

145
United States Indian Claims Commis

National Indian Law Library
Basement - Indian Claims
NILL No. Commission Room - for photc

August 13, 1946
September 30, 1978

**United States Indian Claims Commission
August 13, 1946
September 30, 1978**

Final Report

3953

3953

2

Commissioners:

Jerome K. Kuykendall, *Chairman*
John T. Vance
Richard W. Yarborough
Margaret H. Pierce
Brantley Blue

Members of the Indian Claims Commission

Edgar E. Witt (D-Texas) Appointed Chief Commissioner Apr. 10, 1947	Apr. 10, 1947 – June 30, 1960
William M. Holt (R-Nebraska)	Apr. 10, 1947 – June 30, 1968
Louis J. O'Marr (D-Wyoming)	Apr. 10, 1947 – July 31, 1959
Arthur V. Watkins (R-Utah) Appointed Chief Commissioner July 1, 1960	Aug. 15, 1959 – Sep. 30, 1967
T. Harold Scott (D-Colorado)	July 1, 1960 – June 30, 1968
John T. Vance (D-Montana) Appointed Chairman Mar. 19, 1968	Dec. 19, 1967 – Sep. 30, 1978
Jerome K. Kuykendall (R-Virginia) Appointed Chairman June 11, 1969	Dec. 19, 1967 – Sep. 30, 1978
Richard W. Yarborough (D-Texas)	Dec. 28, 1967 – Sep. 30, 1978
Margaret H. Pierce (R-Wash., D.C.)	Oct. 16, 1968 – Sep. 30, 1978
Theodore R. McKeldin (R-Maryland)	Nov. 21, 1968 – May 1, 1969 (Interim Appointment)
Brantley Blue (R-Tennessee)	May 2, 1969 – Sep. 30, 1978

Preface

This is the Final Report of the Indian Claims Commission. Reports have been issued annually since 1968, but these were for the purpose of showing yearly progress. The Final Report is intended to give an expanded picture of the Commission and its work. In a document limited in extent, a good deal of material has had to be ignored or condensed. The intent is to explore briefly the scope of the problems of Indian claims. To do so we have included a concise history of the Commission. It briefly traces the origin of the Indian claims against the United States Government and the attempt to resolve them in the Federal Courts; discusses the legislative history of the Indian Claims Commission Act; and surveys the growth and work of the Commission from its inception in August 1946 to its termination in September 1978. It is offered as an expanded chronology of legislative and administrative actions and avoids so far as possible discussion of the substance of the Commission's decisions. It does not represent the opinion of the Commission or any Commissioner.

The Commission was a facet in the century and a half old process of Indian claims litigation. It did not create the claims but, in the more than 500 dockets that it decided, it succeeded in mitigating many of the problems which arose as a result of settlement and westward expansion in this country. Hopefully, interested parties will be enlightened with respect to the enormity of the task which faced the Commission from its inception.

To this end, in addition to the historical survey, we have included an alphabetical index and a docket number index to the 617 dockets filed before the Commission. Also, we present a map which delineates the adjudicated land areas of the various Indian tribes. This map is the result of the labor of Commissioner Richard W. Yarborough and is further explained in the Commissioner's own preface to the map.

We wish to thank those who have applied their time and effort to this work. Dr. Harvey D. Rosenthal wrote the historical survey from his larger study of the subject. Ms. Gail Reizenstein and Mr. John B. Yellott, Jr., law clerks, helped Mr. Donald Hyde compile the two indexes. Ms. Mary Ann Glenn, Ms. Jane Otto, and Ms. Judy Femi worked long on the typing and proofing of the index and the history. Lastly, appreciation should be especially expressed to the Chief Counsel of the Commission, Mr. Harry E. Webb, Jr., the man who sponsored and made it a reality.

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
List of Commissioners	i
Preface	ii
Historical Survey	1
Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978	23
Addendum	107
Index of Indian Claims by Docket Number	113
Fiscal Year Totals of Dockets Completed and Awards	125
Preface to Map	127
Introduction	127
Map Area Index	131
Alphabetical Tribal Index	139
Citator, Court of Claims to Federal Reporter	141
Map "Indian Land Areas Judicially Established"	In Pocket

Historical Survey

Indian Grievances, the Government, and the Court of Claims, 1831-1946

The bases of the Indian claims against the American Government were rooted in what has been referred to as the "largest real estate transaction in history." As the Indian's possessions receded, his claim surfaced. This element of American history flowered in the period from the close of the Civil War to the First World War and the "wrongs committed, or at least initiated by our public servants in that period give rise to most of the claims that we are trying to redress today."¹

Historical precedent and national policy called for the United States to acquire this land by the legal forum of treaty-making and legislation rather than the simpler method of conquest and confiscation. The separate Indian tribes were considered as sovereign nations during the treaty-making period and in 370 treaties they negotiated away nearly two billion acres of North America, leaving themselves 140 million acres at the end of that period in 1868. (The last treaty was made and ratified in 1868, but the process was not formally ended until 1871, after which Congressional and Executive "agreements" continued the procedure.)

Politically, morally, culturally, legally, and philosophically, America had all the tools and rationalizations it needed to remove the human blocks to her manifest destiny. In his first annual message to Congress in 1817, President James Monroe said: "The earth was given to mankind to support the greatest numbers of which it is capable, and no tribe or people have a right to withhold from the wants of others more than is necessary for their own support and comfort." The frontiersmen had sounded this theme for two centuries, and Monroe, in the tradition of Jefferson, was not remiss in sounding it again for the nineteenth century. The period of greatest westward expansion, 1815 to 1860, saw 260 treaties signed. Two hundred and thirty of all the treaties between 1789 and 1868 involved Indian lands, 76 called for removal and resettlement, and

nearly 100 dealt with boundaries between Indian and white lands primarily.² These treaties and other Government agreements embodied 720 land cessions from 1784 to 1894.

By the 1890's, the contest for America was over and its possession signed, sealed, and delivered. But, though the white man was contented with his record in these dealings, the Indian was not. One Western historian has noted that "it would be difficult, indeed, to find a land cession made by the Indians entirely of their own volition."³ The American right to buy always superseded the Indian right not to sell. The white man's superior power allowed this policy, and *pro forma* use of the treaty conformed to his Anglo-Saxon tradition and concern for the law. For the Indian the legality of it all was of little comfort.

It was this precise legalistic tradition that necessitated the treaty process, but at the same time harbored the seeds of future redress for inequities in that procedure. Treaties are contracts, and for the land acquired monies and goods were paid or promised. The consequences of this powerful European respect for property are still with us. Thus, the United States, through formal treaty or agreement with the Indian tribes, purchased 95 percent of its public domain for an alleged \$800 million.⁴ This figure and the treaties mitigate the myth of rude conquest and dispossession. Jefferson observed two centuries ago that the lands of this country were not taken from the Indians by conquest as is so generally supposed. "I find in our historians and records, repeated proofs of purchase, which cover a considerable part of the lower country; and many more would doubtless be found on further search. The upper country, we know, has been acquired altogether by purchase made in the most unexceptional form."⁵ Thus the treaties were made and obligations incurred by the United States Government. The fact that these obligations were often not

¹Felix S. Cohen. *The Legal Conscience* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960) 265

²Federal Indian Law (New York: Association on American Indian Affairs, 1966), 163.

³Walter Hart Blumenthal, *American Indian Dispossessed: Fraud in Land Cessions Forced upon the Tribes* (Philadelphia: G. S. MacManus Co., 1955), 43

⁴Cohen, *Legal Conscience*, 69.

⁵Thomas Jefferson, "Notes on the State of Virginia 1781-85," reprinted in Saul K. Padover. *The Complete Jefferson* (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1942), 623.

wholly met did not negate the law of the land. What the white man chose to forget, the Indian chose to remember; and bided his time. When the fever of conquest subsided, that same legal conscience that necessitated the treaties was used to enforce them.

The first important attempt of an Indian tribe to test the theory of the white law in the courts rather than its practice on the battlefield came in 1831. The Cherokee Nation had adopted the white man's culture a generation earlier and had made impressive advances along the road to civilization by 1829. The argument that the hunter must naturally give way to the farmer could no longer be applied to these Indians. But complex historical and political processes and larger issues in the growth of a new nation overwhelmed the Indian cause and the five civilized tribes faced removal to the West. The Indians sought redress in the Supreme Court but lost on a jurisdictional ruling. The Cherokee were declared neither foreign nations nor states of the Union within the meaning of Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution and they could not sue, be sued, or intervene in any case where the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court was involved.⁶

In the mid-1850's, tribal relations with the Government centered on the 52 treaties negotiated from 1853 to 1857, but some tribes filed their claims with the new Court of Claims. None had come to judgment by 1863 when Congress passed an amending law to the Court's enabling act of 1855 which, among other things, expressly excluded the Indian from the new court. Section 9 of this statute declared that jurisdiction of the Court of Claims "shall not extend to or include any claim against the Government not pending in said court on December 1, 1862, growing out of or dependent on any treaty stipulation entered into with foreign nations or with the Indian tribes."⁷ Thus, the oversight that did not exclude the Indians in 1855 was corrected and the Court remained closed to the Indians until 1881, when it was first opened to an individual tribe by a special jurisdictional act of Congress.

In 1871, the treaty-making process was formally ended and the fiction of the tribes' "independent nation" status was terminated, but with the proviso that nothing in that act "shall be construed to invalidate or impair the obligations of any treaty heretofore lawfully made and ratified with any such

⁶Grant Foreman. *Indian Removal: The Emigration of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1932), 229-50. See *Federal Indian Law*, 341. Joseph C. Burke, "The Cherokee Cases: A Study in Law, Politics, and Morality," *Stanford Law Review*, Vol. XXI, No. 3 (February 1969), 500-31. Edwin A. Miles, "After John Marshall's Decision: *Worcester v. Georgia* and the Nullification Crisis," *The Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (November 1973), 519-44. *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, 5 Pet. 1, 1831.

⁷Section 9. 12 Stat. 765. March 3, 1863. 10 Stat. 612, Feb. 24, 1855.

Indian nation or tribe."⁸ This provision kept the past alive for the Indian claimant and enabled him to persevere in his quest for judicial recognition of his treaty-based land claims.

With determination, and with the aid of sympathetic white allies, the Indian made some legal advances. In the famous *Standing Bear v. Crook* trial of 1879, the United States District Court of Nebraska, for the first time, established Indians as persons under the terms of the Fourteenth Amendment. Out of this case also came an investigation of the South Dakota Poncas' (later of Nebraska) claims and a congressional recognition of the obvious justice of these claims. In January 1881, a presidential commission of investigation expressed its conviction, from the Ponca case, that "it is of the utmost importance to white and red men alike that all Indians should have the opportunity of appealing to the courts for the protection and vindication of their rights of person and property."⁹ A door was opened.

The year 1881 was a turning point in the long history of Indian claims frustration. By a special act of March 1881 the tenacious Choctaws were granted access to the Court of Claims for resolution of their 50-year-old claims.¹⁰ In the years of Indian exclusion from this Court the Indians of the West had followed those of the East to military defeat and confinement. As the last of the hostilities and resistance faded, the legal forum was allowed to replace the military arena and the Choctaw precedent broadened this format. It was in this year that a prominent New York attorney, Charles O'Connor, publicly lauded the Court of Claims as the "first-born of a new judicial era." He saw the court as a new principle and as a "practical negative upon that vicious maxim" that the sovereign can do no wrong. "Henceforth our government repudiates the arrogant assumption, and consents to meet at the bar of enlightened justice every rightful claimant, how lowly soever his condition may be."¹¹ After 1881 this would include even the "lowly" Indians, but only by the process of a special jurisdictional act of Congress to open this Court to the petitioning tribes.

The process of securing a jurisdictional act from Congress to grant access to the Court of Claims was an arduous one. From 1881 to 1890 the tribes filed 11

⁸16 Stat. 566. March 3, 1871

⁹Thomas Henry Tibbles, *The Ponca Chiefs: An Account of the Trial of Standing Bear* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1972), 134.

¹⁰21 Stat. 504. Chapter 139. March 3, 1881

¹¹17 Ct. Cl. 3. "History, Jurisdiction and Practice of the Court of Claims of the United States," by William A. Richardson

claims and secured awards on two, but 73 contracts, representing 61 more claims, were approved or pending with the Secretary of Interior. In the years following, to World War I, 20 more claims were filed with the Court and 12 resulted in recoveries totaling \$13 million.¹²

The decade following the beginning of World War I was an unprofitable one as far as Indian success in the Court was concerned, but in those years lay the promise of future victories. From 1914 to 1923 only eight claims cases were referred to the Court of Claims, three of which resulted in awards totaling over \$1.5 million. But the Indian response to America's involvement in the War had been enthusiastic. Thousands joined the service, though not subject to the draft. This motivated a strong movement in Congress and the Executive for a general law to reward them with American citizenship; it was finally passed in 1924. The removal of this cloud over the Indian's legal status, combined with Congressional goodwill, resulted in an explosion of claims to redress old injustices. In the next 3 years, after passage of the necessary jurisdictional acts, almost as many claims cases were filed in the Court of Claims (37) as were filed in the 42 years before citizenship (39). But it was not the legal enactment of citizenship alone that led to the increase in Indian claims. It was the increase in public awareness of Indian patriotism that heightened the willingness in Congress to pass the jurisdictional acts opening the Court to the Indians. In total, by 1946, almost 200 claims were filed with the Court of Claims; but only 29 received awards, while the bulk of the rest were dismissed on technicalities which led to action for revised jurisdictional acts. Obviously, if something was to be done with these claims, a new procedure was necessary.

The Evolution of the Indian Claims Commission, 1928-46

The Court of Claims, narrowly circumscribed by the acts granting it jurisdiction, tried for 65 years to deal conclusively with Indian claims and failed. The Government, the Indians, and impartial researchers all deemed the machinery related to this process to be inadequate. The result of the almost unanimous dissatisfaction was the establishment of a special commission to handle exclusively Indian cases under a broad new jurisdiction and with the firmly expressed goal of finality.

¹²U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, *An Investigation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs*, pursuant to H. Res. 698, 82nd Cong., 2nd sess., December 15, 1952, H. Rept. 2503, 1563-71.

The evolution of the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946 was a long process in the context of American history. The first influential person to take up this theme in the twentieth century was Francis E. Leupp, Commissioner of Indian Affairs from 1905 to 1908. In his book, *The Indian and His Problem* (1910), Leupp recommended "the creation of a special court, or the addition of a branch to the present United States Court of Claims, to be charged with the adjudication of Indian claims exclusively."¹³

In 1913, in hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Indian Affairs, Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs Edgar B. Meritt came to the conclusion that an investigatory commission should be established to sort out the Indian claims and prepare reports upon which basis Congress could dispose of the cases for all time.¹⁴

In 1928, with the publication of *The Problems of Indian Administration* (the Meriam Report), the concept of an Indian Claims Commission received the endorsement that was to carry it into law some 18 years later. This work was done under the general direction of Lewis Meriam of the Institute for Government Research in Washington, D.C. at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, Hubert Work. The Report called for a "special commission" to study the existing claims still without a jurisdictional act. It proposed that this commission should submit recommendations to the Secretary of Interior "so that those claims which are meritorious may be submitted to Congress with a draft of a suitable bill authorizing their settlement before the Court of Claims."¹⁵

Congressional Indian Committees had, since 1924, expressed an interest in this concept. In response, the Institute for Government Research, in the fall of 1929, retained Nathan R. Margold, a New York attorney, to study Indian claims problems and to draft a bill for their solution. After a thorough study of the issues and people involved, Margold reported to the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs in December 1930. He proposed that Congress create an Indian Claims Commission of six commissioners to hear and finally decide all claims within a 15 year period.¹⁶ Nothing came of the Margold study but, also in 1930, Chairman of the House Committee on Indian Affairs, Scott Leavitt of Montana, had introduced a bill (H.R.

¹³Francis E. Leupp, *The Indian and His Problem* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), 194-6.

¹⁴U.S. Congress, House, Subcommittee of the Committee on Indian Affairs, *Hearings on Appropriations Bill of 1914*, 64th Cong., 2nd sess., 1913, 99.

¹⁵Lewis Meriam, et al., *The Problems of Indian Administration* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1928), 805-11.

¹⁶U.S. Congress, Senate, Subcommittee of Committee on Indian Affairs, *Hearings on the Survey of Conditions of Indians in the U.S.*, part 25, 70th and 71st Cong., 13670-77.

7963) to create a United States Court of Indian Claims. This *court* was to consist of three judges, have a 5-year filing period for all claims founded upon the Constitution, laws of Congress, treaties, and contracts, and render final decisions within a 10-year life span. Thus, by 1930, the resolution of the Indian claims was proposed under two forms of tribunal.

In 1934 and early 1935, the proponents of an Indian court submitted two more bills to establish an Indian Claims Court. Both bills were ignored, largely because they were not, by this time, considered practical answers to the claims situation. In a report to the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes argued against them and directed the Senators' attention to a bill recently introduced in the House to create an Indian Claims Commission instead of a court, which he considered preferable.

With the introduction, in March 1935, of H.R. 6655, an act to create an Indian Claims Commission, the legislative movement to expedite Indian claims shifted irreversibly from the consideration of a judicial to a commission format. Both Congress and the Secretary of Interior now felt that a commission rather than an adversary proceeding could better "cut through" the red tape of Government agencies charged with the preparation of Indian cases. An investigatory commission appeared to be a better vehicle for "claims involving history and anthropology as much as law."¹⁷ This bill, and three similar ones, aroused a good deal of debate throughout the 1930's, but no legislation resulted.

The final phase of the quest for claims legislation began on August 1, 1940, with the introduction of S. 4234. Unlike all previous bills it gave the commission authority to make *final* determinations of the claims on matters of fact and law. Review on questions of law was allowed by certiorari to the Court of Claims. Its jurisdiction was to embrace all outstanding tribal claims of a legal, equitable, or moral nature presented within a 5 year limit. The commission had thus matured from a fact-finding advisory body to a self-contained agency able to conduct its own investigations, determine the facts, adjudicate the legal issues, and make a final determination. Congress, of course, still had final review when it received the complete report on each case.

This bill met many of the problems of Indian claims but it still did not grant the commission the power to deal finally with the claims in its own right.

¹⁷Vine Deloria, Jr. (ed.), *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1974). 221

The Interior Department then presented its own bill (S. 4349) to close this gap. Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier correctly saw *finality* as the key to Government acceptance of any claims format. He also stressed this need in order to give "meaning" to the 1940 platform declarations of the two major parties, both of which called for final settlement.¹⁸

The intervention of World War II silenced most of the debate on Indian claims temporarily but in 1944 the final push for the establishment of a commission began. Reworked versions of the earlier bills were presented and the Congress showed a revived interest in dealing with this issue.

The most extensive hearings of these bills to date were held in five sessions over a 4 month period in 1945. Representative Henry M. Jackson of Washington, Chairman of the House Committee on Indian Affairs, was determined to act favorably upon H.R. 1198 or one similar in purpose. Chairman Jackson's perception of that purpose was clear: "We are being harassed constantly by various pieces of legislation," he said, "and we plan to dispose of all those routine claims and let the Commission decide what the obligation is of this Government to the Indians . . . and appropriate the money . . . I think that is our congressional intent."¹⁹ On this there was near unanimous agreement among the witnesses at the hearings.

On October 25, 1945, Chairman Jackson introduced H.R. 4497, the embodiment of many of the ideas contained in the several bills since 1935. The bill's jurisdiction was to include moral claims based on "unconscionable consideration" and "fair and honorable dealings" as well as those over which the Court of Claims then had jurisdiction. In its report, the Committee on Indian Affairs stated that the bill was "primarily designed to right a continuing wrong to our Indian citizens for which no possible justification can be asserted." The report noted that Indians were rewarded with citizenship for patriotism following World War I and that it was "only fitting" that this same quality was again rewarded by the removal of the "last serious discrimination with which they are burdened in their dealings with the federal Government." Hereafter, the Court of Claims would be open to Indians and end the need to accord special treatment to their claims. But it was thought advisable, concluded the report, to

¹⁸Virgil J. Vogel, *This Country Was Ours, A Documentary History of the American Indian* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972) 270-77

¹⁹U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Indian Affairs, *Hearings on H.R. 1198 and H.R. 1341 to Create an Indian Claims Commission*, 79th Cong., 1st sess., March 2, 3, 28, and June 11, 14, 1945, 68

establish the commission to deal with the backlog of cases accumulated over the 82 years Indians had been denied equal access to the courts. The bill easily passed the House and, after a conference and minor alterations, the Senate on August 2, 1946.

There was yet the hurdle of presidential approval but little trouble was expected and none materialized. Secretary of Interior Julius A. Krug wrote that H.R. 4497 was "certainly the most important Indian legislation enacted in more than a decade," and that it would "strengthen our moral position in the eyes of many other minority peoples" in little nations abroad. His prepared statement for President Truman read, in part, as follows:

The bill makes perfectly clear what many men and women, here and abroad, have failed to recognize, that in our transactions with the Indian tribes we have at least since the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 set for ourselves the standard of fair and honorable dealings, pledging respect for all Indian property rights. Instead of confiscating Indian lands, we have purchased from the tribes that once owned this continent more than 90 percent of our public domain, paying them approximately 800 million dollars in the process. It would be a miracle if in the course of these dealings—the largest real estate transaction in history—we had not made some mistakes and occasionally failed to live up to the precise terms of our treaties and agreements with some 200 tribes. But we stand ready to submit all such controversies to the judgment of impartial tribunals. We stand ready to correct any mistakes we have made.²⁰

The passage of the Indian Claims Commission Act capped 16 years of intensive campaigning for an idea almost half a century old. This struggle involved ardent friends of the Indian on one side, vigorous defenders of the Government on the other, and many sincere middlemen who tried to serve justice as they saw it. To the credit of Congress, the moral issues were openly faced and debated. This debate engendered much divisiveness but the substantial problems were finally overcome or compromised and the moral issues recognized by the Act along with the purely legal and financial considerations. The final and just resolution of the tribal claims was a projected hope and, though the legislators planned that one decade would bring results rather than three, their ideal, in context, was not unrealistic.

The Indian Claims Commission: The Formative Decade, 1947-1957

The Indian Claims Commission, created on August 13, 1946, was finally constituted when its three appointed members were sworn in on April 10,

²⁰Public Papers of the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, 1946 (Washington D.C., 1962), 414.

1947. President Truman named as assistant Commissioners Louis J. O'Marr, an ex-Attorney General of Wyoming and William M. Holt, a Nebraska lawyer. As Chief Commissioner he appointed Edgar E. Witt, a former Lieutenant Governor of Texas. Witt had been appointed chairman of two Mexican Claims Commissioners by President Roosevelt and the second had ended its work in 1947.

The Commission began its first full fiscal year of operation in July 1947. It was authorized 23 employees but employed only 12 that first year. It had already adopted its rules of procedure and had sent notice to most Indian groups in June. By the end of the calendar year, 17 claims were filed for an aggregate amount of \$253 million.²¹

In 1948 the Commissioners estimated that anywhere from 200 to 500 claims would be filed.²² The cases came in slowly over most of the 5-year filing period and, with 200 in by early 1951, the Commissioners thought that 300 would be the total. Also, by this time, 25 cases had been decided. (Two claims won an award total of \$3.5 million, nine were dismissed and 14 withdrawn).

In the summer of 1951, there occurred a dramatic change which destroyed the predictions made for the size of the final claims docket. It appears now that many of the Indian attorneys held off on filing to await the outcome of the early decisions. Also, many tribes had difficulty securing legal representation. And, as always in these claims, the case work-up was tedious and time consuming. The result was that in the last weeks of the 5 year filing period the activity increased tremendously. As this rush developed, congressional friends of the Indian made an attempt to extend the filing period for 1 year but failed. The flurry of claims filing intensified in the last month and a half of the filing period, which saw double the number filed in the 4½ years before. With all the claims in, the total came to 370 petitions that were divided eventually into more than 600 dockets.

The Commission was confronted with a massive job. Almost all the 176 known tribes or bands filed one or more claims on old grievances. Only 17 tribes (as of July 1951) were undecided as to their desire to file claims and several said they had none.²³ The Commission had some 600 claims before it, only 26 of which had been adjudicated by the end of 1951.

²¹U.S. Congress, Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, *Hearings on Independent Offices Appropriations Bills*, 1949-52.

²²Ibid. House for 1949

²³U.S. Congress, House, *Providing a One Year Extension of the Five Year Limitation on the Time for Presenting Indian Claims to the Indian Claims Commission*, 82nd Cong., 1st sess., Pt. 3, 1953, 593-601.

Primarily these claims, most of which were concerned with western lands, dealt with the under-valuation of tribal lands transferred to the United States in treaties of purchase. But many concerned the alleged failure of the Government to abide by treaty provisions and called for an historical accounting. It was estimated that the tribes spent one million dollars preparing their early cases for trial.²⁴

The Commission was a new concept for the Indians and it embodied unprecedented causes for legal action. The immediate difficulty was to distinguish the role of a commission from that of a court. It will be recalled that the earliest legislation to enact a claims forum was in the form of a court but, after 1935 the commission framework was settled upon. In spite of this titular designation, history proved stronger than semantics. Since 1881 it was the Court of Claims that had handled all Indian tribal cases and it was to this body of precedent that the new Commission looked. These procedures and theories were thus largely adopted by the Commission, in effect making it a court, a reality formally acknowledged early in the life of the Commission.²⁵

The Commission evolved a workable procedure to accomplish its task. The great majority of claims, being land cases, were heard in three stages: title, value-liability, and offsets. The title phase was often a difficult one for the Commission. Establishing the "definable territory the Indians occupied exclusively" was a most complex undertaking and required the labor of experts in the field and in the archives. If and when the first stage was decided in favor of the tribe, then the trial proceeded to the next stage. At least 2 years or more were required for preparation. Valuation-liability proceedings were usually lengthy and required the expert testimony of many specialists and diligent research in a mass of governmental records. Many judgments on inclusion of pertinent information distilled from this vast amount of material had to be made along the way. With the liability of the United States Government established, the last stage, that of determination of allowable offsets, took place before a final award could be made. These stages required two interlocutory judgments and a final judgment by the Commission. Each stage almost always received motions for rehearing (and appeal after 1961) and the final judgment was appealable to the Court of Claims and

to the Supreme Court through a writ of certiorari. The appeal process took from 8 months to 3 years as a matter of course. Also there were numerous miscellaneous motions for time extensions or the admission of new evidence.

The apparent slow process of the Commission's early work and the probability of the job being a protracted one troubled Congress. Chief Commissioner Witt often explained that the nature of the litigation precluded quick resolutions. Justice Department representative Perry Morton concurred with Witt stating, "there is nothing as complex as these cases."²⁶ Outside of Government, interested parties were also anxious about the Commission's progress. In late 1954, specialists with extensive experience in Indian-claims work gathered at a symposium in Detroit to explore mutually the problem of expert courtroom testimony and propose remedies for the difficulties that had arisen. All groups declared that they wanted quicker action.

As mentioned above, the determination of the tribal boundaries, duration of tribal possession of the land, and the appraisal of its value called for the advice of expert witnesses. Without this material the job of the Commission would have been nearly impossible. But the massive, often technical input of the experts frequently served as much to complicate the litigatory procedure as to clarify it. Anthropologist Julian H. Steward of the University of Illinois noted that "virtually no evidence presented in these cases can properly be called 'primary evidence,' 'first hand knowledge,' or an 'eye witness account'" and "it is therefore ridiculous to proclaim that the facts speak for themselves." The Commissioners learned this reality quite early and asked for more than the "facts" as they were. For their total consideration they asked for theories, interpretations, and the reasoned deductions that led the expert to the formulation of his final opinion. This type of evidence was presented and allowed because the expert witness, unlike the ordinary witness, could offer his opinion. In spite of the deficiencies of the process, attorney Donald C. Gormley, of one of the most prominent firms engaged in Indian law (Wilkinson, Boyden, Cragun & Barker, Law Offices, Washington, D.C.) felt that where expert opinion had been employed "there was no question but that the tasks of the Commission

²⁴ U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, *Amending the Indian Claims Commission Act to accom^p S. 751*, 87 Cong., 1st sess., May 1961, Rept. 208.

²⁵ U.S., Congress, House, Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, *Hearings on Interior Department and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for 1956*, 84th Cong., 1st sess., 1955, 573-80.

²⁶ U.S., Congress, Senate, Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, *Hearings on H. R. 9390 for the Appropriations for Interior and Related Agencies for 1957*, 84th Cong., 2nd sess., 1956, 552-58. In 1846 the Attorney General of the United States wrote in his report to the President: "There is nothing in the whole compass of our laws so hard to bring within precise definition or logical or scientific arrangement as the relation in which the Indian stands to the United States."

and the counsel had been greatly aided, and the cause of justice forwarded."²⁷

Another hotly contested issue (and agent of delay) of Indian claims was that of gratuitous offsets. The debate over the justice of offsetting gratuities did not end with the passage of the Commission Act in 1946. Though the Act eliminated for offset purposes about one-fourth of the more than 50 categories of gratuities, the remaining ones brought a debate on every case where claimed. To be allowable as an offset the item claimed must have been a gratuitous expenditure made without obligation on the part of the Government to make it or the Indians to repay it. It also must have been of benefit to the tribe rather than to an individual. Under Section 2 of the Commission Act the limitations with respect to allowable offsets had to be observed. Lastly, the Commission was to determine if the nature of the claim and the whole course of dealing between tribe and Government warranted the offset.

The gratuities issue was made a part of the life of the Commission by Section 2 of the Act, which allowed them as offsets. The Commission, though, allowed relatively lower percentages of offsets pleaded as the years passed. In a case decided in 1957, only \$400,000 was allowed of the \$2 million pleaded by the Government. But even the \$400,000 was eliminated on rehearing.²⁸ Certainly the allowance of offsets complicated the work of all parties involved in the claims, but their negative impact on the awards probably declined.

The debate on renewal of the life of the Commission began in 1955. In that year the Senate considered a bill granting a 5-year extension, but it died. In 1956 the House passed a bill simply granting 5 more years to the Commission. This was debated and amended by the Senate but finally agreed upon in conference and, in 1956, a brief law was passed that continued the Commission for 5 more years.²⁹

The question and problems in law that arose in the first decade of the Commission were equal in complexity to the procedural development. For this reason their parallel elaboration deserves separate consideration.

Law and Precedent, 1947-1957

The most persistent theme of the legislative history of the Indian Claims Commission was that the

Indians should have "their day in court." But the forum created for this purpose was a commission. In establishing a temporary Commission of three men, Congress exercised its political function, fashioning new legal "causes of action" and acknowledging the possible liability of the United States. But the Commission was a court in fact and its method was adjudicatory. It functioned largely as did the Court of Claims but dealt only with Indian claims. Its expanded grounds for Government liability gave the Indian a wider scope of claims presentation and the potential for greater success in award recovery.

The Commission Act allowed any identifiable group of Indian claimants residing in the United States or Alaska to sue the Government for (1) claims in law or equity arising under the Constitution, laws, treaties of the United States, and Executive orders of the President; (2) all other claims in law or equity, including those sounding in tort, with respect to which the claimant would have been entitled to sue in a court of the United States if the United States was subject to suit; (3) claims which would result if the treaties, contracts, and agreements between the claimant and the United States were revised on the ground of fraud, duress, *unconscionable consideration*, mutual or unilateral mistake, whether of law or fact, or any other ground cognizable by a court of equity; (4) claims arising from the taking by the United States, whether as the result of a treaty of cession or otherwise, of lands *owned or occupied* by the claimant without the payment for such lands of compensation agreed to by the claimant; and (5) claims based upon fair and honorable dealings that are not recognized by any existing rule of law or equity.³⁰ Parts (3) and (5) created several new causes of action, allowed the Commission to "go behind" or treat the Indian treaties *as if* revised, and gave cognizance to the broad concept of moral claims. The reaction to these causes of action by the claimants on the one side and the Justice Department on the other, and the theoretically neutral Commission and Court of Claims in the middle, formed the legal history of the Indian Claims Commission.

As a highly specialized court, the Commission had some unique characteristics. The Commission sent, as required, a written explanation of its function to all potential claimants, as garnered from the list furnished by the B.I.A. (Section 13a) and followed this up (Section 17) with a notice for claims presentation. Ultimately it received 370 petitions (a single

²⁷"Anthropology and Indian Claims Litigation: Papers presented at a Symposium held at Detroit in December 1954," *Ethnohistory*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Fall 1955), 336.

²⁸*Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Tribes v. U.S.*, 5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 297 (1957). Compare *Quapaw Tribe v. U.S.*, 1 Ind. Cl. Comm. 644, 128 Ct. Cl. 45.

²⁹70 Stat. 624, July 24, 1956.

³⁰Section 2, 60 Stat. 1049, Aug. 13, 1946.

tribe often having several) that were eventually separated into 617 dockets. It also was authorized (Section 13b) its own Investigation Division to check all claims referred to it, but this provision was rarely used or deemed necessary. The Commission's principal office was in the District of Columbia but its members were free to travel for field hearings, onsite land inspections, and conferences whenever necessary. All of its final decisions were subject to appeal by either party and the Commission itself could ask the Court of Claims for guidance on questions of law. Appeals might result in affirmation, reversal, remand for future proceedings or any combination of the three. Its final report to Congress on a claim ended its duty and forever barred "any further claim or demand against the United States arising out of the matter involved in the controversy."³¹

The Act of 1946 laid out the general framework for the prosecution of the claims. The tribes could secure representation of their choice, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Interior. The Attorney General or his assistants were to represent the United States Government. The Indian Tribal Claims Branch of the General Accounting Office (G.A.O.) garnered the vital fiscal information and data needed by both sides and presented it in a detailed report to all parties (the G.S.A. handled this job after February 27, 1965). If a trial, with appeals, led to a final money award, the only kind allowed the Commission, it was certified and reported to Congress as with the Court of Claims. All awards were automatically referred to the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget and included in the next appropriation bill. (Separate appropriation was made unnecessary in 1978.) Final payment to the Indians was then deposited in the Treasury until Congress directed how it should be distributed among the various members of the tribes.

The many tribal land cessions to the United States made up the main source of alleged wrongs that the Indian claimants sought to redress. They held that the United States acquired valuable land for unconscionably low prices in bargains struck between unequals. The typical case before the Commission was a claim for additional compensation over the amount originally granted in the "taking" or purchase of the land. Just over 80 percent of these transactions were by treaty and involved some compensation in the form of money, goods, services or a combination of the three. If the Commission recognized Government liability for "grossly inadequate"

³¹See the Act of 1946 Section 22(b), and the "General Rules of Procedure for the Indian Claims Commission," *Federal Register*, Vol. 21, No. 216, Nov. 6, 1956. These Procedures were revised in 1968, and printed by the Commission.

consideration, the difference between that consideration and the fair market value of the land at the time of the treaty was awarded.³²

The other type of claim that embodied most of the remaining non-land cases was that for a Government accounting. When the Marshall Court, in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, accorded to tribes the status of domestic dependent nations it established a special relationship between the Federal Government and the Indians. The Government, as legal guardian for the tribes, became accountable for its management of tribal funds. The mismanagement, misfeasance, or mishandling of such funds constituted a major source of Indian claims. Again, the General Services Administration (G.A.O. before 1965) provided the detailed accounting reports for all cases, whether to establish offsets for the land cases or to show fiscal irresponsibility in the accounting cases. In most of these cases a long and complex trial was necessary because, as historian Thomas LeDuc has pointed out, "the material facts are not only embarrassingly abundant but buried in a mass of irrelevant government records."³³ The attorney's job was the disinterment of this material.

It was only late in the second decade of the Commission's life that the claimants first pressed the accounting cases, the second most numerous type of claim. These cases required an accounting by the Government of any funds belonging to Indians, how they came into being, how they were expended, and what balances were held in the United States Treasury. Many of these records were quite old and the accounting involved thousands of transactions. The reports were made up by the G.S.A. The Government attorneys filed these reports with the Commission and later answered the exceptions made by the claimants. A trial was then held to determine the degree, if any, of fiduciary culpability on the part of the Government.

The Government was permitted all defenses except statute of limitations or laches. The Justice Department might move for dismissal of the claim on summary judgment if the petition did not, in its opinion, state a claim upon which relief could be granted. Failing this, it stated its defense and moved to trial.

In the first phase of a land claim the consulting

³² See the first *Annual Report* of the Indian Claims Commission, 1968, for a good summary of the work of the Commission.

³³ Thomas LeDuc, "The Work of the Indian Claims Commission under the Act of 1946," *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 26, No. 1 February 1957, 2. Another useful early survey of the Commission is that of Nancy O. Lurie, "The Indian Claims Commission Act," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 311, May 1957, 56-70.

experts were likely to be historians and anthropologists. The Attorney General offered in evidence, beside the testimony of his experts, duly certified information and papers from any department or agency of the Government. The Commission considered this material in a very liberal and flexible manner.

In the second, or valuation phase, the Government's and claimant's expert appraisers valued the land as of the treaty date, and the records were combed to determine the compensation received by the Indians as per agreement.³⁴ The Commission determined the fair market value, compared it with the compensation received to determine the Government's liability, and thus fixed the size of the award, if any.

The final phase was that of offsets. These were, again, the gratuities given by the Government to the claiming tribe after the date the claim arose. The Attorney General, on receipt of the petition, requested an accounting by the General Services Administration. When computed, those gratuities allowed by law were deducted from the total award made in the valuation phase.

Whenever the parties questioned the Commission's conclusion regarding errors of fact or law, or where there was newly discovered evidence, a motion for rehearing might be filed. The parties could also appeal interlocutory decisions after the 1960 amendment to the Act (74 Stat. 829). Determinations of questions of law by the Court of Claims were reviewable by the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari.

The Indian attorney's role in these cases was that of the proponent. No member of or delegate to Congress could practice before the Commission. Upon his employment, subject to approval of the Secretary of the Interior, he filed a certified copy of his contract with the Commission. He was to work with the tribe to formulate its claim and file the claims petition with the Commission. He secured expert witnesses when necessary. The Act provided the attorneys for the Indians with complete access to all Government records.

The case did not end for the Indian attorney on final decision. He had then to make application before the Commission for fees and reimbursable expenses. A detailed petition was filed with the Commission and served on the Attorney General.

³⁴No compilation of the Indian attorneys' expense for experts is available and little of the Government's. The one report of the Justice Department, though, may be a fair sample. The Department spent \$2.5 million from 1954 through 1962 for its expert witnesses. \$176,000 was spent in 1961 and \$411,106 in the peak year of 1960. U.S. Congress, House, *Establishing a Revolving Fund*, 88th Cong., 1st sess., July 1, 1963, Rept. 492, to accomp. H.R. 3306.

Payment from the claimant's award was usually approved, but on occasion the Commission determined that a further hearing was necessary. At this hearing the attorney had to justify his fee and expenses in order to receive emolument, but valid challenges sometimes resulted in a reduced figure. In no case could the fee exceed 10 percent of the final award.

The role of the Commission, as noted earlier, was much like that of a court of Indian claims. It molded its rules of procedure after a court and functioned largely as one. Technically it was a quasi-judicial branch of the legislature. In its lifetime there was little opposition to the litigatory interpretation of its function or to this rendering of the intent of Congress. This process continued for the life of the Commission.

Within this procedural-legal context the Commission refereed as the adversaries fell to battling over the interpretation of the complex issues raised by the new act. The great bulk of the early debate surrounded the use of the legal defense of *res judicata* or previous decision, tribal existence as an entity capable of bringing suit and the definition of "identifiable group," the payment of interest, and, most important, the establishment and compensability of Indian title.

The first case of the Commission, that of the *Western (Old Settlers) Cherokee*, involved the legal principle of *res judicata*. *Res judicata* makes a prior judgment binding in a second suit on the same cause of action between the same parties. The first judgment determines every issue in the second suit which was or could have been litigated in the initial suit. This principle is applied to ensure finality of judgment and to protect litigants from a multiplicity of suits. The Western Cherokees alleged that a mistake was made in the writing of their treaty and they claimed damages under the fair and honorable dealing clause. The Commission dismissed the claim on grounds of *res judicata* on motion by defendant. The Government had contended that the same facts and the same parties were involved in this case and a previous one in the Court of Claims (88 Ct. Cl. 452, 1939). Since a large portion of the claims had been submitted to the Court of Claims prior to 1946 by earlier jurisdictional acts this precedent could have voided many of the Indian claims with the Commission. The Court of Claims, however, reversed the Commission. It held that the prior decision on the same subject matter with the same parties did not bar the claim before the Commission because the claim was one of the new causes of action not justiciable in prior cases. That is, not only must there be the

same facts and the same parties, but the same cause of action must be sued on for the defense of *res judicata* to bar the claim. Situations did occur later where *res judicata* was a proper defense, but only rarely, because the Commission Act had greater breadth than most of the prior special jurisdictional acts.³⁵

Another early decision of the Commission was that on which particular parties were allowed to bring suit. Some early pressure on behalf of individual claimants necessitated a definitive ruling and affirmation of Section 2 which states that the Commission shall hear and determine claims "on behalf of any tribe, band, or other identifiable group of American Indians residing within the territorial limits of the United States or Alaska." Acceptance of individual claims, it was stated numerous times, was against the intent of Congress and would have resulted in a docket too huge to manage. Thus the Commission held basically to the claims generated from the 176 groups recognized by the Indian Bureau and notified by the Commission in July 1947. But this ruling did not leave the Commission without problems with this Section.

The expression "tribe" often has been a tricky one for the experts on Indian affairs. The term "nation" was most used in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and was a more appropriate designation than tribe because it referred more to a cultural than a political unity. Tribe came to be used generally after the Federal Government began exclusively handling Indian relations. Indians, said anthropologist A. L. Kroeber, were distinguished as they lived in a "tribal condition" or in a settled, "civilized condition." Tribes were treated as sovereign-state-tribes, for it made dealings more convenient and practical. "It was we Caucasians," said Kroeber, "who again and again rolled a number of related obscure bands or minute villages into the larger package of a 'tribe,' which we then putatively endowed with sovereign power and territorial ownership which the native nationality had mostly never even claimed."³⁶

The claims were generally presented in the context of this tribal presupposition and were thus potentially as faulty as the notion of the tribe.³⁷ In cases where tribes appeared not to have existed or failed to fit the white's political construct, they

could be excluded from suit and thus penalized when, in fact, their land use and possession was a reality. Under these circumstances Congress recognized the category of "other identifiable group" in 1946 to include all groups that might suffer exclusion by semantics.³⁸

The most difficult factual problem facing the Commission was the question of what definable territory the Indians occupied exclusively. The Act allowed claims (Section 2 (4)) arising from the "taking" of lands "owned or occupied" by claimants without proper compensation. The Commission, following the Supreme Court ruling in *U.S. v. Santa Fe Pacific R.R. Co.* (1941), held that *exclusive* occupancy had to be shown in a definable territory to establish aboriginal possession. Only when Indian title rested on exclusive tribal use and occupation from "time immemorial" was there a compensable interest. The Indians, thus, had a vested interest in the concept of tribe in the twentieth century as the whites did in the nineteenth and were obliged to prove its existence.³⁹ Herein rested the role of the anthropologist.

The job of the expert, at this point in a land case, was critical for the claimant. The Court of Claims held that use and occupancy were to be inferred from all the facts and circumstances in each case. If the Government demonstrated that more than one tribe used a particular area, exclusivity was denied and recovery on that area was usually disallowed. The claimant's task to demonstrate this exclusivity was most difficult. Occupancy itself was an arduous matter to prove conclusively. As it pertained to Indian title, exclusivity referred to land-resource use. Most Indians were organized in small, localized, autonomous units ranging in size from the single family to multi-family groups and each unit habitually exploited specific areas in their food quest. Rarely did a group's numbers exceed 500, with only a few reaching 2,000 or more. To qualify for occupancy, land use must have been consistent, either continual or seasonal, and the use must have been of vital importance in the economy of the people constituting the group.⁴⁰

The qualifying term, "exclusive," added immeasurably to the problems presented above. Not thinking of land *per se* in terms of ownership but

³⁵See note 42, 314. See *California Indians v. U.S.*, 1 Ind. Cl. Comm. 149 (1949), Dockets 31 and 37.

³⁶*U.S. v. Santa Fe Pacific R.R.*, 314 U.S. 339 (1941). Morton H. Fried, "The Myth of Tribe," *Natural History*, Vol. 84, No. 4, April 1975, 12-20. See also *Snake Indians v. U.S.*, 125 Ct. Cl. 241, 254 (1953); and Ralph Barney, "The Indian Claims Commission—the Conscience of the Nation in its Dealings with the Original Americans," *Federal Bar Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 3, Summer 1960, 238.

³⁷J. A. Jones, "Problems, Opportunities, and Recommendations," *Ethnohistory*, Vol. 2, No. 4, Fall 1955, 349-50. Also see Peter Farb, *Man's Rise to Civilization as Shown by the Indians of North America from Primeval Times to the Coming of the Industrial State* (New York: Avon Books, 1968), Chapters X and XII.

of the resources on it, tribes claimed use of the land but allowed others access also. Exclusivity was exclusively a white man's concept. But occupation and exclusivity were yet further complicated by the second qualifying term of "time immemorial." Selectively, this term had some meaning, but for many Indian groups it could not be applied. Many in *situ* by 1700 were not there in 1600 and others in *situ* by 1800 were not there in 1700.⁴¹ Obviously the Commission, even with the aid of the experts, could not secure definitive "facts" on these issues and had great latitude for seasoned judgment. Each case, usually laden with an enormous mass of data, had to a degree to be considered separately. No doubt a trio of Solomons would have been hard put to render judgments satisfactory to all in these cases. Of course, if it was shown that the Government had recognized the rights of a tribe to a specific tract, then it was unnecessary for the tribe to prove its actual use and occupancy of that area.

The recognition by the Government of Indian rights in the land, or "recognized title," presented the Commission, as it did the Court of Claims before it, with a major battle in claims litigation. It was *Indian title* that was established when continuous, exclusive occupation was demonstrated. This in jurisprudence was a question of *fact*. *Recognized title* was always a result of Congressional action, a question of *law*. This took the form of a treaty or Congressional agreement which specifically granted to a tribe permanent legal rights of occupancy in a sufficiently defined area.

