory relief concerning the Governor's authority to enter tribal gaming compacts on behalf of Oklahoma.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Original-jurisdiction review of a request for declaratory relief; the court determined the legal validity of the compacts under Oklahoma law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Oklahoma Supreme Court memorandum opinion; the opinion states that it had not yet been released for publication and was subject to revision or withdrawal.
PARTIES	The Honorable Greg Treat, Senate President Pro Tempore, in his official capacity, The Honorable Charles McCall, Speaker of the House, in his official capacity v. The Honorable J. Kevin Stitt, Governor of the State of Oklahoma, in his official capacity

TOPICS

tribal gaming

separation of powers

statutory interpretation

indian affairs

subject matter jurisdiction

PRACTICE AREAS

constitutional law

Indian law

gaming law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Oklahoma Supreme Court should exercise original jurisdiction over the petition for declaratory relief.
2. Whether Governor Stitt had authority under Oklahoma law to bind the State by entering tribal gaming compacts authorizing Class III gaming prohibited by the State-Tribal Gaming Act.
3. Whether approval by the Joint Committee under 74 O.S. Supp. 2012, § 1221 could validate the challenged compacts.

HOLDINGS

1. The Oklahoma Supreme Court assumed original jurisdiction because the petition presented an issue of public interest in urgent need of judicial determination.
2. Governor Stitt lacked authority to bind Oklahoma through compacts authorizing Class III gaming expressly prohibited by the State-Tribal Gaming Act.
3. Even approval by the Joint Committee under 74 O.S. Supp. 2012, § 1221 would not validate the compacts because the Joint Committee, like the Governor, is constrained by the statutory limits on Class III gaming.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The limited question before this Court is whether Governor Stitt had the authority to bind the State with respect to the new tribal gaming compacts with the Comanche Nation and Otoe-Missouria Tribes. We hold he did not.” (¶ 3)

“The tribal gaming compacts Governor Stitt entered into with the Comanche Nation and Otoe-Missouria Tribes are invalid under Oklahoma law.” (¶ 8)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Governor J. Kevin Stitt negotiated and entered into tribal gaming compacts with the Comanche Nation and Otoe-Missouria Tribes to increase state gaming revenues. The compacts authorized Class III gaming, including house-banked card and table games and event wagering. Oklahoma's State-Tribal Gaming Act expressly prohibited those forms of gaming, and the Legislature had not amended the Act to authorize them. The United States Department of the Interior deemed the compacts approved by inaction only to the extent they were consistent with the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Oklahoma Supreme Court assumed original jurisdiction under the Oklahoma Constitution and exercised its publici juris doctrine because the dispute presented an issue of urgent public interest. The court granted petitioners' requested declaratory relief and held that the challenged compacts were invalid under Oklahoma law.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Fent v. Contingency Review Bd., 2007 OK 27, ¶ 11, 163 P.3d 512, 521
- Ethics Comm'n of State of Okla. v. Cullison, 1993 OK 37, ¶ 4, 850 P.2d 1069, 1072
- Griffith v. Choctaw Casino of Pocola, 2009 OK 51, ¶ 12, 230 P.3d 488, 492
- Pueblo of Santa Ana v. Kelly, 104 F.3d 1546, 1557 (10th Cir. 1997)
- Northern Arapaho Tribe v. Harnsberger, 697 F.3d 1272, 1277-84 (10th Cir. 2012)
- Dewberry v. Kulongoski, 406 F. Supp. 2d 1136, 1146-48 (D. Or. 2005)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

TREAT v. STITT Skip to Main Content Accessibility Statement Help Contact Us e-payments Careers Home Courts Decisions Programs News Legal Research Court Records Quick Links OSCN Found Document:TREAT v. STITT Previous Case Top Of Index This Point in Index Citationize Next Case Print Only TREAT v. STITT2020 OK 64Case Number: 118829Decided: 07/21/2020THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA Cite as: 2020 OK 64, __ P.3d __ NOTICE: THIS OPINION HAS NOT BEEN RELEASED FOR PUBLICATION.

