

# 02-6111(L),

02-6130(CON), 02-6140(CON), 02-6200(CON), 02-6211(CON),  
02-6219(CON), 02-6301(CON), 02-6131(XAP), 02-6151(XAP), 02-6309(XAP).

---

---

## United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

---

CAYUGA INDIAN NATION OF NEW YORK,

*Plaintiff/Appellee/Cross-Appellant,*

SENECA-CAYUGA TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA,

*Plaintiff-Intervenor/Appellee/Cross-Appellant,*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff-Intervenor/Appellee,*

— vs. —

GEORGE E. PATAKI, as Governor of the State of New York,  
CAYUGA COUNTY and SENECA COUNTY, and MILLER BREWING CO., *et al.*

*Defendants/Appellants/Cross-Appellees.*

---

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

---

---

### DEFENDANTS'/APPELLANTS'/CROSS-APPELLEES' OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING AND REHEARING *EN BANC*

---

---

ELIOT SPITZER  
Attorney General of the State of New York  
The Capitol  
Albany, New York 12224  
(518) 473-6857  
*Attorneys for Defendants/Appellants/  
Cross-Appellees the State of New York, et al.*

WILLIAM L. DORR  
DANIEL J. MOORE  
BRIAN LAUDADIO  
HARRIS BEACH LLP  
99 Gamsey Road  
Pittsford, New York 14534  
(585) 419-8800  
*Attorneys for Defendants/Appellants/  
Cross-Appellees the Counties of Cayuga and Seneca*

GUS P. COLDEBELLA  
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP  
Exchange Place  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109  
(617) 570-1780  
*Attorneys for Defendant/Appellant/Cross-Appellee  
Miller Brewing Co., Individually and As  
Representative of the Defendant Class*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. THE PETITIONS SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE, AFTER *SHERRILL*, THERE IS NO CIRCUIT CONFLICT AND NO QUESTION OF EXCEPTIONAL IMPORTANCE. .... 1**

A. After *Sherrill*, The Panel’s Decision Does Not Conflict With Any Other Circuit Or Supreme Court Decision. .... 1

B. After *Sherrill*, This Case No Longer Presents A Question Of Exceptional Importance. .... 2

**II. THE PETITIONS SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THE MAJORITY OPINION CORRECTLY APPLIED *SHERRILL* AND DID NOT OVERLOOK ANY RELEVANT FACTS OR LAW. .... 3**

A. Monetary Remedies Are Premised Upon, And Are In Lieu Of, The Inherently Disruptive And Forward-Looking Remedies Of Ejectment And Repossession. .... 3

B. The Majority Properly Applied *Sherrill* To Conclude That Plaintiffs’ Delay In Bringing Suit Was Not Excusable. .... 6

C. The Panel Correctly Interpreted *Sherrill* To Allow It To Dismiss A Claim Under The Nonintercourse Act. .... 7

D. The *Oneida VI* Court’s Remark That The Application Of Laches To An Ancient Land Claim Would Be “Novel” Is Not A Bar To Its Application. .... 7

E. The Equities In This Case Mirror Those In *Sherrill* And Overwhelmingly Favor A Finding Of Laches. .... 9

**III. THE UNITED STATES IS SUBJECT TO LACHES. .... 11**

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### FEDERAL CASES

<i>A.C. Aukerman Co. v. R.L. Chaides Constr. Co.</i> , 960 F.2d 1020 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (en banc) .....	8
<i>Alexian Bros. Health Providers Assoc. v. Humana Health Plan, Inc.</i> , 330 F. Supp. 2d 970 (N.D. Ill. 2004) .....	8
<i>Alsop v. Riker</i> , 155 U.S. 448 (1894) .....	8
<i>Baker v. Pataki</i> , 85 F.3d 919 (2d Cir. 1996) (en banc).....	1
<i>Blatchford v. Native Village of Noatak</i> , 501 U.S. 775 (1991).....	12
<i>Board of Comm'rs of Jackson County v. United States</i> , 308 U.S. 343 (1939).....	13
<i>Cayuga Indian Nation v. Cuomo</i> , 565 F. Supp. 1297 (N.D.N.Y. 1983) .....	4
<i>Cayuga Indian Nation v. Cuomo</i> , 1999 WL 509442 (N.D.N.Y. July 1, 1999)..	6, 10
<i>Cayuga Indian Nation v. Pataki</i> , 79 F. Supp. 2d 78 (N.D.N.Y. 1999) .....	10
<i>Cayuga Indian Nation of N.Y. v. Pataki</i> , 165 F. Supp. 2d 266 (N.D.N.Y. 2001) .....	5, 6
<i>Central States, Southeast and Southwest Areas Pension Fund v. Lloyd L. Sztanyo Trust</i> , 693 F. Supp. 531 (E.D. Mich. 1988).....	8
<i>City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation</i> , 544 U.S. ___, 125 S. Ct. 1478 (2005).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>County of Oneida v. Oneida Indian Nation</i> , 470 U.S. 226 (1985).....	2, 5, 6, 7, 14
<i>Harris v. Beynon</i> , 570 F. Supp. 690 (N.D. Ill. 1983) .....	8
<i>Heckman v. United States</i> , 224 U.S. 413 (1912) .....	14
<i>Hot Wax, Inc. v. Turtle Wax, Inc.</i> , 191 F.3d 813 (7th Cir. 1999).....	8
<i>Hubbard v. Manhattan Trust Co.</i> , 87 F. 51 (2d Cir. 1890) .....	9
<i>In re T &amp; M Enter., Inc.</i> , 284 B.R. 256 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 2002).....	8