Generally, before the Act, only a claim based on recognized title could receive compensation. Out of the 370 petitions filed pursuant to the Act, most involved Indian title with no ratified treaty of recognition.⁴² In the *Alcea* case the Supreme Court apparently had decided that the taking of land held under Indian title was compensable under the Fifth Amendment. But in a subsequent *per curiam* decision in the same case, the Court held that its earlier decision had rested on a statutory direction to pay and not on any obligation under the Constitution. Thus, it was still held that compensation in these cases was a political matter for Congress, not a legal one for the courts. In *Tee-Hit-Ton Indians v. U.S.*, the Supreme Court ruled that their land was held merely by the grace of the sovereign, so that whatever interest they had in it could be terminated without obligation to compensate under the Fifth

⁴¹Ibid., J. A. Jones, 351

⁴²Donald C. Gormley, "The Role of the Expert Witness," *Ethnohistory*, Vol. 2, No. 4, Fall 1955, 12n. Berlin B. Chapman, *Otoe and Missouria. A Study of Indian Removal and the Legal Aftermath* (New York: Times Journal Publishing Company, 1965), 250-1.

Amendment. Only recognized title called for such compensation on taking, and the Tee-Hit-Ton had no such recognition. But the Court indicated that this decision might not affect the claims before the Commission. The Court of Claims, in the same year as the *Tee-Hit-Ton* case (1955), upheld a Commission decision that Indian title was compensable under Section 2 of the Commission Act. This was the landmark *Otoe and Missouria* case.⁴³

The case of *Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians v. U.S.* was a leading one in Indian claims and a critical precedent for the Commission. In the *Otoe* case the Commission ruled that its Act provided a remedy for seizure of lands held under Indian title. It was a momentous trial involving hundreds of documents and exhibits and 1,500 pages of testimony in hearings. And, it was a signal victory for the claimants.

Another key issue of precedent for the Commission was that of interest on the awards. In one of the Commission's earliest decisions, the *Loyal Creek* case, it ruled, and was affirmed by the Court of Claims, that interest not be allowed on the award. The Commission and the Court were guided not so much by the Creek's case as by the firm rulings of previous Supreme Court decisions. Soon after, in the *Osage Nation* case, the Commission confirmed and broadened the denial of interest in the *Creek* case under its provision for "fair and honorable dealings." Interest was also denied in the *Osage* case which was tried under the provision for "unconscionable consideration." Relying on the *Creek* case, the Court of Claims affirmed the Commission and held that no "taking" of the Osage's property occurred in the constitutional sense and hence no interest was allowable.⁴⁴

Behind the precedent, and the most compelling reason for it, as seen in the *Alcea* case, was what has been called "judicial fiscal responsibility." Interest is due only in cases of a Fifth Amendment "taking," a very small portion of the claims. If allowed under other forms of taking, interest alone could have mounted into billions of dollars. This at least was the argument used by the Solicitor General to the Supreme Court in the *Alcea* appeal. The award of \$15 million in interest on a \$3 million settlement seemed to bear him out and the Court reversed itself.⁴⁵ Justice Department officials agreed with this

⁴³For a concise survey of this issue see the *Harvard Law Review*, Vol. 69, 1955, 147-51. *Otoe and Missouria Tribes of Indians v. U.S.*, 131 Ct. Cl. 593, 1955 cert. den., 350 U.S. 848 (1955). *U.S. v. Tillamooks*, 329 U.S. 40, 1946

⁴⁴*Loyal Creek Indians v. U.S.*, 97 F. Supp. 426 (Ct. Cl.) cert. den., 342 U.S. 813 (1951). *Osage Nation v. U.S.*, 97 F. Supp. 381 (Ct. Cl.) cert. den., 342 U.S. 896 (1951).

⁴⁵See note 33. The Thomas LeDuc article presents a lengthy discussion on this case.

"financially judicious" stand and thus the Commission and the Court of Claims adhered to the earlier Supreme Court ruling that "Congress, not this Court or other federal courts, is the custodian of the national purse."⁴⁶

The Commission, as might be expected of any such adjudicatory body that was engaged in resolving ancient and fiercely partisan issues, faced many challenges. Chief Commissioner Witt often tried to convey the complexity of his office. Speaking to the House Appropriations Committee toward the end of the Commission's first decade, he attempted to pinpoint the higher purpose of his agency. "We have tried to keep in mind the interests of the taxpayers but also what is right for the Indians," and "above all be fair." The Indians may have been conquerors themselves but it was a fact

that the Christian spirit and the human spirit actuate our type of people, requiring us to do justice towards these people, and not just undertake to say that 'to the victor belongs the spoils,' and 'get hither' to the vanquished; that we owed them a moral duty of some compensation for taking away from them the lands where we found them, from which they were then making their livelihood.⁴⁷

The Court of Claims also saw the Commission as a positive agent of good. In the *Otoe and Missouria* opinion the Court wrote of the Commission Act:

The Indian Claims Commission Act is both remedial legislation and special legislation. It broadens the Government's consent to suit and as such is in derogation of its sovereignty. It confers special privileges upon the Indian claimant apart from the rest of the community, and to some extent is in derogation of the common law. This was, we think, because of the peculiar nature of the dealings between the Government and Indians from very early times. On the other hand, it remedies defects in the common law and in pre-existing statutory law as those laws affected Indians, and it was designed to correct certain evils of long standing and well known to Congress. Fortunately, under these circumstances, rules of interpretation and construction are subordinate to the principle that the object of all construction and interpretation is the just and reasonable operation of the particular statute, and accordingly it should be possible to construe the statute liberally to affect its remedial purpose and intent, and strictly to limit undue abrogation of fundamental rights or to prevent undue extension of extraordinary remedies.⁴⁸

The Commission, the courts, the attorneys, and all the others involved in these claims did their duty as they saw it from 1947 to 1957. The Commission assembled a formidable docket soon after it was

constituted. Under its rules of procedure the advocates of both sides vigorously attacked the mountainous legal and material problems presented by the 151 year claim backlog. The Court of Claims strove to add its wisdom, experience, and guidance to this difficult process. The Commission faced and resolved many issues and saw new ones created in this first decade. Precedent directed much of its action, but a growing experience with the claims, more familiarity with the Act's provisions and precedential rulings on them, and the expanding life of the Commission brought some changes in the positions of all parties involved. First of all, of course, the life of the Commission, made unrealistically short by the Act of 1946, had to be extended.

The Second Decade; Renewal and Reform, 1957-1967

The enabling act of the Commission granted it a 10-year life span and did not provide for extension on the contingency that it might not complete its work. This specific limitation was unavoidable at the time to gain enactment. The Act also complied with the legal principle that restricted a too-liberal grant of power and life to "quasi-judicial" agencies. Therefore Congress extended the life of the Commission in 1956, and again in 1961, 1967, 1972, and 1976 because the job was still unfinished. The extension act of 1967 increased the number of Commissioners from three to five, and firmed up the procedures. The fact was that the time span of 20 years (or even 32 as it developed) was not an exorbitant one to resolve the immense and complex backlog of work involved in over 600 claims covering 150 years. The case exhumation and presentation, and the defense in the courtroom context was inherently a lengthy procedure. The Commission could and did tighten its own procedures where lax; but it had to function within the limits set by Congress in its Act, the precedents prescribed by its adversary forum, and the always difficult legal issues of Indian law.

Through the late 1950's and into the 1960's the Commission persisted in its work. Its staff numbered 14 and operated on a budget of \$132,000 by 1957.⁴⁹ In its first decade the Commission had completed 80 cases and awarded \$17.1 million on the 15 claims held to be valid. By the end of 1959, the Commission had dismissed 30 more claims, accorded some attention to over half of the remaining dockets, had a

⁴⁶U.S. v. Standard Oil Co., 322 U.S. 301, 314 (1947).

⁴⁷U.S., Congress, House, Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Hearings on Appropriations for Interior Department and Related Agencies for 1956 84th Cong., 1st sess., 1955, 578-80.

⁴⁸Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians v. U.S., 131 Ct. Cl. 602 (1955).

⁴⁹U.S., Congress, Senate, Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Hearings on H.R. 5189 making Appropriations for Interior and Related Agencies for 1958, 85th Cong., 1st sess., 1957, 193-98.

stable budget for 2 years in a row, and declared that the staff was adequate.

From mid-1959 into 1961 the work of the Commission slowed due to personnel changes. In the summer of 1959 Commissioner Louis J. O'Marr resigned and Senator Arthur V. Watkins was appointed to replace him. The following year Chief Commissioner Witt resigned, and T. Harold Scott, an attorney from Boulder, Colorado, who had worked for the Federal Trade Commission, took his seat on the Commission. Watkins then was appointed Chief Commissioner. Watkins had been elected to the Senate from Utah in 1946 and 1952 and was a member of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs for that period, being its chairman during his last 4 years in office.

This "period of transition," as Watkins later referred to it, during which the two new Commissioners acclimated themselves, seemed to slow the progress of claims disposition.⁵⁰ The increase of work from that of the early and mid-1950's to the completion of 14 dockets per year from 1957 through 1959, with a peak of 20 in 1960, fell off to 10 in 1961 and only six in 1962. It did not surpass 20 again until 1965.⁵¹ But this transition effected a striking change in the management and production of the Commission.

After 1960 the Commission lost little time in initiating changes necessary to increase its output. The Commissioners knew well the feelings of Congress toward their Commission, and its concern about the seemingly slow progress.⁵² Chief Commissioner Watkins had observed when first appointed that the Government and Indian lawyers set the hearings by mutual agreement and then notified the Commission. He felt that this leisurely procedure was untenable and planned a regular calendar controlled by the Commission. In September 1960 the Commission called the first calendar conference. The participants were told that "justice delayed is often justice denied" and informed that, to end much of the delay, a continuous 3-year schedule of hearings would be followed. By this calendar, the Commission would hear an average of 30 claims per year and limit continuances to extreme emergencies. In addition to tightening the trial schedule, the Commission urged all parties to try to reach compromise

settlements. The Commission initiated a procedure to better inform the Indians of the proposed settlement and to insure their understanding and approval. Previously the Commission had no way of knowing to what extent the tribes were involved in the compromise settlements. The Commission firmly established the "Omaha Rule" to obviate future recriminations in cases of compromise settlement.⁵³

The Commission entered the final year of its second 5-year extension with a staff, in 1961, 17 strong and with a budget of over \$205,000. As of 1960, some 125 cases had been disposed of and \$42 million awarded. This represented a small fraction of the billions in payment foreseen by some. These low annual award totals began to rise rapidly, though, after 1960. The cumulative total to 1959 of \$20 million more than doubled in 1960 and this figure quintupled by 1966. Nineteen sixty-one was a low point in case-disposal over the previous 5 years but the award total was five times that of 1959. The new trial calendar was rigorously enforced. Of the 104 cases set for 1960, 86 were heard and only 18 received continuances for good cause.⁵⁴ Five cases, already processed by 1960, matured to awards totaling \$15 million. But the Commission still had the bulk of its work ahead of it: 471 of the 596 dockets still remained. An Administration bill calling for another extension was submitted to Congress in 1961.

Congressional consideration of the bill of extension for the Commission mostly took place in May 1961. It was a short, unheated debate and it appeared that 14 years of operation had established the Commission's legitimacy, at least among most of the members of the Indian committees. All the parties involved concurred that the original time period was too short for the unexpected work load the Commission received and they agreed that another extension was necessary to give the claimants their "day in court."⁵⁵ The bills submitted to the Indian committees requested a 5-year extension, expansion of the Claims Commission membership from three to five, and the authorization of the use of hearing examiners to accelerate the work.⁵⁶ The consensus

⁵⁰U.S., Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Hearings on S. 307, A Bill to Amend the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946 as Amended, 90th Cong., 1st sess., February 1967, 20 *Omaha Tribe of Nebraska v. U.S.*, Dkt. 225-A, 8 Ind Cl Comm. 392 1960.

⁵¹U.S., Congress, Senate, Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Hearings on H.R. 10802 for Appropriations for Interior and Related Agencies for 1963, 87th Cong., 2nd sess., 1962, 773-88.

⁵²Ibid., S. Rept. 208, and see U.S., Senate, *Congressional Record*, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Feb. 2, 1961, Vol. 107, Pt. 2, 1618-19.

⁵³U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs Amending the Indian Claims Commission Act, 87th Cong., 1st sess., May 9, 1961, Rept. 208 to accomp. S. 751. Compare Senate Rept. 208 to House Rept. 2719 on H.R. 5566 of the 84th Cong., 2nd sess., July 16, 1956 for similar rejection of hearing examiners. Also see U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Amending the Indian Claims Commission Act, 87th Cong., 1st sess., May 23, 1961, Rept. 424 to Accompl. H.R. 4109, and U.S., Senate, *Congressional Record*, 84th Cong., 1st sess., 1955, Vol. 101, Pt. 9, 11019.

that emerged was that the growing experience of the Commission, its better accommodations, and the new trial calendar offered real hope for completion by 1967. The problem of giving the Indian his due had to be balanced somehow with giving him his walking papers, that is, ending government supervision. And, what was accomplished had to be done with finality, for the specter of the old jurisdictional acts haunted the Commission's work as it had all earlier efforts at claims settlement. A Senate Committee report echoed two generations of claims rhetoric when it recognized these facts and concluded:

It cannot be stressed too strongly that the Claims Commission Act was passed by Congress to give the Indians their day in court to present their claims of every kind, shape and variety. Until all these claims are heard and settled, we may expect the Indians to resist any effort to terminate federal supervision and control over them.⁵⁷

The Commission extension act of June 1961, like that of 1956 simply provided a five-year extension of the Commission.⁵⁸ The other suggested amendments could not be agreed upon and were dropped. It was in 1967 that Congress would radically alter and try more vigorously to force the Commission to realize its goal of extinguishing itself and its claims docket. Before that, the Commission disposed of 106 more cases and awarded another \$170 million.

The early 1960's also saw another key change in the claims procedure, that of the establishment of the Revolving Fund for expert assistance loans. This Fund was necessitated by the rulings in the *Crow* and *Northern Paiute* cases of 1961.⁵⁹ Prior to these cases expert witnesses were sometimes employed by the Indians on a contingent fee basis. The practice had been allowed as in other courts, but some feared that the testimony might be weighted in the light of the financial interest of the witness in the outcome of the case. Even when the attorneys themselves paid the experts, the fact of the lawyer's own contingent contract disturbed some observers. The Commission recommended that Congress make funds available for this expense, which many an impecunious tribe could not bear.⁶⁰ A bill introduced by Representative James A. Haley of Florida became law in late 1963. This new law, not funded until July 1964, provided for a \$900,000 fund for interest-bearing loans to be made available to only those tribes with-

out other funds to employ expert witnesses. Repayment was to be out of awards or to be declared non-repayable at the discretion of the Secretary of Interior in cases of dismissal. This fund was fully subscribed by July 1966 with half again its amount in applications pending. With some 30 tribes having sought loans, Congress doubled the fund total in 1966.⁶¹

The second decade of the Commission was a busy time. The number of case-disposals, after the "transition period" and a low point of 1962, was almost tripled in 1963. The number of major interlocutory decisions doubled in the same period.⁶² These figures are meant only to relate to the Commission's overall progress toward extinguishing its total docket and not as an accurate measure, by comparison, of yearly progress. The 3-year period from 1964 to 1966 saw more awards (48) than in the 17 years previous (45). The \$111 million paid out in those 3 years was also greater than the total to 1963. At the same time, the number of dismissals was lower than any previous 3-year period.⁶³ In 1966 the Commission had heard every case the Indians had readied and said it had the capacity for up to 50 more if the attorneys were prepared.

With the need for an extension agreed upon by all parties, the debate focused on three issues: the length of the extension period, the rigidity of the new trial calendar, and the expansion of the Commission membership.⁶⁴ The debate of 1967 occasioned a thorough revival of all the fundamental issues of the Commission's creation and an opportunity to acquaint many in public and private life with its very existence.

The first issue, that of time, was easily resolved. The idea of only a 2-year extension was first considered merely as an emergency measure and rejected in the light of the amount of work that remained to the Commission. Also, the threat of so short a tenure, a Commission report warned, would cause an "immediate exodus of our ablest staff lawyers."⁶⁵ Another 5-year extension period was a foregone conclusion but both Watkins and the Indian Law Committee of the Federal Bar Association felt that a 7-year period would be more realistic.⁶⁶ By 1967, though,

⁵⁷Ibid., S. Rept. 208.
⁵⁸75 Stat. 92, June 16, 1961.

the 5 year figure had become institutionalized. The other two issues were not so easily disposed of.

Congress thought that the statutory imposition of a firm trial calendar was the most expeditious way to hasten the claims cases to final resolution. A House and a Senate bill called for a 5-year extension and a new section (27) establishing this calendar. This section provided for a trial date for all pending claims no later than January 1, 1970. If a claimant was "unable or unwilling" to proceed, the Commission was to dismiss with prejudice and thus preclude reinstatement. It provided for one 6-month extension for good cause and a stay on this if a compromise was in the process of negotiation. By these measures the Congress expressed its intent to end the life of the Commission in 1972 and to require assurances from the Commission that all claims would be disposed by that date.

The last issue was that of increasing the number of Commissioners, which was yet another attempt to hasten the end. The lawmakers hoped that an increase in personnel, along with the change in the Act, would bring progress. It was reasoned that more Commissioners and a larger staff would result in more work being done.

The bill that finally became law on April 10, 1967, was a compromise agreement.⁶⁷ It renewed the Commission for 5 more years and expanded it to five members; the President would designate a "chairman." The seated Commissioners were to continue in office only until June 30, 1968, unless reappointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate prior to that date. The new law established a firm trial calendar and targeted, with exceptions, 1970 as the final year for the trial of all pending claims.

In the period under discussion two main legal problems beset the Commission, and both affected its effort to expedite the workload. One was the confusion over Clause 3 of Section 2 of the Act. This clause, among other things, allowed claims that would result if dealings between the Indians and the United States were revised on the ground of "unconscionable consideration." In one of the Sioux cases, decided in 1956 (146 Fed. Supp. 229), the Court of Claims ruled that unconscionable consideration was that which was "so much less than the actual value of the property sold that the disparity shocks the conscience." The Court acknowledged that no exact formula existed to measure the disparity between payment and value and used "very gross" as its guide until 1961.

⁶⁷81 Stat. 11 April 10 1967

The "very gross" cases were easy for the Commission to handle, but when payment approached 50 percent of the value more precision was required. In the *Miami Tribe* case the Court concurred with the Commission that payment of *less* than half the true value was unconscionable. Then the problems began. When the Commission denied liability of the Government, that is when the compensation was *more* than half the true value, the Court consistently reversed it by finding a smaller figure for the payment or a larger value for the land or claimed the value figure ruled on by the Commission to be a bare minimum.

A missing element that slowed the work of the Commission was the lack of compromise settlements that normally dispose of most private litigation. The original Act allowed for the non-litigatory settlement of claims by the parties with the approval of the Commission. The claimants had long been allowed this right under the jurisdictional acts with approval of the Secretary of Interior. In the political arena, the Republican platform of 1956 had urged "the prompt adjudication or *settlement* of pending Indian claims," and the Indian claims plank of the Democratic platform of 1960 insisted that the claims be "settled promptly whether by *negotiation* or other means, in the best interests of both parties."⁶⁸ But the Commission was given no opportunity to approve a compromise settlement until the claims attorneys advanced their strongest cases first and pushed for the maximum award. Also, it was long-standing policy of the Justice Department not to make settlement offers but to await them.

It was only in 1960 that the Justice Department inaugurated a policy of encouraging settlement. One-half the cases which resulted in an award in 1960 were disposed by compromise settlement and 32 of the 51 from 1961 to 1965. Watkins was encouraged by the efficacy of this procedure.⁶⁹ He related that government and Indian attorneys advised him that possibly over half of the remaining cases would be settled, and he saw a chance of ending the Commission's work "within a reasonable length of time."⁷⁰ Out of the 94 final awards by 1966 for a total of \$194 million, settlement was negotiated in 38 for \$87 million. Thirty other compromise settlements had been reached on secondary considerations such as offsets.⁷¹ But, though settlements affected some

⁶⁸Virgil Vogel (ed.), *This Country was Ours: A Documentary History of the American Indian* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972). 270-77

⁶⁹See note 53, chart on 47.

⁷⁰U.S. Congress, Senate, Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Hearings on H.R. 6767 for Appropriations for Interior Department for 1966, 89th Cong 1st sess., 1966. 631-35

⁷¹See note 53, 74.

savings in time and expenses, the benefits, as later became apparent, proved to be limited because most settlements were reached only after substantial adjudicative work had already been done.⁷²

The placing of blame for delay in these cases was as complex as everything else connected with them. Watkins defended his and the Commission's record as laudable and refused to be singled out for censure. Justice, possibly beleaguered with its 17 lawyers and 12 clerks arrayed against the formidable legal force of the claimants, also defended its past. And, the Indians' attorneys were proud of their defense of the hapless tribes against a powerful Government. But, it can be safely asserted that most of the delay was caused by other factors such as the original enormous workload, the lack of sufficient personnel, the use of the adversary conception of the Commission, the mass of data involved and generated, the appellate processes, and the complex interaction of all these elements.

Using the word in its broadest sense, the "trials" of Indian claims settlement were many. It had completed only 12 percent of its caseload by 1957. By 1960 some 490 cases still remained on the docket. But, after 1960, the reform program dramatically boosted the performance of the Commission, doubling its annual output. The award total in 1960 stood at \$42 million and at \$226 million in 1967. The Commission could not, though, speed its work to allow it to complete its task by 1967 and the dissatisfaction of the Congress grew concomitantly with the length of the life of the Commission. All the parties to the Commission's creation and function contributed to its seemingly slow progress, but the prime agents of delay were the wording of the Act of 1946 and the nature of the cases themselves.

Expansion, Reorganization, and Final Renewal, 1967-1978

With the renewal act of 1967, Congress forcibly declared its intent to finalize the Indian claims and end the Commission. To accomplish this goal it expanded the Commission, guaranteed it a fresh change of personnel, and more rigidly directed its work schedule. Nevertheless new problems arose to complicate the Commission's docket and frustrate all the parties involved. However, the Commission did indeed perform in an impressive fashion, accomplishing in 5 years 63 percent of the work total compiled in its 20 years of life. Congress was so

struck that in 1972 it agreed that another renewal was a necessity but decreed it to be the last and further tightened the procedural strictures. The Commission, though, did not complete its task, but left a still active docket as a legacy to the courts.

The enlargement of the Commission, and its turnover of membership, dominated its activities for over 2 years after the renewal of April 1967. Chief Commissioner Watkins retired in October 1967, 9 months before the date set for new appointments or reappointment. This left Commissioners William Holt and T. Harold Scott without a Chairman and the Commission without the necessary three members for a quorum. Reorganization, it began to appear, took time as well as legislation. Three new Commissioners were appointed in December 1967, and the year 1968 opened with the full complement of five Commissioners as required by the extension act of 1967. The President designated no chairman until March. One year of the third 5-year renewal thus passed in expansion and reorganization, that is, one-fifth of the period that Congress granted to the Commission to wind up its work. About 40 percent of the task was completed in the previous 20 years; the remaining 60 percent was targeted for extinction in the next five. By early 1968 the chances for this seemed as remote as they were in the 1946 projection.

Nevertheless, the congressional mandate for "new blood" had been fulfilled—three-fifths of the expanded Commission was freshly appointed by 1968. These positions were filled by John T. Vance, Richard W. Yarborough, and Jerome K. Kuykendall. Vance had been an attorney in Montana and was on the faculty of the law school at the University of North Dakota when appointed to the Commission. Yarborough had practiced law in Texas before becoming a legislative assistant to his father, Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, in 1958. Kuykendall was an attorney from Washington State. There he practiced law and served in the State Goverment. From 1953 to 1961 he served as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission but returned to private practice in Washington, D.C. until appointed to the Commission.⁷³ It was January 1968 before the Commission began operating with its full complement and, in March, Commissioner Vance was appointed Chairman. Three months hence, the unrenewed terms of Commissioners Holt and Scott expired leaving the three newcomers with a bare quorum.

⁷²U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, *Hearing on the Nomination of John T. Vance, Richard W. Yarborough, and Jerome K. Kuykendall to be Commissioners of the Indian Claims Commission*. 90th Cong., 1st sess. Dec. 14, 1967.

⁷³Annual Report of the Indian Claims Commission, 1973, 2

as
er
is-
ill

n-
or
ef
9
or
r-
ie
s,
r,
-
e
f
il
s
-
-
1
;
-
-
1
;

It was almost a year before the Commission returned permanently to full strength. Margaret Pierce became a fourth Commissioner in October 1968. Pierce spent most of her legal career with the Federal Government and was the Law Clerk and Court Reporter of Decisions for the Court of Claims from 1948 until her Commission appointment. A five and one-half month "recess appointment" was given to ex-Governor of Maryland Theodore R. McKeldin in November 1968. Then, in May 1969, the President appointed Brantley Blue the fifth permanent Commission member. Blue had practiced law in Kingsport, Tennessee, and had been a city judge there before his appointment. He was, having Lumbee ancestors, the first Indian member of the Commission.⁷⁴ Jerome Kuykendall, a Republican, was soon after, in June 1969, appointed Chairman in place of Democrat John Vance by the new administration. This last alteration rounded out the Commission's composition, which remained in effect until the demise of the Commission on September 30, 1978.

The new Commissioners were strongly encouraged by Congress to complete their work. The Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, anxious that the nominees get the "mood" of Congress, told them that the "job must be finished by 1972 or there is going to be trouble." He offered the aid of his committee to help in any way possible but warned that no further extensions would be considered.

The "new Commission," in the midst of the sweeping personnel changes, reorganized some aspects of its procedure and got "the backlog moved along." It removed, for the fourth time, to larger quarters to accommodate its expanded staff. Five more attorneys were approved, and with the two new Commissioners the budget of \$394,000 for 1967 grew to a half a million in 1968 (90 percent of the budget was expended for salary and personnel benefits required by law). This reorganization caused some lag in work according to Commissioner Scott's testimony in early 1968,⁷⁵ and case disposal had dropped from an all time annual high of 34 in 1965 to 14 in 1966 and only 9 in 1967. Nevertheless, the preparatory work was still being vigorously prosecuted by the new team and, in 1968, 26 dockets were completed.⁷⁶

⁷⁴U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, *Hearing on the Nomination of Margaret H. Pierce to be a Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission*, 90th Cong., 2nd sess., Oct. 9, 1968. U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, *Hearings on the Nomination of Brantley Blue to be a Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission*, 91st Cong., 1st sess., April 24, 1969.

⁷⁵U.S., Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Hearing on H.R. 17354 for Appropriations for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies for 1969*, 90th Cong., 2nd sess., 1968, 1803-16.

⁷⁶*Annual Report of the Indian Claims Commission* 1974.

The new procedures adopted by the Commission were largely responsible for its increased output. The Commission completed the trial calendar called for in the extension act of 1967 in early 1968. It then established the Office of Chief Counsel to supervise and correlate the work of the increasing staff of attorneys. On July 15, 1968, the amended General Rules of Procedure became effective. The Commissioners were aided in this revision of the procedures by an *ad hoc* committee of the plaintiffs and the Justice Department attorneys who practiced before the Commission. The new rules clamped down on extensions and made several minor changes for efficiency. It also made three important major changes. Prior to 1968, more than one Commissioner was generally present at a trial. Under the new rules only one was required in attendance, which allowed his colleagues to attend to other duties or hear other cases. Another major change was the increased use of pretrial conferences and procedures to shorten the actual trial. Lastly, expert witnesses were required to submit written testimony in advance. At the trial they testified only on cross-examination.⁷⁷ This had long been the general practice of other Federal Commissions and did more than any other change to increase the output of the Commission.

Under its new Chairman, Jerome Kuykendall, the Commission moved ahead with its still formidable workload. By July 1, 1969, the Commission had finished 51 percent of its work. In that year the five Commissioners had 11 attorneys on the professional staff and a budget of \$619,000. The work output continued to rise from 1968 and the completed dockets for 1969 reached a new single-year high of 49. The next year the awards total finally surpassed that of dismissals, 163 to 159. By 1971, the Commission had doubled its legal staff to continue its increasing work output.⁷⁸

In 1970, the Commission continued the reorganization of procedure. The Commission conducted a study of its accomplishments and future work needs. This had never been done before in an analytical manner. Kuykendall testified that the Commission, as well as the Congress, never before accurately knew the extent of its workload. This analysis was completed and made available to Congress and the Bureau of the Budget. Most important, in 1970, Chairman Kuykendall told a Senate hearing that the

⁷⁷*General Rules of Procedure of the Indian Claims Commission* 33 Federal Register 9236, 1968.

⁷⁸U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Appropriations, *Hearings on H.R. 17319 for Appropriations for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies for 1971*, 91st Cong., 2nd sess., 1970, 2209-29.

Commission could not finish by 1972. But he tentatively told them that with the 1971 budget allowance for 21 lawyers and a firm adherence to the proposed schedule, they could finish by 1976. Five more years were necessary.⁷⁹

The Commission now moved to request a fourth renewal. It had completed 44 more dockets since 1969 and had adjusted its progress "at a rate consistent with completion" by April 1977.⁸⁰ Kuykendall told the House Indian Subcommittee that the "new Commission" had attempted a crash program in 1968 to finish by 1972, but staff shortages and unaccountable delays made it impossible. But, said the Chairman, since 1970 productivity was high and the prospect of completion by 1977 was very good.⁸¹ He cautioned that non-renewal would mean that "those tribes who had cases not yet completed would get nothing on those claims;" about 50 tribes would not get their day in court.⁸²

As the Commission entered 1972, its last year of operation by the renewal act of 1967, the movement for another extension gained momentum. The record stood at 164 dismissals and 182 awards for \$410 million; 264 cases were still pending. The Commission had 42 employees and a budget of \$1,045,000 for 1972. Chairman Kuykendall told the Senate Appropriations Committee that he "hoped" they could finish in another 5 years.⁸³ What had previously been a hope was finally a possibility. The Commission's pace had indeed picked up. More dockets were completed by monetary awards from 1968 to 1972 than were made during the entire prior life of the Commission (102-100). (The number of dismissals also favored the claimants: 44 to 131.)

The debate over the fourth renewal of the Commission was short. The bills of renewal made it clear that the life of the Commission was to finally end in 1977. Two similar bills were introduced in Congress, varying only in minor points. The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considered allowing the Commission to end in 1972 and transferring all cases to the Court of Claims, but it concluded that such action would result in delay and not save any administrative expenses. It was willing to extend because the renewal bill provided for (1) automatic

transfer of remaining claims, if any, to the Court of Claims in 1977, (2) dismissal with prejudice of dilatory claims, (3) progress reports to each session of Congress, and (4) yearly authorization hearings before the Indian Affairs Subcommittees as well as the unusual appropriation committees hearings. This bill was an administration measure worked out by the Commission and the Office of Management and Budget. With a few minor amendments to enforce calendar compliance it was accepted. Congressional intent was pointedly expressed that this renewal would be the last. "If delay on the part of the Government threatens to defeat this policy, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs expects to be notified at the earliest opportunity." Congress intended to tighten further its scrutiny over the Commission's work.⁸⁴

One source of delay that threatened to slow the Commission's progress more than any other was the accounting cases. These claims, briefly discussed previously, involved some 50 cases that hinged on a Government accounting of the use of Indian trust funds. The record of these funds usually covered many decades and involved thousands of financial transactions. The Justice Department had, as a matter of form to determine offsets, requested accounting reports on all petitions since 1946. This work was completed by September 1971.⁸⁵ When the numerous figures were totaled and arrayed in appropriate accounting form, the legal question then became whether the various summary expenditures charged against the Indians were proper. For example, did the Government follow the *Menominee* rule and expend money from noninterest-bearing funds before interest-bearing funds? The amount to make these funds "whole" for funds judged improperly spent was the basis for a money judgment. But these claims had to await the Government's completion of the reports and were pushed by plaintiffs to the end of the docket behind the more familiar land claims and were neglected until the 1960's.

As it stood in 1971, the accountings being completed, the Commission could have dealt with them despite their complexities. But in 1966, a ruling in the *Southern Ute* case expanded the scope of these claims. Until this decision the accountings were required only to 1946 in compliance with the Commission's Act that forbade consideration of any claim accruing after August 13, 1946. Nevertheless, the

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, *Hearings on H. R. 9417 for Appropriations for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies for 1972*, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., 1971, 1433-50.

⁸¹U.S., Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, *Hearing on S. 2408 to Authorize the Extension of the Indian Claims Commission*, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., Oct. 21, 1971, 3-15, 40-1.

⁸²See note 83.

⁸³U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, *Hearings on Appropriations for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies for 1972*, 92nd Cong., 2nd sess., 1972, 2761-88.

⁸⁴U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, *Extending the Life of the Indian Claims Commission*, 92nd Cong., 2nd sess., March 1, 1972, H. Rept. 895 to accom. H. R. 10390

⁸⁵See note 81, 35.

Government had brought its reports up to 1951 because most of the records were located in Washington, D.C., and were completed from 1975 to 1951. The *Southern Ute* decision, affirmed by the Court of Claims, held that the tribe's accounting must be updated from 1951 to be current with the date of trial because of the possible "continuing" nature of some of the claims.⁸⁶

This ruling presented a potentially "insurmountable burden" to the General Services Administration.⁸⁷ The records subsequent to 1951 were mostly in federal record centers in the Mid and Far West and in field offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Also, the number of specialized personnel in the General Services Administration needed to handle this burden was "woefully inadequate."⁸⁸ When the General Services Administration received this job from the General Accounting Office in 1965 the work had been ongoing for 40 years but was scheduled to end in 6. The General Services Administration met this schedule and finished the 96 remaining petitions plus the 19 added after 1965. It did this with its own personnel and the 37 experts that transferred from the General Accounting Office. On schedule and with a declining workload on a terminal job, the General Services Administration allowed attrition to reduce its staff. Representatives of the General Services Administration did say, though, that they could do the job if funded. Both the Justice Department and the Commission agreed that the Court of Claims could "readily handle" these cases if any remained after 1977.⁸⁹ Thus assured, Congress passed the fourth renewal act on March 17, 1972.⁹⁰

The accounting issue was the main one in the debate over the fourth extension act but as an element of delay it was only one factor among many in the long history of items blamed for slowing the Commission's work and prolonging its life. Key legal decisions also contributed to the need for extension past 1972. In select claims the Commission found it necessary, "in good conscience," to set new precedents that led to extended litigation.

The Commission had led a busy existence in its fourth period of renewal. Its Commissioners had changed, and many of its procedures. Its output over 5 years improved over that of the 8-year period from 1960 to 1969: 146 to 126 dispositions. But with 227 pending cases, the Commission still had an arduous

charge. To finish its total docket by 1977 it had to increase its annual decisions by 50 percent. This was a possibility but the accounting cases made it unlikely.

Entering its last renewal period in 1972, the Commission in its remaining years set itself to finish as much of its docket as possible. It also pushed for new administrative measures it deemed necessary to hasten or facilitate its work. The Commission had the resources to finish the bulk of its cases, that is the land claims, by 1977, but there were still elements of the claims process that were largely beyond its control. Appeals to the Court of Claims were the right of the two contending parties and once a case was taken to the Court the Commission had to await its ruling. Appeals were always a part of the Commission's litigation delay but their incidence increased slightly after 1972, amounting to one-third of the cases. Several of the accounting cases were on appeal by 1975 and promised to be a form of claim that would necessitate appeal in every case to the Court of Claims and even to the Supreme Court, which had only granted a review on certiorari thrice in the life of the Commission. In total, there had been 206 appeals. The Commission was affirmed in 96 of those, reversed in 79, and partially affirmed and reversed in the remainder.⁹¹ Also, with the accounting cases, as with appeals, the Commission had to wait on the work of another agency—the General Services Administration.

Yet, by 1973, a good deal of activity was taking place upon the Indian claims. The Commissioners testified that they had adequate staff and budget in 1972 and 1973. Congress had moved to eliminate some areas of claims delay. The Expert Assistance Loan Fund established in 1963 and doubled in 1966 was increased again in 1973 to \$2.7 million.⁹² Funds were appropriated for the General Services Administration in late 1972 to rebuild its accounting staff from a low point of two. This staff had reached only nine by early 1973, but in another 2 years soared to 103.⁹³ And, Congress streamlined the process of final award distribution.

The Commission's progress through 1975 was good. At the close of 1972, 227 of the 611 dockets were still pending but all of the land cases were in some advanced stage of litigation or on appeal. Early in 1973, the Commission worked out a projection of

⁸⁶*Southern Ute Tribe v. U.S.*, Docket No. 328, 17 Ind. Cl. Comm. 28, 63, 1966.

⁸⁷See note 78, 54.

⁸⁸See note 84.

⁸⁹Ibid.

⁹⁰86 Stat. 114. March 30, 1972.

⁹¹U.S. Congress, House Subcommittee on the Committee on Appropriations, *Hearings on Appropriations for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies for 1975* Pt. 1, 93rd Cong., 2nd sess., 1974, 392-401.

⁹²87 Stat. 73, May 24, 1973.

⁹³U.S. Congress, Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, *Hearing on S. 876 to Authorize Appropriations for the Indian Claims Commission for Fiscal Year 1976*, 94th Cong., 1st sess., April 18, 1975, 78.

annual output to complete its cases by 1977. From 1973 through 1977 it proposed annually to complete 33, 43, 79, 47, and 25 cases respectively.⁹⁴ Through 1974 it was ahead of its schedule but appeals held up its progress. By March 1975, 176 dockets were still pending. The 44 member staff, now operating on a budget of \$1,324,000, was deemed adequate by Chairman Kuykendall to handle the work brought to it, but he could not assure the Congress that the work would be completed by 1977. He did say, though, that it was not the Commission's intention to ask for another extension.⁹⁵

Other agencies of Government and the private sector, though, were active in promoting extension past 1977. At the Commission's 1976 authorization hearing, representatives of the Court of Claims and the tribes urged another renewal of at least 3 years. The proponents of more time believed that the remaining cases could best be completed in the Commission rather than the Court of Claims. They saw a transfer of unfinished cases to the Court as inefficient, costly, and counterproductive to all concerned.⁹⁶

Several arguments to give the Commission another lease on life were put forward. The dissolution of the Commission as scheduled, it was claimed, would (1) leave some 120 dockets as a legacy to the Court of Claims, an unmanageable number not contemplated in 1972, (2) saddle the Court with the 51 complex accounting cases, (3) congest an already busy Court, (4) lead to further delay by the very process of transfer, (5) fail to utilize the expertise built up by the Commission, and (6) cause an injustice to the tribes that would not be heard by the same tribunal.

The debate over a renewal of the Commission lasted for 18 months. With little chance of gaining another 5 years, considering the directives of Congress in 1972, the adherents of extension fought for one of 3½ years. Several bills in the House and Senate had varying success but none could gain the assent of both bodies. In general, the bills made their case upon leaving as little work for the Court of Claims as possible, eliminating delay, and keeping Congress closely informed.

The result of the division on the future of the Commission was a Congressional compromise on an administration bill allowing an 18-month extension. Public Law 94-465 was passed on October 8, 1976.

⁹⁴See note 73

⁹⁵U.S. Congress. Senate. Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. *Hearings on Appropriations for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies for 1976*. 94th Cong., 1st sess., March 12, 1975. 203-7

⁹⁶See note 93

This act extended the life of the Commission to September 30, 1978, and provided (1) that, no later than December 31, 1976, the Commission would certify and transfer to the Court of Claims all cases it determined it could not finish by September 30, 1978, (2) that, at any time prior to September 30, 1978, the Commission could transfer other cases, and (3) that all unfinished cases would be transferred to the Court of Claims on September 30, 1978.

With its end firmly in sight, the Commission continued its work and attempted to fulfill its mandate to lighten its remaining caseload. By September 1976 it had disposed of 474 dockets and had 141 pending; 16 of these were on appeal before the Court of Claims. Before the deadline of December 31, 1976, it transferred 20 cases to the Court that it had determined could not be completed before 1978. As of January 1, 1977, the Commission had 21 months left to complete some 120 dockets, though one-quarter of these were accounting cases which would surely be transferred.

The Commission on January 1, 1978, had 102 dockets remaining and a fair chance at leaving a manageable remnant to the Court of Claims. The Court had secured a law in July of 1977 (P.L. 95-69) to define more precisely the transference of claims and increase its staff and was prepared to take over from the Commission. Less than 68 dockets remained undisposed by September 1978, and the prospect for their final resolution by the Court of Claims within the hoped for 5 years seemed good.

Conclusion

The process of Indian claims resolution has been a lengthy one and the Indian Claims Commission was simply an element of that process. Very few of the legal issues of Indian history have progressed to a point where a conclusion can be written to them. The legal history of Indian claims is certainly not one of these few. The Commission may terminate but, in spite of the Congressional mandate that Indian claims arising prior to 1946 also terminate, they will persist.

The future of the debate on land claims rests now in a more searching examination of the treaties and the intent of both participants. It also lies in how far the Indians are able to push their claims for land and how far the United States is willing to acknowledge them. Between these contending positions the treaties will be interpreted or reinterpreted, or even revoked, as the ripening climate of American opinion allows it to happen.

Considering its limitations, the Commission had several positive effects. For one, some tribes have used their share of the \$800 million in awards wisely and aided their economies. Secondly, others have hired full-time legal counsel to serve their ongoing interests. The Commission, with its extended tenure, has greatly raised the "legal consciousness" of the tribes. Thirdly, large segments of American society, in public and private life, have concomitantly had their own consciousness raised concerning Indians, reservations, and the tribal relation to the American Government via the ancient but active treaties. Fourth, the ethno-historical research findings amassed as a by-product of the Commission Act constitute an unprecedented source for the study of Indian-white relations. The tribes now have the satisfaction that their side of American History has finally been told with voluminous documentation. Lastly, the process of the Commission's work, over 3 decades, has brought the many tribes together in one cause and given them a cause for unity that they have rarely had. These are not minor accomplishments.

The last question that needs an answer is did the Indians gain "their day in court?" The answer is yes. The Commission was a court, complete with appellate review. And it was unique among courts in its jurisdiction over "moral claims" and having no statute of limitations except the requirement that the claims must have accrued prior to 1946. The tribes,

represented by some of the best legal talent in the country, litigated more than 500 claims and won awards on over 60 percent of them.

This struggle for perpetuating Indian culture and settling tribal claims has run through American history for almost 150 years. Possibly it will continue for another century or until America finds an accommodation with these internal wards. There is no easy solution to this problem, or maybe no solution at all. For, at best, the existence of a tribal society within the borders of a highly individualistic and technical culture is tenuous. It is not that the tribal society materially threatens the technological way of life, but that it presents a moral threat to settled myths. It keeps an unpleasant past alive and presents challenging questions for the future. Perhaps it is time to appreciate that the triumphs of the frontier period were mitigated by the sordid dealings with the Indians. "To dust off and to pour over these old account books might show us what investments to avoid in the future. That would certainly be one path evening the balance of the future, though the debits of former errors will remain forever old debts beyond reparations, atonement or forgiveness."⁹⁷ The Indian Claims Commission went a long step in this direction but could offer only money. Other remedies to the unresolved problems between the Government and the Indians may now be found.

⁹⁷Cecil D. Eby, *The Black Hawk War: That Disgraceful Affair* (New York: Norton, 1973), 24.