UNTIL RELEASED, IT IS SUBJECT TO REVISION OR WITHDRAWAL. THE HONORABLE GREG TREAT, SENATE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE, in his official capacity, and THE HONORABLE CHARLES MCCALL, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE, in his official capacity, Petitioners,v.THE HONORABLE J. KEVIN STITT, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, in his official capacity, Respondent. MEMORANDUM OPINION ¶0 Petitioners brought this action seeking declaratory relief that Respondent lacked authority to enter into two tribal gaming compacts on behalf of the State and that the agreements do not bind the State.

Original jurisdiction is assumed, and the declaratory relief sought by Petitioners is granted. Winchester, J. ¶1 Original jurisdiction is assumed. Okla. Const. art. VII, § 4. The Court invokes its publici juris doctrine to assume original jurisdiction here as the Petitioners, the Honorable Greg Treat, Senate President Pro Tempore, and the Honorable Charles McCall, Speaker of the House, have presented this Court with an issue of public interest in urgent need of judicial determination.

Fent v. Contingency Review Bd., 2007 OK 27, ¶ 11, 163 P.3d 512, 521. The declaratory relief sought by Petitioners is granted. Ethics Comm'n of State of Okla. v. Cullison, 1993 OK 37, ¶ 4, 850 P.2d 1069, 1072. ¶2 Through mediation efforts in connection with a federal lawsuit pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma,¹ Respondent, the Honorable J. Kevin Stitt, Governor of the State of Oklahoma, negotiated and entered into new tribal gaming compacts with the Comanche Nation and Otoe-Missouria Tribes to increase state gaming revenues.

The tribal gaming compacts were submitted to the United States Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Interior deemed them approved by inaction, only to the extent they are consistent with the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA). 25 U.S.C. § 2710(d)(8)(C).

The Court acknowledges that the Comanche Nation and Otoe-Missouria Tribes are not parties in this matter; these tribes are sovereign nations and have not submitted to the jurisdiction of this Court. ¶3 The limited question before this Court is whether Governor Stitt had the authority to bind the State with respect to the new tribal gaming compacts with the Comanche Nation and Otoe-Missouria Tribes.

We hold he did not. ¶4 This question implicates the core notion of our constitutional structure: separation of powers. The legislative branch sets the public policy of the State by enacting law not in conflict with the Constitution. Okla. Const. art. V, § 1.

The Governor has a role in setting that policy through his function in the legislative process, but the Governor's primary role is in the faithful execution of the law. Okla. Const. art. VI, §§ 8 & 11. Oklahoma's separation of powers doctrine is evident in the State's negotiation of tribal gaming compacts with Indian Tribes. ¶5 The Legislature, through the vote of the people, enacted those laws in the State-Tribal Gaming Act.

3A O.S. Supp. 2018, §§ 261-282. The State-Tribal Gaming Act sets forth the terms and conditions under which the State's federally recognized tribes can engage in Class III gaming on tribal land through Model Gaming Compacts.

The Governor has the statutory authority to negotiate gaming compacts with Indian tribes to assure the State receives its share of revenue. However, the Governor must negotiate the compacts within the bounds of the laws enacted by the Legislature, including the State-Tribal Gaming Act. See 74 O.S. Supp. 2012, § 1221; Griffith v. Choctaw Casino of Pocola, 2009 OK 51, ¶ 12, 230 P.3d 488, 492. ¶6 The tribal gaming compacts Governor Stitt entered into with the Comanche Nation and Otoe-Missouria Tribes authorize certain forms of Class III gaming, including house-banked card and table games and event wagering.

Any gaming compact to authorize Class III gaming must be validly entered into under state law, and it is Oklahoma law that determines whether the compact is consistent with the IGRA. Pueblo

of *Santa Ana v. Kelly*, 104 F.3d 1546, 1557 (10th Cir. 1997); see also 25 U.S.C. § 2710(d)(8)(C). ¶7 Under Oklahoma law, conducting and participating in Class III gaming is not subject to criminal penalties as long as it occurs in conformance with the State-Tribal Gaming Act.

3A O.S. Supp. 2018, § 262(A). The State-Tribal Gaming Act is "game-specific" and allows for specified forms of Class III gaming. The State-Tribal Gaming Act expressly bars house-banked card games, house-banked table games involving dice or roulette wheels, and event wagering. See 3A O.S. Supp. 2018, § 262(H).

The Legislature has yet to amend the State-Tribal Gaming Act to include house-banked card and table games and event wagering as covered games. As a result, the tribal gaming compacts at issue authorize types of Class III gaming expressly prohibited by the State-Tribal Gaming Act.