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Absentee Delaware of Oklahoma, <i>see</i> Delaware					
Absentee Shawnee of Oklahoma, <i>see</i> Shawnee					
Acoma, Pueblo de, <i>see</i> Pueblo de Acoma, Dkt. 266					
Alaska Cases, <i>see</i> Aleut Community of St. Paul Island, Dkt. 352; Aleut Tribe, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 369; Athabaska Indians, Stevens Village, Dkt. 199; Chitina, Natives of, Dkt. 187; Gambell, Native Village of, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 284; Nisgah Tribe, Dkt. 287; Palmer, Alaska, Natives of, Dkt. 370; Shungnak, Native Village of, and Kowagmut Tribe, Dkt. 286; Tatitlek Village, Natives of, Dkt. 200; Tee-hit-ton, Dkt. 171; Tlingit and Haida, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 278 & 278-A; Tlingit and Haida and Angoon Tribe, Dkt. 278-B; Unalakleet, Native Village of, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 285; Aleut Community of St. George Island, Dkt. 369-A					
Alabama-Coushatta of Texas, <i>see</i> intervenors in Caddo, Dkt. 226					
Aleut Community of St. Paul Island, Dkt. 352, consolidated with Native Village of Unalakleet, Dkt. 285 & Aleut Tribe, Dkt. 369 for rulings on motions	19 188 C.C. 22 22	140 1 356 359	Opinion holding Commission has jurisdiction Order denying motions for summary judgment Affirmed Opinion on motion for default judgment & motion to suspend further proceedings Order denying motions & directing defendant to answer	5/2/68 5/2/68 6/20/69 12/23/69 12/23/69	
Aleut Community of St. Paul Island, Dkt. 352, and Aleut Tribe, Dkt. 369	23 27 202 C.C. 202 C.C. 35	371 375 177 186 182 205 21 30 31 235 251 252 36 42 42 42	Opinion on motions to strike amended petitions Order denying motions to strike Opinion on motions to dismiss Order granting motions to dismiss Affirmed as to land claims; reversed as to claims for breach of fair & honorable dealings; remanded Rehearing denied Opinion in Dkt. 369 Order denying motion for judgment & for other purposes in Dkt. 369 Order denying motion for more definite statement in Dkt. 352 Opinion Concurring opinion Order granting motion to sever from Dkt. 369 claim of St. George Island and consolidating that claim for trial in Dkt. 352 Opinion — Damages Findings Interlocutory order Order granting plaintiffs' motion for final severance of claims, & for other purposes	7/29/70 7/29/70 3/24/72 3/24/72 6/20/73 9/28/73 10/17/74 10/17/74 10/17/74 7/18/75 7/18/75 7/18/75 7/18/75 6/9/78 6/9/78 6/9/78 8/30/78	
Aleut Community of St. Paul Island, Dkt. 352; and Aleut Community of St. George Island, Dkt. 369-A, consolidated, <i>see</i> prior decisions above under Dkts. 352 & 369	42	529	Final award	8/30/78	\$11,239,604.00 for breach of fair & honorable dealings
American Indians Residing on the Maricopa-Ak Chin Reservation, Dkt. 235, <i>see</i> Maricopa-Ak Chin Reservation					
Angoon Tribe, Dkt. 278-B, <i>see</i> Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska					
Apache Nation, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 22		unnumbered	Order dismissing	5/8/64	Dismissed

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Apache, Jicarilla, Dkt. 22-A; and Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkt. 257	12	439 470	Findings — Title (Dkt. 22-A) Opinion Interlocutory order	8/26/63 8/26/63 8/26/63	
Apache, Jicarilla, Dkt. 22-A	17	338 406	Additional findings — Date of taking Opinion Interlocutory order Report of Commissioner	11/9/66 11/9/66 11/9/66 5/29/69	\$9,150,000.00 for land
	24	123 132 146	Opinion — Value Additional findings Interlocutory order	12/2/70 12/2/70 12/2/70	
	25	227 248	Additional findings — Compromise Final award	4/21/71 4/21/71	
Apache, Lipan and Mescalero, Dkt. 22-C	15	532	Per curiam opinion	8/6/65	\$10,000,000.00
	180 C.C.	487	Order granting motion to dismiss	8/6/65	for land
	22	1 9	Reversed & remanded Opinion on Tigua's motion to intervene	6/9/67 11/5/69	
	27	485	Interlocutory order granting Tigua's motion to intervene	11/5/69	
	34	287	Order granting part & denying part of Tonkawa's motion to intervene	4/19/72	
	35	302	Order denying motion to consolidate Dkt. 257 w/Dkts. 22-C & 226	7/17/74	
	35	378	Order granting in part motion to dismiss applications to intervene, etc.	1/15/75	
	36	7 23 67	Order [based on opinion in Caddo, Dkt. 226] denying motion for consolidation of Dkts. 226 & 22-C Opinion — Title Findings	1/24/75 3/14/75 3/14/75	
	37	221	Interlocutory order Opinion on intervenors' motion to amend order granting in part motion to dismiss applications to intervene	3/14/75	
	37	227 229 239	Order denying motion Findings — Compromise Final award	2/19/76 2/19/76 2/19/76	
Apache, Mescalero, Dkt. 22-B	17	100 150	Findings — Title Opinion Interlocutory order	7/7/66 7/7/66 7/7/66	\$8,500,000.00 for land
Apache, Mescalero, Dkts. 22-B & 22-G	18	367 378	Findings — Compromise Opinion Final judgment in Dkt. 22-B & dismissal of claims in Count I of petition in Dkt. 22-G	4/27/67 4/27/67	
Apache, San Carlos, White Mountain, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 22-D; and Navajo, Dkt. 229	21	189 198 221	Opinion — Title Findings Interlocutory order	6/27/69 6/27/69 6/27/69	See San Carlos of Arizona, Dkt. 223
Apache, San Carlos, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 22-D, and Apache, Northern Tonto, Dkt. 22-J	28	399 421 423	Findings — Compromise Final award in Dkt. 22-D Final award in Dkt. 22-J	9/12/72 9/12/72 9/12/72	\$4,900,000.00 awarded in Dkt. 22-D, and \$685,800.00 in Dkt. 22-J for land
Apache, Yavapai, Dkt. 22-E	15	68 95	Findings — Title Opinion Order	3/3/65 3/3/65 3/3/65	
	15	193	Order amending finding 34	3/24/65	
Apache, Yavapai, Dkts. 22-E & 22-F	20	361 377	Additional findings — Compromise Final judgment	3/13/69 3/13/69	\$5,100,000.00 awarded for land in Dkts. 22-E & F

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Apache, Mescalero, Dkt. 22-G; <i>see also</i> Shoshone	23	181	Opinion on motion for proper accounting	6/10/70	
		188	Order	6/10/70	Transferred to Court of Claims
Te-Moak Bands, Dkt. 236-A; and Apache, Dkt. 22-B	31	559	Order [on interest issue based on opinion in Dkt. 326-A]	10/4/73	
	207 C.C.	369	Affirmed in part; reversed in part & Remanded (Dkts. 22-G, 326-C, & 326-A)	7/11/75	
	C.C.		Rehearing denied	10/3/75	
	425 U.S.	911	Certiorari denied	4/5/76	
	39	239	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	12/15/76	
Apache, San Carlos, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 22-H; <i>see also</i> San Carlos of Arizona, Dkt. 223	33	416	Order granting motion for supplemental accounting	3/20/74	
	39	239	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	12/15/76	Transferred to Court of Claims
Apache, Northern Tonto, Yavapai, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 22-J, and Navajo, Dkt. 229	21	223	Opinion — Title	6/27/69	
		230	Findings	6/27/69	<i>see</i> Apache, San Carlos, Dkt. 22-D, and final award, above
		252	Interlocutory order	6/27/69	
Apache, Jicarilla, Dkt. 22-K	33	364	Findings — Compromise	2/21/74	
		388	Final award	2/21/74	\$7,000,000.00 for accounting
Apache, Fort Sill, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 30	1	137	Opinion — Dismissal of 1st cause (imprisonment claim)	4/6/49	
			Order dismissing 1st cause	4/6/49	
Apache, Fort Sill, Chiricahua Tribe, Warm Springs Band, Chiricahua Band, Dkts. 30 & 48; and Navajo, Dkt. 229	22	527	Opinion — Title, Navajo overlap	4/1/70	
		533	Findings	4/1/70	
		544	Interlocutory order	4/1/70	
Apache, Fort Sill, Chiricahua Tribe, Warm Springs Band, Chiricahua Band, Dkts. 30-A & 48-A	19	212	Findings — Title	6/28/68	
		248	Opinion	6/28/68	
			Interlocutory order	6/28/68	
Apache, Fort Sill, Chiricahua Tribe, Warm Springs Band, Dkts. 30-A & 48-A, 30 & 48, & 182	23	417	Order denying motion for rehearing and reconsideration of date of taking	8/26/70	
	25	352	Opinion — Value	6/9/71	\$521,796.00 awarded in Dkts. 30 & 48, and \$15,967,300.00 in Dkts. 30-A & 48-A for land
		364	Additional findings	6/9/71	
		380	Interlocutory order	6/9/71	
		382	Order denying motion to consolidate Dkts. 30-A, 48-A, 30, 48, & 182	6/9/71	
		384	Interlocutory order in Dkts. 30 & 48	6/9/71	
	26	193	Additional findings in Dkts. 30-A & 48-A re stipulation on offsets	8/25/71	
		197	Interlocutory order in Dkts. 30 & 48, and Dkts. 30-A & 48-A	8/25/71	
		198	Final judgment in Dkts. 30 & 48, and Dkts. 30-A & 48-A	8/25/71	
	202 C.C.	134	Affirmed	8/25/71	
				6/20/73	
Apache, Fort Sill, Warm Springs Band, and Chiricahua Bands, Dkt. 49	unnumbered		Opinion	10/22/51	Dismissed
			Order overruling motion for severance & dismissal of three of the petitioners	10/22/51	
	26	281	Opinion on motion to dismiss	9/24/71	
		294	Concurring opinion	9/24/71	
		296	Dissenting opinion	9/24/71	
		301	Order dismissing	9/24/71	
	201 C.C.	630	Affirmed	5/11/73	
	C.C.		Rehearing denied	11/14/73	
	416 U.S.	993	Certiorari denied	5/13/74	
Apache, Fort Sill, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 182; <i>see also</i> Apache, Fort Sill, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 30-A	28	433	Opinion re motion to separate or sever claims	9/13/72	
		443	Dissenting opinion	9/13/72	Appealed to Court of Claims
		452	Order granting motion	9/13/72	May 1978
	29	126	Order denying motion for rehearing	10/18/72	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Apache, Fort Sill, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 182, <i>see also</i> Apache, Fort Sill, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 30-A (cont.)	29	188 193	Opinion on motions Order denying motion to dismiss or to strike exceptions or for more definite statement & granting motion to amend petition	11/29/72	
	202 C.C. 34	525 81 105 120 121	Appeal dismissed Opinion — Damages, Group A claims Findings Interlocutory order Order permitting filing of defendant's supplemental memorandum	11/29/72 7/13/73 5/10/74 5/10/74 5/10/74	
	34 41	204 37 52 72 175	Order granting motion for severance of claims Opinion — Recognized title Findings Interlocutory order Order denying rehearing	6/19/74 10/6/77 10/6/77 10/6/77 2/8/78	
Apache, Fort Sill, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 182 & 182-A	205 C.C. 209 C.C.	805 433	Appeal partially dismissed Reversed & remanded	12/18/74 4/14/76	
Apache, Fort Sill, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 182-A	40	143	Opinion — Measure of damages	5/6/77	Transferred to Court of Claims
	40	154	Interlocutory order	5/6/77	
	41	260 83	Order denying rehearing Order certifying & transferring Dkt. 182-A to Court of Claims	7/21/77 10/27/77	
Apache, <i>see also</i> Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkts. 32, 257, 258, 259, & 259-A					
Arapaho, Northern Dkt. 82	unnumbered		Order dismissing	8/15/51	Dismissed
Arapaho, Northern, of Wind River Reservation, Dkt. 329-D	12	212 229	Additional findings on compromise settlement of offsets Opinion Final judgment	6/27/63 6/27/63 6/27/63	\$3,230,000.00 for land; see prior decisions under Cheyenne-Arapaho, Dkts. 329 and 348
Arapaho, <i>see</i> Cheyenne-Arapaho, Dkts. 329, 329-A, B, & D, & 348					
Arikara Tribe, <i>see</i> Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes					
Assiniboine Indians, Dkt. 62	1 1 2 128 C.C. 348 U.S.	530 573 272 300 617 863	Opinion on motion for summary judgment Final order Per curiam opinion Order for rehearing Opinion Concurring opinion Order dismissing Affirmed Certiorari denied	4/27/51 4/27/51 6/22/51 6/22/51 12/12/52 12/12/52 12/12/52 6/8/54 10/25/54	Dismissed
Assiniboine, <i>see also</i> Fort Belknap, Dkt. 250; Intervenors in Blackfeet and Gros Ventre, Dkt. 279-A					
Athabaska Indians of Stevens Village, Alaska, Dkt. 199	unnumbered		Order dismissing	6/4/57	Dismissed
Bannock or Bannack, <i>see</i> Shoshone-Bannock					
Bay Mills Community, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-E; Ottawa and Chippewa of Michigan, Dkt. 58	7 20 22 24	576 605 137 141 372 378 381 383 50	Findings — Title Opinion Interlocutory order Opinion — value Additional findings Second interlocutory order Opinion on consideration item Findings Third interlocutory order Order denying motion for preliminary adjudication Opinion on motion for rehearing & modification of finding	5/20/59 5/20/59 5/20/59 12/23/68 12/23/68 12/23/68 1/14/70 1/14/70 1/14/70 1/14/70 10/28/70	\$10,109,003.55 for land

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Bay Mills Community, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-E; Ottawa and Chippewa of Michigan, Dkt. 58 (cont.)	26	54 538 550 562 94 27 97	Order amending findings of 5/20/59 and adding a finding Opinion — offsets Additional findings Final award Order denying in part & granting in part motion to amend decision Amended final award	10/28/70 12/29/71 12/29/71 12/29/71 3/15/72 3/15/72	
Bay Mills Community, Sault Ste. Marie Bands, Dkt. 18-F	22	79 81 84 35 32 54 58 73 208 C.C. 1001	Report of Commissioner Opinion — Title Findings Interlocutory order Opinion — Value Dissenting opinion Additional findings Order dismissing Affirmed	4/8/69 11/19/69 11/19/69 11/19/69 10/24/74 10/24/74 10/24/74 10/24/74 11/26/75	Dismissed
Bay Mills Community, Sault Ste. Marie Bands, Dkt. 18-R	22	85 87 91 32 303 311 319 206 C.C. 850	Report of Commissioner Opinion — Title Findings Interlocutory order Opinion — Value Additional findings Final award Affirmed	4/8/69 11/19/69 11/19/69 11/19/69 12/26/73 12/26/73 12/26/73 1/31/75	\$15,000.00 for land
Biloxi, <i>see</i> Pascagoula, Biloxi and Mobilian Consolidated Band, Dkt. 170					
Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes, Dkt. 279	2	302	Opinion Order sustaining in part & denying in part motion for summary judgment	12/17/52	Dismissed
	127 C.C.	807	Affirmed	12/17/52	
	348 U.S.	835	Certiorari denied	3/2/54	
	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition after viable claims separated and refiled in Dkts. 279-A, 279-B, & 279-C	10/19/54	
				12/10/68	
Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes, Plaintiffs; Assiniboine of Fort Belknap and Fort Peck Reservations, & Sioux of Fort Peck Reservation, Intervenors, Dkt. 279-A	162 C.C. 18	136 241 289	unnumbered Order denying Assiniboine's motion to intervene Reversed, intervention allowed Findings Opinion — Title and value Interlocutory awards to plaintiffs Interlocutory award to Assiniboine Interlocutory award to Sioux Final judgment for Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Final judgment for Sioux	10/21/57 6/7/63 3/31/67 3/31/67 3/31/67 3/31/67 3/31/67 8/23/68 8/23/68	\$3,108,506.40 to the Assiniboine; \$1,161,354.41 to the Sioux; and \$8,679,814.92 to the Blackfeet and Gros Ventre for land
	19	363 365			
Assiniboine Tribes, Intervenors	19 21	361 unnumbered 310	Final award to the Assiniboine Tribes Order vacating final award Opinion — reconsideration of consideration and offsets Additional findings Final order (award)	8/21/68 10/28/68 6/30/69 6/30/69 6/30/69 7/15/70	
	192 C.C.	679	Affirmed		
Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes, Dkt. 279-B	15	561 569	Findings Opinion Order dismissing petition	8/16/65 8/16/65 8/16/65	Dismissed
	175 C.C.	893	Affirmed	5/2/66	
Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes, Dkt. 279-C, and Fort Belknap Indian Community, Dkt. 250-A	32	65	Opinion on motions for supplemental accounting, partial summary judgment, and pleadings to conform to the proof	10/18/73	
		149	Concurring opinion	10/18/73	
		150	Interlocutory order	10/18/73	
	34	122 155	Opinion on motion for rehearing Order denying motion for rehearing & for other purposes	6/7/64 6/7/64	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes, Dkt. 279-C, and Fort Belknap Indian Community, Dkt. 250-A (cont.)	35	15	Order severing separate Blackfeet claims from Dkts. 279-C & 250-A and assigning them Dkt. 279-D, and establishing basis for division of recoveries on joint claims of Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes	9/25/74	
	35	114	Order withdrawing Part XI on interest of opinion & order of 10/18/73	11/7/74	
	39	108	Per curiam opinion on motions	10/15/76	C In
		120	Order on pending motions	10/15/76	C Ca
	39	293	Opinion	1/21/77	Di
		298	Dissenting opinion	1/21/77	
		299	Order denying motion for admission of evidentiary material	1/21/77	
	41	188	Opinion on motion to strike	2/24/78	
		191	Order denying motion to strike	2/24/78	
Blackfeet, Dkt. 279-D	35	15	Order severing separate Blackfeet claims, etc.	9/25/74	
	39	108	Per curiam opinion	10/15/76	C Ca
		120	Order on pending motions	10/15/76	Di
	42	202	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	7/13/78	
	42	207	Order vacating certification & transfer to Court of Claims	7/17/78	
Bois Forte Band, Dkt. 18-D, <i>see</i> Chippewa					
Brothertown Indians, <i>see</i> Emigrant New York Indians					
Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, Dkt. 148, <i>see</i> California Indians					
Caddo Tribe of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 226	unnumbered		Order dismissing Counts II & IV of plaintiffs' petition	\$383,475.55	
	4	201	Findings — title	3/1/55	for land.
		214	Opinion	3/8/56	Remaining
			Interlocutory order	3/8/56	general account-
140 C.C.	63		Review denied	3/8/56	ing claims trans-
8	354		Additional findings — Value	10/9/57	ferred to Court
	373		Opinion	12/22/60	of Claims.
			Interlocutory order	12/22/60	
9	557		Additional findings — offsets	10/27/61	Cal
	566		Opinion	10/27/61	Dki
			Interlocutory order	10/27/61	& 3
19	385		Opinion — Offset question	8/30/68	80-
			Order reconsidering & denying offset	8/30/68	Cal
					Ind
	22	181	Opinion — Reinstatement of Counts II & IV	12/5/69	
		185	Order	12/5/69	
	27	1	Opinion — Coushatta intervention	1/12/72	
		8	Order granting Coushatta motion to intervene	1/12/72	Cal
	27	35	Order granting Wichita motion to intervene	2/2/72	Dki
	27	74	Order granting Tonkawa motion to intervene	3/1/72	&
	27	88	Opinion — Cherokee intervention	3/8/72	80-
		92	Order denying Cherokee motion to intervene	3/8/72	Cal
	27	136	Order denying Kickapoo motion to intervene	3/17/72	Dki
	27	138	Order denying Delaware motion to intervene	3/17/72	Cal
	34	287	Order denying motions to consolidate Dkt. 257 w/Dkts. 22-C & 226	7/17/74	Ind
35	321		Opinion on motions, etc.	1/24/75	Cal
		353	Additional findings	1/24/75	of I
		378	Order denying motion to consolidate Dkts. 226 & 22-C	1/24/75	
		380	Order denying Wichita motion re exhibits	1/24/75	Cal
		382	Order granting motion to dismiss complaints in intervention	1/24/75	Mis
		384	Interlocutory order and order dismissing Counts II & IV of plaintiffs' petition	1/24/75	Dkt
209 C.C.	724		Affirmed	3/19/76	
40	266		Opinion on motion to dismiss certain accounting exceptions	8/4/77	Cal
		286	Order granting motion in part & denying it in part	8/4/77	Bar
					Dkt

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Caddo Tribe of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 226 (cont.)	40	288	Opinion — Offsets (1835 treaty)	8/4/77	
		293	Additional findings	8/4/77	
		298	Final award on land claim under 1835 treaty	8/4/77	
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	5/8/78	
California, Federated Indians of, Dkt. 12	unnumbered		Order dismissing	4/28/49	Dismissed
California Indians, Dkt. 31	1	149	Per curiam opinion	5/6/49	
	1	358	Order overruling motion to dismiss	5/6/49	<i>See</i> Dkts. 31 & 37, below
		366	Findings	12/15/50	
	122 C.C.	348	Opinion	12/15/50	
	344 U.S.	856	Order dismissing	12/15/50	
			Reversed & remanded	5/6/52	
			Certiorari denied	10/20/52	
California Indians, Dkt. 37	1	154	Per curiam opinion	5/6/49	
	1	383	Order denying motion to dismiss	5/6/49	<i>See</i> Dkts. 31 & 37, below
		392	Findings	12/21/50	
	122 C.C.	419	Opinion	12/21/50	
	344 U.S.	856	Order dismissing on capacity to sue	12/21/50	
			Reversed & remanded	5/6/52	
			Certiorari denied	10/20/52	
California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37	4	147	Per curiam opinion	1/19/56	
	6	86	Order granting motion to amend	1/19/56	
		93	Opinion	1/20/58	
	6	666	Opinion	1/20/58	
		674	Opinion	10/6/58	
			Order dividing California into Areas A & B	10/6/58	
			Opinion	10/6/58	
		678	Order consolidating Dkts. 176, 215 & 233 w/Dkts. 31 & 37 for all purposes, including judgment	10/6/58	
			Opinion	10/6/58	
	8	1	Order overruling motion to modify decision of 1/20/58	10/6/58	
		11	Findings	7/31/59	
			Opinion — Title	7/31/59	
			Interlocutory order	7/31/59	
	unnumbered		Order clarifying & supplementing findings & amending interlocutory order of 7/31/59	12/7/59	
	13	89	Per curiam opinion on Quechan motion to intervene	3/3/64	
	167 C.C.	886	Order denying Quechan intervention	3/3/64	
	379 U.S.	971	Affirmed	7/8/64	
			Certiorari denied	1/18/65	
California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37 (176, 215, & 333 included), 80 & 80-D, & 347	13	369	Findings — Compromise	7/20/64	\$29,100,000.00
		513	Opinion	7/20/64	for land
			Final determination or judgment	7/20/64	
California, Pitt River Indians of, <i>et al.</i>	202 C.C.	988	Dismissal of petition attacking 1964 judgment of Ind. Cl. Comm.	10/17/73	
	419 U.S.	831	Certiorari denied	10/15/74	
California Indians, <i>see also</i> Mission Indians of California; Pitt River Tribe; Shasta Tribe; Yana Tribe of Indians; and Yokiah Tribe of Indians	unnumbered				
California Indians, Mission Bands of, Dkt. 80			Order permitting filing of amended & supple- mental petitions [asserting causes of action severed from the petition in Dkt. 80 by unnumbered orders of 1/11/55, and 8/28/59] as Dkts. 80-A, 80-B, 80-C, & 80-D	4/4/60	
California Indians, Baron Long, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 80-A	30	419	Opinion on motion to reopen record, etc.	6/13/73	
		429	Order granting motion	6/13/73	Transferred to Court of Claims
	31	375	Opinion on defendant's motion for rehearing	9/19/73	
		383	Order denying rehearing	9/19/73	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
California Indians, Baron Long, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 80-A (cont.)	38	347	Opinion on admissibility of plaintiffs' additional exhibits on liability	6/8/76	
		387	Order	6/8/76	
	39	201	Opinion	12/2/76	
	39	203	Order admitting intervenor's missing exhibits	12/2/76	
		239	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	12/15/76	
California Indians, San Pasqual Band, Dkt. 80-A	30	451	Opinion	6/21/73	Transferred to Court of Claims
		461	Order granting motion to amend petition & denying alternative motion to intervene	6/21/73	with other claims in Dkt. 80-A
	39	239	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	12/15/76	
California Indians, Soboba Band of Mission Indians, Dkt. 80-A	37	326	Opinion — Liability for loss of water	3/5/76	Transferred to Court of Claims
		412	Findings	3/5/76	with other claims in Dkt. 80-A
		490	Order	3/5/76	
		239	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	12/15/76	
California Indians, Baron Long, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 80-B	39	239	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	12/15/76	Transferred to Court of Claims
California Indians, Bands of Mission Indians, Dkt. 80-C	21	110	Opinion	6/18/69	Dismissed
		112	Findings	6/18/69	
		118	Final order	6/18/69	
California Indians, Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, Dkt. 148	21	119	Opinion — Title	6/18/69	\$100,000.00
		133	Findings	6/18/69	for land
	25	141	Interlocutory order	6/18/69	
		392	Findings — Compromise	6/16/71	
		405	Final award	6/16/71	
California Indians, Twenty-nine Palm Band, Dkt. 149	unnumbered		Order dismissing	12/31/58	Dismissed
California Indians, Morongo Band, Dkt. 325	unnumbered		Order dismissing	3/28/55	Dismissed
Cayuga, Dkts. 84, 89, and 344, <i>see</i> Six Nations					
Cayuga, Dkt. 230	26	271	Opinion	9/22/71	Dismissed
		273	Findings	9/22/71	
		280	Order dismissing	9/22/71	
Cayuga, Dkt. 343	20	70	Opinion on motion for partial summary judgment	11/14/68	\$70,000.00
			Order granting partial summary judgment (first claim dismissed)		for land
	28	237	Opinion — Liability	7/20/72	
		242	Findings	7/20/72	
		250	Interlocutory order	7/20/72	
	202 C.C.	1101	Remanded	6/29/73	
	36	75	Opinion	3/27/75	
		82	Additional findings — Remand	3/27/75	
		98	Interlocutory order	3/27/75	
	36	99	Order to show cause	4/23/75	
	41	308	Findings — Compromise	5/11/78	
		326	Final award	5/11/78	
Cayuga, Dkts. 341, 341-A, 341-B, 341-C, 341-D, and 341-E, <i>see</i> Seneca-Cayuga					
Cayuse, Dkt. 264, <i>see</i> Umatilla Reservation Confederated Tribes					
Chehalis, Upper, Dkt. 237	4	301	Findings	6/25/56	\$754,380.00
		330	Opinion	6/25/56	for land
			Final order dismissing	6/25/56	
140 C.C.	192		Reversed & remanded	10/9/57	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Chehalis, Upper, Dkt. 237 (cont.)	8	436 463	Findings — Title Opinion	3/14/60 3/14/60	
	12	644 660	Interlocutory order Additional findings — Compromise Opinion	3/14/60 10/7/63 10/7/63	
			Final judgment	10/7/63	
Chemehuevi, Dkt. 351	6	86 93	Opinion — Capacity to sue Opinion	1/20/58 1/20/58	
	6	666	Interlocutory order Opinion	1/20/58 10/6/58	
			Order separating from California	10/6/58	
Chemehuevi, Dkts. 351 & 351-A, <i>See also</i> California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37; Mohave Indians, Dkt. 283	14	651 673	Findings — Compromise Opinion	1/18/65 1/18/65	\$996,834.81 for land
			Final judgment	1/18/65	
Cherokee, Dkt. 173	9	162 197	Findings Opinion	4/3/61 4/3/61	\$14,364,476.15 for land
	9	435	Interlocutory order (judgment subject to offsets)	4/3/61	
		454	Additional findings on stipulation for entry of final judgment	9/14/61	
	12	426 436	Opinion on motion for approval of stipulation Final judgment	9/14/61 9/14/61	
			Findings — Offsets Compromise	8/8/63	
			Opinion	8/8/63	
			Order approving settlement of offsets	8/8/63	
Cherokee, Cherokee Freedmen, Intervenors, Dkt. 173-A	17	331	Per curiam opinion	10/5/66	
			Order denying motion to dismiss petition of intervenors	10/5/66	\$3,887,557.57 for land
	22	417 426 437 438	Opinion — Value Findings	2/4/70 2/4/70	
			First interlocutory order	2/4/70	
			Order denying intervenor's motion for summary judgment	2/4/70	
	195 C.C. 27	39 23 30 33	Affirmed Opinion — Offsets Additional findings	6/11/71 2/2/72 2/2/72	
			Final award	2/2/72	
	200 C.C.	583	Affirmed on date of valuation; reversed on offset	2/16/73	
	27	34-A	Order amending opinion & findings, & amended final award	5/30/73	
Cherokee, Dkt. 190	12	570 586	Findings Opinion	9/25/63 9/25/63	Dismissed
	180 C.C.	181	Final order dismissing	9/25/63	
			Affirmed	5/12/67	
Cherokee, Dkt. 271	20	379	Order dismissing	3/19/69	Dismissed
Cherokee, Dkt. 297	20	380	Order dismissing	3/19/69	Dismissed
Cherokee Freedmen, Dkt. 123, <i>see also</i> Intervenors in Cherokee Nation, Dkt. 173-A	2	231	Per curiam opinion	9/9/52	Dismissed
	10	109 127	Order Findings Opinion	9/9/52 11/28/61 11/28/61	
	161 C.C.	787	Order dismissing plaintiffs' petition Affirmed as to dismissal of the Freedmen's petition, but remanded with direction they be allowed intervention in a pending Cherokee Nation case	11/28/61 5/10/63	
	13	33	Per curiam opinion Order denying motion to intervene in Cherokee Nation, Dkt. 173	1/6/64	
	unnumbered		Order granting Freedmen's motion to intervene in Dkt. 173-A	1/6/64 10/12/64	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Cherokee Freedmen, Dkt. 123, <i>see also</i> Intervenors in Cherokee Nation, Dkt. 173-A (cont.)	17	331	Per curiam opinion Order denying motion to dismiss petition of intervention in Dkt. 173-A	10/5/66 10/5/66	
Cherokee, Eastern (Emigrant), Dkt. 5, <i>see also</i> Cherokee, Western, Dkt. 2	1	31 40	Opinion Concurring opinion Order sustaining motion for summary judgment and dismissing plaintiffs' petition	11/15/48 11/15/48	Dismissed
	116 C.C. 340 U.S.	665 904	Affirmed Certiorari denied	11/15/48 5/1/50 12/11/50	
Cherokee Indians, Eastern (Emigrant), Dkt. 42	unnumbered 1	408 414	Per curiam opinion Findings Opinion Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing plaintiffs' petition	9/13/49 12/28/50 12/28/50	Dismissed
Cherokee, Eastern Band, Dkt. 282	7	140	Opinion Order dismissing certain claims in plaintiff's petition & dismissing plaintiff's petition upon the filing of separate petitions (assigned Dkts. 282-A through 282-L) for certain other claims in the petition	2/20/59	Dismissed
Cherokee, Eastern Band, Dkts. 282-A through 282-L	28	386 398	Findings — Compromise Final award	9/11/72 9/11/72	\$1,855,254.50 for land
Cherokee, Texas, Dkt. 26	unnumbered 2	516 522	Per curiam opinion Findings Opinion Order dismissing	12/27/51 12/28/53 12/28/53 12/28/53	Dismissed
	26	78	Order denying motions by Alabama-Coushatta Tribes of Texas & Coushatta Tribe of Louisiana to vacate & set aside dismissal	8/5/71	
Cherokee, Western (Old Settler) and Eastern (Emigrant), Dkt. 2	1	1 19	Opinion Concurring opinion Order sustaining motion for summary judgment dismissing plaintiffs' petition	11/15/48 11/15/48	Dismissed
	114 C.C. 2	716 7 22	Reversed & remanded Findings Opinion Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing plaintiffs' petition	11/15/48 11/7/49 2/19/52 2/19/52	
	124 C.C.	127	Affirmed	2/19/52 1/13/53	
Cherokee, Western (Old Settler), Dkt. 3	1	20 29	Opinion Concurring opinion Order sustaining motion for summary judgment & dismissing plaintiffs' petition	11/15/48 11/15/48	Dismissed
	116 C.C. 340 U.S.	665 904	Affirmed Certiorari denied	11/15/48 5/15/50 12/11/50	
Cherokee, Western (Old Settler), Dkt. 24	1 2	165 37 50	Opinion Findings Opinion Final order dismissing plaintiffs' petition	9/13/49 4/3/52 4/3/52 4/3/52	Dismissed
	124 C.C.	315	Affirmed	2/3/53	
Cherokee, Western (Old Settler), Dkt. 41	unnumbered 1	394 399	Per curiam opinion Findings Opinion Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing plaintiffs' petition	9/13/49 12/28/50 12/28/50	Dismissed
Cherokee, Western (Old Settler), Dkt. 43	unnumbered		Per curiam opinion Order dismissing petition	9/13/49 6/11/51	Dismissed

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Cheyenne-Arapaho, Dkts. 329 & 348 <i>see</i> Arapaho, Northern	4	30-A 30-G	Findings Interlocutory order granting partial summary judgment	11/1/55 11/1/55	
	10	1 64	Findings - Value Opinion Interlocutory order Order amending findings & opinion Amended interlocutory order Order amending amended interlocutory order	12/6/61 12/6/61 12/6/61 8/2/62 8/2/62 11/13/62	
Cheyenne-Arapaho, Dkt. 348	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	2/13/64	Dismissed
Cheyenne-Arapaho, Dkt. 329	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	12/10/68	Dismissed
Cheyenne and Arapaho (Southern), Dkts., 329-A & 329-B	16	162 185	Findings - Compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment	10/18/65 10/18/65 10/18/65	\$15,000,000.00 for land
Cheyenne Indians, Northern, Dkt. 329-C	13	1 20	Additional findings - Compromise Opinion Final judgment	11/27/63 11/27/63 11/27/63	\$4,360,886.19 for land
Cheyenne and Northern Arapaho, Dkt. 329-D	12	212 229	Findings — Compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment for the Northern Arapaho Tribe	6/27/63 6/27/63 6/27/63	\$3,230,000.00 for land
Chickasaw, Dkt. 267	5	478	Opinion Order sustaining motion for summary judgment	9/16/57 9/16/57	Dismissed
Chickasaw, Dkt. 268	10	313	Opinion Order sustaining motion for summary judgment	4/20/62 4/20/62	Dismissed
Chickasaw, Dkt. 269	3	402 412	Opinion Dissenting opinion Final order dismissing	11/17/54 11/17/54 11/17/54	
	132 C.C. 7	359 64 79	Reversed & remanded Findings Opinion Interlocutory order Final order	6/7/55 1/23/59 1/23/59 1/23/59 7/17/59	
	unnumbered 149 C.C.	839	Choctaw intervention in appeal denied	5/13/60	
Chickasaw, Dkt. 270	20	247	Opinion Order dismissing	1/16/69 1/16/69	Dismissed
Chickasaw-Choctaw, <i>see</i> Choctaw-Chickasaw					
Chinook, Dkt. 234	6	177 208	Findings - Title Opinion Order	4/16/58 4/16/58 4/16/58	\$48,692.05 for land
	24	56 64 88	Opinion - Value Additional findings Final award	11/4/70 11/4/70 11/4/70	
	196 C.C.	780	Affirmed	12/3/71	
Chippewa, Bay Mills Community, Dkts. 18-E, 18-F, and 18-R, <i>see</i> Bay Mills					
Chippewa, Bois Forte Band, Dkt. 18-D	21	254 257 267	Opinion - Title Findings Order granting summary judgment	6/27/69 6/27/69 6/27/69	\$1,023,808.65 for land
	34	157 172 188	Opinion - Value Additional findings Interlocutory order	6/13/74 6/13/74 6/13/74	
	39	300 311 325	Opinion - Consideration & offsets Additional findings Final award	1/28/77 1/28/77 1/28/77	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Tribe</i>
Chippewa Cree, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 221-A, <i>see also Sioux</i> , Dkt. 74; Fort Berthold, Dkt. 350-B; & Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113	41	173	Order dismissing plaintiffs' petition	2/2/78	Dismissed	Chipp <i>et al.</i> Chipp Missis Super (cont.)
Chippewa Cree, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 221-B, <i>see Chippewa, Little Shell Band, et al.</i> , Dkt. 191						
Chippewa Cree, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 221-C	32	152 155	Opinion Order denying plaintiffs' request for order requiring defendant to amend its accounting report or file a supplemental accounting report, and defendant's request for order requiring plaintiffs to furnish a more definite statement	10/25/73	Transferred to Court of Claims	Chipp <i>et al.</i> Chipp Super Mississ
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	10/25/73 5/8/78		
Chippewa, Fon Du Lac, Bois Forte, and Grand Portage Bands, Dkt. 8	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	1/24/49	Dismissed	Chipp <i>et al.</i> Chipp Missis Super
Chippewa, Little Shell Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 191, 2d Claim; and Chippewa Cree, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 221-B.	33	469 483 509	Opinion - Title Findings Order dismissing 2d claim in Dkt. 191 & the claims in Dkt. 221-B	4/5/74 4/5/74 4/5/74	Dismissed 2d Claim in Dkt. 191 & all claims in Dkt. 221-B	Chipp <i>et al.</i> Chipp Missis Super
Regarding Dkt. 191, <i>see also Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113; Chippewa, Red Lake Band, Dkt. 18-A; Sioux, Dkt. 74; & Fort Berthold, Dkt. 350-B</i>						
Chippewa, Little Shell Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 221, <i>see Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113; Sioux, Dkt. 74; & Fort Berthold, Dkt. 350-B</i>						Chipp <i>et al.</i> Chipp Super
Chippewa, Minnesota, Dkt. 7	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	1/24/49	Dismissed	Chipp <i>et al.</i> Chipp Super
Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18	unnumbered		Order directing separation of causes of action in the original petition and their refiling in separate petitions	7/13/49	Concluded by separating out all causes of action. They were refiled in Dkts. 18-A through N, and 18-P through U.	
Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> [on behalf of the Mississippi, and the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands], Dkts. 18-B and 18-N	8 161 C.C. 13 14 15	781 815 258 77 226 294 466 483 573	Findings in Dkt. 18-B - Title Opinion in Dkt. 18-B Interlocutory order in Dkt. 18-B Reversed in part Opinion in Dkt. 18-B Order amending findings in Dkt. 18-B Amended interlocutory order Additional findings in both Dkts. on value and consideration Opinion Interlocutory order with respect to Dkt. 18-B & final order dismissing the petition in Dkt. 18-N Additional findings on compromise settlement of offsets & entry of final judgment Opinion Final judgment in Dkt. 18-B	6/28/60 6/28/60 6/28/60 4/5/63 2/5/64 2/5/64 2/5/64 11/20/64 11/20/64 11/20/64 7/27/65 7/27/65 7/27/65	For land in Dkt. 18-B: \$1,671,262.18 for the Mississippi Bands, and \$2,260,942.90 for the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands. Dkt. 18-N dismissed.	Chipp <i>et al.</i> Chipp Dkts
Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> [on behalf of the Chippewa Indians of the Mississippi and Lake Superior], Dkt. 18-C	19 26	514 525 22 37 59	Findings - Title Opinion Order granting plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment Opinion - Value Additional findings Interlocutory order	10/10/68 10/10/68 10/10/68 7/21/71 7/21/71 7/21/71	\$9,027,559.60 for land	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> [on behalf of the Chippewa Indians of the Mississippi and Lake Superior], Dkt. 18-C (cont.)	32	192 201 215	Opinion - Offsets Additional findings Final award	11/7/73 11/7/73 11/7/73	
Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> [on behalf of the Chippewas of Lake Superior and the Mississippi], Dkt. 18-S	19	319 322	Findings - Title Opinion Order granting plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment	8/13/68 8/13/68 8/13/68	For land: \$5,677,418.88 for the Chippewas of Lake Superior,
	37	146 169 192 41	Opinion - Value Findings Interlocutory order Opinion - Payments on claim	1/14/76 1/14/76 1/14/76 11/23/77	and \$2,838,709.44 for the Chippewas of the Mississippi
		102 111 129	Additional findings Final award	11/23/77 11/23/77 11/23/77	
Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> [on behalf of the Chippewa Indians of the Mississippi and Lake Superior], Dkt. 18-T	19	341 352	Findings - Title Opinion Order granting plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment	8/20/68 8/20/68	\$529,000 00 for land
	25	146 157 177	Opinion - Value Additional findings Interlocutory order	3/30/71 3/30/71 3/30/71	
	28	103 111 116	Opinion - Payments on the claim Additional findings Final award	5/31/72 5/31/72 5/31/72	
Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> [on behalf of the Chippewas of Lake Superior], Dkt. 18-U	14	360 368	Findings - Title Opinion Order granting plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment	12/8/64 12/8/64	\$2,621,174.58 for land
	25	55 62 82	Opinion - Value Additional findings Interlocutory order	3/24/71 3/24/71 3/24/71	
	26	137	Order amending finding No. 1	8/11/71	
	35	427	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for ruling on defendant's demand for offsets	2/13/75	
		450 452	Opinion dissenting in part Order ruling on legal issues affecting offsets	2/13/75 2/13/75	
	41	249 266 267 293	Opinion - Consideration & gratuitous offsets Dissenting opinion Additional findings Final award	3/30/78 3/30/78 3/30/78 3/30/78	
Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 19 & 188; and Chippewa, Red Lake Band, Dkts. 189-A, 19-B & 189-C	29	211 242 244 246 249	Opinion in Dkts. 19, 188, 189-A, & 189-C on motion for determination of legal issues Order of Dkts. 19 & 189-A dismissing certain claims & consolidating these dchts. for all purposes Order in Dkts. 188 & 189-C dismissing a claim in Dkt. 189-C for a Fifth Amendment taking of tribal land & consolidating Dkts. 188 & 189-C for all purposes Opinion in Dkt. 189-B on defendant's motion for summary judgment and/or dismissal of Dkt. 189-B	11/29/72 11/29/72 11/29/72 11/29/72 11/29/72	All five dchts. transferred to Court of Claims
	30	433 436	Order in Dkt. 189-B dismissing a claim for Fifth Amendment taking of tribal land & consolidating Dkt. 189-B w/Dkts. 19 & 189-A for all purposes Opinion on plaintiffs' motion in the five dchts. to clarify record concerning consolidation of cases Order in the five dchts. clarifying record concerning consolidation of cases	11/29/72 6/21/73 6/21/73	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 19 & 188; and Chippewa, Red Lake Band, Dkts. 189-A, 189-B & 189-C (cont.)	35	98	Opinion in Dkts. 188 & 189-C on plaintiffs' motions for leave to amend the complaints & defendant's motion to strike	11/7/74	
		111	Opinion dissenting in part	11/7/74	
		112	Order in Dkt. 188 granting in part & denying in part plaintiffs' motion to amend complaint	11/7/74	
		113	Order in Dkt. 189-C granting in part & denying in part plaintiffs' motion to amend complaint & denying defendant's motion to strike	11/7/74	
	39	239	Order certifying & transferring all of these dkts. to the Court of Claims	12/15/76	
Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 20	unnumbered		Order combining causes of action in Dkts. 19 & 20, & dismissing the petition in Dkt. 20 without prejudice to prosecution as part of Dkt. 19	11/12/57	Dismissed
Chippewa and Ottawa, <i>see</i> Ottawa and Chippewa					
Chippewa, Pembina Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 246, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113; Fort Berthold, Dkt. 350-B; and Sioux, Dkt. 74					
Chippewa, Pillager Bands in Minnesota, Dkt. 144	19	500	Findings	10/10/68	\$405,293.06
		511	Opinion	10/10/68	for land
			Order granting plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment	10/10/68	
	21	1	Opinion on motion to reconsider date of taking	5/20/69	
		8	Additional findings	5/20/69	
		13	Order denying motion for reconsideration	5/20/69	
		14	Order admitting evidence	5/20/69	
	192 C.C.	698	Affirmed	7/15/70	
	32	156	Opinion - Value & offsets	10/25/73	
		173	Additional findings	10/25/73	
		190	Final award	10/25/73	
Chippewa, Red Lake, Pembina, and White Earth Bands, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-A	1	575	Findings	9/17/51	<i>See below</i>
		584	Opinion	9/17/51	
			Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing plaintiffs' petition	9/17/51	
			Order granting rehearing & vacating findings, opinion & conclusions of law & judgment of 9/17/51	3/13/53	
Chippewa, Red Lake, Pembina, and White Earth Bands, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-A; Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113; and Chippewa, Little Shell Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 191	6	247	Findings - Title & value	5/21/58	
		305	Opinion	5/21/58	For land: \$1,797,761.74 for
			Interlocutory order	5/21/58	Red Lake Band;
	9	315	Additional findings - Consideration	6/15/62	and \$237,127.82
		336	Opinion	6/15/62	for Pembina
			Order amending previous determination of consideration	6/15/62	Band.
	9	457	Additional findings - Gratuitous offsets	10/5/61	Dkt. 18-A com-
		511	Opinion	10/5/61	pleted. Dkts. 113
			Final award	10/5/61	& 191 partially
			Order amending findings	6/18/62	completed - <i>see</i>
	unnumbered		Amended final award	6/18/62	Chippewa,
	unnumbered		Affirmed in part & reversed in part &		Turtle Mountain
	164 C.C.	389	remanded	1/24/64	Band, Dkt. 113,
			Order adding finding No. 69	4/24/64	below.
			Amended final award	4/24/64	
Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-G, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 57					
Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-H, <i>see also</i> Potawatomi, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-C	28	496	Order dismissing petition (5th item of order in Dkts. 15-C, 18-H, 29-A, & 71)	9/20/72	Dismissed
Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-I, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 217					
Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-J, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 59					
Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-K, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-F					

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-L, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-E					
Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-M, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G					
Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-P, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 216					
Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-Q		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	6/20/57	Dismissed
Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 189	30	437	Opinion - Value Findings	6/21/73	\$1,859,306.87
		445	Interlocutory order	6/21/73	for land
	31	450	Order entry interlocutory award of 6/21/73 as a final award	6/21/73	
		87		8/9/73	
Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 189-A through C, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 19					
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13		unnumbered	Order directing separation of causes of action in the original petition & their resiling in separate petitions	7/13/49	Concluded by separating out all causes of action. They were resiled in Dkts. 13-A through N.
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-A	32	1	Order dismissing first claim Order dismissing petition	3/9/50 10/17/73	Dismissed
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-B		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	3/9/50	Dismissed
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-C		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	2/19/54	Dismissed
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-D		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	3/9/50	Dismissed
Chippewa, Saginaw [Strong], Dkt. 13-E;	30	6	Order denying motion of plaintiffs in Dkts. 27-E & 202 for leave to file brief in rebuttal	4/4/73	Dkts. 18-L & 341-C dismissed.
Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-L; Delaware Dkt. 27-E; Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> (Citizen & Prairie Bands, & Potawatomi of Indiana & Michigan, Inc., intervenors), Dkt. 29-D; Six Nations, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 89; Ottawa, Dkts. 133-A & 302; Wyandot, Dkt. 139; Delaware, Absentee, Dkt. 202; and Seneca-Cayuga, Dkt. 341-C	30	8	Opinion - Title	4/4/73	Dkt. 89, <i>see</i> dismissal under Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G group.
		23	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part	4/4/73	
		24	Findings	4/4/73	
		37	Final order dismissing claims in Dkts. 18-L & 341-C, severing Dkt. 89, & interlocutory order in Dkts. 13-E, 27-E, 29-D, 133-A, 139, 202 & 302	4/4/73	
		39	Order denying motion of Stockbridge-Munsee to intervene in Dkts. 27, 27-E & 202	4/4/73	Appeal time running against final awards, shown below, in the other dchts. in this group.
	31	11	Order denying extension of time to move for rehearing in Dkt. 341-C	4/4/73	
	31	13	Order denying motion of Stockbridge-Munsee for rehearing	4/4/73	
	31	359	Opinion on Seneca-Cayuga motions to rehear	4/4/73	
		372	Order admitting exhibits & denying motions for rehearing	4/4/73	
Note: Regarding pleas in intervention allowed in Dkt. 29-D, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-D	207 C.C.	958	Affirmed	9/19/73	
	207 C.C.	959	Rehearing denied	5/30/75	
	425 U.S.	903	Certiorari denied	10/10/75	
	42	264	Opinion - Value & consideration in Dkts. 13-E, 27-E, 29-D, 133-A, 139, 202, & 302	3/29/76	
		281	Additional findings	8/10/78	
		298	Interlocutory order	8/10/78	
	42	346	Final award in Dkt. 13-E	8/17/78	
	42	348	Final award in Dkts. 27-E & 202	8/17/78	
	42	350	Final award in Dkt. 29-D	8/17/78	
	42	352	Final award in Dkts. 133-A & 302	8/17/78	
	42	353	Final award in Dkt. 139	8/17/78	
					\$563,624.21 for land
					\$561,424.21 for land
					\$566,024.21 for land
					\$563,624.21 for land
					\$561,424.21 for land