In turn, any revenue to the State, the Comanche Nation Tribe or the Otoe-Missouria Tribe that would result from the tribal gaming compacts is prohibited. The Court must, therefore, conclude Governor Stitt exceeded his authority in entering into the tribal gaming compacts with the Comanche Nation and Otoe-Missouria Tribes that included Class III gaming prohibited by the State-Tribal Gaming Act.

Even if the Governor had sought and obtained the Joint Committee's approval of these compacts as set forth in 74 O.S. Supp. 2012, § 1221, they would nevertheless be invalid. Just as the Governor is constrained by the statutory limitations on Class III gaming, so too is the Joint Committee. CONCLUSION ¶8 The tribal gaming compacts Governor Stitt entered into with the Comanche Nation and Otoe-Missouria Tribes are invalid under Oklahoma law.

The State of Oklahoma is not and cannot be legally bound by those compacts until such time as the Legislature enacts laws to allow the specific Class III gaming at issue, and in turn, allowing the Governor to negotiate additional revenue. Gurich, C.J., Darby, V.C.J., Kauger, Winchester, Combs, and Rowe (by separate writing), JJ., and Reif, S.J., concur. Kane, J., dissents; Kane, J., dissenting: "The Comanche Nation and Otoe-Missouria Tribes are indispensable parties to this action.

I would dismiss the case for lack of indispensable parties. See 12 O.S.2011 § 2019; *Northern Arapaho Tribe v. Harnsberger*, 697 F.3d 1272, 1277-84 (10th Cir. 2012); *Dewberry v. Kulongoski*, 406 F. Supp. 2d 1136, 1146-48 (D. Or. 2005); see also 12 O.S.2011 § 1653(A)." Edmondson and Colbert, JJ., recused. FOOTNOTES 1 Complaint, *The Cherokee Nation, et al. v. J. Kevin Stitt*, Case No. CIV-19-1198-D (W.D.

Okla. Dec. 31, 2019). Rowe, J., concurring specially: ¶1 In order to expand the scope of permissible Class III gaming, the full Legislature would need to approve any new games by amendment to the State Tribal Gaming Act ("STGA") in accordance with the language of the Model Compact. Specifically, the definition of "covered game" under the Model Compact allows for approval of new games by amendment to the STGA.

3A O.S. § 281. In keeping with this requirement, when the State sought to expand the scope of Class III gaming in 2018 to include non-house-banked table games, it did so through legislation. 3A O.S. § 280.1. Citationizer© Summary of Documents Citing This Document Cite Name Level None Found. Citationizer: Table of Authority Cite Name Level Oklahoma Supreme Court Cases CiteNameLevel 1993 OK 37, 850 P.2d 1069, 64 OBJ 978, Ethics Com'n of State of Okl. v. CullisonDiscussed 2007 OK 27, 163 P.3d 512, FENT v. CONTINGENCY REVIEW BOARDDiscussed 2009 OK 51, 230 P.3d 488, GRIFFITH v. CHOCTAW CASINO OF POCOLADiscussed Title 12.

Civil Procedure CiteNameLevel 12 Ohio St. 1653, Declaratory Relief - Venue - PartiesCited 12 Ohio St. 2019, Joinder of Persons Needed for Just AdjudicationCited Title 3A. Amusements and Sports CiteNameLevel 3A O.S. 262, Authority to Issue Gaming Licenses - Regulation and Oversight of Games Covered by a CompactDiscussed 3A O.S. 281, Provisions of the Model Tribal Gaming CompactCited 3A O.S.

280.1, Gaming Compact SupplementsCited Title 74. State Government CiteNameLevel 74 Ohio St. 1221, Unique Status of Indian Tribes within Federal GovernmentDiscussed oscn EMAIL: webmaster@oscn.net Oklahoma Judicial Center 2100 N Lincoln Blvd. Oklahoma City, OK 73105 courts Supreme Court of Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals Court of Civil Appeals District Courts decisions New Decisions Supreme Court of Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals Court of Civil Appeals programs The Sovereignty Symposium Alternative Dispute Resolution Early Settlement Mediation Children's Court Improvement Program (CIP) Judicial Nominating Commission Certified Courtroom Interpreters Certified Shorthand Reporters Accessibility ADA Contact Us Careers Accessibility ADA