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Chippewa, Saginaw [Strong], Dkt. 13-F; Potawatomi, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-I; Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-K; Delaware, Dkt. 27; Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-G; Shawnee, Dkt. 64-A; Six Nations, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 89; Ottawa, Dkt. 133-C; Wyandot, Dkt. 141; Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 308; and Seneca-Cayuga, Dkt. 341-D	30	337 356 370	Opinion - Title Findings Final order dismissing claims in Dkts. 18-K & 341-D, & severing Dkt. 89, & interlocutory order in Dkts. 13-F, 15-I, 27, 29-G, 64-A, 133-C, 141 & 308	5/23/73 5/23/73	Dkts. 18-K & 341-C dismissed.
	31	359 372	Opinion on Seneca-Cayuga motions for rehearing Order admitting exhibits & denying motions for rehearing	5/23/73 9/19/73 9/19/73	
Chippewa, Saginaw [Strong], Dkt. 13-G	unnumbered		Order dismissing cause of action designated as "Second Claim" in plaintiffs' petition	3/9/50	<i>see below</i>
Chippewa, Saginaw [Strong], Dkt. 13-G; Potawatomi, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-E; Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-M; Delaware, Dkt. 27-B; Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-C; Ottawa, Dkt. 40-F; Shawnee, Dkt. 64; Six Nations, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 89; Wyandot, Dkt. 120; Miami of Indiana Dkt. 130; Miami of Oklahoma, Dkt. 252; Shawnee, Eastern, Dkt. 335; Delaware, Absentee, Dkt. 338; Shawnee, Eastern, Dkt. 338; Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 338; Peoria, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 338; Kickapoo of Oklahoma and Kansas, Dkt. 338; and Ottawa of Oklahoma <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 338	31 207 C.C. 423 U.S.	89 140 141 220 222 254 1015	Opinion - Title Concurring opinion Findings Final order dismissing claims in Dkts. 13-G, 18-M, & 40-F, & dismissing Dkt. 89, & interlocutory order in Dkts. 15-E, 27-B, 29-C, 64, 120, 130, 252, 335, & 338 Order admitting exhibits Commission's title determinations affirmed, but Commission directed on remand to determine the percentage of Miami recoveries which should be given to the Wea Three petitions for certiorari denied	8/9/73 8/9/73 8/9/73 8/9/73 8/9/73 6/25/75 12/8/75	Dkts. 13-G, 18-M, 40-F & 89 dismissed.
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-H	unnumbered		Per curiam opinion on motion to file amended petition	7/7/52	Dismissed
	2	380 390	Order denying motion, but allowing addition of name of James Strong as a party plaintiff Findings Opinion	7/7/52 5/14/53 5/14/53	
	3	1 4	Order dismissing two claims & reopening one for further hearing Supplemental findings Opinion Final order dismissing all claims	5/14/53 4/22/54 4/22/54 4/22/54	
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-I	unnumbered		Per curiam opinion on motion to amend petition	7/7/52	Dismissed
	2	404 416	Order denying motion but allowing addition of name of James Strong as party plaintiff Findings Opinion Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing petition	7/7/52 5/14/53 5/14/53 5/14/53	
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-J	4	409 460	Findings Opinion Order dismissing petition	9/19/56 9/19/56 9/19/56	Dismissed

Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-K, *see* Potawatomi, Citizen Band, Dkt. 216

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-L, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, Dkt. 217					
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-M	6	414 442	Findings Opinion Order dismissing petition	6/30/58 6/30/58 6/30/58	Dismissed
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-N	20	411	Order dismissing petition	4/9/69	Dismissed
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 57; and Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-G	22	504 513 525 526	Opinion - Title Findings Order dismissing petition in Dkt. 18-G & interlocutory order in Dkt. 57 Order admitting Commission exhibits in evidence	4/1/70 4/1/70 4/1/70 4/1/70	Dkt. 18-G dismissed.
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 57	30	295 308 336 31 67	Opinion - Value & consideration Additional findings Second interlocutory order Final award	5/16/73 5/16/73 5/16/73 8/1/73	\$8,117,608.00 for land
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 59; Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-J; Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , (Potawatomi of the Huron, <i>et al.</i> , Citizen and Prairie Bands, and Potawatomi of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., intervenors), Dkt. 29-E; Ottawa, Dkt. 133-B; and Wyandot, Dkt. 140	30 31 207 C.C.	388 404 405 417 408 960	Opinion - Title Concurring opinion Findings Final order dismissing the claims in Dkts. 18-J & 140, & interlocutory order in Dkts. 59, 29-E, & 133-B Order denying motion for rehearing Affirmed, except as to allowance of plea in intervention in Dkt. 29-E of the Potawatomi of the Huron, <i>et al.</i> , dismissal of said plea directed	6/13/73 6/13/73 6/13/73 6/13/73 9/19/73	Dismissed: Dkts. 18-J & 140, & plea in intervention in Dkt. 29-E of the Potawatomi of the Huron, <i>et al.</i>
Note: Regarding pleas in intervention allowed in Dkt. 29-E, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-E	C.C. 41	327 351 380 160	Rehearing denied Opinion - Value & consideration Additional findings Interlocutory order	5/30/75 10/10/75 5/11/78 5/11/78	Appeal time running against final awards shown below in Dkts. 29-E, 59, & 133-B.
Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113; Chippewa, Pembina Band, Dkt. 246; Chippewa, Little Shell Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 191; and Chippewa, Little Shell Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 221	19 23 25 26 26 29	271 315 326 338 179 190 212 326 336 354 360 363 141	Opinion in dkts. on left & Dkts. 74 & 350-B & C on motion to receive Fort Berthold exhibit Order in same dkts. admitting additional evidence Opinion in dkts. on left & Fort Berthold Dkts. 350-B & C on land title issues Findings in same dkts. Order in same dkts. Opinion in dkts. on left & Fort Berthold Dkts. 350-B & C, Sioux Dkt. 74, & Chippewa Cree Dkt. 221-A on overlapping claims Findings in same dkts. Final order dismissing claim in Dkt. 350-B & interlocutory order in Dkt. 350-C Order granting rehearing in same dkts. in which opinion & findings of 3/30/71 were entered Opinion in same dkts. receiving opinion & findings of 3/30/71 Amendments to prior findings on title & additional findings Order amending findings & interlocutory order of 6/30/71 Order amending findings & order of 3/30/71 Order in dkts. on left & Fort Berthold Dkts. 350-B & 350-C denying request for modification of record on appeal	7/3/68 7/3/68 7/3/68 6/30/70 6/30/70 6/30/70 3/30/71 3/30/71 3/30/71 10/13/71 11/11/71 11/11/71 11/11/71 11/11/71 11/9/72	Pending

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Tri</i>
Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113; Chippewa, Pembina Band, Dkt. 246; Chippewa, Little Shell Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 191; and Chippewa, Little Shell Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 221 (cont.)	203 C.C. 36	426 69	Modified & affirmed Order in dchts. on left denying defendant's motion to determine issues in respect to date of extinguishment of aboriginal title	1/23/74 3/19/75		Ch Mc Ch
Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Red Lake, Pembina, and White Earth Bands, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-A						Ch Dk
Chiricahua Apache, <i>see</i> Apache, Fort Sill						Co
Chitina, Alaska, Natives of, Dkt. 187	27	133	Order granting defendant's motion to dismiss claim	3/15/72	Dismissed	Cit Cl
Choctaw, Dkt. 16; and Chickasaw, Dkt. 23	1	291 304	Statement & findings Opinion Conclusions of law & judgment in Dkt. 16 Conclusions of law & judgment in Dkt. 23 Per curiam opinion on motion to amend & correct findings Motion denied Affirmed	7/14/50 7/14/50 7/14/50 7/14/50 10/10/50 10/10/50 12/4/51	\$2,587,835.47 for land in Dkt. 16, and \$902,008.11 for land in Dkt. 23	Cl Co
Choctaw and Chickasaw, Dkt. 39	1	178	Opinion Order dismissing petition	10/28/49	Dismissed	Co Tr
Choctaw, Dkt. 50	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	4/10/51	Dismissed	Co Tr
Choctaw, Dkt. 51	1	182	Opinion Order dismissing petition	3/2/50 3/2/50	Dismissed	Co
	120 C.C. 343 U.S.	734 955	Affirmed Certiorari denied	10/2/51 5/26/52		Co
Choctaw Indians East of the Mississippi, Dkt. 52	3	288 293	Findings Opinion Interlocutory order Order denying application for leave to intervene by the Choctaw Nation	8/16/54 8/16/54 8/16/54	Dismissed	Tr
	unnumbered		Order denying defendant's motions for rehearing	1/24/55		
	unnumbered		Conclusions of law & final award Reversed Commission's final award & denial of intervention to Choctaw Nation, & remanded with direction to permit intervention of the Choctaw Nation & to enter judgment dismissing the petition	1/24/55 2/3/55		
	133 C.C. 352 U.S.	643 841	Certiorari denied Order in compliance with direction of the Court of Claims allowing intervention of the Choctaw Nation, & dismissing plaintiffs' petition	1/31/56 10/8/56		
	unnumbered			2/7/57		
Choctaw, Dkt. 55	1	553 562	Findings Opinion Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing petition	6/11/51 6/11/51	Dismissed	Co Co Di
	128 C.C.	195	Affirmed	6/11/51 5/4/54		
Choctaw, Dkt. 56	1	341	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment of dismissal Order dismissing petition	7/14/50 7/14/50	Dismissed	Co Co
Choctaw, Dkt. 103	2	581 597	Findings Opinion Final order dismissing petition	3/8/54 3/8/54 3/8/54	Dismissed	Co Co
	133 C.C. 352 U.C.	207 825	Affirmed Certiorari denied	11/8/55 10/8/56		D

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Choctaw Indians, McGahey Band, Dkt. 201		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	2/12/57	Dismissed
Choctaw, Dkt. 249	32	286 301	Opinion Order granting motions for summary judgment dismissing 1st & 4th claims	12/6/73 12/6/73	\$250,000.00 for accounting
	38	441 455	Findings - Compromise settlement Final award	7/15/76 7/15/76	
Choctaw, Ridaught Band, Dkt. 346	19	367	Order dismissing case	8/22/68	Dismissed
Cochiti, <i>see</i> Pueblo de Cochiti					
Citizen Band, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band					
Clallam, <i>see</i> S'Klallam Tribe, Dkt. 134					
Clatsop, <i>see</i> Chinook, Dkt. 234; and Tillamook, Dkt. 240					
Coeur D'Alene, Dkt. 81	4	1 13	Findings — Title Opinion Interlocutory order	8/26/55 8/26/55 8/26/55	\$4,342,778.03 for land
	6	1 38	Additional findings — Value & consideration Opinion Second interlocutory order	12/3/57 12/3/57 12/3/57	
		unnumbered	Final judgment entered on joint motion of parties	5/6/58	
Colorado River Indian Tribes, Dkts. 185 & 283-A		unnumbered	Order dismissing petitions in both dcts.	4/23/65	The two cases dismissed
Colorado River Indians, <i>see</i> California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37 (6 Ind. Cl. Comm. 86, 666); and Mojave, Dkts. 283 & 295					
Colorado River Indian Tribes, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 283-B	36	217	Opinion on plaintiff's motion to compel a proper accounting and for determination of points of law	7/10/75	Transferred to Court of Claims
		230	Concurring opinion	7/10/75	
		231	Interlocutory order	7/10/75	
	36	233 425 428	Order denying defendant's motion to dismiss Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for rehearing Order vacating order denying defendant's motion to dismiss, & denying said motion without prejudice	7/10/75 8/28/75 8/28/75	
	37	40	Order denying defendant's motion for rehearing	8/28/75	
	39	42	Opinion on plaintiffs' motions for determination of issues of law, for partial summary judgment, & for supplemental accounting, & defendant's motion to determine scope of supplemental accounting	10/30/75	
	42	71 202	Interlocutory order Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	9/23/76 9/23/76 7/13/78	
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkts. 177, 181-A & 181-B	18	531 545	Findings — Compromise settlement Per curiam opinion Final judgment in Dkts. 181-A & 181-B & order dismissing petition in Dkt. 177	9/7/67 9/7/67 9/7/67	\$3,500,000.00 for land in Dkts. 181-A & B; Dkt. 177 dismissed
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 178	23	493 496	Opinion — Compromise settlement Findings on compromise settlement Final judgment on claims for accounting through 6/30/51, and order severing claims for accounting from and after 7/1/51, and designating same as Dkt. 178-A	9/17/70 9/17/70 9/17/70	\$5,540,598.00 for accounting through 6/30/51
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 178-A	39	122 126	Opinion on defendant's motion to dismiss Order to show cause why claim should not be dismissed	10/22/76 10/22/76	Transferred to Court of Claims

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 178-A (cont.)	39	487	Opinion	2/24/77	
	39	490	Order denying defendant's motion to dismiss	2/24/77	
	39	491	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	2/24/77	
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes as the representatives of the Joseph Band of the Nez Perce Tribe, Dkt. 179	2	179	Per curiam opinion on defendant's motion to dismiss	5/27/52	\$1,119,071.78
	unnumbered		Order denying motion to dismiss	5/27/52	for accounting through 6/30/51
	23	39	Order granting motion by Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho to intervene as a party plaintiff	2/26/69	
	23	43	Per curiam opinion — Compromise	4/29/70	
	23	68	Findings on compromise settlement	4/29/70	
			Final judgment on claim for accounting through 6/30/51, and order severing claim of Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho for an accounting from and after 7/1/51, and assigning said claim Dkt. 179-A	4/29/70	
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 181	4	151	Findings — Title	2/29/56	\$1,000,000.00
		187	Opinion	2/29/56	for land
			Interlocutory order	2/29/56	
	7	187	Additional findings — Value	3/5/59	
		203	Opinion	3/5/59	
			Second interlocutory order	3/5/59	
	8	420	Findings — Compromise settlement of offsets	3/1/60	
		429	Opinion	3/1/60	
			Final judgment	3/1/60	
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkts. 181-C & 181-D	36	183	Opinion in Dkt. 181-C on defendant's motion for summary judgment or determination of points of law	6/13/75	Dkt. 181-C, <i>see below</i>
		201	Order granting partial summary judgment, & conclusions of law	6/13/75	
	39	159	Opinion in Dkt. 181-C on plaintiffs' motion for leave to file amended petition	11/18/76	
		166	Order in Dkts. 181-C & D granting leave to file amended petition setting forth claims arising from construction & operation of Grand Coulee Dam, severing such claims from Dkt. 181-C, establishing Dkt. 181-D with the amended petition filed therein	11/18/76	
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 181-C	42	200	Order separating claims arising from removal of minerals from plaintiffs' aboriginal lands and designating these claims as Dkt. 181-C (Mineral Claims) & certifying & transferring them to the Court of Claims	7/13/78	Mineral claims transferred to Court of Claims. Claims arising from depletion of fisheries pending.
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, <i>et al.</i> , on behalf of the Joseph Band of the Nez Perce Tribe, Dkt. 186	25	99	Opinion — Liability	3/26/71	\$725,000.00
		115	Concurring opinion	3/26/71	for land
		118	Opinion dissenting in part	3/26/71	(Wallowa Reservation)
		125	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part	3/26/71	
		128	Findings	3/26/71	
		144	Interlocutory order	3/26/71	
	35	74	Findings — Compromise settlement	10/31/74	
			Final award	10/31/74	
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes as representatives of the Palouse Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 222, <i>see</i> Yakima, Dkt. 161					
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes as representatives of the Moses Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 224, <i>see</i> Yakima, Dkt. 161					
Comanche, <i>see</i> Kiowa, Comanche and Apache					
Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana, <i>see</i> Flathead					
Coos Bay, Dkt. 265	unnumbered		Order sustaining motion for summary judgment & dismissing peititon	7/11/52	Dismissed

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Cowlitz, Dkt. 218	21	143	Opinion — Title	6/25/69	\$1,550,000.00
		152	Findings	6/25/69	for land
	25	442	Interlocutory order	6/25/69	
		453	Opinion on rehearing	6/23/71	
		462	Amendments to & additional findings	6/23/71	
		464	Order amending findings & interlocutory order	6/23/71	
	199 C.C.	523	Order admitting exhibit	6/23/71	
	30	129	Affirmed	10/13/72	
		143	Findings — Compromise settlement	4/12/73	
			Final award	4/12/73	
<i>Cree, see Chippewa Cree</i>					
Creek, Loyal, Dkt. 1	1	122	Opinion	5/6/49	
	1	195	Order overruling motion to dismiss	5/6/49	\$600,000.00 for tribal property
		207	Findings	7/14/50	
		221	Opinion	7/14/50	
			Dissenting opinion	7/14/50	
	118 C.C.	373	Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing petition	7/14/50	
	342 U.S.	813	Reversed & remanded	2/6/51	
	unnumbered		Certiorari denied	10/8/51	
			Final determination & judgment	10/19/51	
Creek Nation, Plaintiff; Creek Nation, East of the Mississippi, Intervenors, Dkt. 21.	1	546	Per curiam opinion	6/4/51	\$3,913,000.00 for land
	122 C.C.	380	Order denying motion of Creek Nation, East, to intervene	6/4/51	
	344 U.S.	856	Reversed	5/6/52	
	2	66	Certiorari denied	10/20/52	
		98	Findings — Liability	4/22/52	
	unnumbered		Opinion	4/22/52	
	3	455	Interlocutory order	4/22/52	
		463	Order allowing intervention	12/21/53	
	unnumbered		Additional findings	5/5/55	
	4	140	Opinion	5/5/55	
		142	Interlocutory order	5/5/55	
	6	691	Order granting rehearing	12/29/55	
		718	Additional findings	12/29/55	
	unnumbered		Opinion	12/29/55	
	4	140	Interlocutory order	12/29/55	
		142	Supplemental findings — Value	11/19/58	
	6	691	Opinion	11/19/58	
		718	Interlocutory order	11/19/58	
	unnumbered		Order on offsets as per stipulation & final award	9/28/59	
	unnumbered	53	Order granting rehearing as to value	1/15/60	
	11	91	Findings — Value rehearing	9/10/62	
	unnumbered		Opinion	9/10/62	
	165 C.C.	479	Interlocutory order	9/10/62	
	379 U.S.	846	Final award	9/10/62	
	379 U.S.	918	Order denying motion of plaintiff & intervenor for rehearing	12/14/62	
			Affirmed	4/17/64	
			Certiorari denied	10/12/64	
			Rehearing denied	11/16/64	
Creek Freedmen Association, Dkt. 25	1	156	Opinion	8/4/49	Dismissed
			Order dismissing petition	8/4/49	
Creek, Dkt. 166	19	1	Order dismissing petition	2/13/68	Dismissed
Creek, Dkt. 167	12	54	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment	2/28/63	\$50,000.00 for land
	168 C.C.	483	Order dismissing petition	2/28/63	
	18	434	Reversed & remanded	12/11/64	
		451	Findings — Liability	7/6/67	
			Opinion	7/6/67	
	19	127	Interlocutory order	7/6/67	
			Opinion on defendant's motion for entry of judgment	4/24/68	
			Order denying motion	4/24/68	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Creek, Dkt. 167 (cont.)	21	278	Opinion — Dates of taking & value	6/30/69	
		291	Additional findings	6/30/69	
		294	Interlocutory order	6/30/69	
	192 C.C.	425	Affirmed in part; reversed in part & remanded	6/12/70	
	25	340	Additional findings—Compromise settlement	5/26/71	
		351	Final award	5/26/71	
Creek, Dkt. 168	12	123	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment	3/18/63	Dismissed
			Order granting motion for summary judgment & dismissing petition	3/18/63	
	168 C.C.	512	Affirmed	12/11/64	
Creek, Dkt. 169	6	230	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment	4/28/58	\$1,115,706.20 for land.
		234	Dissenting opinion	4/28/58	Petition for
	24	238	Order denying motion for summary judgment	4/28/58	certiorari pending before
		253	Opinion — Liability	12/14/70	Supreme Court.
		269	Findings	12/14/70	
	39	383	Interlocutory order	12/14/70	
		409	Opinion — Value	2/17/77	
		434	Additional findings	2/17/77	
	40	90	Interlocutory order	2/17/77	
	216 C.C.	—	Final award	4/6/77	
			Affirmed	4/4/78	
Creek, Dkt. 272	26	410	Opinion — Title	12/8/71	
		458	Findings	12/8/71	
		489	Interlocutory order	12/8/71	
	201 C.C.	386	Affirmed	4/13/73	
	40	175	Opinion — Value	6/15/77	
		190	Dissenting opinion	6/15/77	
		196	Additional findings	6/15/77	
		223	Interlocutory order and award subject to offsets	6/15/77	
	41	20	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for rehearing	9/28/77	
		24	Concurring opinion	9/28/77	
		25	Order denying rehearing	9/28/77	
Creek, Dkt. 273	17	700	Per curiam opinion on defendant's motions for summary judgment	2/28/67	\$400,000.00 for land
			Order denying motions for summary judgment	2/28/67	
	23	484	Opinion on motions to determine issues	9/9/70	
		489	Order on motions	9/9/70	
	24	97	Order denying defendant's motion for rehearing	11/25/70	
	196 C.C.	639	Reversed	12/10/71	
	406 U.S.	929	Certiorari denied	5/15/72	
	29	519	Findings — Compromise	3/14/73	
		529	Final award	3/14/73	
Creek, Dkt. 274	20	44	Findings	11/5/68	Dismissed
		48	Opinion	11/5/68	
			Final order dismissing claim	11/5/68	
Creek Nation of Oklahoma, Dkt. 275	23	1	Opinion — Title	4/15/70	\$1,346,000.00 for land
		16	Findings	4/15/70	
		37	Interlocutory order	4/15/70	
	24	473	Opinion on defendant's motion for rehearing	3/3/71	
		481	Order denying rehearing	3/3/71	
	28	353	Findings — Compromise settlement	8/23/72	
		365	Final award	8/23/72	
Creek Nation, Dkt. 276	16	431	Findings — Consideration & value	12/15/65	\$1,037,414.62
		461	Opinion	12/15/65	
			Interlocutory order	12/15/65	
			Order amending findings 30 & 32	12/21/65	
			Final award (offsets postponed to other cases)	8/17/66	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Creek Nation, Dkt. 277	17	700	Per curiam opinion on defendant's motions in Dkts. 277 & 273 for summary judgment	2/28/67	Transferred to Court of Claims
	31	499	Order denying motions for summary judgment	2/28/67	
	40	231	Order in Dkt. 247 (Re: valuation dates & measure of damages that also applies in Dkt. 277)	3/17/76	
	40	234	Opinion on plaintiff's offer of proof	6/22/77	
	42	202	Order rejecting offer of proof	6/22/77	
			Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	7/13/78	
Creek Nation East of the Mississippi, Dkt. 280	22	10	Opinion on plaintiff's motion to amend petition & defendant's alternative motions to dismiss in part or consolidate in part		Dismissed
		17	Order denying plaintiffs' motion to amend & granting defendant's alternative motion to dismiss in part [to extent of overlap of award area in Seminole Dkts. 73 & 151]	11/13/69	
	194 C.C.	86	Affirmed in part, reversed in part & remanded Seminole cases (Dkts. 73 & 151) remanded with directive to consolidate them with Dkt. 280 to resolve overlapping claims	11/13/69	
	197 C.C.	350	Order consolidating cases (Seminole Dkts. 73 & 151 w/Dkt. 280) & setting them for trial on issues of aboriginal title to overlap area	2/19/71	
	unnumbered		Opinion (in Dkts. 73 & 151, & 280) on Creek motion to amend petition & Seminole motion to dismiss & for summary judgment	2/18/72	
	31	1	Order denying motion to amend petition & holding in abeyance ruling on motion for summary judgment	3/15/72	
		9	Appeal by Creek Nation East dismissed	7/5/73	
	203 C.C.	754	Order dismissing claims under Dkt. 280 & severing Dkt. 280 from consolidation w/Dkts. 73 & 151	2/11/74	
	35	7	Order denying motion of Creek Nation East for reconsideration	9/13/74	
	207 C.C.	1009	Commission's order affirmed & appeal by Creek's East dismissed	11/13/74	
	207 C.C.	1009	Rehearing denied	6/27/75	
				10/3/75	
Creek Nation East of the Mississippi, Dkt. 281	19	438	Order dismissing petition	9/10/68	Dismissed
Creek, Dkt. 292	7	117	Findings	2/18/59	Dismissed
		127	Opinion	2/18/59	
	152 C.C.	747	Final order dismissing all claims	2/18/59	
	370 U.S.	157	Affirmed	3/1/61	
	371 U.S.	854	Affirmed	6/4/62	
			Rehearing denied	10/8/62	
Crow, Dkt. 54	3	147	Findings & explanatory statement	6/11/54	\$10,242,984.70
		155	Opinion	6/11/54	for land
		179	Concurring opinion	6/11/54	
			Order overruling second, third, & fourth defenses & striking same from defendant's answer		
	6	98	Additional findings	6/11/54	
		112	Opinion	2/12/58	
	unnumbered		Interlocutory order	2/12/58	
	151 C.C.	281	Final judgment	2/12/58	
	366 U.S.	924	Affirmed in part & reversed in part	12/8/58	
	unnumbered		Certiorari denied	11/2/60	
			Amended final judgment	5/15/61	
				5/29/61	
Delaware, Dkt. 27, <i>see Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-F</i>					
Delaware, Dkt. 27-A, and Delaware, Absentee, Dkt. 241	2	253	Findings — Right to sue	10/23/52	\$435,873.86
		262	Opinion	10/23/52	for land
			Interlocutory order	10/23/52	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Delaware, Dkt. 27-A, and Delaware, Absentee, Dkt. 241 (cont.)	2	536	Findings	1/21/54	
		549	Opinion	1/21/54	
			Order dismissing petitions in Dkts. 27-A & 241	1/21/54	
	130 C.C.	782	Affirmed in part & reversed in part	2/8/55	
	3	622	Additional findings — Size of area	8/23/55	
		634	Opinion	8/23/55	
			Order	8/23/55	
	8	150	Supplemental findings — Value	12/4/59	
		178	Opinion	12/4/59	
			Interlocutory order	12/4/59	
	21	18	Opinion — Offsets	6/4/59	
		30	Additional findings	6/4/59	
		38	Final order & award	6/4/59	
	192 C.C.	385	Affirmed in part; reversed in part & remanded	6/12/70	
	26	387	Opinion on remand	11/24/71	
		397	Additional findings	11/24/71	
		408	Final award	11/24/71	
Delaware, Dkt. 27-B, and Delaware, Absentee, Dkt. 338, <i>see prior</i> decisions under Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G	41	146	Order denying as moot plaintiffs' motion re settlement	12/15/77	\$1,199,763.20 for land
	41	147	Findings — Compromise settlement	12/16/77	
		158	Final award	12/16/77	
Delaware, Dkt. 27-C	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	12/26/68	Dismissed
Delaware, Dkt. 27-D	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	8/31/54	Dismissed
Delaware, Dkt. 27-E, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-E					
Delaware, Absentee, Dkt. 72, & Delaware, Dkt. 298	21	344	Opinion	9/10/69	\$9,194,364.99
		350	Findings	9/10/69	for land &
		369	Final award	9/10/69	breach of land sale agreement
Delaware, Absentee, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 202, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-E					
Delaware, Absentee, Dkt. 241, <i>see</i> Delaware, Dkt. 27-A					
Delaware, Absentee, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 289, <i>see</i> Peoria, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 289					
Delaware, Dkt. 298, <i>see</i> Delaware, Absentee, Dkt. 72					
Delaware, Absentee, Dkt. 337, <i>see prior</i> decisions affecting Dkt. 337 under Miami of Oklahoma, Dkt. 67	5	489	Findings	9/20/57	\$1,627,244.64
	9	346	Interlocutory order & conclusions of law	9/20/57	for land
		353	Findings — Consideration	6/22/61	
			Opinion	6/22/61	
	12	404	Interlocutory order	6/22/61	
		417	Additional findings	8/5/63	
			Opinion	8/5/63	
			Final judgment	8/5/63	
	164 C.C. C.C.	749	Order denying severance of part of judgment	1/31/64	
			Order (unpublished) allowing withdrawal of appeal	6/12/64	
Delaware, Absentee, Dkt. 338, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G; & Delaware, Dkt. 27-B					
Duwamish, Dkt. 109	5	117	Findings — Title	3/25/57	
		132	Opinion	3/25/57	\$62,000.00
Re allocation of considera- tion under Point Elliott Treaty, Dkt. 109 & 10 other dks., <i>see</i> 13 Ind. Cl. Comm. 583, 591 (1964)	7	725	Interlocutory order	3/25/57	for land
		739	Findings — Value	7/6/59	
			Opinion	7/6/59	
	10	442	Second interlocutory order	7/6/59	
		447	Findings — Offsets settled	7/20/62	
			Opinion	7/20/62	
			Final judgment	7/20/62	
	unnumbered		Amended final judgment [no change in amount]	12/11/63	
				12/11/63	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Emigrant New York Indians, Oneida of Wisconsin, and Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Dkt. 75	5	553	Per curiam opinion on motions to dismiss & to add Oneida Tribe of Wisconsin & Stockbridge-Munsee Community as parties plaintiff Interlocutory order denying motion to dismiss & adding Oneida Tribe of Wisconsin & Stockbridge-Munsee Community as parties plaintiff	11/1/57	\$1,313,472.65 for land
	5	560	Findings - Title	11/1/57	
		607	Opinion	11/1/57	
	11	336	Interlocutory order	11/1/57	
		359	Supplemental findings - Value	10/8/62	
			Opinion	10/8/62	
	13	560	Interlocutory order	10/8/62	
		566	Findings - Offsets	8/11/64	
			Opinion concluding with summary of computations	8/11/64	
			Order correcting computations	8/11/64	
			Amended interlocutory order	8/11/64	
			Final award	8/11/64	
	177 C.C.	263	Affirmed	10/14/66	
Euchee, <i>see</i> Yuchi					
Flathead Reservation, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Dkt. 61	8	40	Findings - Title	8/3/59	\$4,431,622.18
		60	Opinion	8/3/59	for land
			Interlocutory order	8/3/59	
	16	1	Additional findings - Value	9/29/65	
		41	Opinion	9/29/65	
			Second interlocutory order	9/29/65	
	17	297	Findings on compromise settlement	8/1/66	
			Interlocutory order	8/1/66	
	176 C.C.	1387	Appeal dismissed	8/4/66	
			Final judgment	8/5/66	
Flathead Reservation, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Dkt. 156	unnumbered		Order dismissing 6th cause of action (on plaintiffs' motion)	9/11/64	Dismissed
	unnumbered		Order dismissing 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, & 7th causes of action (on defendant's motion having plaintiffs' consent)	8/13/69	
	24	470	Order dismissing 8th cause of action (at plaintiffs' request), & closing Dkt. 156	2/24/71	
Forest County Potawatomi Community, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>					
Fort Belknap Indian Community, Dkt. 250	11	479	Findings	11/20/62	Dismissed
		520	Opinion	11/20/62	
	C.C.		Final order dismissing petition	11/20/62	
			Order (unpublished) dismissing appeal (No. 5-63)	4/28/65	
Fort Belknap Indian Community, Dkt. 250-A, <i>see</i> Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes, Dkt. 279-C					
Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes, Dkt. 350	3	444	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment as to all claims	3/24/55	Dismissed (all claims except the first were severed out & refiled in Dkts. 350-A through H)
			Order dismissing 1st claim & overruling motion for summary judgment as to other claims	3/24/55	
			Order severing causes of action	1/14/58	
			Order dismissing petition	12/10/68	
Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes, Dkts. 350-A, E & H	16	521	Per curiam opinion in Dkt. 350-H on motion to dismiss	2/18/66	\$1,850,000.00 for settlement of:
			Order denying motion to dismiss	2/18/66	Land claim in Dkt. 350-A;
	20	1	Findings in Dkt. 350-A - Value	10/29/68	Agency buildings
		37	Opinion	10/29/68	claim in Dkt. 350-E; and
	21	92	Interlocutory award, Dkt. 350-A	10/29/68	Buffalo claim in 350-H
			Findings - Compromise settlement of all claims in Dkts. 350-A, E & H	6/18/69	
		109	Final judgment in Dkts. 350-A, E & H	6/18/69	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes, Dkts. 350-B, C, & D; <i>see also</i> Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113	15	577	Findings in Dkts. 350-B & C, 74, 332-A & 221-A	8/27/65	Dkt. 350-B dismissed. On settlement of land claims: \$6,500,000.00 in Dkt. 350-C; & \$3,200,000.00 in Dkt. 350-D.
		599	Opinion on Sioux (Dkt. 74) motion for determination of certain title matters	8/27/65	
			Order defining boundary of the area recognized by Fort Laramie Treaty of September 17, 1851, as belonging to the "Sioux or Dakotah Nation"	8/27/65	
	19	271	Opinion in Dkts. 350-B & C, <i>et al.</i> , on motion to receive Fort Berthold exhibit	7/3/68	
	23	236	Order admitting additional evidence	7/3/68	
	23	243	Opinion in Dkt. 350-D on motions for summary judgment of dismissal or for an order defining issues	6/17/70	
	23	315	Order denying motions	6/17/70	
		326	Opinion in Dkts. 350-B & C, <i>et al.</i> - Chippewa area & overlap	6/30/70	
		338	Findings	6/30/70	
	23	419	Order	6/30/70	
		428	Opinion in Dkts. 350-B & C, <i>et al.</i> - Sioux overlap	8/26/70	
		440	Findings	8/26/70	
	25	179	Interlocutory order	8/26/70	
	25	190	Opinion in Dkts. 350-B & C, <i>et al.</i> on title issues including aboriginal area of the Mandan, Hidatsa, & Arikara Tribes, predecessors of the Fort Berthold Tribes	3/30/71	
		212	Findings	3/30/71	
	26	326	Final order dismissing claim in Dkt. 350-B & interlocutory order in Dkt. 350-C	3/30/71	
	26	336	Order granting Fort Berthold motion for rehearing	10/13/71	
	26	254	Opinion in Dkts. 350-B & C, <i>et al.</i>	11/11/71	
	26	360	Amendments to prior findings & additional findings	11/11/71	
		363	Order amending findings & interlocutory order of 6/30/70	11/11/71	
	29	141	Order amending findings & order of 3/30/71	11/11/71	
	203 C.C.	426	Order in Dkts. 350-B & C, <i>et al.</i> , denying request for modification of record on appeal	11/9/72	
	35	269	Affirmed decisions of 6/30/70 & 3/30/71	1/23/74	
		279	Opinion in Dkt. 350-C - Date of taking	1/2/75	
		286	Additional findings	1/2/75	
	37	502	Order amending findings & admitting exhibits	1/2/75	
		518	Findings in Dkts. 350-C & D - Compromise settlement	3/17/76	
		519	Final award in Dkt. 350-C	3/17/76	
			Final award in Dkt. 350-D	3/17/76	
Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes, Dkt. 350-F	16	341	Findings - Title	11/4/65	\$9,101,912.37
		371	Opinion	11/4/65	for land
	17	614	Interlocutory order	11/4/65	
			Order denying defendant's motion to correct findings	2/21/67	
	182 C.C.	543	Affirmed in part & reversed in part	2/16/68	
	28	264	Opinion - Value & title remand	8/2/72	
		304	Supplemental findings	8/2/72	
		331	Order amending, vacating, or affirming findings & interlocutory order	8/2/72	
	28	352	Final award	8/23/72	
	204 C.C.	831	Affirmed	3/29/74	
	C.C.		Rehearing denied	5/31/74	
	419 U.S.	901	Certiorari denied	10/21/74	
Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes, Dkt. 350-G	36	116	Opinion on plaintiffs' motions for supplemental accounting & partial summary judgment & defendant's motions to strike & to dismiss certain accounting exceptions		Transferred to Court of Claims
		166	Interlocutory order	5/29/75	
	37	129	Opinion on response to orders to show cause why certain accounting exceptions should not be dismissed	5/29/75	
				12/18/75	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes, Dkt. 350-G (cont.)	39	136 435 445	Interlocutory order Opinion Order granting partial summary judgment & supplemental accounting in part	12/18/75 2/17/77 2/17/77	
	39	446 483	Opinion Order denying plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment	2/17/77 2/17/77	
	39	484	Order dismissing exception 18	2/17/77	
	39	486	Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	2/17/77	
Fort Peck Indians of Fort Peck Reservation, Montana, Dkt. 183	3 132 C.C.	78 133 373	Findings Opinion Final order dismissing petition Affirmed	6/8/54 6/8/54 6/8/54 6/7/55	Dismissed
Fort Peck Indians of Fort Peck Reservation, Montana, Dkt. 184	28 34 207 C.C. 39	171 202 24 66 67 77 1045 239	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for proper & more detailed accounting Order Opinion - Accounting exceptions Concurring opinion Opinion dissenting in part Order Reversed on an interest issue; appeal dismissed as premature on two aspects; remanded for further proceedings regarding productivity of tribal funds Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	6/14/72 6/14/72 5/3/74 5/3/74 5/3/74 5/3/74 10/30/75 12/15/76	Transferred to Court of Claims
Fort Sill Apache, <i>see</i> Apache, Fort Sill					
Gambell, Native Village of, Dkt. 284	27	140	Order granting motion to dismiss claim	3/22/72	Dismissed
Goshute, <i>see</i> Shoshone, Goshute, Dkts. 326-B & J					
Grande Ronde Community, Oregon, <i>see</i> Tillamook Band, Dkt. 240					
Gros Ventre (formerly known as the Hidatsa), <i>see</i> Blackfeet; Fort Belknap; and Fort Berthold					
Hannahville Indian Community, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville					
Havasupai, Dkt. 91	20 21	210 222 324 341	Opinion - Title (Navajo, Dkt. 299, overlap included) Findings Interlocutory order Additional findings - Compromise settlement Final judgment	12/30/68 12/30/68 12/30/68 8/6/69	\$1,240,000.00 for land
Hoh, <i>see</i> Quileute					
Hopi, Dkt. 196	23	277 290 312 unnumbered	Opinion - Title (Navajo, Dkt. 229, overlap included) Findings Interlocutory order Order granting rehearing as to dates of taking of aboriginal lands	6/29/70 6/29/70 6/29/70 4/28/71	\$5,000,000.00 for settlement of claims for compensation for land, rent, & for a general accounting
	31	16 37	Opinion Order denying Hopi motion to amend findings	7/9/73 7/9/73	
	33	72	Order denying Hopi motion that the Commission hear further argument on liability phase of counts 5 through 8, amend findings and orders relating thereto, and dispose of the liability phase of said counts	1/23/74	
	33	74	Opinion relating to claims for accounting in count 9 of plaintiff's petition	1/23/74	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Hopi, Dkt. 196 (cont.)		81	Order denying without prejudice defendant's motion to dismiss claim for an accounting beyond 8/13/46; granting defendant's motion for a more definite statement; & directing plaintiff to file a statement alleging with particularity those wrongful acts which occurred prior to 8/13/46 & continued thereafter	1/23/74 9/13/74	
	205 C.C.	828	Motion to dismiss appeal denied		
	36	1	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for leave to file out of time its more definite statement of continuing accounting wrongs	3/13/75	
		6	Order granting plaintiff's motion for leave to file out of time & for other purposes	3/13/75	
	207 C.C.	968	Order staying proceedings relating to count 9 of Dkt. 196, general accounting claim	6/20/75	
	208 C.C.	1027	Affirmed & remanded	1/30/76	
	208 C.C.	1028	Rehearing denied	3/26/76	
	429 U.S.	1030	Petition for certiorari dismissed	12/7/76	
	39	204	Findings & conclusions of law on compromise settlement	12/2/76	
		223	Final award	12/2/76	
Hopi Village of Shungopavi, Dkt. 210	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	5/31/57	Dismissed
Hualapai, Dkt. 70	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	4/28/61	Dismissed
Hualapai, Dkt. 90	11	447	Findings - Title	11/19/62	
		458	Opinion	11/19/62	<i>see below</i>
	17	456	Interlocutory order	11/19/62	
		500	Findings - Value	12/21/66	
	18	382	Opinion	12/21/66	
			Second interlocutory order	12/21/66	
			Opinion	5/11/67	
			Order denying motion for rehearing & modification of findings	5/11/67	
Hualapai, Dkts. 90 & 122	19	161	Additional findings - Compromise settlement	6/18/68	\$2,950,000.00
		177	Opinion	6/18/68	for land in Dkt. 90 & trespass
			Final judgment	6/18/68	damage claims in Dkt. 122
Iowa, Dkt. 79	2	167	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment	5/27/52	Land claims severed out & assigned Dkt. 179-A.
	unnumbered		Order denying motion	5/27/52	
	16	568	Order requiring defendant to render complete accounting	7/28/52	\$11,394.67 on accounting claims.
			Order setting out, <i>inter alia</i> , findings on stipulated facts; entering interlocutory judgment on claims for fair value of 4,798 acres excluded from the reservation created for the Iowa Nation pursuant to Treaty of September 17, 1836, & for the fair value of an additional 94,451.25 acres of trust lands sold by defendant, severing these land claims from Dkt. 79 & giving them Dkt. No. 79-A; & entering final judgment on the remaining claims in Dkt. 79	2/28/66	
Iowa, Dkt. 79-A	20	308	Opinion - Value & damages	2/17/69	\$1,377,207.27
		320	Findings	2/17/69	for land
		335	Interlocutory order	2/17/69	
	unnumbered		Order denying defendant's motion to reserve offsets	5/21/69	
	21	15	Final award	5/21/69	
Iowa, Sac and Fox, Dkt. 135	6	464	Findings - Title	7/2/58	\$633,193.77 for Iowa land.
		496	Opinion	7/2/58	\$965,560.39 for Sac and Fox
			Interlocutory order	7/2/58	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Iowa, Sac and Fox, Dkt. 135 (cont.)	12	487	Findings - Value	8/29/63	
		519	Opinion	8/29/63	
	15	248	Second interlocutory order	8/29/63	
		263	Additional findings - Offsets	5/7/65	
	179 C.C.	8	Opinion	5/7/65	
	389 U.S.	900	Affirmed in part & reversed in part	3/17/67	
	22	232	Certiorari denied	10/16/67	
		331	Opinion - Title remand	12/10/69	
	195 C.C.	365	Order on remand & amending findings &		
	404 U.S.	1017	opinion	12/10/69	
			Affirmed	7/14/71	
			Certiorari denied	1/10/72	
Iowa, Omaha, Sac and Fox, Dkt. 138; and Otoe and Missouri, Dkt. 11-A; and Sac and Fox, Dkt. 232; and Iowa, Dkt. 339	5	316	Findings - Title	7/31/57	For land in Dkt. 138:
		351	Opinion	7/31/57	\$1,372,267.50 to the Iowa;
	unnumbered	367	Interlocutory order	7/31/57	\$1,750,000.00 to the Omaha;
	13	25	Order modifying determinations & interlocutory order of 7/31/57 & denying motions for rehearing, etc., except to extent of amendments made by this order	11/29/57	\$1,096,533.42 to the Sac and Fox. For land in Dkt. 11-A:
	unnumbered		Per curiam opinion on determination of the article 2 line, 1825 Prairie De Chien Treaty, often referred to as the "Sioux-Sac & Fox line" or "Yankton line"	11/18/59	\$1,750,000.00 to the Otoe and Missouri. Sac and Fox petition in Dkt. 232 dismissed by order of 3/2/65.
	13	272	Order in Dkts. 138, 11-A & 332-A amending finding 2, Dkts. 11-A & 138 (re Yankton Sioux boundary)	11/25/59	
		289	Additional findings on compromise settlement of Otoe & Missouri claims in Dkt. 11-A, & Omaha claims in Dkt. 138	4/14/64	
			Opinion	4/14/64	
			Final judgment in Dkt. 11-A	4/14/64	
			Final judgment in Dkt. 138 for the Omaha plaintiffs	4/14/64	
	15	42	Additional findings in Dkts. 138, 11-A, & 232 on compromise settlement of Sac & Fox claims	4/14/64	
		62	Opinion	3/2/65	
			Final judgment on Sac & Fox claim in Dkt. 138 and order dismissing Sac & Fox petition in Dkt. 232	3/2/65	
	15	172	Findings in Dkts. 138 & 339 on compromise settlement of Iowa claims	3/22/65	Iowa petition in Dkt. 339
		191	Opinion	3/22/65	dismissed by order of 3/22/65
	175 C.C.	564	Final judgment on Iowa claims in Dkt. 138 & order dismissing Iowa petition in Dkt. 339	3/22/65	
			Affirmed order of 11/25/59 re Yankton Sioux boundary (the Yankton Sioux appealed from the order)	5/13/66	
Iowa, Sac and Fox, Dkt. 153	7	98	Findings - Title	2/9/59	For land:
		105	Opinion	2/9/59	\$2,783,700.00 to the Iowa;
	22	385	Interlocutory order	2/9/59	
		395	Opinion - Value	2/4/70	\$10,601,282.66
		415	Findings	2/4/70	to the Sac and Fox
			Final award	2/4/70	
Iowa, Sac and Fox, Dkts. 158, 209, & 231	5	367	Findings - Title (in Dkt. 158)	8/2/57	For land in Dkt. 158:
		438	Opinion	8/2/57	\$1,340,435.00 to the Iowa;
			Interlocutory order	8/2/57	
	10	404	Findings - Title (in Dkt. 209)	6/1/62	\$3,530,578.21 to the Sac and Fox. For land in Dkt. 209:
	20	439	Interlocutory order	6/1/62	
			Opinion - Value & consideration (in Dkts. 158, 209, & 231)	5/12/69	
		458	Findings	5/12/69	\$168,555.00 to the Iowa. For land in Dkt. 231:
		505	Final awards: to the Iowa & Sac & Fox in Dkts. 158 & 231, & the Iowa in Dkt. 209, & order dismissing the Sac & Fox claim in Dkt. 209	5/12/69	\$286,516.40 to

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Tribe</i>
Iowa, Sac and Fox, Dkts. 158, 209, & 231 (cont.)	22	439	Order in Dkts. 158, 209 & 231 denying plaintiffs' motion to rehear, & for other purposes	2/11/70	the Iowa; \$943,799.79 to the Sac and Fox. The Sac and Fox claim in Dkt. 209 was dismissed.	Ki
	196 C.C.	548	Remanded with order to supply more specific findings & reasonings as to valuation of the tracts involved in Dkts. 158, 209, & 231 (only the Sac & Fox appealed)	11/12/71 11/23/73		Ki
	32	256	Opinion			Ki
		270	Final awards on remand to the Sac & Fox in Dkts. 158 & 231 in the same amounts awarded on 5/12/69, & order dismissing the Sac & Fox claim in Dkt. 209	11/23/73		Ki
	206 C.C.	897	Affirmed	4/25/75		Ki
	206 C.C.	898	Rehearing denied	6/27/75		
	423 U.S.	1016	Certiorari denied	12/8/75		
Iowa, Dkt. 339, <i>see</i> Iowa, Omaha, Sac and Fox, Dkt. 138	15	172	Order dismissing petition	3/22/65	Dismissed	Ki Dk
Isleta, Pueblo de, <i>see</i> Pueblo de Isleta, Dkt. 211						Ki
Jemez, Pueblo de, <i>see</i> Pueblo de Zia, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 137						
Jicarilla Apache, <i>see</i> Apache, Jicarilla, Dkts. 22-A and 22-K						
Kalapuya, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 238	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	11/17/54	Dismissed	
Kalispel, <i>see</i> Pend d'Oreille						
Kansas, <i>see</i> Kaw						Ki
Karankewa, <i>see</i> Apache, Dkt. 22-C, and Caddo, Dkt. 226, in which the Karankewa of Texas petitioned for intervention						
Kaskaskia, <i>see</i> Peoria, Dkts. 65, 66, 313, & 338						
Kaw, Dkts. 33, 34, & 35	1	348	Per curiam opinion	9/26/50	For land in	Ki
			Order overruling defendant's demurrer to plaintiffs' evidence	9/26/50	Dkt. 33: \$1,600,220.02;	
	1	608	Findings - Value and consideration	9/17/51	For land in	
	617		Opinion	9/17/51	Dkt. 35: \$798,000.00;	
	2	134	Interlocutory order	9/17/51		
	144		Additional findings - Offsets	5/15/52	Dkt. 34 was	
			Per curiam opinion	5/15/52	dismissed.	
			Conclusions of law & final awards on causes of action in Dkts. 33 & 35, & order dismissing petition in Dkt. 34	5/15/52		
	125 C.C.	628	Remanded for Commission's determination of questions as to which group of Indians was entitled to represent the Kaw Tribe in the prosecution of the claims in Dkts. 33, 34, & 35 & which group of attorneys was entitled to prosecute such claims			Ki
	3	180	Findings on remanded questions	7/13/53		Ki
	196		Opinion ruling on remanded questions	6/24/54		Ki
	209		Separate opinion	6/24/54		Ki
	130 C.C.	693	Order denying motion of Arthur B. Honnold for leave to intervene in the appeals & file a motion to dismiss	6/24/54		
	130 C.C.	695	Order dismissing Kaw appeals	2/16/55		
			Order dismissing cross appeals by the United States	2/23/55		
				3/2/55		
Kaw, Dkt. 36	unnumbered		Order approving plaintiffs' dismissal of their cause in Dkt. 36, & dismissing said cause, effective 2/14/50	2/14/50	Dismissed by order dated 2/12/52 that related back & became effective as of 2/14/50	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Kaw, Dkt. 38		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	12/19/55	Dismissed
Kent Schaghticoke, <i>see</i> Schaghticoke, of Kent, Connecticut, Dkt. 112					
Kickapoo, Dkt. 145	16	675	Findings on accounting claim Conclusions of law & final judgment	4/21/66 4/21/66	On Government's accounting: \$11,511.53
Kickapoo, Dkt. 193	19	37 54	Findings - Compromise settlement Per curiam opinion Final judgment	2/29/68 2/29/68 2/29/68	\$540,000.00 for land
Kickapoo, Dkt. 194		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition in Dkt. 194 & directing that the claims pleaded therein be included by amendment in the petition in Dkt. 315	3/22/57	Dismissed
Kickapoo, Dkt. 315, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-D, <i>et al.</i> ; Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 67, <i>et al.</i> ; and Peoria (Piankeshaw), Dkt. 99, <i>et al.</i>					
Kickapoo, Dkt. 316	10	320 333	Findings Opinion Interlocutory order	5/4/62 5/4/62 5/4/62	\$771,441.26 for land
	15	628 650	Additional findings - Offsets Opinion	8/31/65 8/31/65	
	178 C.C. 18	527 550 553	Interlocutory order Affirmed in part, reversed in part & remanded Supplemental findings Opinion Final award	8/31/65 2/17/67 9/29/67 9/29/67 9/29/67	
Kickapoo, Dkt. 316-A	23	189 197 218 23	Opinion - Value Findings Interlocutory order Final award	6/10/70 6/10/70 6/10/70 9/24/70	\$125,209.61 for land
Kickapoo, Dkt. 317	5	180 198	Findings Opinion	6/4/57 6/4/57	
	10	271 279	Interlocutory order Findings in Dkts. 317 & 314-C (Peoria) re Kickapoo & Wea lands Opinion	6/4/57 3/2/62 3/2/62	
		unnumbered	Interlocutory order Order amending findings & interlocutory order of 3/2/62	3/2/62	
	174 C.C. 22	550 186 197 223 22	Affirmed Opinion - Value Supplemental findings Interlocutory order Final award	3/10/64 2/18/66 12/5/69 12/5/69 12/5/69 2/11/70	
Kickapoo, Dkt. 318	21	39 49	Findings - Compromise settlement Final judgment	6/11/69 6/11/69	\$273,250.00 for land
Kickapoo, Dkt. 338, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Dkt. 13-G, <i>et al.</i>					
Kikiallus, Dkt. 263	7	456 469	Findings - Title Opinion	4/13/59 4/13/59	
	13	583	Interlocutory order Findings on allocation of consideration under Point Elliott Treaty	4/13/59 8/13/64	
	25	591 83	Opinion Order	8/13/64 8/13/64	
	28	88 98 159	Opinion - Value Findings Interlocutory order Opinion - Gratuitous offsets	3/26/71 3/26/71 3/26/71 6/7/72	
		163 167	Additional findings Final award	6/7/72 6/7/72	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkt. 32			Findings - Right to recover Opinion Interlocutory order Additional findings - Value Opinion Second interlocutory order Additional findings - Offsets Opinion Final determination Opinion - Offsets reconsidered Amended final order Affirmed Motion for reconsideration denied 359 U.S. 934 Certiorari denied	4/9/51 4/9/51 4/9/51 12/13/55 12/13/55 12/13/55 3/12/57 3/12/57 3/12/57 7/18/57 7/18/57 7/16/58 10/8/58 3/9/59	\$2,067,166.00 for land
Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkt. 257	12	439 470	Findings - Jicarilla Apache (Dkt. 22-A) overlap Opinion Interlocutory order Order granting Wichita's motion to intervene Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment of recognized title & defendant's motion to dismiss claim for failure to prosecute Order admitting exhibits Order granting motion for summary judgment of recognized title Order denying motion to dismiss Reversed as to summary judgment of recognized title & order allowing Wichita intervention C.C. Rehearing denied 416 U.S. 936 Certiorari denied	8/26/63 8/26/63 8/26/63 2/10/71 8/9/71 8/9/71 8/9/71 8/9/71 6/20/73 9/28/73 4/15/74	see disposition below
Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkts. 257 & 259-A, <i>see</i> prior decisions in Dkt. 259-A, below	34	263 286 287	Findings on compromise settlement Order of consolidation & final award Order denying motion to consolidate Dkt. 257 with Dkts. 22-C & 226	7/17/74 7/17/74 7/17/74	\$35,060,000.00 for land in Dkts. 257 & 259-A
Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkts. 258 & 259	18	640 658	Findings on compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment	1/29/68 1/29/68 1/29/68	\$6,000,000.00 for settlement of accounting claims
Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkt. 259-A	22	482 503	Opinion on defendant's motion to dismiss or require plaintiffs to make petition more definite & certain Order denying motion to dismiss or in the alternative to make more definite & certain	4/1/70	Disposed of by final award cited above under Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkts. 257 & 259-A
	24	393	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment	4/1/70	
	29	401 476	Order denying motion for summary judgment Order on motions requiring, <i>inter alia</i> , that defendant supplement its accounting for certain rentals	2/10/71 2/10/71 2/28/73	
Klamath, Modoc and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, Dkt. 100, <i>see</i> reference to this case in opinions of 1/20/58 & 10/6/58 under California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37	2 unnumbered	684	Opinion on plaintiff's procedural motion Order overruling plaintiff's motion Order in Dkts. 100 & 87 (Paiute, Northern) dismissing a claim in Dkt. 87 on behalf of the Yahooskin Band & granting said band the right to maintain in Dkt. 100 its claim for the same land	4/9/54 4/9/54	\$2,500,000.00 for land
	13	41 73	Findings - Compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment	5/19/55 1/31/64 1/31/64 1/31/64	
Klamath, Modoc and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, Dkt. 100-A	20	522 528 543	Opinion - Value Findings Conclusions of law & first interlocutory order	5/14/69 5/14/69 5/14/69	\$4,162,992.80 for land
	21	343	Final judgment	9/2/69	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Klamath, Modoc and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, Dkts. 100-B-1 & 100-C	37	1	Order severing certain claims from Dkt. 100-B-1 & designating them as Dkt. 100-C	10/31/75	For settlement of accounting
	37	2	Findings on compromise settlement	10/31/75	\$18,000,000.00
		38	Final award in Dkt. 100-C	10/31/75	in Dkt. 100-B-1;
		39	Order approving stipulation in Dkt. 100-B-1	10/31/75	\$785,000.00 in
	39	262	Findings in Dkt. 100-B-1 on compromise settlement	1/21/77	Dkt. 100-C
		292	Final award in Dkt. 100-B-1	1/21/77	
Klamath, Modoc and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, Dkt. 100-B-2	34	209	Opinion	6/26/74	
		218	Order denying motion to strike testimony of certain defense witnesses	6/26/74	
Kootenai, <i>see</i> Flathead Reservation, Confederated Salish and Kootenai					
Kootenai of Idaho, Dkt. 154	5	456	Findings - Title	8/9/57	
		464	Opinion	8/9/57	\$425,000.00
			Interlocutory order	8/9/57	for land
	8	504	Findings - Compromise settlement	4/25/60	
		510	Opinion	4/25/60	
			Final judgment	4/25/60	
Laguna, <i>see</i> Pueblo of Laguna					
La Jolla, <i>see</i> California Indians, Dkts. 80, 80-A, B & C					
Lake, <i>see</i> Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes					
Lemhi, <i>see</i> Shoshone, Lemhi, Dkt. 326-I					
Little Shell, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Little Shell					
Lummi, Dkt. 110	2	1	Per curiam opinion	1/30/52	
	unnumbered		Order denying defense of res judicata	1/30/52	\$57,000.00
	5	525	Order consolidating cases	5/12/53	for land
		543	Findings - Title	10/30/57	
	10	286	Opinion	10/30/57	
		294	Interlocutory order	10/30/57	
			Additional findings - Value	3/2/62	
	13	583	Opinion	3/2/62	
		591	Second interlocutory order	3/2/62	
			Findings - Consideration	8/13/64	
	16	526	Opinion	8/13/64	
		530	Order	8/13/64	
			Findings - Defendant's motion for judgment	2/18/66	
			Opinion	2/18/66	
			Final order granting defendant's motion and dismissing petition	2/18/66	
	181 C.C.	753	Reversed & remanded	12/15/67	
	21	408	Opinion - Value remand	10/8/69	
		416	Order amending findings	10/8/69	
		418	Order vacating final order, & interlocutory award	10/8/69	
	24	21	Opinion - Gratuitous offsets	10/22/70	
		24	Additional findings	10/22/70	
		33	Final judgment	10/22/70	
	197 C.C.	780	Affirmed	3/17/72	
Makah, Dkt. 60	1	466	Per curiam opinion	1/4/51	Dismissed
			Order on defendant's motion that plaintiff be required to separately state & number its several causes of action	1/4/51	
	7	477	Findings	4/15/59	
		509	Opinion	4/15/59	
	151 C.C.	701	Final order dismissing claims	4/15/59	
	365 U.S.	879	Affirmed	12/1/60	
			Certiorari denied	4/17/61	
Makah, Dkt. 60-A	23	165	Opinion - Title	5/20/70	
		171	Findings	5/20/70	
		176	Order	5/20/70	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Makah, Dkt. 60-A (cont.)	195 C.C.	539	Affirmed	6/14/71	
	30	220	Opinion on motion for leave to amend petition	4/30/73	
	34	232	Order denying motion	4/30/73	
	34	14	Opinion on plaintiff's amended motion for leave to amend petition, motion to clarify or in the alternative for rehearing, & motion to open record for additional evidence	5/1/74	
		23	Order granting amended motion for leave to amend petition, motion to reopen record for additional evidence, & denying motion to clarify or for rehearing, & setting hearing	5/1/74	
	34	23a	Order denying plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment & defendant's motion to strike	5/1/74	
		23b	Order denying defendant's motion to dismiss	5/1/74	
		23c	Order denying plaintiff's motion to permit inspection of defendant's appraisal report	5/1/74	
	34	406	Opinion on defendant's motion for partial summary judgment	8/14/74	
		412	Order denying motion for partial summary judgment	8/14/74	
		413	Order granting defendant's motion for trial in two stages, & plaintiff's motion for continuance	8/14/74	
	39	88	Opinion	10/15/76	
		97	Additional findings	10/15/76	
		107	Interlocutory order & award on claim for breach of promise to supply fishing gear	10/15/76	
	40	131	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for rehearing	5/4/77	
		137	Order granting motion for rehearing	5/4/77	

Malheur Reservation, *see* Snake or Piute Indians of former Malheur Reservation, Oregon, Dkt. 17

Mandan, *see* Fort Berthold, Dkts. 350, 350-A through H

Maricopa, *see* Pima-Maricopa

Maricopa-Ak Chin Reservation Indians, Dkt. 235	19	80	Order dismissing second & third causes	3/7/68	Transferred to Court of Claims
	21	423	Order dismissing fourth & fifth causes	10/15/69	
	31	384	Opinion	9/19/73	
		396	Findings	9/19/73	
	37	407	Order dismissing first cause	9/19/73	
		193	Opinion	1/14/76	
		201	Order granting in part plaintiff's motion for supplemental accounting & for other purposes	1/14/76	
	42	202	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	7/13/78	

McGahey Band, *see* Choctaw Indians, McGahey Band, Dkt. 201

Menominee, Dkt. 129 unnumbered Order dismissing petition 4/24/52 Dismissed

Mescalero Apache, *see* Apache, Dkts. 22-B, C, & G

Methow, *see* Colville Reservation Confederated Tribes

Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124, *see* Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 67, *et al.*

Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-A, *see* Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 251

Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-B, *see* Potawatomi, Citizen Band, Dkt. 128, *et al.*

Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-C, *see* Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 255

Miami, Indiana, Dkts. 124-D, E & F, *see* Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 256

Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-G unnumbered Order dismissing complaint 4/24/58 Dismissed

Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-H 33 49 Order to show cause why petition should not be dismissed 1/9/74 Dismissed

 33 129 Order dismissing petition 2/14/74

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
<i>Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 130, see Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G, et al.</i>					
<i>Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 131, see Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 253, et al.</i>					
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 67, & Dkts. 124 (Miami, Indiana), 314 (Peoria, Wea), & 337 (Delaware) consolidated therewith; and intervenors: Dkts. 15-D (Potawatomi, Prairie), Dkt. 29-B, (Potawatomi, Hannahville), Dkt. 89 (Six Nations), Dkt. 311 (Potawatomi, Citizen), & 315 (Delaware)	2 4 5 146 C.C. 9 159 C.C.	617 635 346 398 494 500 517 421 1 3 19 108 593	Findings - Overlapping claims Opinion Interlocutory order Supplemental findings - Value Opinion Interlocutory order Findings - Offsets Opinion Final award Affirmed on title & offsets; remanded on value Amended & additional findings Opinion Dissenting opinion Conclusions of law & final award Additional dissenting opinion Order denying defendant's motion for rehearing (one Commissioner dissenting) Affirmed	3/26/54 3/26/54 3/26/54 9/17/56 9/17/56 9/17/56 9/17/56 9/30/57 9/30/57 9/30/57 9/30/57 7/13/59 6/30/60 6/30/60 6/30/60 6/30/60 6/30/60 4/3/61 4/3/61 11/16/62	\$4,647,467.67 for land to the Miami plaintiffs in Dkts. 67 & 124, as repre- sentatives of the Miami Tribe of 1818
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 76	9	580 586	Findings Opinion Order dismissing each count in the petition	11/21/61 11/21/61 11/21/61	Dismissed
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 251; & Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-A	6 150 C.C. 366 U.S. unnumbered	513 552 725 924	Findings Opinion Order dismissing petitions in Dkts. 251 & 124-A Affirmed in part, & reversed in part Certiorari denied Final judgment	7/14/58 7/14/58 7/14/58 7/15/60 5/15/61 5/31/61	For land & accrued interest: \$349,193.59 to Miami of Oklahoma, Dkt. 251; \$64,738.80 to Miami of Indiana, Dkt. 124-A
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 251-A	20	236 239	Opinion on compromise settlement Findings on compromise settlement Final judgment	1/9/69 1/9/69 1/9/69	\$10,000.00 for settlement of an accounting claim & some miscel- laneous damage claims
<i>Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 252, see Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G</i>					
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 253, consolidated with Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 131; Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314; Potawatomi, Prairie Band, Dkt. 15-H; Kickapoo, Dkt. 317; Potawatomi, Citizen Band, Dkt. 307; & Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al., Dkt. 29-F	5	180 198	Findings - Title Opinion Interlocutory order in Dkts. 253, 131, & 314; order dismissing the petitions in Dkts. 15-H & 29-F; & order removing from this consolidated group Dkts. 307 & 317	6/4/57 6/4/57 6/4/57	Dismissed: Potawatomi, Prairie Band, et al., Dkt. 15-H; & Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al., Dkt. 29-F. Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 253, et al., con- tinued below.
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 253, consolidated with: Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 131; Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314-D	22 22 23	92 136 179 unnumbered 469 480 490	Opinion - Value Additional findings on value Final award Order amending conclusions of law & opinion Amended final award Opinion on Miami motion for severance & reconsideration Order denying motion for severance & reconsideration Order denying motion by plaintiffs in Dkt. 131 for an extension of time for filing an appeal	11/26/69 11/26/69 11/26/69 1/8/70 1/8/70 3/18/70 3/18/70 9/9/70	For land: \$3,826,660.20 to Miami plaintiffs in Dkts. 253 & 151; \$1,209,900.00 to Peoria, Wea, plaintiffs in Dkt. 314-D

Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 254 *see* Potawatomi, Prairie Band, Dkt. 15-D, and Potawatomi, Citizen Band, Dkt. 128

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 255, consolidated with Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-C	20	97 110	Findings - Compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment	12/3/68 12/3/68 12/3/68	\$66,966.00 for land in Dkts. 255 & 124-C
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 256, consolidated with Miami, Indiana, Dkts. 124-D, E & F	14	375 434	Findings - Liability, value, & consideration Opinion Interlocutory order	12/18/64 12/18/64 12/18/64	\$1,373,000.00 for land in settlement of
	15	195	Final judgment	4/1/65	claims in Dkts. 256, 124-D, E & F
	17	427	Opinion on motion of Miamis of Indiana that consideration for Kansas lands be charged solely against Miamis of Oklahoma	11/29/66	N
	20	113 127	Order denying motion Findings - Compromise settlement Per curiam opinion Final judgment	11/29/66 12/3/68 12/3/68 12/3/68	N
					N
					3 ⁴

Mission Indians of California, *see* California Indians, Mission Bands of, Dkt. 80; California Indians, Baron Long, *et al.*, Dkt. 80-A; California Indians, San Pasqual Band, Dkt. 80-A; California Indians, Soboba Band of Mission Indians, Dkt. 80-A; California Indians, Baron Long, *et al.*, Dkt. 80-B; California Indians, Bands of Mission Indians, Dkt. 80-C; California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37, *et al.* (including Dkts. 80 & 80-D); California Indians, Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, Dkt. 148; California Indians, Twenty-nine Palms Band, Dkt. 149; & California Indians, Morongo Band, Dkt. 325

Missouri, *see* Otoe and Missouria, Dkts. 11 & 11-A

Mobilian, *see* Pascagoula, Biloxi and Mobilian Consolidated Bands, Dkt. 170

Modoc, *see* Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin

Mohave, *see* Colorado River Indian Tribes, Dkts. 185, 283-A, & 283-B

Mohave-Apache Community (Fort McDowell), *see* Apache, Yavapai, Dkts. 22-E & F; and Apache, Northern Tonto, Dkt. 22-J

Mohaves of Colorado River Tribes, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 283; & Mohave Tribe of Arizona, California, and Nevada, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 295; <i>see</i> earlier related opinions under California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37, <i>et al.</i> , dated 1/20/58 & 10/6/58	7 23 26 28 31 203 C.C. 31	219 245 87 93 106 563 570 582 232 357 709 410 425	Findings - Title Opinion Interlocutory order Opinion - Value Findings Interlocutory order Opinion - Offsets Findings Final award Order denying motion for rehearing Interlocutory order approving compromise settlement & stipulation for entry of final judgment & suspending further proceedings pending dismissal of appeal Order granting motion to dismiss appeal Findings on compromise settlement Final award	3/19/59 3/19/59 3/19/59 5/13/70 5/13/70 5/13/70 12/29/71 12/29/71 12/29/71 7/6/72 9/13/73 9/14/73 9/26/73 9/26/73	\$468,358.07 for land in Dkts. 283 & 295
Mohave Tribe of Arizona, California, and Nevada, Dkt. 295-A	23 25 36	346 351 356 409 413 452 471	Opinion - Right to sue & liability Findings Interlocutory order Opinion on defendant's motion for rehearing Order denying motion Findings on compromise settlement Final award	6/30/70 6/30/70 6/30/70 6/16/71 6/16/71 9/18/75 9/18/75	\$550,000.00 for land
Muckleshoot, Dkt. 98	2 3 6 12	424 429 658 669 608 624 743 751	Findings on special defenses Opinion Order denying special defenses Findings - Title Opinion Interlocutory order Additional findings - Value Opinion Interlocutory order Additional findings - Settlement of offsets Opinion Final judgment	5/14/53 5/14/53 5/14/53 8/25/55 8/25/55 8/25/55 7/17/58 7/17/58 7/17/58 10/18/63 10/18/63 10/18/63	\$80,377.00 for land

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Muckleshoot, Dkt. 98 (cont.)	174 C.C. 385 U.S.	1283 847	Affirmed Certiorari denied	2/23/66 10/10/66	
Munsee, <i>see</i> Emigrant New York Indians, <i>et al.</i>, Dkt. 75; Six Nations, <i>et al.</i>, Dkt. 84; and Stockbridge and Munsee, Dkts. 300, 300-A, & 300-B (consolidated with Dkt. 84)					
Nambe, Pueblo of, <i>see</i> Pueblo of Nambe					
Natchez, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 365		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	2/24/54	Dismissed
Navajo, Dkts. 69, 299 & 353	31	40 59	Opinion Order on plaintiff's motions & consolidating dockets	7/25/73 7/25/73	All claims transferred to Court of Claims
	34	432 438	Opinion Order modifying previous order & for supplemental accounting	8/23/74 8/23/74	
		439	Order denying motions to dismiss & vacating order to show cause	8/23/74	
	35	305 311	Opinion Order separating consolidated accounting claims in Dkts. 69, 299, & 353 from remaining claims in Dkt. 69	1/23/75 1/23/75	
		312	Order denying plaintiff's motion for leave to amend its petitions	1/23/75	
		313	Order denying plaintiff's motion for rehearing	1/23/75	
		315	Order in Dkt. 69 granting motion to amend petition (as to Claims 1 through 6) & denying defendant's motion for final judgment	1/23/75	
	36	108 112	Opinion in Dkt. 69 (claims 1 through 6 & claim 8) Order denying defendant's motion for final judgment of dismissal of claim 8, & directing that plaintiff make an offer of proof	5/28/75 5/28/75	
		113	Order in Dkts. 69, 299, & 353 separating accounting claims from other claims in Dkt. 69	5/28/75	
		114	Order (in accounting claims) sustaining plaintiff's objections to defendant's interrogatories	5/28/75	
	36	181	Order (in accounting claims) denying defendant's motion for partial summary judgment	6/11/75	
	36	215	Order in Dkt. 69 (claims 1 through 6 & claim 8) denying defendant's motion for certification of a question to the Court of Claims	7/9/75	
	36	415	Order that plaintiff make available certain records	8/13/75	
	36	433 437	Opinion (in accounting claims) Order vacating in part order of 7/25/73, & for other purposes	9/4/75 9/4/75	
	39	10 22	Opinion (in accounting claims) Findings	9/1/76 9/1/76	
		32	Order granting in part & denying in part defendant's motion for partial summary judgment, & for other purposes	9/1/76	
	39	144 148	Opinion (in accounting claims) Order granting defendant's motion to dismiss supplemental exception 4(c) & dismissing plaintiff's motion to strike	11/10/76 11/10/76	
	39	252 257	Opinion (in accounting claims) Dissenting opinion	12/27/76 12/27/76	
		260	Order granting plaintiff's motion for an up-to-date accounting as to miscellaneous agency expenses	12/27/76	
	39	261	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims the consolidated accounting claims (claim 7 in Dkt. 69, & Dkts. 299 & 353), & remaining claims 1 through 6 & claim 8 in Dkt. 69	12/27/76	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Navajo, Dkt. 229 For decisions regarding overlaps of the area claimed in Dkt. 229, <i>see</i> : Apache, San Carlos, White Mountain, Dkt. 22-D; Apache, Northern Tonto, Yavapai, Dkt. 22-J; Apache, Fort Sill, Chiricahua Tribe <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 30 & 48; Havasupai, Dkt. 91; Hopi, Dkt. 196; Pueblo of Acoma, Dkt. 266; Pueblo de Laguna, Dkt. 227	23 41 41 41 41 41 41	244 256 276 85 96 130 138 140 144 187	Opinion - Title Findings Interlocutory order Opinion on defendant's motion for summary determination Order granting defendant's motion for summary determination that the Navajo claim in this case is limited to those aboriginal title lands of the Navajo Tribe to which the U.S. extinguished title pursuant to the Treaty of June 1, 1868 (15 Stat. 667), but which the U.S. did not subsequently return to the Navajo Tribe Opinion on plaintiff's motion to amend petition & for severance Order denying plaintiff's motion Opinion on government's motions to quash subpoena duces tecum & for protective order Order granting government's motions Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	6/29/70 6/29/70 6/29/70 11/2/77 11/2/77 11/23/77 11/23/77 12/2/77 12/2/77 2/15/78	Transferred to Court of Claims
New York Emigrant Indians, <i>see</i> Emigrant New York Indians, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 75					
Nez Perce, Dkt. 175	18 24 26	1 119 429 449 177 192	Findings - Title Opinion Interlocutory order Opinion Order granting in part & denying in part plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment Findings - Compromise settlement Final award	3/21/67 3/21/67 3/21/67 2/18/71 8/25/71 8/25/71	\$3,550,000.00 for land
Nez Perce, Dkt. 175-A	8 8	220 271 759 777	Findings - Value, reservation land Opinion Interlocutory order Additional findings - Compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment	12/31/59 12/31/59 12/31/59 6/17/60 6/17/60 6/17/60	\$4,157,605.06 for land
Nez Perce, Dkt. 175-B	13 176 C.C. 386 U.S. 386 U.S. 22 22 194 C.C. 404 U.S. 29	184 238 815 984 1015 53 70 74 76 78 490 872 127 138 140	Findings Opinion Final order dismissing petition Affirmed in part & reversed in part Certiorari denied Motion to clarify certiorari denial order denied Opinion - Value Opinion dissenting in part Opinion dissenting in part Order amending findings & entering conclusions of law Final award Reversed as to interest question & remanded Certiorari denied Opinion Order amending findings & conclusions of law Final award	4/7/64 4/7/64 4/7/64 7/15/66 3/26/67 4/24/67 11/14/69 11/14/69 11/14/69 11/14/69 11/14/69 3/19/71 10/12/71 11/1/72 11/1/72 11/1/72	\$1,387,911.00 for land
Nez Perce of Idaho, Dkt. 179-A, <i>see also</i> Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 179	39	127	Order denying defendant's motion to dismiss & setting time to file exceptions to accounting report		Transferred to Court of Claims
Nez Perce, Dkt. 180	2 2	193 245	Per curiam opinion on defendant's motion to dismiss Order dismissing defendant's motion Per curiam opinion Order dismissing petition	6/4/52 6/4/52 10/17/52 10/17/52	Dismissed (after viable claims severed out)

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Nez Perce, Dkt. 180 (cont.)		unnumbered	Order setting aside dismissal order of 10/17/52 & reinstating Dkt. 180, & for other purposes	2/27/53	
		unnumbered	Order severing from petition in Dkt. 180 & designating as Dkt. 180-A the gold conversion & trespass claims	5/1/53	
		unnumbered	Order dismissing original petition in Dkt. 180	12/4/57	
Nez Perce, Dkt. 180-A	3	571	Findings - Liability	8/10/55	
		582	Opinion	8/10/55	
		618	Opinion agreeing in part & disagreeing in part	8/10/55	
	8	300	Additional findings	12/31/59	
		338	Opinion	12/31/59	
		unnumbered	Interlocutory order & award	12/31/59	
	153 C.C.	697	Final judgment	7/5/60	
			Affirmed	5/12/61	
Nez Perce, Joseph Band, <i>see</i> Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes as the representatives of the Joseph Band of the Nez Perce Tribe, Dkt. 179; and Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, <i>et al.</i> , on behalf of the Joseph Band of the Nez Perce Tribe, Dkt. 186					
Nisgah, Dkt. 287	28	366	Order dismissing plaintiff's claims	9/7/72	Dismissed
Nisqually, Dkt. 197	21	173	Opinion - Title	6/25/69	
		179	Findings	6/25/69	
		187	Interlocutory order	6/25/69	
	29	432	Opinion - Value	2/7/73	
		447	Additional findings	2/7/73	
		470	Interlocutory order	2/7/73	
	34	297	Opinion - Offsets	7/31/74	
		303	Additional findings	7/31/74	
		310	Final award	7/31/74	
	208 C.C.	1029	Affirmed	1/30/76	
Nooksack, Dkt. 46	1	333	Memorandum opinion	7/14/50	
		unnumbered	Order limiting hearing on merits	1/31/52	
		unnumbered	Order denying special defenses for defendant	1/20/52	
	3	479	Findings - Title	5/9/55	
		492	Opinion	5/9/55	
		578	Interlocutory order	5/9/55	
	6	596	Additional findings	7/17/58	
		681	Opinion	7/17/58	
		681	Interlocutory order	7/17/58	
		162 C.C.	Opinion	10/20/58	
		712	Order denying motions for rehearing & amending finding No. 35	10/20/58	
	10	219	Additional findings	2/9/62	
		225	Opinion	2/9/62	
		375 U.S.	Final judgment	2/9/62	
		993	Affirmed	7/12/63	
			Certiorari denied	1/20/64	
Okanogan, <i>see</i> Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes					
Omaha, Dkt. 85	1	683	Opinion	12/19/51	
			Order dismissing petition	12/19/51	Dismissed
Omaha, Dkt. 138, <i>see</i> Iowa, Omaha, Sac and Fox, Dkt. 138; and Otoe and Missouri, Dkt. 11-A					
Omaha, Dkt. 225		unnumbered	Order substituting petitions numbered 225-A, 225-B, & 225-C for petition No. 225, & dismissing original petition in Dkt. 225	10/6/53	Original petition in Dkt. 225 dismissed
Omaha, Dkts. 225-A, 225-B, 225-C, & 225-D	3	352	Findings in Dkt. 225-A	10/19/54	
		365	Opinion	10/19/54	
			Interlocutory order	10/19/54	
	4	627	Findings — Title & consideration in Dkt. 225-A	1/18/57	
		662	Opinion	1/18/57	
			Interlocutory order	1/18/57	
	6	68	Opinion in Dkt. 225-C	12/27/57	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Tri</i>
Omaha, Dkts. 225-A, 225-B, 225-C, & 225-D (cont.)			Order sustaining in part & overruling in part defendant's motion to dismiss petition in Dkt. 225-C	12/27/57		Os (co)
		unnumbered	Order in Dkt. 225-A amending findings & interlocutory order of 1/18/57	2/6/58		
	6	730	Findings in Dkt. 225-A on value	11/28/58		
		751	Opinion —	11/28/58		
		unnumbered	Interlocutory order	11/28/58		
		unnumbered	Conclusions of law & final award in Dkt. 225-A in net sum of \$2,735,833.86	5/6/59		
	7	573	Opinion on orders disallowing a claimed offset credit of \$374,465.02 in Dkt. 225-A	5/13/59		
		unnumbered	Order in Dkt. 225-C granting leave to file amended & supplemental complaint [assigned Dkt. No. 225-D asserting a claim for accounting severed by this order from the petition in Dkt. 225-C]	11/19/59		
	148 C.C.	727	Order dismissing appeal from the Commission's determination in Dkt. 225-A, by request of the parties	1/15/60		
	8	392	Findings — Compromise settlement in Dkts. 225-A through 225-D	2/11/60		Os 10
		407	Opinion	2/11/60		
			Final judgment or final determination consolidating for all purposes Dkts. 225-A through 225-D; setting aside the final award of 5/6/59 in Dkt. 225-A; & entering a final award in the consolidated dks.	2/11/60		
Oneida, <i>see also</i> Emigrant New York Indians, Dkt. 75; and Six Nations, Dkts. 84, 89, and 344						
Oneida of Wisconsin, Dkt. 159	12	1	Findings	12/6/62	Dismissed	Os 10
		6	Opinion	12/6/62		
			Final order denying each asserted claim	12/6/62		
	165 C.C.	487	Affirmed	4/17/64		
	379 U.S.	946	Certiorari denied	12/14/64		
Oneida of Wisconsin, Dkt. 290	18	433	Order dismissing case	6/30/67	Dismissed	
Oneida Nation of New York, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 301, claims 1 & 2	20	337	Opinion on defendant's motion for partial summary judgment dismissing claims 1 & 2 of the petition	2/26/69		Os
		351	Dissenting opinion	2/26/69		
		360	Order denying defendant's motion	2/26/69		
	26	583	Opinion	12/29/71		
		591	Dissenting opinion	12/29/71		
		592	Findings	12/29/71		
	37	624	Interlocutory order	12/29/71		
		522	Opinion	3/19/76		
		554	Dissenting opinion	3/19/76		Os
		568	Additional findings	3/19/76		
		617	Interlocutory order	3/19/76		
	217 C.C.	—	Affirmed	5/17/78	675 F. 2d 870	
Oneida Nation of New York, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 301, claims 3 through 8	26	138	Opinion	8/18/71	Claim 8	
		149	Findings	8/18/71	dismissed at	
		163	Interlocutory order	8/18/71	request of the	
	201 C.C.	546	Affirmed in part, remanded in part	5/11/73	plaintiffs	
	33	69	Order dismissing claim 8	1/16/74		
	41	391	Opinion on petition to intervene of counties of Madison & Oneida, New York	6/8/78		
		395	Concurring opinion	6/8/78		
		398	Order denying motion to intervene	6/8/78		
Osage Nation, Dkt. 9	1	43	Findings	12/30/48	\$864,107.55	Os
		54	Opinion	12/30/48	for land	
		96	Dissenting opinion	12/30/48		
		112	Appendix	12/30/48		
	119 C.C.	592	Final order dismissing petition	12/30/48		
			Reversed & remanded	5/1/51		

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Osage Nation, Dkt. 9 (cont.)	342 U.S. 3	896 217 231 274 3	Certiorari denied Additional findings — Value Opinion Dissenting opinion Interlocutory order 344 Opinion on plaintiff's motion for reconsideration Order denying motion 422 Additional findings on offsets 434 Opinion Final order	12/1/51 8/13/54 8/13/54 8/13/54 8/13/54 9/27/54 9/27/54 3/1/55 3/1/55 3/1/55	
Osage Nation, Dkt. 105	11	733 812 894	Findings — Title Opinion Concurring opinion Interlocutory order	11/29/62 11/29/62 11/29/62 11/29/62	<i>See consolidated</i> Dkts. 105, 106, 107, & 108 below
	21	67 75 90	Opinion — Value & consideration Additional findings Order [and interlocutory award of \$6,943,166.21]	6/18/69 6/18/69 6/18/69	
Osage Nation, Dkts. 106 & 107	19	447 481	Findings — Title Opinion Interlocutory order	9/20/68 9/20/68 9/20/68	<i>See consoli-</i> <i>dated Dkts.</i> 105, 106, 107, & 108 below
Osage Nation, Dkt. 108	16	190	Per curiam opinion on defendant's & plaintiff's motions for summary judgment & order denying motions for summary judgment	10/27/65	<i>See consoli-</i> <i>dated Dkts.</i> 105, 106, 107, & 108 below
Osage Nation, Dkts. 105, 106, 107, & 108	23	447 462	Findings on compromise settlement Interlocutory order approving compromise settlement & stipulation for entry of final judgment	9/3/70	\$13,250,000.00 for settlement of claims for compensation for land in Dkts. 105, 106 & 107,
	C.C.		Order dismissing appeals numbered 9-69, 10-69, & 11-69	9/3/70	, & a claim for recovery of cer- tain legal fees & expenses in Dkt. 108
	23	492	Final judgment	9/15/70 9/15/70	
Osage Nation, Dkt. 126	7	864 878	Findings Opinion Order dismissing petition	7/30/59 7/30/59 7/30/59	Dismissed
	155 C.C.	824	Affirmed	11/1/61	
Osage Nation, Dkt. 127	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	12/11/63	Dismissed
Otoe and Missouria Tribe, Dkt. 11	2	335 355 374	Findings Opinion Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part	3/31/53 3/31/53 3/31/53 3/31/53	\$1,156,034.35 for land
	2	500 507	Interlocutory order [and interlocutory award on 3d & 4th causes of action] Additional findings — Offsets Opinion	3/31/53 12/11/53 12/11/53	
	131 C.C.	593	Conclusions of law & final award [on 3d & 4th causes of action, & order dismissing remaining 1st, 2d, 5th, 6th, & 7th causes of action]	12/11/53	
	350 U.S.	848	Affirmed in part & remanded in part Certiorari denied	5/3/55 10/10/55	
	unnumbered		Order affirming on remand the interlocutory award of 3/31/53 as final award	2/17/56	
Otoe and Missouria, Dkt. 11-A, <i>see</i> Iowa, Omaha, Sac and Fox, Dkt. 138 (consolidated with Otoe and Missouria, Dkt. 11-A)					
Ottawa and Chippewa of Michigan, Dkt. 4	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	3/25/49	Dismissed

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>T</i>
Ottawa, Dkt. 40		unnumbered	Order directing separation of all causes of action & the setting forth of these causes in separate petitions	7/13/49	Concluded by separating out all causes of action which were assigned Dkt. Nos. pre-fixed with No. 40	Ot
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-A		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	3/9/50	Dismissed	Ot
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-B	2	461 469	Findings Opinion Order	8/6/53 8/6/53 8/6/53	Dismissed after the 4 causes asserted in the petition were separated out & assigned Dkt. Nos. 40-H, I, J, & K	O
		unnumbered	Order striking from petition in Dkt. 40-B the 1st claim & requiring the refiling thereof in a separate petition assigned Dkt. No. 40-I	9/30/53	O	
		unnumbered	Order striking from petition in Dkt. 40-B the 3rd claim & requiring the refiling thereof in a separate petition assigned Dkt. No. 40-J	9/30/53	O	
		unnumbered	Order striking from petition in Dkt. 40-B the 2d claim & requiring the refiling thereof in a separate petition assigned Dkt. No. 40-K	9/30/53	O	
		unnumbered	Order overruling defendant's motion to deny the filing of an amended petition for the 4th claim & to dismiss the same, & permitting the filing of an amended petition for such claim & assigning it Dkt. No. 40-H	8/14/53	O	
		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	2/19/54	O	
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-C	2	461 469	Findings Opinion Order	8/6/53 8/6/53 8/6/53	Dismissed	C
		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	11/6/59	C	
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-D	2	461 469	Findings Opinion Order	8/6/53 8/6/53 8/6/53	Dismissed	C
		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	11/6/59	C	
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-E	2	461 469	Findings Opinion Order	8/6/53 8/6/53 8/6/53	Dismissed	C
		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	12/10/59	C	
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-F, <i>see</i> decisions after 8/6/53 affecting Dkt. 40-F under Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G	2	461 469	Findings Opinion Order	8/6/53 8/6/53 8/6/53	Dismissed	C
	31	220	Final order dismissing claims	8/9/73	C	
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-G		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	3/9/50	Dismissed	M
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-H	4	409 460	Findings Opinion Order dismissing petition	9/19/56 9/19/56 9/19/56	Dismissed	M
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-I	32	400 413 428	Opinion Findings Order dismissing petition	12/26/73 12/26/73 12/26/73	Dismissed	M
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-J	11	641 693	Findings Opinion Final order dismissing case	11/29/62 11/29/62 11/29/62	Dismissed	M
Ottawa [on behalf of Grand River Band of Ottawa Indians], Dkt. 40-K, <i>see</i> prior decisions in Dkt. 40-K under Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 146, <i>et al.</i>	19	95	Additional findings on compromise settlement of offsets	3/27/68	\$932,620.01	
		102	Opinion Final judgment	3/27/68 3/27/68	for land	
				3/27/68		

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Ottawa and Chippewa of Michigan, Dkt. 58, <i>see</i> Bay Mills Community, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-E (consolidated with Dkt. 58)					
Ottawa, Dkt. 68	9	80	Order dismissing petition	1/11/61	Dismissed
Ottawa, Dkt. 133	unnumbered		Order dismissing claim asserted in paragraphs 66, 67, 68, & 69 of the petition based on Treaty of 8/29/1821, a claim asserted in Dkt. 40-B		Dismissed after viable claims severed out
	unnumbered		Order severing certain causes of action from the petition in Dkt. 133, requiring that they be refiled in separate petitions assigned Dkt. Nos. 133-A, 133-B, & 133-C, & dismissing original petition in Dkt. 133	8/21/53	
					12/26/57
Ottawa, Dkt. 133-A, <i>see</i> decisions & final award in Dkt. 133-A (& Dkt. 302) under Saginaw, Chippewa, Dkt. 13-E					
Ottawa, Dkt. 133-B, <i>see</i> decisions & final award in this case under Saginaw, Chippewa, Dkt. 59					
Ottawa, Dkt. 133-C, <i>see</i> Saginaw, Chippewa, Dkt. 13-F					
Ottawa, Dkt. 302, <i>see</i> decisions & final award in Dkt. 302 (& Dkt. 133-A) under Saginaw, Chippewa, Dkt. 13-E					
Ottawa, Dkt. 303	8	831	Findings	6/29/60	\$406,166.19
		874	Opinion	6/29/60	for land &
	9	98	Interlocutory order	6/29/60	accountings for
			Opinion on defendant's motion for rehearing	3/10/61	trust funds
			Order admitting additional evidence &		
			denying motion for rehearing	3/10/61	
	11	550	Findings — Damages & offsets	11/26/62	
		566	Opinion	11/26/62	
			Final award	11/26/62	
	166 C.C.	373	Reversed in part	6/12/64	
	379 U.S.	929	Certiorari denied	12/7/64	
	14	677	Amended final award	2/11/65	
Ottawa, Dkt. 304	25	1	Opinion — Value	3/17/71	\$182,610.00
		10	Findings	3/17/71	for land
		20	Interlocutory order	3/17/71	
	30	206	Final award	4/25/73	
Ottawa, Dkt. 305	27	98	Opinion — Value	3/15/72	\$80,585.76
		115	Findings	3/15/72	for land
		131	Interlocutory order	3/15/72	
	28	251	Opinion on defendant's motion for rehearing	7/26/72	
		254	Order amending findings entered 3/15/72	7/26/72	
	30	208	Final award	4/25/73	
Ottawa of Oklahoma, Dkt. 338, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G					
Ottawa-Chippewa Tribe of Michigan, Dkt. 364	30	288	Findings	5/9/73	\$25,461.92
		293	Order directing certain persons & their attorneys to show cause why they should not be instructed to assume prosecution of this case		for accounting
		294	Order that defendant show cause why a certain accounting should not be filed in this case	5/9/73	
	33	142	Per curiam opinion	2/14/73	
		149	Order	2/14/73	
	35	385	Opinion on plaintiff's accounting exceptions & motions by both parties	1/27/75	
		416	Opinion dissenting in part	1/27/75	
		417	Order	1/27/75	
	40	6	Opinion	4/1/77	
		51	Concurring opinion	4/1/77	
		52	Additional findings	4/1/77	
		88	Final award	4/1/77	

Paiute, *see also* Snake or Piute Indians of former Malheur Reservation, Oregon, Dkt. 17

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>T</i>
Paiute Nation, Northern, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 87, <i>see</i> reference to Dkt. 87 in opinions of 1/20/58 & 10/6/58 under California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37	7	322	Findings — Title	3/24/59	Concluded by	P
		381	Opinion	3/24/59	judgments	et
	7	615	Interlocutory order	3/24/59	shown below,	33
			Additional findings on dates of taking of the Oregon & Nevada portions of claimants' aboriginal lands	6/4/59	which represent	D
			Interlocutory order	6/4/59	compensation	of
		unnumbered	Order, entered on plaintiffs' motion, amending findings of fact & interlocutory order of 3/24/59	6/4/59	for land	C
	9	417	Additional findings of fact on compromise settlement of the "Snake-Paiute Tract [Oregon land] claim"	7/3/61		D
		429	Statement & opinion of the Commission	7/3/61		P
			Final judgment for the plaintiffs in behalf of the Snake or Paiute Indians of the Oregon Area (for the Snake-Paiute Tract)	7/3/61		B
	16	215	Additional findings on valuation of the Mono & Paviotso tracts	11/4/65	\$3,650,000.00	P
		289	Opinion	11/4/65		of
			Order approving stipulation of settlement . of offsets	11/4/65		P
			Final judgment for plaintiffs on behalf of: (1) The Monos or Paiutes of Owens Valley (for the Mono Tract); (2) The Paviotso or Paiutes of western Nevada (for the Paviotso Tract)		\$935,000.00	D
	183 C.C.	321	Affirmed	11/4/65		P
				4/19/68	\$15,790,000.00	D
Paiute Nation, Northern, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 87-A	27	39	Opinion on motion for interlocutory order as to dates of establishment of Pyramid Lake	2/16/72	Transferred to	P
		45	Reservation & Walker River Reservation Order fixing dates of establishment of the		Court of Claims	D
	28	256	Pyramid Lake Reservation & the Walker River Reservation	2/16/72		P
		263	Opinion on motion for determination of defendant's liability for resources removed from Nevada portion of the Paviotso Tract	8/1/72		D
	30	210	Order finding defendant liable to plaintiffs for resources removed from Nevada portion of the Paviotso Tract	8/1/72		P
		219	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for interlocutory order pertaining to issues of liability on claim for depriving Pyramid	4/25/73		M
	203 C.C.	468	Lake of water	4/25/73		B
	C.C.	414	Order	1/23/74		P
	34	414	Order of 8/1/72 reversed & the cause remanded	4/24/74		A
		426	Rehearing denied			D
	35	11	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for a complete & proper accounting	8/14/74		P
		426	Interlocutory order	8/14/74		DI
	36	254	Order relieving defendant of requirement of supplementing its accounting as to certain matters	9/18/74		P
		254	Order granting motion to separate water claim of Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe from Dkt. 87-A, assigning said claim Dkt. No. 87-B, & granting leave to file amended & supple- mental petition in Dkt. 87-A	7/23/75		M
	41	222	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	3/2/78		B
Paiute, Pyramid Lake Tribe, Dkt. 87-B, <i>see</i> prior decisions under Dkt. 87-A relating to Pyramid Lake Reservation & water	36	256	Findings — Compromise settlement	7/23/75	\$8,000,000.00	P
		270	Final award	7/23/75	for deprivation of water	D

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Paiute Nation, Southern, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 88, 330 & 330-A, <i>see mention of</i> Dkts. 88 & 330 in opinions of 1/20/58 & 10/6/58 under California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37	14	618 647	Findings — Compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment	1/18/65 1/18/65 1/18/65	\$7,253,165.19 for settlement of aboriginal land, & account- ing claims
Pala and Pauma Bands of Mission Indians, <i>see California Indians, Baron Long, et al.</i> , Dkts. 80-A, 80-B; California Indians, Mission Bands of, Dkts. 80, 80-C, & 80-D (under California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37)					
Palmer, Alaska, Natives of, Dkt. 370	27	135	Order granting motion to dismiss claim	3/15/62	Dismissed
Papago of Arizona, Dkt. 102	26	365 370	Opinion Order denying without prejudice plaintiff's request for a full & complete accounting for the period 7/1/51 to present date, & requiring defendant to supplement its account- ing report dated 7/24/70 in certain respects	11/16/71	Concluded with an award in consolidation with Dkt. 345, <i>see below</i>
	35	316	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment	11/16/71	
		319	Order denying defendant's motion & setting a pretrial hearing	1/23/75	
Papago of Arizona, Dkt. 345	19	394 424	Findings — Title Opinion	9/10/68 9/10/68	Concluded with an award in consolidation with Dkt. 102, <i>see below</i>
	21	403 406 407	Interlocutory order Additional findings Interlocutory order on date of taking Order amending interlocutory order dated 9/10/68	9/10/68 10/1/69 10/1/69	
		unnumbered	Report of the Commissioner	10/1/69 2/22/71	
Papago of Arizona, Dkts. 102 & 345	38	542 559	Findings on compromise settlement Final award	7/21/76 7/21/76	\$26,000,000.00 for settlement of land & trespass damage claims in Dkt. 345 & a claim for a general accounting in Dkt. 102
Papago, <i>see also</i> Maricopa-Ak Chin Reservation Indians, Dkt. 235					
Pascagoula, Biloxi and Mobilian Consolidated Band, Dkt. 170	20	130	Order dismissing case	12/3/68	Dismissed
Pawnee, Oklahoma, Dkt. 10	1	230 245	Findings Opinion	7/14/50 7/14/50	\$7,316,097.70, of which amount some
			Interlocutory order re 6th & 7th causes of action	7/14/50	\$7,315,800.00
			Final order dismissing 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, & 8th causes of action	7/14/50	was for land & the balance for small sums
	124 C.C. 5	324 224 268	Affirmed in part, reversed in part Findings — Title Opinion	2/3/53 6/17/57 6/17/57	owing, one in the amount of \$31.90 with interest
	7	721	Interlocutory order Opinion — Admissibility of exhibits	6/17/57 6/26/59	
	8	648 718	Order Additional findings — Value Opinion	6/26/59 6/14/60	
	9	82 85	Third interlocutory order Additional findings — Offsets Opinion	6/14/60 1/31/61 1/31/61	
			Interlocutory order amending findings & the third interlocutory order of 6/14/60	1/31/61	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Pawnee, Oklahoma, Dkt. 10 (cont.)	9	94	Supplemental opinion Order amending interlocutory order of 1/31/61	2/7/61	
	157 C.C.	134	Amended conclusions of law & final award	2/7/61	
	370 U.S.	918	Reversed in part & remanded	4/4/62	
	unnumbered		Certiorari denied	6/11/62	
	unnumbered		Order amending findings	7/6/62	
			Amended conclusions of law & final award	7/6/62	
Pecos, Pueblo de, <i>see</i> Pueblo de Pecos, Dkt. 174					
Pembina Band, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Red Lake, Pembina, & White Earth Bands, Dkt. 18-A; Chippewa, Little Shell Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 191 & 221; Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113; and Chippewa, Pembina Band, Dkt. 246 (consolidated with Dkts. 113, 191 & 221)					
Pend d'Oreille, Lower (Kalispel), Dkt. 94	6	353	Findings — Title	6/9/58	\$3,000,000.00
		369	Opinion	6/9/58	for land
			Interlocutory order	6/9/58	
	12	141	Additional findings on compromise settlement	3/21/63	
		157	Opinion	3/21/63	
			Final judgment	3/21/63	
Peoria, Dkts. 65, 66, 99, 289, 313, 314, & 338 (con- solidated for single hearing on issues considered in the findings, opinion, & order of 3/26/56)	4	223	Findings in respect to the capacity of the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma [“Peoria” in this index] to maintain suit on claims for or on behalf of the Wea, Kaskaskia, Piankeshaw & Peoria tribes or nations of Indians	3/26/56	See separate dockets below
		239	Opinion upholding capacity of the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma to sue	3/26/56	
		249	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part	3/26/56	
			Interlocutory order & allowance of motion to amend corporate name of petitioner	3/26/56	
Peoria, Kaskaskia, Piankeshaw, Wea, Dkt. 65	11	171	Additional findings [to those of 3/26/56, cited above]	9/12/62	\$1,139,532.91
		174	Opinion	9/12/62	for land & damages, mea- sured by in- terest, resulting from breach of
			Interlocutory order, including orders dis- missing petition for an accounting under all treaties enumerated therein, except the Treaty of May 30, 1854, & denying “Claim I”	9/12/62	re sale of land
	15	123	Findings	3/17/65	
		142	Opinion	3/17/65	
			Interlocutory order & award	3/17/65	
Peoria, Kaskaskia, Piankeshaw, Wea, Dkt. 65 (cont.)	15	488	Final award	8/4/65	
	177 C.C.	762	Affirmed	12/16/66	
	390 U.S.	468	Revised & remanded	4/1/68	
	184 C.C.	801	Order withdrawing & vacating decision of 12/16/66 as to issue involving liability of the U.S. for interest on funds it failed to invest, & remanding the case to the Commission		
			Opinion	5/6/68	
	20	62	Order substituting finding, vacating final award of 8/4/65, & final award	11/13/68	
				11/13/68	
Peoria, Kaskaskia, Dkts. 66 & 313		unnumbered	Order upon stipulation dismissing petition in Dkt. 66, & ordering, <i>inter alia</i> , that the claims pledged therein be included by amendment in the petition in Dkt. 313	5/6/57	Dkt. 66 dis- missed. <i>See</i> later decisions re Dkt. 313, below
Peoria, Piankeshaw, Dkt. 99, <i>see</i> mention of this case in opinion, findings, & order of 4/4/73 under Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, Dkt. 15-D	16	574	Findings on title, including Kickapoo overlap claim (in Dkt. 315)	4/4/66	\$3,270,400.00
		593	Opinion	4/4/66	for land
			Interlocutory order	4/4/66	
	22	186	Report of the Commissioner	1/21/69	
		197	Opinion — Value	12/5/69	
		223	Supplemental findings	12/5/69	
			Interlocutory order	12/5/69	
	22	442	Final award	2/11/70	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Peoria, Piankeshaw; and Delaware, Absentee, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 289	19	107	Findings — Title	3/27/68	For land:
		118	Opinion,	3/27/68	\$1,501,294.35
			Interlocutory order	3/27/68	to the Peoria
	unnumbered		Report of the Commissioner	12/2/69	plaintiffs on
	24	179	Opinion — Value	12/11/70	behalf of the
		186	Findings	12/11/70	Piankeshaw
		195	Interlocutory order	12/11/70	Tribe; &
	24	468	Final award	2/24/71	\$1,497,246.11
					to the Delaware
					plaintiffs on
					behalf of the
					Delaware Tribe
Peoria, Kaskaskia, Dkt. 313, <i>see</i> Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, Dkt. 15-D, & Peoria, Kaskaskia, Dkt. 66	34	428	Opinion on denying plaintiffs' motion with respect to valuation date of lands ceded by the Illinois	8/22/74	
		431	Order denying plaintiffs' motion	8/22/74	
Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314	unnumbered		Severence order allowing withdrawal of petition & the filing in place thereof of 6 petitions assigned Dkt. Nos. 314 Amended, 314-A, 314-B, 314-C, 314-D, & 314-E	1/9/58	Original petition withdrawn
Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314 Amended, <i>see</i> prior decisions in this case under Peoria, Dkts. 65, <i>et al.</i> ; Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 67; & Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 253	9	49	Per curiam opinion on plaintiffs' motion for partial summary judgment	8/5/60	\$876,477.30 for land
	9	274	Order granting in part & denying in part plaintiffs' motion for partial summary judg- ment	8/5/60	
		289	Explanatory statement & findings —	4/18/61	
	12	392	Consideration and other offsets	4/18/61	
		398	Opinion	4/18/61	
			Interlocutory order	4/18/61	
	169 C.C.	1009	Additional findings — Value of 1832 grant claimed as an offset	7/29/63	
	15	266	Opinion	7/29/63	
			Final order (& award)	7/29/63	
			Modified & affirmed	3/12/65	
			Order amending final order	5/7/65	
Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314-A, <i>see</i> Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, Dkt. 15-D					
Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314-B, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 128					
Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314-C	10	271	Findings on Wea & Kickapoo lands	3/2/62	\$349,750.00
		279	Opinion	3/2/62	for land
	unnumbered		Interlocutory order	3/2/62	
			Order amending findings &		
	174 C.C.	550	interlocutory order of 3/2/62	3/10/64	
	22	186	Affirmed	2/18/66	
		197	Opinion — Value	12/5/69	
		223	Supplemental findings	12/5/69	
	22	384	Interlocutory order	12/5/69	
			Final award	1/28/70	
Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314-D, <i>see</i> Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 253, consolidated with Dkts. 131 & 314-D					
Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314-E	18	463	Findings on compromise settlement	7/18/67	\$33,262.92
		473	Opinion	7/18/67	for land
			Final judgment	7/18/67	
Peoria, Kaskaskia, Piankeshaw, Wea, Dkt. 338, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G					
Piankeshaw, <i>see</i> Peoria, Dkts. 65, 99, 289, & 338					
Pillager Band, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 18-B & 18-N; and Chippewa, Pillager Bands in Minnesota, Dkt. 144					
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkt. 228	24	301	Opinion — Title	12/17/70	Transferred to
		311	Findings	12/17/70	Court of Claims
		337	Interlocutory order	12/17/70	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tri</i> <i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkt. 228 (cont.)	27	11	Opinion — Dates of taking	1/20/72	
		17	Additional findings	1/20/72	
		21	Interlocutory order	1/20/72	
	28	170	Order denying plaintiffs' motion for rehearing on date of taking	6/7/72	
	204 C.C.	137	Affirmed	4/17/74	
	419 U.S.	1021	Certiorari denied	11/18/74	
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	5/8/78	
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkt. 236	unnumbered		Order dismissing	2/26/69	Dismissed (after all causes removed & assigned other dkt. nos.)
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkts. 236-A & 236-B	unnumbered		Report of Commissioner (Dkt. 236-A)	11/20/68	
	25	250	Opinion — Liability	4/28/71	Additional compensation for use of reservation land during World War II & damages for diminution in the value of the land related to such use:
		260	Findings	4/28/71	\$1,569,396.20 in Dkt. 236-A; &
		278	First interlocutory order (Dkt. 236-A)	4/28/71	\$6,069.70 in Dkt. 236-B
		279	First interlocutory order (Dkt. 236-B)	4/28/71	
	199 C.C.	586	Affirmed in part, reversed in part, & remanded	10/13/72	
	38	393	Opinion — Value & damages	6/30/76	
		408	Additional findings	6/30/76	
		430	Interlocutory order	6/30/76	
	39	85	Order granting plaintiffs' motion for judgment & denying defendant's motion for leave to file out of time its amended answer for offsets	9/20/76	
	39	87	Final award	9/30/76	
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkt. 236-C	29	144	Opinion on extent of plaintiff's right to divert water from the Gila River	11/17/72	Transferred to Court of Claims
		168	Interlocutory order	11/17/72	
	42	202	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	7/13/78	
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkt. 236-D	42	202	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	7/13/78	Transferred to Court of Claims
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkt. 236-E	33	18	Opinion — Liability	1/10/74	\$5,451,229.90, consisting of a principal sum of \$2,930,338.83 illegally collected for operation & maintenance charges of San Carlos Project, & \$2,520,891.07 in damages measured by 4% interest through 12/31/75 on the principal sum. The award includes an additional sum to be measured by interest at 4% per annum from and including 1/1/76, until paid, on the principal sum of \$2,930,338.83. Appeal pending in Court of Claims.
		29	Findings	1/10/74	
		48	Interlocutory order	1/10/74	
	38	1	Opinion — Amount of liability & damages	4/5/76	
		37	Opinion dissenting in part	4/5/76	
		40	Additional findings	4/5/76	
		60	Final award	4/5/76	
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkts. 236-F & 236-I	30	233	Order dismissing claims pertaining to some 1,349.88 acres of land (known as Memorial Airfield)	5/9/73	see below

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkt. 236-F	41	304	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	5/8/78	Transferred to Court of Claims
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkt. 236-G	34	290	Opinion	7/25/74	Dismissed
		296	Order to show cause why petition should not be dismissed	7/25/74	
	35	17	Order dismissing petition	9/30/74	
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, 236-H	25	21	Order dismissing petition	3/24/71	Dismissed
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkt. 236-I, <i>see also</i> Dkts. 236-F & I above	25	305	Opinion on defendant's motion for preliminary adjudication	5/19/71	Transferred to Court of Claims
		310	Order denying defendant's motion	5/19/71	
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	5/8/78	
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkt. 236-J	21	277	Order dismissing petition	6/27/69	Dismissed
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkts. 236-K, L, & M	20	131	Opinion	12/12/68	Dismissed
	190 C.C.	790	Order dismissing petitions	12/12/68	Dismissed
	400 U.S.	819	Affirmed	2/20/70	
			Certiorari denied	10/12/70	
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkt. 236-N	35	209	Opinion on plaintiff's exceptions to defendant's accounting report	11/22/74	Transferred to Court of Claims
		222	Interlocutory order [including, <i>inter alia</i> , an order dismissing certain exceptions]	11/22/74	
	39	224	Order dismissing certain exceptions	12/2/76	
	39	239	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	12/15/76	
Pima-Maricopa, Salt River, Dkt. 291	35	225	Order granting partial summary judgment [as to certain accounting exceptions] and for supplemental filing	11/22/74	Transferred to Court of Claims
	36	274	Opinion	8/13/75	
		279	Order requiring the submission of information and denying defendant's motion to dismiss exceptions 8 & 9	8/13/75	
	39	239	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	12/15/76	
Pitt River, Dkt. 347, <i>see other decisions involving</i> Dkt. 347 under California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37, <i>et al.</i>	6	86	Opinion	1/20/58	Concluded with other cases by award under California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37, <i>et al.</i>
		93	Opinion	1/20/58	
	6	666	Opinion	10/6/58	
	7	815	Order dividing California into Areas A & B	10/6/58	
		850	Findings — Title	7/29/59	
			Opinion	7/29/59	
			Interlocutory order	7/29/59	
			Order denying petition to file a belated appeal from, or to set aside or modify a judgment of the Indian Claims Commission	11/1/72	
Piute, <i>see</i> Paiute, and Snake or Piute Indians of former Malheur Reservation, Oregon, Dkt. 17					
Ponca, Dkt. 322	12	265	Findings — Title	7/26/63	\$1,878,500.00
		293	Opinion	7/26/63	for land
	20	272	Interlocutory order	7/26/63	
		281	Opinion — Value & consideration	2/4/69	
	26	203	Additional findings	2/4/69	
		209	Secondary interlocutory order	2/4/69	
	27	217	Opinion — Offsets	9/8/71	
		10	Additional findings	9/8/71	
			Final award	9/8/71	
			Order denying motion for rehearing to amend finding & final award	1/12/72	
Ponca, Dkt. 323	6	409	Per curiam opinion	6/19/58	\$1,013,425.24
			Order dismissing Count II of the petition	6/19/58	for land

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
	17	162	Findings	7/26/66	
		206	Opinion	7/26/66	
		236	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part	7/26/66	
			Order	7/26/66	
	183 C.C.	673	Affirmed in part with modifications, reversed in part & remanded	4/19/68	
	unnumbered		Report of Commissioner	6/9/69	
	24	339	Opinion — Value & extent of defendant's liability	12/30/70	
		349	Additional findings	12/30/70	
		362	Final award	12/30/70	
	197 C.C.	1065	Remanded in part & affirmed in part	2/25/72	
	197 C.C.	1068	Rehearing denied	5/15/72	
	28	335	Opinion	8/23/72	
		347	Supplemental findings	8/23/72	
		350	Final award on remand	8/23/72	
Ponca, Dkt. 324	15	573	Findings — Accounting claim	8/27/65	\$2,458.30
			Final award	8/27/65	for accounting
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 71, <i>see</i> Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-C; and Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity					
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 71-A, <i>see</i> Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-J					
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 96	6	646	Findings — Liability	9/18/58	\$797,508.99
		658	Opinion	9/18/58	for land
			Interlocutory order	9/18/58	
	14	570	Supplemental findings — Value	12/30/64	
		585	Opinion	12/30/64	
			Interlocutory order	12/30/64	
	19	368	Additional findings — Offsets	8/27/68	
		379	Opinion	8/27/68	
			Final judgment	8/27/68	
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 101	14	1	Findings — On the merits	4/14/64	
		6	Final order dismissing petition	4/14/64	Dismissed
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 111, <i>see</i> Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-B					
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 128, 309, 310; Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts., 15-N, 15-O, 15-Q, 15-R; Potawatomi, Hannaville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, 29-P; Potawatomi of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., intervenors in the Potawatomi dkts.; Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-B; Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 254; Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314-B, <i>see also</i> Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity	32	461	Opinion — Title	12/28/73	
		496	Concurring opinion	12/28/73	
		497	Findings	12/28/73	
		531	Interlocutory order	12/28/73	
	206 C.C.	867	Affirmed	3/7/75	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 146; Pottawatomi, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-M; Ottawa, Dkt. 40-K; Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-K. <i>see also</i> Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; & under consolidated Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P opinions & order dated 10/14/64 relating to Dkt. 29-K	6 14	414 442 329 341 14	Findings — Title Opinion Interlocutory order Opinion accompanying order denying plaintiffs' motion in Dkt. 29-K, & for other purposes Dissenting opinion as to motion of Dkt. 29-K plaintiffs to amend findings of 6/30/58, & Appendix A thereto, a related dissenting opinion as to plaintiffs' motion to admit additional evidence dated 10/14/64 Order denying motion by Dkt. 29-K plaintiffs to amend findings dated 6/30/58 Order dismissing the petition in Dkt. 29-K, & for other purposes Additional findings — Value & consideration (Dkts. 146, 15-M, & 40-K) Opinion	6/30/58 6/30/58 6/30/58 12/2/64 12/2/64 12/2/64 12/2/64 12/2/64 12/2/64 12/2/64 12/2/64 12/2/64 12/23/64 12/23/64 12/23/64 12/23/64 12/23/64	\$2,296,870.70 to Potawatomi plaintiffs in Dkts. 146, 15-M, & 29-K, for land. See disposition of Dkt. 40-K under Ottawa, Dkt. 40-K
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 216; Pottawatomi, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-L; Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-I; Potawatomi of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., intervenor in Dkts. 216, 15-L, & 29-I; Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-K; Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-P; Ottawa, Dkt. 40-I. <i>see also</i> Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; & under consolidated Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P opinions & order dated 10/14/64 relating to Dkt. 29-I	32 unnumbered 42	400 413 428 1 524	Opinion — Title Findings on title Final order dismissing claims in Dkts. 13-K, 18-P, & 40-I, & for other purposes Order in Dkts. 216, 15-L, & 29-I approving & adopting the parties' stipulation in respect to value of Royce Area 78 Interlocutory order [and interlocutory award] in Dkts. 216, 15-L, & 29-I	12/26/73 12/26/73 12/26/73 6/9/67 4/19/74 12/26/73 8/6/75 8/30/78	Dkts. 13-K, 18-P, & 40-I dismissed

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Tri.</i>
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 217; Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-K; Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-J; Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-L; Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-I; Ottawa, Dkt. 40-J; <i>see also</i> Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; & under consolidated	11	641 693	Findings — Title, value & consideration Opinion Interlocutory order with respect to Dkts. 217, 15-K, & 29-J, & final order dismissing petitions in Dkts. 13-L, 18-I, & 40-J	11/29/62 11/29/62	Dkts. 13-L, 18-I, & 40-J dismissed. \$4,104,818.98 for land in Dkts. 217, 15-K, & 29-J.	Pot Ha Dk
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P opinions & order dated 10/14/64 relating to Dkt. 29-J	15	232	Order amending Commission's findings, opinion, & interlocutory order of 11/29/62	4/15/65		Pot Ba
	15	234 237	Supplemental findings on offsets Opinion	4/15/65 4/15/65		Pot and
	179 C.C.	473	Final award in Dkts. 217, 15-K, & 29-J Commission's determinations of 11/29/62 & 4/15/65 on the Potawatomi claims affirmed in part, reversed in part, & remanded	4/15/65 4/14/67		Pot 13-
	180 C.C.	477	Commission's determinations of 11/29/62 & 4/15/65 on the Potawatomi claims reversed & remanded	6/9/67		Pot Ha Dk
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 306, <i>see</i> Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-D, and Dkt. 15-P	389 U.S.	1046	Certiorari denied [Dkt. 217 plaintiffs as to 179 C.C. 473]	1/15/68		see 1
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 307, <i>see also</i> Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 253; opinion & order dated 7/15/76 under Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-D & 29-E; & Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity	390 U.S.	957	Certiorari denied [Dkt. 29-J plaintiffs as to 179 C.C. 473]	3/4/68		I H e
	30	144 171 172 203 204	Opinion Concurring opinion Supplemental findings Order vacating & amending findings Final award	4/25/73 4/25/73 4/25/73 4/25/73 4/25/73		r e
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 308, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-F; and Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity						f c
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 309, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 128						Pot Dk
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 310, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 128						Pot str
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 311, <i>see</i> Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 67; and Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-D						Pot 10/ str
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 312	17	536	Order dismissing petition with prejudice	12/22/66	Dismissed	Pot 10/ str
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 338, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G; and Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity						Pot 10/ str
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 28 <i>see</i> orders in the group of Hannahville Dkts. immediately below	unnumbered		Order sustaining defendant's motion to dismiss as to claims of Canadian Potawatomi Indians & striking from the petition allegations relating to claims in behalf of Canadian Potawatomi Indians		Partially dismissed. Transferred to Court of Claims.	Pot 10/ str
	115 C.C.	823	Appeal dismissed on appellant's motion	1/25/49		Pot et 29-
	unnumbered		Order directing plaintiffs to file their exceptions to defendant's accounting reports	1/3/50		
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	9/1/76		
				5/8/78		
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 28, & 29-A, B, C, D, E, G, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, & P	unnumbered		Order denying plaintiffs' motion for preliminary determination	12/1/64	Preliminary matter in a group of Hannahville dkts. The disposition of Dkt. 28 is given above.	Pot dat Po
	unnumbered		Order denying plaintiffs' motion for rehearing & reconsideration	12/1/64		
	173 C.C.	1186	Appeal dismissed	11/19/65		

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29		unnumbered	Order directing separation of all causes of action in plaintiffs' petition & the refiling thereof in separate petitions assigned separate docket numbers	7/13/49	Concluded by separating out all causes of action
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-A, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 28, <i>et al.</i> , above; and Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-C					
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-B, <i>see</i> Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 67; Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 28, <i>et al.</i> , above; and Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-D					
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-C, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 28, <i>et al.</i> , above; Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G; and Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity					
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-D & 29-E, <i>see also</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 28, <i>et al.</i> , above; Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; final award & related decisions in Dkt. 29-D under Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-E; & final award & related decisions in Dkt. 29-E under Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 59	14 180 C.C. 38	204 219 477 456 467	Opinion on defendant's motions to dismiss Dissenting opinion Order denying plaintiffs' motion to insert the name of "Albert Mackety" as party plaintiff & granting defendant's motions to dismiss the petitions in Dkts. 29-D & 29-E Reversed & remanded Opinion treating as a motion to intervene in Dkts. 29-D & 29-E a joint motion by the Prairie Band of Pottawatomie Indians, <i>et al.</i> (plaintiffs in dismissed Dkts. 15-F & 15-G), & the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians, <i>et al.</i> (plaintiffs in dismissed Dkt. 307, as amended) to reinstate their respective petitions Interlocutory order denying joint motion to reinstate petitions in Dkts. 15-F, 15-G, & 307, as amended, & granting leave to the applicants in those dismissed dockets to intervene in 29-D & 29-E	10/14/64 10/14/64 10/14/64 4/9/67 7/15/76 7/15/76	<i>See</i> final award in Dkt. 29-D under Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-E. <i>See</i> final award in Dkt. 29-E under Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 59
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-F, <i>see</i> order dismissing this case and related findings and opinion under Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 253					
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-G, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 28, <i>et al.</i> , above; Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; and Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-F					
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-H		unnumbered	Order dismissing the cause set forth in the petition	5/8/53	Dismissed
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-I, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 28, <i>et al.</i> , above; opinions and order dated 10/14/64 under consolidated Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P, below; Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; and Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 216					
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-J, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 28, <i>et al.</i> , above; opinions and order dated 10/14/64 under consolidated Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P, below; Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; and Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 217					
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-K, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 28, <i>et al.</i> , above; opinions and order dated 10/14/64 under consolidated Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P, below; Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; and Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 146					
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P	14 189 173 C.C.	172 Dissenting opinion 1186	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion to admit certain of their proposed exhibits in Dkts. 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P as evidence in Dkts. 29-I, 29-J, & 29-K Order denying admission of additional evidence in Dkts. 29-I, 29-J, & 29-K Appeal dismissed	10/14/64 10/14/64 10/14/64 11/19/65	Special grouping to consider plaintiffs' motion. <i>See</i> Dkts. 29-L, M, O, & P, below.
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-L & 29-M, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 28, <i>et al.</i> , above; the opinions and order dated 10/14/64 immediately above, under Dkts. 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P; Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; and Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 128					

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-N, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 28, <i>et al.</i> , above; Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-D (title phase); and Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-P					
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-O & 29-P, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 28, <i>et al.</i> , above; the opinions and order dated 10/14/64 above under consolidated Dkts. 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P; Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; and Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 128					
Potawatomi, Henry Jackson, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 6		unnumbered	Order dismissing claim	2/15/49	Dismissed
Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity, proceeding in: Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 71, 128, 146, 216, 217, 306, 308, 309, 310, 311, 338; Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 15-C, D, E, I, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, & R; & Potawatome, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-A, B, C, D, E, G, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, & P	27	187 252 325	Opinion Findings Order denying defendant's motion to dismiss petitions in Dkts. 29-D & 29-E, reinstating petition in Dkt. 29-K, granting petition of Michigan, Inc., to intervene as plaintiffs in Dkts. 29-D, 29-E, 29-J, & 29-K, & for other purposes Dissenting opinion	3/28/72 3/28/72	<i>De novo</i> proceeding to resolve the question of the political structure of the Potawatomi Indians during the period 1795-1833 when they ceded their lands & settlements in the Great Lakes region east of the Mississippi in Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, & Wisconsin
	29	328 419	Order denying motion by Citizen & Prairie Bands for rehearing & amendment of findings, & for other purposes, two Commissioners dissenting	3/28/72 3/28/72	
	205 C.C.	765	Affirmed	1/24/73 12/18/74	
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, Dkt. 15		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition, amended petition, & 2d amended petition, all causes being pleaded in separate petitions filed under other docket numbers	12/27/57	Dismissed
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-A	2	207 219	Findings on the merits Opinion Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing petition	6/5/52 6/5/52	Dismissed
	125 C.C.	60	Affirmed	6/5/52 4/7/53	
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-B; & Potawatomie, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 111	3	10 40	Statement & findings Opinion Interlocutory order	4/23/54 4/23/54 4/23/54	For land: \$126,306.24 to the Prairie Band, Dkt. 15-B; & \$233,154.36 to the Citizen Band, Dkt. 111
	3	540 547	Additional findings - Offsets Opinion Conclusions of law & final award	8/8/55 8/8/55 8/8/55	
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-C; Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-H; Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-A; & Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 71	28	454 469 496	Opinion - Title Findings Interlocutory order [in Dkts. 15-C, 29-A, & 71 including an order granting motion of the Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., to intervene in Dkts. 15-C, 29-A, & 71; & an order dismissing the petition of the Chippewa plaintiffs in Dkt. 18-H]	9/20/72 9/20/72	\$4,239,200.00 for land to the plaintiffs in Dkts. 15-C, 29-A, & 71, in behalf of the Potawatomi Tribe or Nation.
	33	498 394	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part Opinion on denying plaintiffs' motion regarding pretrial determination of basis for valuation of "Exchange Land"	9/20/72 9/20/72	Dkt. 18-H dismissed.
	38	407 128 231 341	Order denying plaintiffs' motion Opinion - Value & consideration Findings Interlocutory order	3/20/74 3/20/74 5/26/76 5/26/76	
	38	389	Final award	6/23/76	
<i>see also</i> Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity	215 C.C.	1	Affirmed	10/10/77	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 15-D, P, & Q; Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-B, N, & O; Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 306, 309, & 311; Peoria, Piankishaw, Dkt. 99; Peoria, Kaskaskia, Dkt. 313; Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314-A; Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-H; Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 254; Kickapoo, Dkt. 315, <i>see also</i> Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 67; and Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity	30	42 82 85 86 124 31	Opinion - Title Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part Findings Order [including, <i>inter alia</i> , an order dismissing from this proceeding the claims in Dkts. 99, 124-H, & 254] Opinion on granting defendant's motion to file out of time, & denying defendant's motion for rehearing	4/4/73 4/4/73 4/4/73 4/4/73 4/4/73 8/29/73	Initial proceeding to determine land title issues. <i>See</i> particular dockets. Dkts. 15-D, 29-B, 311, 313, 314-A, & 315 are continued together, below. <i>See</i> final award in Dkts. 15-P, 29-N, & 306, below, under Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-P.
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-D; Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-B; Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 311; Potawatomi of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., intervenor in Dkts. 15-D, 29-B, & 311; Peoria, Kaskaskia, Dkt. 313; Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314-A; Kickapoo, Dkt. 315	42	354 434 521	Opinion - Value & consideration Findings on value & consideration Order setting awards subject to offsets	8/25/78 8/25/78 8/25/78	
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-E, <i>see</i> Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; and Saginaw, Chippewa, Dkt. 13-G, <i>et al.</i>					
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 15-F & 15-G, <i>see opinion and order of 7/15/76 under Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al., Dkts. 29-D & 29-E</i>	unnumbered	unnumbered	Order dismissing petition in Dkt. 15-F Order dismissing petition in Dkt. 15-G	11/3/59 11/3/59	Dkts. 15-F & 15-G dismissed
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-H, <i>see order dismissing this case and related findings and opinion under Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 253</i>					
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-I, <i>see</i> Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; and Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-F					
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-J; Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 71-A	4	409 460	Findings on general issues Opinion on general issues Interlocutory order [and award subject to offsets]	9/19/56 9/19/56 9/19/56	\$3,288,974.90 in Dkts. 15-J & 71-A for land
	4	473	Findings on motion by Prairie & Citizen Bands to dismiss intervening petition by Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	9/19/56	
		514	Opinion on motion to dismiss intervening petition Order dismissing amended intervening petition	9/19/56	
	143 C.C.	131	Affirmed dismissal of petition for intervention	7/16/58	
	359 U.S.	908	Certiorari denied	2/24/59	
	7	170	Additional findings on offsets	2/26/59	
		178	Opinion Conclusions of law & final award	2/26/59 2/26/59	

Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, *et al.*, Dkt. 15-K, *see* Potawatomi, Citizen Band, *et al.*, Dkt. 217

Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, *et al.*, Dkt. 15-L, *see* Potawatomi, Citizen Band, *et al.*, Dkt. 216

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-M, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 146					
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 15-N & 15-O, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 128					
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-P; Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-N; Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 306; Potawatomi of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., intervenors in Dkts. 15-P, 29-N, & 306	41	399 445 508 42	Opinion - Value & consideration Findings Interlocutory order Final award	6/8/78 6/8/78 6/8/78 7/14/78	\$1,809,552.57 in Dkts. 15-P, 29-N & 306 for land
<i>See prior decision in Dkts. 15-P, 29-N, & 306 on land title issues under Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>, Dkt. 15-D. See also Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity.</i>					
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 15-Q & 15-R, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 128					
Pueblo de Acoma, Dkt. 266	17	615 666 18	Findings - Laguna (Dkt. 227) & Navajo (Dkt. 229) overlaps Opinion Interlocutory order 154 202	2/28/67 2/28/67 2/28/67 3/31/67 3/31/67	\$6,107,157.00 for land
	19	152	Findings - Title, Laguna & Navajo overlaps included	3/31/67	
	23	219 235	Order amending findings of fact & opinion Additional findings - Compromise settlement Final judgment	5/2/68 6/17/70 6/17/70	
Pueblo de Cochiti, Dkt. 136	7	422 437	Findings on the merits Opinion Final order dismissing petition	3/27/59 3/27/59 3/27/59	Dismissed
Pueblo de Isleta, Dkt. 211	7	619 642 152 C.C. 368 U.S.	Findings on the merits Opinion Final order dismissing petition Affirmed Certiorari denied	6/5/59 6/5/59 6/5/59 3/10/61 10/9/61	Dismissed
Pueblo de Jemez, <i>see</i> Pueblos de Zia, Jemez, and Santa Clara, Dkt. 137; and Pueblo de Pecos, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 174					
Pueblo of Laguna, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 227	17	615 666 18	Findings on title, including Acoma (Dkt. 266) & Navajo (Dkt. 229) overlaps Opinion Interlocutory order 366	2/28/67 2/28/67 2/28/67 4/20/67	\$900,000.00 for land
	18	380	Order amending opinion	5/4/67	
	19	154	Order amending findings & opinion	5/7/68	
	24	197 207	Findings - Compromise settlement Final award	12/11/70 12/11/70	
Pueblo of Nambe, Dkt. 358	16	393 408 24	Findings - Title Opinion Interlocutory order 425	11/9/65 11/9/65 11/9/65 2/10/71	Transferred to Court of Claims
	39	34	Order denying plaintiff's motion for summary judgment of liability for interest on money paid under Pueblo Lands Act of 6/7/24	9/16/76	
	41	41	Opinion on motion for rehearing Order denying motion for rehearing	9/16/76	
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	5/8/78	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Pueblo de Pecos, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 174	4	130	Per curiam opinion	12/13/55	Dismissed
	8	195	Order sustaining claimant's motion to amend & overruling defendant's motion to dismiss	12/13/55	
		209	Findings	12/11/59	
	152 C.C.	865	Opinion	12/11/59	
	368 U.S.	821	Final order dismissing petition	12/11/59	
			Affirmed	3/10/61	
			Certiorari denied	10/9/61	
Pueblo de San Antonio de la Ysleta del Sur, <i>et al.</i> , <i>see</i> Apache, Lipan and Mescalero, Dkt. 22-C					
Pueblo of San Ildefonso, Dkt. 354	24	425	Order denying plaintiff's motion for summary judgment of liability for interest on money paid under Pueblo Lands Act of 6/7/24	2/10/71	Transferred to Court of Claims
	27	37	Order requiring, <i>inter alia</i> , that plaintiff file a corrected land description	2/9/72	
	30	234	Opinion on title & related issues	5/9/73	
		256	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part	5/9/73	
		259	Findings	5/9/73	
	206 C.C.	282	Interlocutory order	5/9/73	
	39	649	Affirmed	4/16/75	
		34	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for rehearing on order of 2/10/71 denying summary judgment	9/16/76	
			Order denying motion for rehearing	9/16/76	
	41	38	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	5/8/78	
Pueblo de Santa Ana, <i>see</i> Pueblos de Zia, Jemez, and Santa Ana, Dkt. 137					
Pueblo of Santa Clara, Dkt. 356	24	425	Order denying plaintiff's motion for summary judgment of liability for interest on money paid under Pueblo Lands Act of 6/7/24	2/10/71	Transferred to Court of Claims
	27	37	Order requiring, <i>inter alia</i> , that plaintiff file a corrected land description	2/9/72	
	30	234	Opinion on title & related issues	5/9/73	
		256	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part	5/9/73	
		259	Findings	5/9/73	
	206 C.C.	286	Interlocutory order	5/9/73	
	39	649	Affirmed	4/16/75	
		34	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for rehearing on order of 2/10/71 denying summary judgment	9/16/76	
			Order denying motion for rehearing	9/16/76	
	41	29	Opinion on motion for summary judgment: Townsite of Espanola	10/5/77	
		36	Order denying motion for summary judgment	10/5/77	
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	5/8/78	
Pueblo of Santo Domingo, Dkt. 355	24	425	Order denying plaintiff's motion for summary judgment of liability for interest on money paid under Pueblo Lands Act of 6/7/24	2/10/71	
	27	37	Order requiring, <i>inter alia</i> , that plaintiff file a corrected land description	2/9/72	
	30	234	Opinion on title & related issues	5/9/73	
		256	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part	5/9/73	
	206 C.C.	284	Interlocutory order	5/9/73	
	39	649	Affirmed	4/16/75	
		34	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for rehearing on order of 2/10/71 denying summary judgment	9/16/76	
			Order denying motion for rehearing	9/16/76	
	39	39	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for summary judgment for Fifth Amendment taking of certain land	12/22/76	
		241	Order denying motion for summary judgment	12/22/76	
	40	251	Opinion on motion for rehearing	4/18/77	
		101	Order denying rehearing & calling conference	4/18/77	
	42	105	Opinion on question of eastern boundary	8/17/78	
		306	Additional findings	8/17/78	
		319	Interlocutory order	8/17/78	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Pueblo of Taos, Dkt. 357	15	666 688	Findings - Title & related issues Opinion Interlocutory order & interlocutory award on claim relating to land in town of Taos	9/8/65 9/8/65 9/8/65	Transferred to Court of Claims
	21	342	Order granting leave to amend petition - Claims arising from proceedings under Pueblo Lands Act assigned Dkt. 357-A; claims for taking without compensation of aboriginal lands to remain in Dkt. 357	8/13/69	
	22	444	Order granting leave to amend petition & to file additional petition to be designated as Dkt. 357-B, said petition to relate to some 48,000 acres (Blue Lake aboriginal land area)	2/18/70	
	33	127	Order vacating order of 2/18/70 (22 Ind. Cl. Comm. 444) insofar as it granted plaintiff leave to file a new petition with respect to its Blue Lake claim to be designated as Dkt. 357-B [see related opinions of 2/4/74 under Dkt. 357-A, below]	2/4/74	
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	5/8/78	
Pueblo of Taos, Dkt. 357-A	24	406	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for summary judgment of liability for interest	2/10/71	\$1,030,437.35,
	24	413 414	Order denying motion for summary judgment Order to show cause why the Commission's findings, opinion, & interlocutory order of 9/8/65 [in Dkt. 357] relating to the plaintiff's town of Taos claim, should not be vacated	2/10/71	in principal & interest for 926 acres of land in town of Taos, N.M.
	33	82	Opinion on issues raised by order to show cause of 2/10/71	2/4/74	
		115	Opinion dissenting in part	2/4/74	
		119	Findings	2/4/74	
		127	Interlocutory order [& interlocutory award]	2/4/74	
	207 C.C. C.C.	53	Affirmed	5/14/75	
	37	520	Rehearing denied	10/10/75	
			Final award	3/17/76	
Pueblo of the Tigua Indian Community, <i>see</i> Apache, Lipan and Mescalero, Dkt. 22-C					
Pueblo de Zia, Pueblo de Jemez, and Pueblo de Santa Ana, Dkt. 137	11	131 147	Findings - Title Opinion	9/11/62 9/11/62	\$749,083.75 for land
	165 C.C. 165 C.C.	501 509	Final order dismissing petition Reversed & remanded	9/11/62 4/17/64	
	19	56 67	Amendment of remand directive Additional findings - Dates of taking Opinion	1/22/65 3/7/68 3/7/68	
	19	94	Interlocutory order	3/7/68	
	21	316	Order correcting opinion of 3/7/68 Opinion on defendant's motion for a pretrial determination of the basis for the appraisal of gratuitous offsets of real property	3/26/68 7/23/69	
		321	Order determining basis for the appraisal of gratuitous offsets of real property	7/23/69	
	unnumbered	270 284	Report of Commissioner Opinion - Value	9/3/69 12/17/70	
	26	300	Additional findings	12/17/70	
	26	218	Interlocutory order	12/17/70	
		243	Opinion - Offsets	9/15/71	
	200 C.C. C.C.	264 601	Additional findings Final award	9/15/71 9/15/71	
	33	1 16	Affirmed in part, reversed in part, & remanded Order amending amount of offset Findings - Compromise settlement	2/16/73 4/27/73 1/10/74	
			Order amending opinion & findings, & amended final award	1/10/74	
Puyallup, Dkt. 203	17	1 16	Findings - Title Opinion	4/25/66 4/25/66	Transferred to Court of Claims
	41	304	Interlocutory order Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	4/25/66 5/8/78	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of the Pyramid Lake Reservation, <i>see</i> Paiute, Pyramid Lake Tribe, Dkt. 87-B					
Quapaw, Dkt. 14	1	469 474	Findings Opinion	3/15/51 3/15/51	\$927,668.04 for land in 2d
	1	644 652	Interlocutory order [& award on 2d cause] Additional findings - Offsets Opinion	3/15/51 12/6/51 12/6/51	cause; remaining 1st cause dismissed
	128 C.C. unnumbered	45	Conclusions of law & final award Reversed in part & remanded Amended final award [on cause 2, cause 1 dismissed]	12/6/51 4/6/54 5/7/54	
Quechan of Fort Yuma Reservation, California, Dkt. 86	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	8/22/58	Dismissed
Quechan of Fort Yuma Reservation, California, Dkt. 319	6 6 8 156 C.C. 13	86 93 666 111-A 138 714 89	Opinion Opinion Opinion Order dividing California into Areas A & B Findings - Title Opinion Interlocutory order Appeal & cross appeal withdrawn Opinion on issue remanded by Court of Claims Order determining issue remanded by Court of Claims	1/20/58 1/20/58 10/6/58 10/6/58 9/30/59 9/30/59 9/30/59 3/23/62 3/3/64	\$520,000.00 for land
	15	489 512	Additional findings - Compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment	3/3/64 8/5/65 8/5/65 8/5/65	
Quechan of Fort Yuma Reservation, California, Dkt. 320	26	15 20	Opinion on plaintiff's motion to reopen record & to vacate order staying further proceedings Order granting plaintiff's motion to vacate order staying further proceedings & conditionally denying plaintiff's motion to reopen the record	7/21/71	Transferred to Court of Claims
	39	239	Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	7/21/71 12/15/76	
Queets Tribe or Band, <i>see</i> Quinaielt, Dkt. 242					
Quileute, Dkt. 155	7	31 49	Findings - Title Opinion	12/1/58 12/1/58	\$112,152.60
	unnumbered		Interlocutory order Order amending findings of fact & interlocutory order of 12/1/58	12/1/58	
	158 C.C. 10	701 427 438	Appeal dismissed Findings - Compromise settlement Opinion	7/2/59 7/6/62 7/9/62	
	unnumbered		Final determination or judgment Amended final determination or judgment	7/9/62 4/17/63	
Quinaielt, Dkt. 242	7	1 17	Findings — Title Opinion	12/1/58 12/1/58	\$205,172.40
	unnumbered		Interlocutory order Order amending findings of fact & interlocutory order of 12/1/58	12/1/58	
	158 C.C. 10	702 411 423	Appeal dismissed Findings — Compromise settlement Opinion	6/29/59 7/6/62 7/9/62	
			Final determination or judgment Amended final determination or judgment	7/9/62 4/17/63	

Red Lake, *see* Chippewa, Red Lake Band

Ridaught, Horace G., *see* Choctaw, Ridaught Band, Dkt. 346

Rincon Band, *see* California Indians, Dkts. 80 & 80-D (under California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37); California Indians, Baron Long, *et al.*, Dkt. 80-A; California Indians, Baron Long, *et al.*, Dkt. 80-B; California Indians, Bands of Mission Indians, Dkt. 80-C

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Tri</i>
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 83	3	395	Opinion	11/17/54	\$1,969,585.00	Sac
	7	675	Order denying 3d defense	11/17/54	for land	
		708	Findings — Title	6/12/59		
			Opinion	6/12/59		
			Interlocutory order	6/12/59		
	161 C.C.	189	Affirmed	4/5/63		Sac
	375 U.S.	921	Certiorari denied	11/18/63		
	18	548	Order granting defendant's motion to amend answer	9/7/67		
	19	159	Order granting motion to exclude grants, denying motions to vacate order granting defendant's motion to amend answer, & denying motion to expunge	5/16/68		
	25	414	Opinion on boundary & acreage issues	6/16/71		
		423	Additional findings	6/16/71		
		429	Interlocutory order	6/16/71		
	32	320	Opinion — Value	12/26/73		Sac
		348	Additional findings	12/26/73		
		398	Final award	12/26/73		
	206 C.C.	898	Affirmed	4/25/75		Sac
	206 C.C.	898	Rehearing denied	6/27/75		(co)
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 95	26	513	Opinion -- Accounting liability	12/27/71		Sag
		520	Findings	12/27/71		
			Interlocutory order & award of \$20,421.78, less any allowable gratuitous offsets	12/27/71		
	202 C.C.	1088	Interlocutory order affirmed as to awarded amount & reversed insofar as it failed to enter judgment for a sum found to be held for claimant's credit in a trust account, & the Commission was directed to enter judgment for such fund	6/1/73		Sai
	202 C.C.	1090	Rehearing denied	10/17/73		Sai
	34	189	Opinion on remand	6/19/74		Sai
		196	Dissenting opinion	6/19/74		
		200	Interlocutory order	6/19/74		
	35	12	Final award, one Commissioner dissenting	9/25/74		
						Dkt
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 135, <i>see</i> Iowa, Sac and Fox, Dkt. 135						
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 135-A	9	301	Findings on the merits	5/8/61	Dismissed	San
		308	Opinion	5/8/61		
			Final order dismissing petition	5/8/61		
	159 C.C.	247	Affirmed	11/7/62		San
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 138, <i>see</i> Iowa, Omaha, Sac and Fox, Dkt. 138 (consolidated with Otoe and Missouria, Dkt. 11-A)						
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 143	15	381	Findings - Value & consideration	5/19/65	\$1,789,201.45	San et al
		409	Opinion	5/19/65	for land	Indi
			Final order [and judgment]	5/19/65		
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 153, <i>see</i> Iowa, Sac and Fox, Dkt. 153						San
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 158, <i>see</i> Iowa, Sac and Fox, Dkts. 158, 209, & 231						San
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 195	13	295	Findings - Value & consideration	5/1/64	\$192,000.00	San
		313	Opinion	5/1/64	for land to	
			Interlocutory order & award	5/1/64	Missouri Sac	San
	15	120	Final judgment	3/10/65	and Fox	
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 209, <i>see</i> dismissal of this claim under Iowa, Sac and Fox, Dkts. 158, 209, & 231						Mis
						Sau

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe ~</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 219	18	558 612	Findings - Value & consideration Opinion Final award	9/29/67 9/29/67 9/29/67	\$889,408.54 for land to Sac and Fox of Mississippi
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 220	11	578 608	Findings on the merits Opinion Final order dismissing the claims	11/28/62 11/28/62 11/28/62	\$692,564.15 for land to Sac and Fox of Oklahoma
	167 C.C. 17	710 544	Reversed & remanded Opinion accompanying order amending findings of fact & for entry of final judgment Order denying motion of Oklahoma Sac and Fox for modification of certain findings of fact Order amending findings of fact & for entry of final judgment	10/16/64 2/14/67 2/14/67 2/14/67	
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 231, <i>see</i> Iowa, Sac and Fox, Dkts. 158, 209, & 231					
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 232, <i>see</i> order of 3/2/65 dismissing Sac and Fox petition in Dkt. 232 under Iowa, Omaha, and Sac and Fox, Dkt. 138 (consolidated with Otoe and Missouria, Dkt. 11-A)					
Saginaw Chippewa, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw					
Salish and Kootenai, <i>see</i> Flathead Reservation, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes					
Samish, Dkt. 261	6	159 169	Findings — Title Opinion Interlocutory order	3/11/58 3/11/58 3/11/58	\$5,754.96 for land
	13	583	Findings on allocation of consideration under Point Elliott Treaty	8/13/64	
		591	Opinion Order relating to allocation of Point Elliott Treaty consideration	8/13/64	
	26	61 67 75	Opinion — Value Findings Interlocutory order	7/28/71 7/28/71 7/28/71	
	26	318	Final award	10/6/71	
San Antonio de la Ysleta del Sur, Pueblo de, <i>see</i> Apache, Lipan and Mescalero, Dkt. 22-C					
San Carlos Apache, <i>see</i> Apache, San Carlos					
San Carlos of Arizona, Dkt. 223	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition in Dkt. 223 without prejudice to the determination in Dkts. 22-D or 22-H of claims originally presented in Dkt. 223	8/23/63	Dismissed
San Ildefonso, Pueblo of, <i>see</i> Pueblo of San Ildefonso, Dkt. 354					
San Juan, Dkt. 214	5	517 520	Findings on the merits Opinion Final order dismissing petition	10/30/57 10/30/57 10/30/57	Dismissed
San Pasqual Band, <i>see</i> California Indians, Dkts. 80 & 80-D (under California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37); California Indians, Baron Long, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 80-A; California Indians, San Pasqual Band, Dkt. 80-A; California Indians, Baron Long, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 80-B; California Indians, Bands of Mission Indians, Dkt. 80-C					
Sanpoil-Nespelem, <i>see</i> Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes					
Santa Ana, Pueblo de, <i>see</i> Pueblos de Zia, Jemez and Santa Anna, Dkt. 137					
Santa Clara, Pueblo of, <i>see</i> Pueblo of Santa Clara, Dkt. 356					
Santo Domingo, Pueblo of, <i>see</i> Pueblo of Santo Domingo, Dkt. 355					
Santee, <i>see</i> Sioux Dkts. 74, 74-B, 104, and mention of the Santee Sioux in findings on compromise settlement of certain claims of the Mississippi Sioux at 18 Ind. Cl. Comm. 477 (1967)					
Sauk, <i>see</i> Suiattle-Sauk, Dkt. 97					

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Schaghticoke, of Kent, Connecticut, Dkt. 112	unnumbered 147 C.C.	656	Order dismissing petition Appeal dismissed	9/9/58 10/16/59	Dismissed
Seminole Nation, Dkt. 53	2	115 122	Findings on the merits Opinion Conclusions of law & final order dismissing petition	4/22/52 4/22/52	Dismissed
	125 C.C.	375	Affirmed	4/22/52 6/2/53	
Seminole Indians, of Florida, Dkts. 73 & 73-A	unnumbered		Order sustaining plaintiffs' motion to strike motion to quash the cause of the Seminole plaintiffs in Dkts. 73 & 73-A filed by Ingraham Billie, <i>et al.</i> , as the General Council of the Miccosukee Seminole Nation		Preliminary matter—see disposition of these cases below
	137 C.C. 355 U.S.	161 843	Appeal dismissed Certiorari denied	4/8/55 12/5/56 10/14/57	
Seminole Indians of Florida, Dkt. 73, & Seminole Nation of Oklahoma, Dkt. 151	13	326 342	Findings - Title Opinion	5/8/64 5/8/64	\$16,000,000.00 for land to plaintiffs in Dkts. 73 & 151
	180 C.C.	375	Interlocutory order	5/8/64	
	19	179 187	Affirmed Additional findings - Boundaries Opinion Second interlocutory order	6/9/67 6/28/68 6/28/68 6/28/68	
	unnumbered		Order in Dkts. 73 & 73-A separating from the petition in Dkt. 73 the claim for compensation for Macomb's area or "Reservation" & making this claim an integral part of the petition in Dkt. 73-A		
	19	440	Decision in Dkts. 73, 73-A, & 151 on motion to intervene by Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, <i>et al.</i> Interlocutory order & order denying Miccosukee motion to intervene	8/13/68	
	23	108	Opinion - Value	9/17/68	
		115	Additional findings	9/17/68	
	24	134	Order [and interlocutory award]	5/13/70	
		1	Opinion - Offsets	5/13/70	
		14	Dissenting opinion	10/22/70	
		17	Additional findings	10/22/70	
		20	Final award	10/22/70	
	197 C.C.	350	Remanded	2/18/72	
	unnumbered		Order consolidating Dkts. 73 & 151 with Dkt. 280 (Creek Nation East of the Mississippi) for trial on issue of aboriginal title to overlap area		
	31	1	Opinion in Dkts. 73 & 151, & 280 on Creek motion to amend petition & Seminole motion to dismiss & for summary judgment	3/15/72	
		9	Order denying motion to amend petition & holding in abeyance ruling on motion for summary judgment	7/5/73	
	203 C.C.	754	Appeal by Creek Nation East dismissed	7/5/73	
	35	7	Order dismissing claims under Dkt. 280 & severing Dkt. 280 from consolidation with Dkts. 73 & 151	2/11/74	
	35	117	Order denying motion of Creek Nation East for reconsideration	9/13/74	
	207 C.C.	1009	Commission's order affirmed & appeal by Creeks East dismissed	11/13/74	
	207 C.C.	1009	Rehearing denied	6/27/75	
	38	92	Order admitting exhibits & for other purposes	10/3/75	
	38	62	Findings - Compromise settlement	4/23/76	
		91	Final award	4/27/76	
				4/27/76	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Seminole Indians of Florida, Dkt. 73-A, <i>see prior decisions</i>	22	448	Opinion on defendant's motion to strike	2/18/70	\$50,000.00 for difference in value of some
		450	Order directing that documents be filed by plaintiff	2/18/70	99,200 acres of Seminole reservation land in Monroe County, Florida, exchanged for some 104,800 acres of land in Florida's Broward & Palm Beach Counties
relating to Dkt. 73-A above under Seminole Indians of Florida, Dkts. 73 & 73-A; & Seminole Indians of Florida, Dkt. 73, & Seminole Nation of Oklahoma, Dkt. 151	25	25	Opinion on title & related issues	3/24/71	
		39	Findings	3/24/71	
		53	Order dismissing claim in Count I of the petition respecting the 5-million acre tract known as the Macomb area or "reservation" & ordering that the claim in Count II of the petition arising from the exchange of the 99,200 acre reservation in Monroe County for the 104,800 acre Broward County reservation be scheduled for further hearing	3/24/71	
		unnumbered	Order denying plaintiff's motion for leave to amend petition to conform to the evidence	5/17/72	
		unnumbered	Order denying defendant's motion to report dismissal of Count I of Dkt. 73-A to Congress	5/17/72	
		unnumbered	Order denying plaintiff's motion to modify & supplement findings 1 to 21, inclusive, & for rehearing	5/17/72	
	200 C.C. C.C.	417	Appeal dismissed	1/18/73	
	33	70	Rehearing denied	4/27/73	
			Order denying plaintiff's motion for an order supplementing orders of 3/24/71 & 5/17/72, subdividing Dkt. 73-A [striking therefrom the Macomb area claim designated as Count I & requiring said claim to be refiled <i>pro forma</i> in its entirety under a new petition assigned Dkt. 73-B] & setting trial date in Dkt. 73-A	1/16/74	
	35	298	Order denying plaintiff's motion requesting the Commission to notice judicially certain documents & for such other action on valuation date as the Commission may take	1/8/75	
	40	107	Additional findings on compromise settlement	4/20/77	
		125	Final award	4/20/77	
Seminole Indians of Florida, Dkt. 73-B	33	70	Order striking the Count I Macomb area claim from the petition in Dkt. 73-A, assigning this claim Dkt. 73-B, & dismissing this claim effective 1/16/74		Dismissed
	206 C.C.	876	Affirmed	1/16/74	
	206 C.C.	876	Rehearing denied	3/14/75	
Seminole Indians, Loyal Group, represented by Lincoln Burden, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 121	6	127	Opinion Order sustaining motion for summary judgment & dismissing petition	4/25/75	
				2/27/58	Dismissed
Seminole Nation, Oklahoma, Dkt. 150	4	66	Findings	12/5/55	\$34,053.66 for the value of 320
		77	Opinion	12/5/55	acres of land in excess of the amount for which the Government sold these acres for the Indians
		87	Dissenting opinion	12/5/55	
	6	336	Interlocutory order [& award]	12/5/55	
		345	Additional findings - Offsets	6/4/58	
	146 C.C.	171	Opinion	6/4/58	
			Conclusions of law & final award	6/4/58	
			Affirmed	6/3/59	
Seminole Nation, Oklahoma, Dkt. 152	10	450	Findings	8/22/62	
		461	Opinion	8/22/62	
			Final order dismissing this suit	8/22/62	
Seminole Nation, Oklahoma, Dkt. 204	17	67	Findings - Liability	6/24/66	
		76	Opinion	6/24/66	
	26	7	Interlocutory order	6/24/66	
	28	117	Order denying motion to dismiss the claim, one Commissioner dissenting	7/7/71	
		130	Opinion by two Commissioners	5/31/72	
			Opinion by one Commissioner concurring in the result	5/31/72	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Seminole Nation, Oklahoma, Dkt. 204 (cont.)		132	Dissenting opinion by one Commissioner concurred in by another	5/31/72	
		137	Preliminary statement & findings	5/31/72	
		144	Order vacating Commission's findings, opinion, & interlocutory order of 6/24/66	5/31/72	
		145	Order dismissing petition	5/31/72	
	29	421	Order denying plaintiff's motion for rehearing, two Commissioners dissenting	1/26/73	
	204 C.C.	655	Affirmed	6/19/74	
	420 U.S.	907	Centiorari denied	1/27/75	
	420 U.S.	984	Rehearing denied	3/17/75	
Seminole Nation, Dkt. 205	12	798	Findings	11/7/63	Dismissed
		809	Opinion	11/7/63	
			Final order dismissing petition	11/7/63	
	171 C.C.	477	Affirmed	6/11/65	
Seminole Nation, Oklahoma, Dkt. 247	18	428	Per curiam opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment	6/30/67	Transferred to Court of Claims
			Order denying motion	6/30/67	
	27	141	Opinion	3/24/72	
		155	Dissenting opinion	3/24/72	
		157	Findings	3/24/72	
		175	Final order of dismissal	3/24/72	
	29	422	Order denying plaintiff's motion for rehearing, two Commissioners dissenting	1/26/73	
	203 C.C.	637	Affirmed in part, reversed in part & remanded	2/20/74	
	37	203	Order determining valuation date & for other purposes	1/28/76	
	37	499	Order rescinding order of 1/28/76 (37 Ind. Cl. Comm. 203), stating Commission's conclusions on certain issues, & for other purposes	3/17/76	
	38	560	Order denying plaintiff's motion for rehearing as to matters determined in order of 3/17/76	7/21/76	
	40	231	Opinion on offer of proof	6/22/77	
		234	Order rejecting plaintiff's offer of proof	6/22/77	
	42	202	Order certifying and transferring case to Court of Claims	7/13/78	
Seminole Nation, Oklahoma, Dkt. 248	14	484	Findings	12/23/64	\$63,680.00
		505	Opinion	12/23/64	additional compensation
			Final award	12/23/64	for oil & gas lease covering 320 acres of land
Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma, Dkt. 341	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition [all causes of action having been separated or stricken from the petition & assigned Dkts. 341-A through 341-E]	9/4/58	Dismissed
Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma, Dkts. 341-A & B	26	625	Opinion - Liability	12/29/71	\$43,215.58 in principal & interest
		635	Findings	12/29/71	
			Interlocutory order	12/29/71	
	29	262	Opinion - Accounting claims	12/7/72	recovered on accounting claims in Dkts. 341-A & B
		275	Additional findings	12/7/72	
		287	Interlocutory order & award on accounting claims	12/7/72	
	33	436	Opinion on value of lands involved & related issues	4/4/74	
		454	Additional findings	4/4/74	
		468	Interlocutory order expressing finding of no damages sustained on sale of the lands & no entitlement to a recovery on this part of the case	4/4/74	
	36	170	Findings on final award	6/11/75	
		180	Final award	6/11/75	
Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma, Dkt. 341-C, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-E					Dismissed

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma, Dkt. 341-D, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-F					Dismissed
Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma, Dkt. 341-E		unnumbered	Order dismissing the cause of action designated sixth claim of the petition [in Dkt. 341, which claim was stricken therefrom & assigned Dkt. No. 341-E]	9/4/58	Dismissed
Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma, <i>see also</i> Cayuga, Dkt. 343, & Six Nations, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 84, 89, & 344					
Seneca Nation, Dkt. 77		unnumbered 122 C.C. 163	Order sustaining motion to dismiss petition Affirmed	6/12/51 4/8/52	Dismissed
Seneca Nation, Dkt. 342		unnumbered	Order dismissing original petition [the 12 claims pleaded therein having been severed & stricken therefrom & refiled, the first 4 in Dkt. 342-A, & the remaining 8 in Dkts. 342-B through 342-I]	10/3/60	Dismissed
Seneca Nation, Dkt. 342-A; & Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians, Dkt. 368-A	12 173 C.C. 28	755 780 917 12 42 90 28 29	Findings - Liability Opinion Final order dismissing petitions Affirmed in part, reversed in part & remanded Opinion - Value & consideration Findings Order vacating finding of fact [entered on 10/24/63], & interlocutory order Order denying motion for rehearing Final award	10/24/63 10/24/63 10/24/63 12/17/65 5/3/72 5/3/72 5/3/72 7/6/72 11/22/72	\$5,466,615.04 in Dkts. 342-A & 368-A for land
Seneca Nation, Dkts. 342-B, C, D, E, F, & I; and Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians, Dkt. 368	18 18 20 28	412 424 177 186 12 42 92 94 95 96 97 390 392 393	Order sustaining defendant's motion to dismiss for lack of prosecution, & dismissing the petitions in Dkts. 342-B, 342-C, 342-D, & 368 Order setting aside order of 5/11/67 dismissing petitions & allowing plaintiffs to file proposed findings of fact & brief Opinion in Dkts. 342-B, C, & D, & Dkt. 368 on title & related issues Findings in same dchts. Interlocutory order in Dkts. 342-B & D, & 368, & order dismissing the petition in Dkt. 342-D Opinion on value & consideration issues in, among others, the dchts. on the left, except 342-D Findings in same dchts. Interlocutory order [and award] in Dkts. 342-B, C, & 368 Final order dismissing claim in Dkt. 342-E Interlocutory order [and award] in Dkt. 342-F Order denying motion to dismiss petition in Dkt. 342-I Interlocutory order [and award] in Dkt. 342-I Final award in Dkts. 342-B, C, & 368 Final award in Dkt. 342-F Final award in Dkt. 342-I	5/11/67 6/19/67 12/30/68 12/30/68 12/30/68 5/3/72 5/3/72 5/3/72 5/3/72 5/3/72 3/13/74 3/13/74 3/13/74	For land: \$101,000.00 in Dkts. 342-B & C & 368; \$2,650.00 in Dkt. 342-F; & \$79,320.00 in Dkt. 342-I. Dismissed: Dkts. 342-D & 342-E
Seneca Nation, Dkt. 342-G	39	355 369	Findings on compromise settlement Final award	2/3/77 2/3/77	\$600,000.00 for settlement of claims for an accounting of proceeds from land leases & claim for compensation for land covered by leases
Seneca Nation, Dkt. 342-H	12 173 C.C.	552 563 912	Findings - Liability Opinion Final order dismissing petition Affirmed	8/30/63 8/30/63 8/30/63 12/17/65	Dismissed

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Seneca Nation, <i>see also</i> Six Nations, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 84, 89, & 344					
Shasta, Dkt. 333, <i>see</i> California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37					
Shawnee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 64; & Shawnee, Eastern, of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 335 & 338. Prior decisions are under Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G	40	161 173	Findings on compromise settlement Final award	6/3/77 6/3/77	\$1,745,146.86 in settlement of Shawnee Dkts. 64 & 335, & Shawnee portion of Dkt. 338—for land
Shawnee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 64-A, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-F					
Shawnee, Absentee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 334, Amended	6	337 395	Findings Opinion Interlocutory order [and award] Final judgment	6/19/58 6/19/58 6/19/58 7/27/59	\$1,269,338.02 for land
		151 C.C. 700 366 U.S. 924 unnumbered	Modified & affirmed Certiorari denied Amended final judgment	11/2/60 5/15/61 5/29/61	
Shawnee, Absentee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 334-A	12	161 174	Findings Opinion Final order dismissing petition	3/22/63 3/22/63 3/22/63	Dismissed
	165 C.C.	510	Affirmed (Appeal No. 6-63)	4/17/64	
Shawnee, Absentee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 334-B	12	180 191	Findings Opinion Final order dismissing petition	3/29/63 3/29/63 3/29/63	\$300,000.00 for land
	165 C.C.	510	Affirmed in part, reversed in part & remanded (Appeal No. 7-63)	4/17/64	
	2	18	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for determination of certain issues	11/13/69	
		25	Additional findings	11/13/69	
	25	27	First interlocutory order	11/13/69	
		311	Per curiam opinion on compromise settlement	5/19/71	
		314	Findings on compromise settlement	5/19/71	
		324	Final award	5/19/71	
Shawnee, Eastern of Oklahoma & Shawnee, Absentee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 336	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	11/28/68	Dismissed
Shoshone of Wind River Reservation, Wyoming, Dkt. 63	1	464	Per curiam opinion on defendant's motion to require plaintiff to separately state their claims Order directing separation of causes of action [requiring plaintiff to file an amended petition setting forth in separate counts the causes of action set forth in said petition]	1/2/51	\$433,013.60 for land
	3	313 333	Findings Opinion Interlocutory order [and award]	1/2/51 8/20/54 8/20/54	
		unnumbered	Order of final judgment [entered upon joint motion of the parties]	8/20/54 4/22/57	
Shoshone of Wind River Reservation, Wyoming, Dkt. 157	3	380	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment	11/8/54	
		393	Dissenting opinion Order on defendant's motion for summary judgment, etc.	11/8/54	\$120,000.00 for gold removed from reservation land
	14	729 744	Findings on compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment	11/8/54 2/24/65 2/24/65	
Shoshone of Wind River Reservation, Wyoming, Dkt. 326, & Shoshone Nation or Tribe, Dkt. 367	11	387	Findings on title phase of aboriginal land claim determining, <i>inter alia</i> , that within the claimed area in aboriginal times there were four tribes or identifiable groups of Shoshone Indians, each of which held Indian title to a separate & distinct area of land	10/16/62	Dkt. 326 closed after all claims severed out & redocketed in Dkts. 326-A through K. <i>See</i>

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Shoshone of Wind River Reservation, Wyoming, Dkt. 326, & Shoshone Nation or Tribe, Dkt. 367 (cont.)		417 unnumbered	Opinion Interlocutory order Order closing Dkt. 326 [all claims having been severed out of Dkt. 326 & assigned Dkts. 326-A through K]	10/16/62 10/16/62 7/3/68	decisions in these dockets & the disposition of Dkt. 367 below.
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho, Dkts. 326-D, E, F, & G; Shoshone Tribe, Dkt. 326-H; Bannack Tribe, Dkt. 366; Shoshone Nation or Tribe, Dkt. 367; consolidated; <i>see</i> findings, opinion, & interlocutory order of 10/16/62 under Dkts. 326 & 367, above	19	3 34	Findings on compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment in consolidated Dkts. 326-D, 326-E, 326-F, 326-G, 326-H, 366, & 367	2/13/68 2/13/68 2/13/68	\$15,700,000.00 for settlement of an accounting claim in Dkt. 326-D & land claims in the remaining consolidated dockets
Shoshone, Western (Temoak Bands suing on behalf of), Dkt. 326-A; Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho, Dkt. 326-C	23 31	70 '86 427 545 551 557 559 unnumbered	Opinion in Dkt. 326-A on plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment in respect to certain accounting exceptions Order in Dkt. 326-A Opinion in Dkts. 326-A & 22-G (Mescalero Apache) regarding, <i>inter alia</i> , obligation to make Indian trust funds productive Concurring opinion Dissenting opinion Order in Dkt. 326-A Order in Dkt. 22-G Order & pretrial notice in Dkt. 326-C holding holding that the opinion of 10/4/73 in Dkts. 326-A & 22-G (31 Ind. Cl. Comm. 427) constitutes the law of the case in Dkt. 326-C Opinion in Dkt. 326-A on plaintiff's motion for rehearing Order in Dkt. 326-A denying motion for rehearing	4/29/70 4/29/70 10/4/73 10/4/73 10/4/73 10/4/73 10/4/73 1/16/74 4/4/74 4/4/74	Dkts. 326-A & 326-C were transferred to the Court of Claims
Shoshone, Goshute, Dkt. 326-B	33	417 435 369	Opinion in Dkt. 326-A on plaintiff's motion for rehearing Order in Dkt. 326-A denying motion for rehearing Affirmed in part, reversed in part & remanded (Appeal No. 2-74, Dkt. 22-G; Appeal No. 10-74, Dkt. 326-C; & Appeal No. 12-74, Dkt. 326-A)	4/4/74 4/4/74	
Shoshone, Goshute, Dkt. 326-J, <i>see</i> findings, opinion & order of 10/16/62 under Shoshone of Wind River Reservation, Wyoming, Dkt. 326, & Shoshone Nation or Tribe, Dkt. 367, for the title phase of this case	31 32 206 C.C.	130 141 225 252 256 307 230 401	Opinion Order partially granting plaintiff's motion for supplemental accounting & denying defendant's motion to dismiss Order suspending further action pending completion of settlement negotiations Report to the Commissioner Opinion on date of extinguishment of aboriginal title & value Concurring opinion Findings Interlocutory order Order denying defendant's motion for rehearing Affirmed	2/14/74 2/14/74 5/7/75 10/13/69 8/9/73 8/9/73 8/9/73 8/9/73 11/14/73 3/19/75	Settled with Dkt. 326-J, <i>see</i> below Settled with Dkt. 326-B, <i>see</i> below

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Shoshone, Goshute, Dkts. 326-B & 326-J	37	41 58	Findings on compromise settlement Final award	11/5/75 11/5/75	\$7,300,000.00 for settlement of accounting claims in Dkt. 326-B, & claims in Dkt. 326-J for compensation for aboriginal lands, & minerals re- moved there- from prior to extinguishment of claimant's aboriginal title
Shoshone, Lemhi, Dkt. 326-I, <i>see</i> findings, opinion, & order of 10/16/62 under Shoshone of Wind River Reservation, Wyoming, Dkt. 326, & Shoshone Nation or Tribe, Dkt. 367, for the title phase of this case	24 26	482 485 498 80	Per curiam opinion on compromise settlement Findings Final award Order dismissing "Petition in Intervention"	3/8/71 3/8/71 3/8/71 8/5/71	\$4,500,000.00 for land
Shoshone, Western Identifiable Group (represented by Temoak Bands), Dkt. 326-K, <i>see</i> findings, opinion & order of 10/16/62 under Shoshone of Wind River Reservation, Wyoming, Dkt. 326, & Shoshone Nation or Tribe, Dkt. 367, for the title phase of this case	29 29 35 40 209 C.C. C.C. 429 U.S. 40 40 40 311 317 40 318 388 453	5 60 124 472 457 478 43 885 305 311 317 318 388 453	Opinion - Valuation issues Additional findings on value Interlocutory order Order denying defendant's motion for rehearing Opinion on petition by Western Shoshone Legal Defense & Education Association, an unincorporated group, & Frank Temoak, for a stay of the proceedings & for leave to present an amended claim Order denying petition to stay proceedings & present an amended claim & for other purposes Affirmed Rehearing denied Certiorari denied Order denying motions to stay proceedings & for other purposes Opinion Order granting leave to file & denying defendant's second motion for rehearing Opinion - Offsets Additional findings Final award	10/11/72 10/11/72 10/11/72 2/21/73 2/20/75 2/18/76 4/23/76 10/12/76 8/15/77 8/15/77 8/15/77 8/15/77 8/15/77 8/15/77 8/15/77	Pending at date hereof on appeal in the Court of Claims from Commission's final award of \$26,145,189.89 representing compensation for aboriginal land & profits lost from ores mined there- from before July 1, 1872
Shungnak, Native Village of, Dkt. 286	28	334	Order granting defendant's motion to dismiss & dismissing the claims in this case	8/16/72	Dismissed
Siletz, Confederated Tribes, <i>see</i> Tillamook					
Sioux Tribe, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 74	2 146 F.Sup. 182 C.C.	646 671 229 912 15 577 599	Findings Opinion Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing petition Affirmed Opinion of 11/7/56 vacated & case remanded to the Commission (as indicated in the Court's summary of proceedings, published in 1968) Findings in Dkts. 74, 350-B & C, 322-A & 221-A Opinion on Sioux (Dkt. 74) motion for determination of certain title matters Order defining boundary of the area recognized by Fort Laramie Treaty of September 17, 1851, as belonging to the "Sioux or Dacotah Nation"	4/5/54 4/5/54 4/5/54 11/7/56 11/5/58 8/27/65 8/27/65 8/27/65	On the date hereof appeal time was running from a final award in Dkt. 74 of \$43,949,700.00 for the value of Sioux interests in lands extinguished under the Treaty of April 29, 1868, 15 Stat. 635

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Sioux Tribe, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 74 (cont.)	19	271	Opinion in Dkt. 74, <i>et al.</i> , on motion to receive Fort Berthold exhibit	7/3/68	
		unnumbered	Order admitting additional evidence	7/3/68	
	21	371	Order in Dkts. 74 & 74-B setting questions for determination	10/29/68	
		381	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion to modify Fort Laramie boundary determination of 8/27/65	9/10/69	
	22	344	Order amending findings & interlocutory order	9/10/69	
		354	Opinion in Dkt. 332-C on motion by plaintiffs in Dkt. 74 to intervene	12/17/69	
	23	358	Interlocutory order granting in part & denying in part the motion to intervene	12/17/69	
		369	Opinion on scope & meaning of articles 11 & 16 of the Treaty of April 29, 1868	7/8/70	
	23	419	Interlocutory order	7/8/70	
		428	Opinion (in Dkts. 74, 221-A, 350-B & C) - Teton & Yanktonai Sioux aboriginal title area	8/26/70	
		440	Findings	8/26/70	
	24	98	Interlocutory order	8/26/70	
		105	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 74-B on plaintiffs' motions for, <i>inter alia</i> , modification of order of 7/8/70	11/30/70	
	24	147	Order amending interlocutory order & denying other motions	11/30/70	
		161	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C on respective interests of the Teton & Yankton Sioux divisions in Fort Laramie treaty land	12/2/70	
		175	Additional findings	12/2/70	
		177	Interlocutory order	12/2/70	
	24	208	Order admitting exhibits	12/2/70	
		218	Opinion in Dkt. 332-C on Yankton Sioux lands east of the Missouri in South Dakota	12/14/70	
		236	Findings	12/14/70	
	24	364	Interlocutory order - Intervention of Dkt. 74 plaintiffs dismissed	12/14/70	
		373	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C on motions for rehearing & modification of opinion, findings, & order of 8/26/70	1/6/71	
	25	179	Order denying motions for rehearing & modification of order	1/6/71	
		191	Opinion in Dkts. 74, 350-B & C, <i>et al.</i> , - Fort Berthold overlap	3/30/71	
		212	Findings	3/30/71	
	27	49	Final order dismissing claim in Dkt. 350-B, & interlocutory order in Dkt. 350-C	3/30/71	
		58	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C on motion for rehearing	3/1/72	
	27	79	Order denying motion for rehearing	3/1/72	
		87	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for leave to amend petition	3/8/72	
	28	204	Order granting leave to amend petition	3/8/72	
		215	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C	6/23/72	
		217	Order denying Dkts. 332-C plaintiffs' motion to strike notices of appeal	6/23/72	
		218	Order denying defendant's motion to dismiss Dkt. 74	6/23/72	
		219	Order to the Clerk of Commission	6/23/72	
	205 C.C.	148	Order denying defendant's motion for rehearing & consolidation	6/23/72	
	205 C.C.	148	Affirmed in part, reversed in part, & remanded Defendant's motion for rehearing <i>en banc</i>	7/19/74	
		469	denied	10/4/74	
	38	487	Opinion - Value	7/15/76	
		532	Additional findings	7/15/76	
	40	454	Interlocutory order & award	7/15/76	
		476	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C on remanded matter of apportionment of Fort Laramie Treaty lands	8/25/77	
			Findings	8/25/77	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Sioux Tribe, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 74 (cont.)		518	Order reentering order of 12/2/70 & dissolving consolidation of Dkt. 74 & 332-C	8/25/77	
	41	160	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C on Dkt. 74 plaintiffs' motion for rehearing	12/27/77	
		167	Amended findings	12/27/77	
		170	Order granting motion for rehearing & interlocutory order	12/27/77	
	41	172	Order amending order of 12/27/77	1/6/78	
	42	208	Opinion on defendant's motion to enter adjustments in valuation award	7/19/78	
		213	Order granting in part, denying in part defendant's motion	7/19/78	
	42	214	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion that no offsets, either payments on the claim or gratuities, be deducted from the award in this case	7/19/78	
		233	Additional findings	7/19/78	
		256	Order granting plaintiffs' motion	7/19/78	
	42	257	Final award	7/19/78	
Sioux Tribe, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 74-A	unnumbered	unnumbered	Order striking the petition	1/30/62	Disposed of by striking
			Order striking amendments to amended petition in Dkt. 74-A & defendant's tentative answer thereto [& confirming "that said Docket No. 74-A has been stricken by order of this Commission dated January 30, 1962"]	4/5/62	
Sioux Nation, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 74-B	unnumbered		Order in Dkts. 74 & 74-B setting questions for determination	10/29/68	Transferred to Court of Claims upon the filing on 4/3/78 of plaintiffs' notice of application for review pursuant to Public Law 95-243, approved March 13, 1978, 92 Stat. 153
	24	98	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 74-B on plaintiffs' motions for, <i>inter alia</i> , modification of order of 7/8/70 in Dkt. 74 (23 Ind. Cl. Comm. 358, 369)	11/30/70	
		105	Order amending interlocutory order & denying other motions	11/30/70	
	28	425	Opinion on defendant's motion to dismiss all claims but one in this docket	9/13/72	
		432	Order denying defendant's motion	9/13/72	
	29	180	Opinion on plaintiffs' motions to amend petition & for clarification of opinion of 9/13/72	11/29/72	
		187	Order granting leave to amend petition & denying motion for clarification	11/29/72	
	33	151	Opinion on valuation & related issues	2/15/74	
		236	Opinion dissenting in part	2/15/74	
		243	Findings	2/15/74	
		362	Interlocutory order [& award]	2/15/74	
207 C.C.	234	Affirmed in part, reversed in part & remanded	6/25/75		
423 U.S.	1016	Certiorari denied	12/8/75		
	unnumbered	Report of the Commissioner on issues in respect to the value of rights of way obtained by the United States from the Sioux by the Act of February 28, 1977			
	unnumbered	Order holding defendant's motion for final judgment in abeyance	5/20/76		
Sioux Tribe of Lower Brule Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 78	2	183	Findings	5/29/52	Final order finding no entitlement to recover
		189	Opinion	5/29/52	
			Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing petition	5/29/52	
	125 C.C.	439	Reversed	5/5/53	
4		250	Additional findings - Value	4/26/56	
		259	Opinion	4/26/56	
	9	538	Interlocutory order	4/26/56	
		544	Additional findings - Offsets	10/27/61	
			Opinion	10/27/61	
			Final order finding a balance in defendant's favor of \$85,656.83 & plaintiff's not entitled to recover	10/27/61	
161 C.C.	413	Affirmed	4/5/63		
375 U.S.	825	Certiorari denied	10/14/63		

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Sioux of Santee Reservation, Nebraska, Dkt. 104	2	237	Per curiam opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment dismissing the petition Order sustaining motion for summary judgment & dismissing plaintiffs' petition	10/17/52 10/17/52	Dismissed
Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 114, <i>see</i> Dkt. 192 of this claimant, below	12	541	Opinion in Dkts. 114, & Dkts. 115 through 119 on procedure in accounting cases Order in same dks. denying defendant's motion for more definite statement or for summary judgment, plaintiffs' motions for further accounting facts & ordering cause to proceed upon the filing of exceptions by plaintiffs	8/29/63	\$1,300,000.00 for settlement of accounting claim
	21	52 66	Findings on compromise settlement Final judgment	8/29/63 6/18/69 6/18/69	
Sioux Tribe of Crow Creek Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 115, <i>see</i> opinion & order of 8/29/63 under Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 114, above	26	92 98	Opinion in Dkts. 115, 116, 118, & 119 Order in same dks. granting in part plaintiffs' motions to file amended exceptions, & denying plaintiffs' motions to file amendments to their accounting petitions	8/6/71	Transferred to Court of Claims
	35	194 206 207	Opinion Concurring opinion Interlocutory order	8/6/71 11/22/74 11/22/74	
	37	114	Order vacating determination [at 35 Ind. Cl. Comm. 194] of Commission concerning expenditure of tribal funds for educational purposes	11/22/74	
	37	127	Order for supplemental accounting	12/11/75	
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	12/11/75	
				5/8/78	
Sioux Tribe of Lower Brule Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 116, <i>see</i> opinion & order of 8/29/63 under Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 114, above	26	92 98	Opinion Order	8/6/71 8/6/71	Transferred to Court of Claims
	35	175 191 192	Opinion Concurring opinion Interlocutory order	11/22/74 11/22/74 11/22/74	
	37	116	Order vacating determination of Commission [at 35 Ind. Cl. Comm. 175] concerning expenditure of tribal funds for educational purposes	11/22/74	
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	12/11/75	
				5/8/78	
Sioux Tribe of Pine Ridge Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 117, <i>see</i> opinion & order of 8/29/63 under Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 114, above	26	100	Order granting in part plaintiffs' motion to file amended exceptions, & denying plaintiff's motion to file amendments to accounting petition	8/6/71	Transferred to Court of Claims
	35	152 172 173	Opinion Concurring opinion Interlocutory order	11/22/74 11/22/74 11/22/74	
	37	118	Order vacating determination of Commission [at 35 Ind. Cl. Comm. 152] concerning expenditure of tribal funds for educational purposes	11/22/74	
	37	128	Order for supplemental accounting	12/11/75	
	37	624	Order denying plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on exception No. 14	12/11/75	
	39	79	Order granting plaintiff's motion to file amended exception 14	3/25/76	
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	9/23/76	
				5/8/78	
Sioux Tribe of Rosebud Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 118, <i>see</i> opinion & order of 8/29/63 under Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 114, above	26	92 98	Opinion Order	8/6/71 8/6/71	Transferred to Court of Claims
	35	123 149 150	Opinion Concurring opinion Interlocutory order	11/22/74 11/22/74 11/22/74	
	37	120	Order vacating determination of Commission [at 35 Ind. Cl. Comm. 123] concerning expenditure of tribal funds for educational purposes	11/22/74	
				12/11/75	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>T</i>
Sioux Tribe of Rosebud Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 118, <i>see opinion & order of 8/29/63 under Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 114, above (cont.)</i>	37	625	Order denying plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on exception No. 14	3/25/76		Si
	39	80	Order granting plaintiff's motion to file amended exception 14	9/23/76		W
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	5/8/78		Tr
Sioux Tribe of Standing Rock Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 119, <i>see opinion & order of 8/29/63 under Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 114, above</i>	26	92	Opinion	8/6/71	Transferred to Court of Claims	Lo
	34	98	Order	8/6/71		C
	230	Opinion	7/11/74		35	
	252	Concurring opinion	7/11/74		(C)	
	253	Interlocutory order	7/11/74			
	37	107	Opinion	12/11/75		
		113	Order vacating determination of Commission [at 34 Ind. Cl. Comm. 230, 241] concerning expenditure of tribal funds for educational purposes	12/11/75		
	37	122	Opinion	12/11/75		
	126	Order for supplemental accounting	12/11/75			
	37	618	Opinion	3/25/76		
		623	Order denying plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on exception No. 16	3/25/76		
	39	73	Opinion	9/23/76		
		78	Order granting plaintiff's motion to file amended exception 16	9/23/76		
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	5/8/78		
Sioux, Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands or tribes, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 142; Lower Sioux Indian Community, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 359, 360, 361, 362, & 363	10	137	Findings on title & related issues including title claims of the Yankton Sioux (Dkt. 332-A) to some of the land in suit	1/12/62	Dkts. 142 & 359 through 363, except the "Second Claim"	S
		178	Opinion	1/12/62	in Dkt. 363, concluded by final judgments in settlement of claims for additional compensation for land, as follows: Dkt. 142, to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Tribes of Sioux Indians	E
		199	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part	1/12/62	\$5,097,575.00; Dkt. 359, to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Tribes of Sioux Indians	S
	163 C.C.	329	Interlocutory order	1/12/62	\$776,464.50; to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians	D
	163 C.C.	329	Reversed in part & remanded	12/13/63	\$776,464.50; to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians	S
	unnumbered		Rehearing denied	3/13/64	\$776,464.50; to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians	D
	15	451	Order amending Commission's interlocutory order of 1/12/62	6/11/64	\$776,464.50; to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians	S
			Per curiam opinion in Dkt. 363 on plaintiffs' "Motion for Findings in Accordance with Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Proposed Finding 16-A"	6/21/65	\$776,464.50; to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians	D
			Order denying plaintiffs' motion	6/21/65	\$776,464.50; to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians	S
			Order in Dkt. 359 granting motion of Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands for leave to intervene in Dkt. 359 & for other purposes	6/21/65	\$776,464.50; to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians	D
	16	678	Opinion in Dkts. 142 & 362 regarding plaintiffs' motion for determination of questions of law, etc.	4/22/66	\$776,464.50; to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians	S
			Order granting plaintiffs' motion for determination of questions of law with respect to the Mississippi Sioux Treaties of 1851 in Dkts. 142 & 362	4/22/66	\$776,464.50; to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians	D
	16	688	Order in Dkt. 359 granting Sisseton and Wahpeton intervenors' motion for summary judgment of title	4/22/66	\$776,464.50; to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians	S
	175 C.C.	564	Reversed order of 1/12/62, above, but affirmed order of 11/25/59 in Dkts. 138 (Iowa, <i>et al.</i>), 11-A & 332-A	4/22/66	\$776,464.50; to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians	D
	18	427	Interlocutory order approving compromise settlement & entry of final judgments subject to dismissal of appeal No. 8-66 in the Court of Claims	5/13/66	\$776,464.50; Dkt. 360, to the Medawakanton Tribe of Sioux Indians	S
	18	477	Findings on compromise settlement of the claims in Dkts. 142 & 359 through 363, excluding the general accounting claim denominated "Second Claim" in the first amended petition in Dkt. 363	6/29/67	\$1,129,359.00; Dkt. 361, to the Medawakanton Tribe of Sioux Indians	D
				7/25/67	\$64,680.00;	S

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Sioux, Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands or Tribes, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 142; Lower Sioux Indian Community, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 359, 360, 361, 362, & 363 (cont.)	18	523 639	Opinion Final judgments in Dkts. 142, 359 through 363, except the general accounting claim in Dkt. 363 Order amending Indian Claims Commission's findings & opinion approving compromise settlement	7/25/67 7/25/67 9/8/67	Dkt. 362, to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians \$4,338,517.00; Dkt. 363, to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians \$66,940.00. See decisions below on causes involved in the "Second Claim" in Dkt. 363.
Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S.D., Dkt. 192, <i>See</i> Dkt. 114, of this claimant, above	2 5 unnumbered	201 165 173	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment of dismissal Order denying defendant's motion Findings Opinion Final order dismissing petition Order denying motion for rehearing	6/4/52 6/4/52 3/29/57 3/29/57 3/29/57 8/10/59	Dismissed
Sioux Tribe of Fort Peck Reservation, Montana, intervenor in Dkt. 279-A, <i>see</i> Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 279-A					
Sioux, Yankton, Dkt. 332	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition [the causes therein having been separated out & assigned Dkt. Nos. 332-A & 332-B]	9/30/60	Dismissed
Sioux, Yankton, Dkt. 332-A	13 unnumbered 10 175 C.C. 19	25 unnumbered 137 178 199 564 131 unnumbered 252 255	Per curiam opinion on determination of the article 2 line, 1825 Prairie de Chien Treaty, often referred to as the "Sioux-Sac & Fox line" or "Yankton line" Order in Dkts. 138, 11-A & 332-A amending finding 2, Dkts. 11-A & 138 re Yankton Sioux boundary Findings in Mississippi Sioux Dkts. 142, <i>et al.</i> , & Dkt. 332-A Opinion Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part Interlocutory order in Mississippi Sioux dks., & order dismissing Yankton Sioux claim for Royce Area 289 Affirmed order of 11/25/59, reversed order of 1/12/62 Opinion on plaintiff's motion for summary judgment Order granting plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on issue of title as to Royce Area 151 Order severing Royce Area 410 (N.D. & S.D. 1) from Dkt. 332-A & designating it Dkt. 332-C Opinion on compromise settlement Findings on compromise settlement Final judgment	11/18/59 11/25/59 1/12/62 1/12/62 1/12/62 5/13/66 4/24/68 4/24/68 12/10/68 1/28/69 1/28/69 1/28/69	\$1,250,000.00 for land (Yankton interest in Royce Area 151)
Sioux, Yankton, Dkt. 332-B	28 29	367 385 143	Findings on compromise settlement Final award Order granting motion to sever claims for an accounting for the period of July 1, 1951, to date, & for claims arising from Agreement of 12/31/1892, 28 Stat. 314, & to file amended petition asserting said claims in Dkt. 332-D	9/8/72 9/8/72 11/9/72	\$4,750,000.00 in settlement of accounting claims through 6/30/51; remaining claims severed out & assigned Dkt. 332-D

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Sioux, Yankton, Dkt. 332-C	15	577	Findings in Dkts. 74, 350-B & C, 332-A & 221-A	8/27/65	
Note: This dkt. was created in 1968 when the claim in Dkt. 332-A relating to Royce Area 410 was severed from Dkt. 332-A & assigned Dkt. 332-C (see order of 12/10/68 under Dkt. 332-A).		599	Opinion on Dkt. 74 Sioux motion for determination of certain title matters	8/27/65	
			Order defining boundary of area recognized by Fort Laramie Treaty of September 17, 1851, as belonging to the "Sioux or Dakotah Nation"		
	22	344	Opinion on motion by Dkt. 74 plaintiffs to intervene	8/27/65	
		354	Interlocutory order granting in part & denying in part motion to intervene	12/17/69	representing additional compensation for the Yankton Sioux interest in lands ceded under the Treaty of April 19, 1858, 11 Stat. 743
	24	147	Opinion on undivided interests of the Dkt. 74 Sioux & Yankton Sioux in Fort Laramie Treaty lands	12/2/70	
		161	Additional findings	12/2/70	
		175	Interlocutory order	12/2/70	
		177	Order admitting exhibits	12/2/70	
	24	208	Opinion on Yankton Sioux lands east of the Missouri in South Dakota	12/14/70	
		218	Findings	12/14/70	
		236	Interlocutory order [intervention of Dkt. 74 Sioux dismissed]	12/14/70	
	24	364	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C on motions for rehearing & modification of opinion, findings, & order of 8/26/70 in Dkt. 74 (23 Ind. Cl. Comm. 419)	1/6/71	
		373	Order denying motions for rehearing & modification of order	1/6/71	
	27	49	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C on motion for rehearing	3/1/72	
		58	Order denying motion for rehearing	3/1/72	
	28	204	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C	6/23/72	
		215	Order denying motion to strike notices of appeal	6/23/72	
		218	Order to the Clerk of Commission	6/23/72	
		219	Order denying defendant's motion for rehearing & consolidation	6/23/72	
	29	1	Opinion on defendant's motion to consolidate Dkts. 363 (2d claim) & Dkt. 332-C	10/4/72	
		4	Order denying motion to consolidate	10/4/72	
205 C.C.	148		Affirmed in part, reversed in part, & remanded	7/19/74	
205 C.C.	148		Defendant's motion for rehearing <i>en banc</i> denied	10/4/74	
	40	454	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C on remanded matter of apportionment of Fort Laramie Treaty lands	8/25/77	
		476	Findings	8/25/77	
		518	Order reentering order of 12/2/70 & dissolving consolidation of Dkts. 74 & 332-C	8/25/77	
	41	160	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C on Dkt. 74 plaintiffs' motion for rehearing	12/27/77	
		167	Amended findings	12/27/77	
		170	Order granting motion for rehearing & interlocutory order	12/27/77	
		172	Order amending order of 12/27/77	1/6/78	
	43	1	Opinion — Value & offsets	8/31/78	
		30	Additional findings	8/31/78	
		72	Final award	8/31/78	
Sioux, Yankton, Dkt. 332-D	29	143	Order in Dkt. 332-B granting motion to sever claims for an accounting for the period of July 1, 1951, to date, and for claims arising from Agreement of 12/31/1892, 28 Stat. 314, & to file amended petition asserting said claims in Dkt. 332-D	11/9/72	Transferred to Court of Claims after dismissal of post 6/30/51 accounting claims
	37	64	Opinion	11/20/75	
		93	Opinion dissenting in part	11/20/75	
		94	Order to show cause why the claim for an accounting in respect to plaintiff's money & property during the period after 6/30/51 should not be dismissed, & for other purposes	11/20/75	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Sioux, Yankton, Dkt. 332-D (cont.)	39	149 157 158	Opinion Order making show cause order absolute & dismissing post-1951 accounting claim Order striking plaintiff's motion for a call for documents	11/12/76 11/12/76 11/12/76	
	42	202	Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	7/13/78	
Sioux, Lower Sioux Indian Community in Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 363 (Second Claim, Act of 1904)	22	226	Opinion	12/10/69	\$8,473,221.26 in principal & interest awarded
	30	231 463 498 533	Order Opinion — Valuation & damage issues Findings Interlocutory order	12/10/69 6/30/73 6/30/73 6/30/73	plaintiffs on behalf of the Sisseton & Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians for certain Devils Lake Reservation lands & lands excluded from the reservation by survey errors
	33	51 63 66 68	Opinion on payments on the claim Amendment to & additional findings Order that the parties show cause why a final judgment may not be entered Order admitting exhibits	1/16/74 1/16/74 1/16/74 1/16/74	
	33 207 C.C.	389 492	Final award Affirmed	2/27/74 7/11/75	
Sioux, Lower Sioux Indian Community in Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 363 (Second Claim, amended, Treaty of 1867, Agreement of 1872)	22	226	Opinion	10/10/69	\$13,384,934.00 awarded to the plaintiffs on behalf of the Sisseton & Wahpeton Bands as additional compensation for lands ceded by the said Bands under the Agreement of September 20, 1872. Of this total amount \$13,129,661.00 was included in the final award of 9/14/77, & the remaining amount of \$255,273.00 was in the final award of 12/1/77.
	26	231 267 270	Order Opinion Order granting plaintiffs' motion for leave to amend first amended petition, second claim	10/10/69 9/22/71 9/22/71	
	29	1	Opinion in Dkts. 363 (second claim) & Dkt. 332-C	10/4/72	
		4	Order denying defendant's motion to consolidate	10/4/72	
	36	472	Opinion — Title & liability issues	9/25/75	
		484	Findings	9/25/75	
		496	Order	9/25/75	
	36	497	Order amending Conclusion 1	10/22/75	
	37	491	Opinion on motions	3/12/76	
	41	1	Findings on compromise settlement	9/8/77	
	C.C.	16	Order approving compromise settlement Order, entered on joint motion, dismissing appeal No. 2-76 & remanding cause to the Commission	9/8/77	
	41	18	Final award	9/12/77	
	41	139	Additional final award	9/14/77 12/1/77	
Sioux, Lower Sioux Indian Community in Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 363 (claims for an accounting for money and for the misuse or mismanagement of money)	36	295	Opinion — Accounting	8/22/75	Transferred to Court of Claims
	39	414 239	Order relating to accounting exceptions Order certifying & transferring to the Court of Claims	8/22/75 12/15/76	

Sisseton and Wahpeton, *see* Sioux, Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands or Tribes, *et al.*, Dkt. 142, *et al.*; Sioux, Lower Sioux Indian Community in Minnesota, *et al.*, Dkt. 363 (Second Claim, Act of 1904), and Dkt. 363 (Second Claim, amended, Treaty of 1867, Agreement of 1872)

See paragraph 6 of stipulation at 41
Ind. Cl. Comm. 4 in findings of 9/8/77, under the Dkt. 363 claim immediately above.

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Six Nations, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 84; and Stockbridge Munsee Community, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 300-B	23	376	Opinion on accounting under certain agreements & treaty provisions	8/11/70	In satisfaction of accounting claims:
		387	Findings	8/11/70	\$29,930.25 to
		401	Interlocutory order & award	8/11/70	plaintiffs in both dcts.; & to the
	32	440	Opinion on offsets	12/28/73	Seneca Nation,
		453	Additional findings	12/28/73	one of the plain- tiffs in Dkt. 84,
		460	Final award	12/28/73	an additional sum of \$25,399.50
Six Nations, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 89, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkts. 13-E, 13-F, & 13-G, & mention of Dkt. 89 under Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 67 at 2 Ind. Cl. Comm. 617					
Six Nations, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 344	12	86	Findings — Liability	3/1/63	Dismissed
		98	Opinion	3/1/63	
			Final order dismissing this suit in its entirety	3/1/63	
			Affirmed	12/17/65	
Skagit, Upper, Dkt. 92	8	475	Findings — Title	3/25/60	\$385,471.42
		492	Opinion	3/25/60	for land
			Interlocutory order	3/25/60	
	13	583	Findings on allocation of consideration under Point Elliott Treaty	8/13/64	
		591	Opinion	8/13/64	
			Order	8/13/64	
	19	496	Final judgment [entered pursuant to stipulation for compromise settlement]	9/23/68	
Skagit, Lower (Whidbey Island Skagits), Dkt. 294	7	292	Findings — Title	3/20/59	\$74,856.50
		313	Opinion	3/20/59	for land
			Interlocutory order	3/20/59	
	22	28	Opinion on value	11/13/69	
		35	Additional findings on value	11/13/69	
		51	Order & interlocutory award	11/13/69	
	26	325	Final award	10/13/71	
S'Klallam, Dkt. 134	5	680	Findings — Title	12/2/57	\$385,820.00
		697	Opinion	12/2/57	for land
			Interlocutory order	12/2/57	
		unnumbered	Order reopening the record	3/15/68	
	23	510	Opinion — Value	10/1/70	
		519	Additional findings	10/1/70	
		530	Interlocutory order & award	10/1/70	
	28	146	Opinion	6/7/62	
		157	Order denying defendant's motion for rehearing & amendment of findings, & amending findings	6/7/62	
	39	129	Opinion	11/5/76	
		133	Order denying plaintiff's motion for rehearing & amendment of findings	11/5/76	
	39	134	Opinion — Offsets	11/5/76	
		140	Additional findings	11/5/76	
		143	Final award	11/5/76	
Skokomish, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 260	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	3/30/53	Dismissed
Skokomish, Dkt. 296	6	135	Findings — Title	3/6/58	\$373,577.00
		152	Opinion	3/6/58	for land
			Interlocutory order	3/6/58	
	9	359	Additional findings — Value	6/30/61	
		390	Opinion	6/30/61	
			Second interlocutory order	6/30/61	
	12	197	Findings on compromise settlement	5/24/63	
		208	Opinion	5/24/63	
			Final determination or judgment	5/24/63	

Skykomish, *see* Snoqualmie Tribe on its own behalf, and on relation of the Skykomish Tribe, Dkt. 93

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Snake or Piute Indians of former Malheur Reservation in Oregon, Dkt. 17	1	422	Findings — Liability	12/29/50	\$567,000.00
		436	Opinion	12/29/50	for land
			Conclusions of law & judgment		
			dismissing petition	12/29/50	
	125 C.C.	241	Reversed & remanded	6/2/53	
	4	571a	Amended findings — Title	12/28/56	
		608	Opinion	12/28/56	
			Interlocutory order	12/28/56	
		unnumbered	Order amending finding No. 3 as to description		
			of claimed area	2/4/57	
	7	526	Additional findings — Value	4/15/59	
		555	Opinion	4/15/69	
			Second interlocutory order	4/15/59	
		unnumbered	Final judgment	12/4/59	
Snake, Yahooskin Band, <i>see</i> Klamath, Modoc and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians					
Snohomish, Dkt. 125	4	549	Findings — Title	11/21/56	\$136,165.79
		564	Opinion	11/21/56	for land
			Interlocutory order	11/21/56	
	7	768	Additional findings — Value	7/23/59	
		783	Opinion	7/23/59	
			Second interlocutory order	7/23/59	
	13	583	Findings on allocation of consideration under		
			Point Elliott Treaty	8/13/64	
		591	Opinion	8/13/64	
			Order	8/13/64	
	15	243	Additional findings	4/29/65	
		245	Opinion	4/29/65	
			Third interlocutory order	4/29/65	
	18	134	Additional findings on compromise settlement	3/30/67	
		144	Opinion	3/30/67	
			Final judgment	3/30/67	
Snoqualmie Tribe on its own behalf, and on relation of the Skykomish Tribe, Dkt. 93	9	25	Findings — Title	6/30/60	\$257,698.29
		41	Opinion	6/30/60	for land
			Interlocutory order	6/30/60	
	13	583	Findings on allocation of consideration under		
			Point Elliott Treaty	8/13/64	
		591	Opinion	8/13/64	
			Order	8/13/64	
	15	267	Per curiam opinion on plaintiff's motion to modify Commission's findings & order of		
			6/30/60	5/7/65	
			Order denying plaintiff's "Motion to Modify Commission's Findings and Order," & withdrawing the Commission's findings, opinion & interlocutory order of 6/30/60 & substituting in lieu thereof the findings, opinion, & interlocutory order entered 5/7/65		
		282	Findings	5/7/65	
		308	Per curiam opinion	5/7/65	
			Interlocutory order	5/7/65	
	178 C.C.	570	Affirmed in part, reversed in part, & remanded	2/17/67	
	19	498	Final judgment [entered pursuant to stipulation for compromise settlement]	9/23/68	
Soboba Band, <i>see</i> California Indians, Soboba Band of Mission Indians, Dkt. 80-A, & Dkts. 80, 80-B, 80-C, & 80-D under California Indians					
Southern Arapaho and Cheyenne, <i>see</i> Cheyenne and Arapaho					
Southern Paiute, <i>see</i> Paiute Nation, Southern, et al.					
Southern Ute, <i>see</i> Ute, Southern					
Spokane, Dkts. 331 & 331-A	9	236	Findings in Dkt. 331 on title issues	4/17/61	\$6,700,000.00
		254	Opinion in Dkt. 331	4/17/61	for settlement
			Interlocutory order in Dkt. 331	4/17/61	of a claim in
	163 C.C.	58	Affirmed in part, reversed in part, & remanded	10/11/63	Dkt. 331 for

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Spokane, Dkts. 331 & 331-A (cont.)	17	584 612	Findings on compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment	2/21/67 2/21/67 2/21/67	additional compensation for land, & settlement of a general accounting claim in Dkt. 331-A
Squaxin, Dkt. 206	21	295 301 308 29	Opinion — Title Findings Interlocutory order 288 302 323 34	6/30/69 6/30/69 6/30/69 12/8/72 12/8/72 12/8/72 7/31/74 7/31/74 7/31/74	\$7,661.82 for land
		311 319 326	Opinion — Offsets Additional findings Final award	7/31/74 7/31/74 7/31/74	
	208 C.C.	1031	Affirmed	1/30/76	
Steilacoom, Dkt. 208	11	304 320	Findings — Title Opinion Interlocutory order	9/21/62 9/21/62 9/21/62	\$9,146.32 for land
	29	481 496 518	Opinion — Value & consideration Additional findings Interlocutory order	3/14/73 3/14/73 3/14/73	
	34	327 332 338	Opinion — Offsets Additional findings Final award	7/31/74 7/31/74 7/31/74	
	208 C.C.	1033	Affirmed	1/30/76	
Stillaguamish, Dkt. 207	13	583 591	Findings on allocation of consideration under Point Elliott Treaty Opinion Order	8/13/64 8/13/64 8/13/64	\$48,570.00 for settlement of claim for additional compensation for land
	15	1 33	Findings — Title Opinion Interlocutory order	2/26/65 2/26/65 2/26/65	
	19	531	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for rehearing Order denying rehearing	10/17/68 10/17/68	
	22	361 371	Additional findings on compromise settlement Final judgment	1/8/70 1/8/70	
Stockbridge Munsee Community, et al., Dkt. 300	26	491 499 500 512	Opinion — Accounting Dissenting opinion Findings Order	12/15/71 12/15/71 12/15/71 12/15/71	\$4,203.09 for accounting
	203 C.C.	742	Affirmed	1/29/73	
	30	372	Final award	5/30/73	
Stockbridge Munsee Community, et al., Dkt. 300-A	25	281 293 302	Opinion — Liability Findings Interlocutory order	4/28/71 4/28/71 4/28/71	Pending on date hereof
	41	192 206 220	Opinion on scienter question Additional findings Interlocutory order	2/24/78 2/24/78 2/24/78	
Stockbridge Munsee Community, et al., Dkt. 300-B, see Six Nations, et al., Dkt. 84					
Stockbridge-Munsee Community, see Emigrant New York Indians, Oneida of Wisconsin, and Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Dkt. 75					
Strong, James, see Chippewa, Saginaw					
Suiattle-Sauk, Dkt. 97	2	324 327	Findings Opinion Conclusions of law & final order dismissing the claim	12/18/52 12/18/52 12/18/52	Dismissed
	133 C.C.	57	Affirmed	10/4/55	
Squamish, Dkt. 132	5	140 158	Findings — Title Opinion Interlocutory order	3/25/57 3/25/57 3/25/57	\$42,170.49 for land

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Suquamish, Dkt. 132 (cont.)	7	747	Additional findings — Value	7/10/59	
		760	Opinion	7/10/59	
	13	583	Second interlocutory order Findings on allocation of consideration under Point Elliott Treaty	7/10/59	
		591	Opinion	8/13/64	
			Order	8/13/64	
	16	479	Additional findings on consideration	8/13/64	
		481	Opinion	8/13/64	
			Order	8/13/64	
	24	34	Third interlocutory order	8/13/64	
		39	Opinion — Offsets	1/21/66	
		49	Additional findings	1/21/66	
	197 C.C.	775	Final judgment	10/22/70	
			Affirmed	10/22/70	
				3/17/72	
Swinomish, Dkt. 233	13	583	Findings on allocation of consideration under Point Elliott Treaty	8/13/64	\$29,000.00 for land
		591	Opinion	8/13/64	
	26	371	Order	8/13/64	
		377	Opinion — Title	11/18/71	
		385	Findings	11/18/71	
	28	220	Interlocutory order	11/18/71	
		231	Additional findings on compromise settlement	7/6/72	
			Final award	7/6/72	
Swinomish Tribal Community, Dkt. 293	unnumbered		Order striking parts of petition	5/19/55	Dismissed
	25	465	Opinion	6/25/71	
		468	Findings	6/25/71	
		474	Order dismissing petition	6/25/71	
Taos, Pueblo of, <i>see</i> Pueblo of Taos, Dkts. 357 & 357-A					
Tatitlek Village, Alaska, Natives of, Dkt. 200	27	134	Order granting defendant's motion to dismiss claim	3/15/72	Dismissed
Tee-Hit-Ton, Dkt. 171	21	420	Order dismissing petition	6/14/68	Dismissed
	186 C.C.	959	Affirmed	1/17/69	
Temoak Bands of Western Shoshone Indians, <i>see</i> Shoshone, Western, Dkt. 326-A, and Shoshone, Western Identifiable Group, Dkt. 326-K					
Tenino Indians, <i>see</i> Warm Springs Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 198					
Thompson, Clyde F., <i>see</i> California Indians, Dkt. 31					
Tigua Indian Community, Pueblo of, <i>see</i> Apache, Lipan and Mescalero, Dkt. 22-C					
Tillamook, Dkt. 238, <i>see</i> Kalapuya, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 238					
Tillamook, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 239	4	31	Findings	11/23/55	
		57	Opinion	11/23/55	\$416,240.85 for land
	unnumbered		Interlocutory order [and award]	11/23/55	
			Order amending findings of fact, overruling plaintiffs' motion for final judgment & granting defendant extension of time		
	unnumbered		Order of final judgment [entered upon joint motion pursuant to stipulation for entry of judgment]	2/5/57	
Tillamook Band of Tillamooks, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 240	3	526	Findings — Title	6/10/55	
		533	Opinion	6/10/55	For land: \$72,162.50 to
	11	1	Interlocutory order	6/10/55	Nehalem Band of Tillamooks,
		26	Additional findings — Value & offsets	8/27/62	& \$97,025.00
			Opinion	8/27/62	to Tillamook
			Final award	8/27/62	Band of Tillamooks
Tlingit and Haida, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 278	28	168	Order granting defendant's motion to dismiss	6/7/72	Dismissed

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Tlingit and Haida, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 278-A	20	508	Opinion on defendant's motion to dismiss petition	5/14/69	Dismissed
		520	Order denying motion to dismiss	5/14/69	
		521	Order denying plaintiffs' motion for an interlocutory order	5/14/69	
	28	169	Order granting defendant's motion to dismiss	6/7/72	
Tlingit and Haida and Angoon Tribe, Dkt. 278-B	32	273	Findings on compromise settlement	11/26/73	\$90,000.00 for settlement of damage claims stemming from a naval bombardment
		282	Final award	11/26/73	
Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians, Dkts. 368 & 368-A, <i>see</i> Seneca Nation, Dkts. 342-A & 342-B					
Tonkawa, <i>see</i> intervenors in Apache, Lipan and Mescalero, Dkt. 22-C, and Caddo Tribe of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 226					
Tonto, <i>see</i> Apache, San Carlos, Dkt. 22-D, and Apache, Northern Tonto, Dkt. 22-J; and Apache, Northern Tonto, Yavapai, Dkt. 22-J					
Tulalip Tribes, Inc., Dkt. 262		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	1/13/58	Dismissed
Turtle Mountain, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113; and Chippewa, Red Lake, Pembina, and White Earth Bands, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-A					
Tuscarora Nation, Dkt. 321	23	140	Opinion — Liability	5/14/70	
		152	Findings	5/14/70	
		164	Order	5/14/70	
	29	194	Opinion — Value	11/29/72	
		204	Additional findings	11/29/72	
		210	Interlocutory order	11/29/72	
	29	471	Final award	2/21/73	
Tuscarora Nation, Dkt. 340	15	116	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment	3/9/65	Dismissed
			Order dismissing petition	3/9/65	
Tuscarora Nation, <i>see also</i> Six Nations; and Emigrant New York Indians, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 75					
Tygh Indians, <i>see</i> Warm Springs Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 198					
Uintah, <i>see</i> Ute, Uintah of Utah, Dkts. 44, 45; and Ute Tribe of Uintah and Ouray Reservation on behalf of Uncompahgre Band of Ute Indians					
Umatilla Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkts. 264, 264-A, & 264-B	8	513	Findings on title & related issues in Dkt. 264	6/10/60	\$2,450,000.00
		540	Opinion in Dkt. 264	6/10/60	for settlement of: claims in Dkt.
			Interlocutory order in Dkt. 264	6/10/60	264 for additional compensation for land; claims
		unnumbered	Order in Dkt. 264 denying plaintiffs' motion for rehearing & vacating Commission's find- ings, opinion, & interlocutory order of 6/10/60	9/28/64	relating to fishing rights in Dkt.
	14	14	Findings in Dkt. 264 (revised)	9/28/64	264-A; and a
		104	Opinion in Dkt. 264 (revised)	9/28/64	claim in Dkt.
	C.C.		Interlocutory order in Dkt. 264 (revised)	9/28/64	264-B; and a
	16	484	Order dismissing appeal No. 1-65	1/21/66	claim in Dkt.
		510	Findings on compromise settlement	2/11/66	264-B for com- pensation for
			Opinion	2/11/66	lands excluded
			Final judgment	2/11/66	from claimants' reservation by survey error
Umpqua, <i>see</i> Coos Bay, Dkt. 265					
Unalakleet, Native Village of, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 285	19	140	Opinion holding Commission has jurisdiction	5/2/68	Dismissed
			Order denying defendant's motion for summary judgment	5/2/68	
	188 C.C.	1	Affirmed	6/20/69	
	22	356	Opinion on motions	12/23/69	
		359	Order denying motions & granting other relief	12/23/69	
	28	333	Order granting defendant's motion to dismiss	8/16/72	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Uncompahgree, <i>see</i> Ute Tribe of Uintah and Ouray Reservation on behalf of Uncompahgre Band of Ute Indians, Dkt. 349					
Ute, Uintah of Utah, Dkts. 44 & 45	5	1 20	Findings in Dkt. 44 on title issues Opinion in Dkt. 44 Interlocutory order in Dkt. 44	2/21/57 2/21/57 2/21/57	\$7,700,000.00 in settlement of claims for compensation for land
	5	47 59	Findings in Dkt. 45 on title issues Opinion in Dkt. 45 Interlocutory order in Dkt. 45	2/21/57 2/21/57 2/21/57	
	8	620 638	Findings on compromise settlement of Dkts. 44 & 45 Opinion Final judgment	6/13/60 6/13/60 6/13/60	
Ute Indians, Confederated Bands of, Dkt. 327	11	180 263	Findings — Value & payment on claim Opinion Interlocutory order	9/14/62 9/14/62 9/14/62	\$7,908,586.16 for land
	14	679 704	Additional findings on settlement of offsets Opinion Final judgment	2/18/65 2/18/65 2/18/65	
Ute, Southern Tribe or Band, Dkt. 328	17	28 42	Findings — Liability Opinion First interlocutory order	5/6/66 5/6/66 5/6/66	Dismissed
	C.C.		Remanded with directions to hear additional evidence & to make & report to the Court findings on the question whether the parties intended by a stipulation in case No. 46640 before the Court of Claims that the final judgment in said case would be <i>res judicata</i> as to lands involved in Dkt. 328		
	21	268 276	Additional findings Order transmitting findings to the Court of Claims	5/15/67 6/27/69	
191 C.C.	1		Affirmed	6/27/69	
400 U.S.	915		Certiorari granted	3/20/70	
402 U.S.	159		Reversed	11/16/70	
195 C.C.	540		Order vacating the Court's opinion of 3/20/70 affirming the Commission's decision, reversing the Commission's decision of 5/6/66, & remanding the case for further proceedings pursuant to the opinion of the Supreme Court & its remand of 4/26/71, & this order	4/26/71	
	26	10	Final order dismissing case	6/18/71 7/14/71	
Ute Tribe of Uintah and Ouray Reservation, on behalf of Uncompahgree Band of Ute Indians, Dkt. 349	14	707 725	Findings on compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment	2/18/65 2/18/65 2/18/65	\$300,000.00 in settlement of claim arising from breach of promise to provide a reservation for the Uncompahgree Band
Wahpakoota, <i>see</i> Sioux, Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands or Tribes, <i>et al.</i>, Dkt. 142, <i>et al.</i>					
Wahpeton, <i>see</i> Sioux, Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands or Tribes, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 142, <i>et al.</i> ; Sioux, Lower Sioux Indian Community in Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 363 (Second Claim, Act of 1904), and Dkt. 363 (Second Claim, amended, Treaty of 1867, Agreement of 1872)					
Walapai, <i>see</i> Hualapai					
Walla Walla, <i>see</i> Umatilla Reservation, Confederated Tribes					
Warm Springs Apache Band, <i>see</i> Apache, Fort Sill, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 30, 30-A, 48, 48-A, 49, 182, & 182-A					
Warm Springs Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 198	8	557 585	Findings — Title Opinion Interlocutory order	6/10/60 6/10/60 6/10/60	\$1,225,000.00 in settlement of claims for additional compensation for interest in land
	12	664 712	Findings — Title rehearing Opinion Interlocutory order	10/10/63 10/10/63 10/10/63	

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Warm Springs Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 198 (cont.)	177 C.C. 18	184 354	Reversed & remanded Opinion on remand Order amending findings & interlocutory order of 10/10/63	10/14/66 4/4/67 4/4/67	
	29	324 344 369 406	Opinion — Value & consideration Dissenting opinion Additional findings Interlocutory order [& award]	12/18/72 12/18/72 12/18/72 12/18/72	
	32	7 31	Findings on compromise settlement Final award	10/17/73 10/17/73	
Warm Springs Reserva- tion, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 198-A	23	314	Order dismissing petition	6/30/70	Dismissed
Wasco Indians, <i>see</i> Warm Springs Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 198					
Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, Dkt. 288	6 6 7 7 21 24	86 93 666 266 282 792 447 464 490 492 107 117 121	Opinion Opinion Opinion Order dividing California into Areas A & B Findings — Title Opinion Interlocutory order Additional findings — Date of taking Interlocutory order Opinion — Value Findings Interlocutory order Interlocutory order granting plaintiff's motion to amend plaintiff's proposed findings & brief	1/20/58 1/20/58 10/6/58 3/20/59 3/20/59 3/20/59 7/24/59 7/24/59 10/31/69 10/31/69 10/31/69 10/31/69 12/2/70 12/2/70 12/2/70	\$4,959,350 00 for land
Wayampam Indians, <i>see</i> Warm Springs Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 198					
Wea, <i>see</i> Peoria, Dkts. 65, 314, 314 Amended, 314-A through E, & 338; Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 130; & Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 252					
Wichita Tribe of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , <i>see</i> intervenors in Caddo Tribe of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 226; & Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkt. 257					
Wichita Tribe and its Affiliated Bands and Groups, namely the Keechi, Tawakoni, and Waco, Dkt. 371	42	154	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	6/8/78	Transferred to Court of Claims
Winnebago Tribe and Nation, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 243, 244, & 245	8 16 181 C.C. 23	78 100 81 117 1202 464 467 482	Findings — Title Opinion Interlocutory order Additional findings — Value Opinion Second interlocutory order Affirmed Opinion on compromise settlement Findings on compromise settlement Final judgment	8/10/59 8/10/59 8/10/59 10/13/65 10/13/65 10/13/65 12/18/67 9/3/70 9/3/70 9/3/70	\$4,600,000.00 in settlement of claims for addi- tional compensa- tion for land
Wyam Indians, <i>see</i> Warm Springs Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 198					
Wyandot, Dkt. 120, <i>see</i> , Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G					
Wyandot, Dkt. 139, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-E					
Wyandot, Dkt. 140, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 59					
Wyandot, Dkt. 141, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-F					
Wyandot, Dkts. 212 & 213	38	561 583	Opinion — Values Findings	8/5/76 8/5/76	Transferred to Court of Claims

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Wyandot, Dkts. 212 & 213 (cont.)		615	Interlocutory order [& award on land claims, subject to gratuitous offsets]		
	39	370	Opinion — Procedural matters	8/5/76	
		374	Order	2/9/77	
	42	202	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	2/9/77	
				7/13/78	
Yahooskin, <i>see</i> Klamath, Modoc and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, Dkts. 100, 100-A, 100-B-1, 100-B-2, & 100-C					
Yakima, Dkts. 47, 147, 160, & 164	2	433	Findings in Dkt. 47 on liability	5/29/53	The final judg-
		433	Opinion in Dkt. 47	5/29/53	ment: awarded
			Interlocutory order in Dkt. 47	5/29/53	\$2,100,000.00
	2	481	Amended findings in Dkt. 47	11/6/53	for settlement of
	5	636	Amended interlocutory order in Dkt. 47	11/6/53	claims in Dkt. 47
		661	Amended & supplemental findings in Dkt. 47 on some valuation issues	11/29/57	for the value of
			Opinion in Dkt. 47	11/29/57	land reserved to
	158 C.C.	672	Interlocutory order in Dkt. 47	11/29/57	the Yakima Tribe
	16	536	Affirmed in part, reversed in part & remanded	10/3/62	by treaty, which
		553	Findings in Dkt. 47 on remanded issues	2/25/66	was excluded
			Opinion in Dkt. 47	2/25/66	from the Tribe's
	18	426	Order in Dkt. 47	2/25/66	reservation, & for
	20	76	Order in Dkt. 47 re Tract D	6/19/67	land within the
			Statement & additional findings on compromise settlement	11/14/68	reservation
			Final judgment	11/14/68	patented in error
					to white settlers,
					& the claim in
					Dkt. 164 for the
					value of lands
					allotted to per-
					sons not mem-
					bers of the tribe
					& for reimburse-
					ment of tribal
					funds paid to
					such allottees;
					authorized
					severance of a
					claim in Dkt. 47
					for 21,008.66
					acres of land to
					be designated
					Dkt. 47-B; &
					dismissed the
					claims in Dkts.
					147 & 160
Yakima, Dkt. 47-A	15	456	Findings [explanatory statement] Final award	6/25/65 6/25/65	\$61,991.40 in principal and interest for land
Yakima, Dkt. 47-B	29	125	Order dismissing claim with prejudice [the 21,008.66 acres of land involved having been restored to the Yakima Reservation by E.O. 11670 of May 20, 1972]	10/11/72	Dismissed
Yakima, Dkt. 161, Con-federated Tribes of Colville Reservation, <i>et al.</i> , inter-venor in Dkt. 161; Con-federated Tribes of Colville Reservation as representa-tives of the Palouse Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 222; and Con-federated Tribes of Colville Reservation as representatives of the Moses Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 224	7	794	Findings on representation issues in Dkts. 161 & 224	7/28/59	\$3,446,700.00 to
		805	Opinion in Dkts. 161 & 224	7/28/59	the Yakima
			Order denying motion to dismiss Dkt. 224 insofar as Dkt. 161 is concerned & granting motion of plaintiff in Dkt. 224 to intervene in Dkt. 161		Tribe and the
	12	301	Additional findings on title issues	7/29/63	Confederated
		362	Opinion	7/29/63	Tribes of Colville
			Interlocutory order	7/29/63	Reservation for
	15	196	Findings on compromise settlement	4/5/65	the benefit of the
		225	Opinion	4/5/65	Yakima Nation of
			Final judgment	4/5/65	1855 in settle- ment of claims in
					Dkts. 161, 222, & 224 for addi- tional compensa- tion for ceded lands

Alphabetical Index of Indian Claims Commission Cases Through September 1, 1978—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Vol.</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Disposition</i>
Yakima, Dkt. 162	4	269 294	Findings — Value & consideration Opinion	6/5/56 6/5/56	\$49,000.00 for land
	15	617 625	Interlocutory order & award Additional findings Opinion Final award	6/5/56 8/31/65 8/31/65 8/31/65	
Yakima, Dkt. 163		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	8/22/58	Dismissed
Yakima, Wishram Band, Dkt. 165	15	464	Order dismissing petition	7/19/65	Dismissed
Yana, Dkt. 215, <i>see</i> California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37					
Yavapai, <i>see</i> Apache, Dkts. 22-E, 22-F, & 22-J					
Yokiah, Dkt. 176, <i>see</i> California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37					
Yuchi (Euchee), <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 172	3	506 515	Findings Opinion Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing petition	5/16/55 5/16/55 5/16/55	Dismissed
	136 C.C.	433	Affirmed	10/2/56	Pc
	352 U.S.	1016	Certiorari denied	2/25/56	Pc
	353 U.S.	948	Rehearing denied	4/29/57	M
Zane, Lawrence, <i>see</i> Wyandot					M
Zia, Pueblo de, <i>see</i> Pueblo de Zia					Pe

Note: Public Law 94-465, approved October 8, 1976 (90 Stat. 1990) provides for transfer to the United States Court of Claims of all cases before the Commission not completely adjudicated by September 30, 1978.

Sets of the Commission's decisions (opinions, findings of fact, and orders), including indexes thereto, and decisions in particular cases are available from:

Clearwater Publishing Company, Inc., 1995 Broadway, New York City, New York 10023. (This firm can supply both microfiche and printed copies of the decisions, and it can also supply copies of briefs, transcripts of oral testimony, expert witness reports, and other materials.)

National Indian Law Library of the Native American Rights Fund, 1506 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado 80302.
(Mrs. Diana Lim Garry is the librarian.)

Testimony and written reports in Indian Claims Commission cases by anthropologists, ethnologists, and other experts, compiled and edited by Dr. David Agee Horr, formerly Professor of Anthropology, Brandeis University, now with Peabody Museum, Harvard University, are available in printed volumes from: Garland Publishing, Inc., 545 Madison Avenue, New York City, New York 10022.

Addendum

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME 43, THE LAST VOLUME OF OPINIONS, FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDERS ISSUED BY THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

	<i>Pages</i>	<i>Date</i>
Sioux, Yankton, Dkt. 332-C		
Opinion — Value and offsets	1-29	8/31/78
Additional findings of fact	30-71	8/31/78
Final award of \$15,269,924.83	72-73	8/31/78
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, Dkts. 128, 309 and 310		
Potawatomie, Prairie Band, et al., Dkts. 15-N, O, Q & R		
Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al., Dkts. 29-L, M, O & P		
Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Incorporated, intervenors in the Potawatomi Dkts.		
Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-B		
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 254		
Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314-B		
Opinion on valuation and consideration issues	74-149	9/8/78
Additional findings of fact	150-248	9/8/78
Order setting awards, subject to gratuitous offsets	249-250	9/8/78
Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113		
Chippewa, Pembina Band, et al., Dkt. 246		
Chippewa, Little Shell Band, et al., Dkt. 191		
Chippewa, Little Shell Band, et al., Dkt. 221		
Opinion on valuation and consideration issues	251-274	9/20/78
Additional findings of fact	275-305	9/20/78
Interlocutory order and award, subject to gratuitous offsets	306-307	9/20/78
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, Dkt. 15-D		
Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al., Dkt. 29-B		
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, Dkt. 311		
Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Incorporated, intervenors in the three Dkts.		
Final award of \$307,046.00	308	9/20/78
Peoria, Kaskaskia, Dkt. 313 (tried on value and consideration issues with Dkt. 15-D, et al.)		
Final award of \$7,142,750.00	309	9/20/78
Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314-A (tried on value and consideration issues with Dkt. 15-D, et al.)		
Final award of \$377,874.00	310	9/20/78
Chippewa, Saginaw (James Strong, et al.), Dkt. 13-F		
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, et al., Dkt. 15-I		
Delaware, Dkt. 27		
Potawatomi, Hannahville, Dkt. 29-G		
Shawnee of Oklahoma, et al., Dkt. 64-A		
Ottawa, Dkt. 133-C		
Wyandot (Lawrence Zane, et al.), Dkt. 141		
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, et al., Dkt. 308		
Opinion on valuation and consideration issues	311-328	9/22/78
Additional findings of fact	329-349	9/22/78
Interlocutory order and awards, subject to gratuitous offsets	350-351	9/22/78
Creek Nation, Dkt. 272		
Opinion — Remaining issues	352-368	9/22/78
Additional findings of fact	369-371	9/22/78
Final award of \$7,718,427.92	372	9/22/78

**TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME 43, THE LAST VOLUME OF OPINIONS,
FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDERS ISSUED BY
THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION—Continued**

	<i>Pages</i>	<i>Date</i>
Oneida Nation of New York, et al., Dkt. 301 (Claims 3-7)		
Opinion on remanded issue of whether the United States had actual or constructive knowledge of 23 treaties between the plaintiffs and the State of New York	373-407	9/22/78
Additional findings of fact	408-467	9/22/78
Interlocutory order	468-469	9/22/78
Seminole Indians of Florida, and Seminole Nation of Oklahoma, Dkts. 73 and 151 (consolidated)		
Findings of fact and order allowing attorneys' expenses	470-475	9/22/78
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, et al., Dkt. 216		
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, et al., Dkt. 15-L		
Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al., Dkt. 29-I		
Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., intervenors in the three Dkts.		
Final award of \$888,623.04	476-477	9/28/78
Chippewa, Minnesota, et al., on behalf of the Chippewas of Lake Superior, Dkt. 18-U		
Findings of fact on attorneys' fee	478-488	9/28/78
Order allowing attorneys' fee	489-490	9/28/78
Cayuga Nation, et al., Dkt. 343		
Findings of fact and order allowing attorneys' fees	491-494	9/28/78
Seminole Indians of Florida, Dkt. 73-A		
Findings of fact and order allowing attorneys' expenses	495-499	9/28/78
Shawnee of Oklahoma, Dkts. 64, 335, and Shawnee portion of Dkt. 338		
Findings of fact and order allowing attorneys' expenses	500-504	9/28/78
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, et al., Dkt. 181-C (Fisheries Claims)		
Opinion	505-551	9/29/78
Opinion dissenting in part and concurring in part	552	9/29/78
Findings of fact	553-605	9/29/78
Interlocutory order and award	606-607	9/29/78
Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al., plaintiffs, and		
Potawatomi, Citizen Band,		
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, et al., and		
Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., intervenors, Dkt. 29-D (tried with Dkt. 13-E, et al.)		
Findings of fact and order allowing attorney fees	608-616	9/29/78
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, et al., intervenors in		
Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al., Dkt. 29-E		
Findings of fact and order allowing expenses of counsel for the Citizen Band	617-620	9/29/78
Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al., plaintiffs, and		
Potawatomi, Citizen Band,		
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, et al., and		
Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., intervenors, Dkt. 29-E (tried with Dkts. 59 and 133-B)		
Findings of fact and order allowing attorney fees	621-629	9/29/78
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, et al., intervenors in Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al., Dkt. 29-D (tried with Dkt. 13-E, et al.)		
Findings of fact and order allowing expenses of counsel for the Citizen Band	630-633	9/29/78
Delaware, Dkt. 27-E (tried with Dkt. 13-E, et al.)		
Delaware, Absentee, et al., Dkt. 202 (tried with Dkt. 13-E, et al.)		
Findings of fact and order allowing attorneys' expenses	634-639	9/29/78
Findings of fact and order allowing attorneys' fees	640-645	9/29/78
Bay Mills Indian Community, Sault Ste. Marie Bands, et al., Dkt. 18-R		
Findings of fact and order allowing attorneys' fees	646-651	9/29/78
Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314-B (tried with Dkts. 128, 15-N, et al.)		
Final award of \$116,144.00	652-653	9/29/78

**TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME 43, THE LAST VOLUME OF OPINIONS,
FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDERS ISSUED BY
THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION—Continued**

	<i>Pages</i>	<i>Date</i>
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims:		
Dkt. 15-C, Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, et al. Dkt. 29-A, Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al. Dkt. 71, Potawatomi, Citizen Band Dkt. 18-B, Chippewa, Minnesota, et al. Dkt. 18-D, Chippewa, Bois Forte Band, et al. Dkt. 18-R, Bay Mills Indian Community, et al. Dkt. 144, Chippewa, Pillager Bands in Minnesota Dkt. 146, Potawatomi, Citizen Band, et al. Dkt. 29-K, Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al. Dkt. 15-M, Potawatomi, Prairie Band, et al. Dkt. 217, Potawatomi, Citizen Band, et al. Dkt. 15-K, Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, et al. Dkt. 29-J, Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al. Dkt. 227, Pueblo of Laguna, et al. Dkt. 364, Ottawa-Chippewa of Michigan Transferred for adjudication of pending matters in respect to applications for allowance of attorney expenses, and in one case, applications for allowance of attorneys' fees and expenses	654-657 9/29/78	
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims:	658-660	9/29/78
Dkts. 341-A, B, C, and D, Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma Dkt. 343, Cayuga Nation, et al. Dkts. 342, 342-A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I, Seneca Nation Dkts. 368 and 368-A, Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians Dkts. 84, 89, and 344, Six Nations, et al. Dkt. 321, Tuscarora Transferred for adjudication of applications for reimbursement of attorneys' expenses		
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims:	661-666	9/29/78
Dkt. 60-A, Makah Dkt. 74, Sioux Tribe, et al. Dkt. 100-B-2, Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians Dkt. 169, Creek Nation Dkt. 181-C (Fisheries Claims), Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, et al. Dkt. 181-D, Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, et al. Dkt. 182, Apache, Fort Sill, et al. Dkt. 236-E, Pima-Maricopa, Gila River Dkt. 272, Creek Nation Dkt. 300-A, Stockbridge Munsee Community, et al. Dkt. 301, Oneida Nation of New York, et al. Dkt. 326-K, Shoshone, Western Identifiable Group (represented by Temoak Bands) Dkt. 332-C, Sioux, Yankton Dkt. 355, Pueblo of Santo Domingo Dkts. 372, 373, 374 and 375, Wichita Indian Tribe and its affiliated bands and groups, namely, the Keechi, Tawakonie and Waco		
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims:	667-668	9/29/78
Dkt. 216, Potawatomi, Citizen Band, et al. Dkt. 15-L, Potawatomi, Prairie Band, et al. Dkt. 29-I, Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al. Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., intervenors in the three dockets		
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims:	669-670	9/29/78
Dkt. 279-C, Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes Dkt. 250-A, Fort Belknap Indian Community Dkt. 279-D, Blackfeet	Consolidated	
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims:	671-672	9/29/78
Dkt. 352, Aleut Community of St. Paul Island Dkt. 369-A, Aleut Community of St. George Island Dkt. 369, Aleut Tribe, et al.	Consolidated	

**TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME 43, THE LAST VOLUME OF OPINIONS,
FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDERS ISSUED BY
THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION—Continued**

	<i>Pages</i>	<i>Date</i>
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims: Dkt. 113, Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band Dkt. 246, Chippewa, Pembina Band, et al. Dkt. 191, Little Shell Band, et al. Dkt. 221, Little Shell Band, et al.	673-674	9/29/78
}	Consolidated	
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims: Dkts. 128, 309, 310, Potawatomi, Citizen Band, et al. Dkts. 15-N, O, Q and R, Potawatomi, Prairie Band, et al. Dkts. 29-L, M, O and P, Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al. Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., intervenors in the Potawatomi Dkts. Dkt. 124-B, Miami, Indiana Dkt. 254, Miami, Oklahoma Dkt. 314-B, Peoria, Wea	675-676	9/29/78
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims: Dkt. 59, Chippewa, Saginaw Dkt. 29-E, Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al., plaintiffs, Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., and the Prairie and Citizen Bands of Potawatomi Indians, intervenors Dkt. 133-B, Ottawa	677-678	9/29/78
Order certifying and transferring the following consolidated cases to the United States Court of Claims: Dkt. 15-P, Potawatomi, Prairie Band, et al. Dkt. 29-N, Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al. Dkt. 306, Potawatomi, Citizen Band, et al. Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Inc. are intervenors in the three Dkts.	679-680	9/29/78
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims: Dkt. 15-E, Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, et al. Dkt. 29-C, Pottawatomie, Hannahville, et al. Dkt. 120, Wyandot Dkt. 130, Miami, Indiana Dkt. 252, Miami, Oklahoma Dkt. 338, Potawatomi, Citizen Band, et al. Dkt. 338, Peoria, Wea and Kaskaskia Dkt. 338, Kickapoo Tribes of Oklahoma and Kansas, et al. Dkt. 338, Ottawa	681-682	9/29/78
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims: Dkt. 15-D, Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, et al. Dkt. 29-B, Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al. Dkt. 311, Potawatomi, Citizen Band, et al. Dkts. 313 and 314-A, Peoria Tribe on behalf of the Kaskaskia, Wea, and Peoria Nations Dkt. 315, Kickapoo of Kansas and Oklahoma Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., intervenors in Dkts. 15-D and 29-B	683-684	9/29/78
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims: Dkt. 13-F, Chippewa, Saginaw (James Strong, et al.) Dkt. 15-I, Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, et al. Dkt. 27, Delaware Dkt. 29-G, Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al. Dkt. 64-A, Shawnee of Oklahoma, et al. Dkt. 133-C, Ottawa Dkt. 141, Wyandot (Lawrence Zane, et al.) Dkt. 308, Potawatomi, Citizen Band, et al.	685-686	9/29/78
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, et al., Dkt. 15-E Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al., Dkt. 29-C Wyandot (Lawrence Zane, et al.), Dkt. 120 Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 130		

**TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME 43, THE LAST VOLUME OF OPINIONS,
FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDERS ISSUED BY
THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION—Continued**

	<i>Pages</i>	<i>Date</i>
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 252		
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, Dkt. 338		
Peoria, Wea and Kaskaskia, Dkt. 338		
Kickapoo of Oklahoma and Kansas, Dkt. 338		
Ottawa, Dkt. 338		
Opinion on value and consideration issues	687-719	9/29/78
Additional findings of fact	720-744	9/29/78
Final order dismissing the claims in Dkts. 120, 130, 252, and certain claims in Dkt. 338, and interlocutory order and awards in Dkts. 15-E, 29-C and 338	745-748	9/29/78
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims:	749-750	9/29/78
Dkt. 13-E, Chippewa, Saginaw (James Strong, et al.)		
Dkt. 27-E, Delaware		
Dkt. 29-D, Potawatomi, Hannahville, et al., plaintiffs, Citizen and Prairie Bands of Potawatomi Indians, and Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., intervenors		
Dkts. 133-A and 302, Ottawa		
Dkt. 139, Wyandot (Lawrence Zane, et al.)		
Dkt. 202, Delaware, Absentee		

Index of Indian Claims by Docket Number, September 22, 1978

Docket No.	Tribe, Band, or Group	Disposition	Date
1	Creek, Loyal	Award	10/19/51
2	Cherokee, Western (Old Settler) and Eastern (Emigrant)	Dismissed	2/19/52
3	Cherokee, Western (Old Settler)	Dismissed	1/15/48
4	Ottawa & Chippewa of Michigan	Dismissed	3/25/49
5	Cherokee, Eastern (Emigrant)	Dismissed	1/15/48
6	Potawatomi, Henry Jackson, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	2/15/49
7	Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	1/24/49
8	Chippewa, Fon Du Lac, Bois Forte, Grand Portage Bands	Dismissed	1/24/49
9	Osage Nation	Award	3/1/55
10	Pawnee, Oklahoma	Award	7/6/62
11	Otoe & Missouria	Award	2/17/56
11-A	Otoe & Missouria	Award	4/14/64
12	California, Federated Indians of	Dismissed	4/28/49
13	Chippewa, Saginaw	Concluded by separating out all claims	7/13/49
13-A	Chippewa, Saginaw	Dismissed	10/17/73
13-B	Chippewa, Saginaw	Dismissed	3/9/50
13-C	Chippewa, Saginaw	Dismissed	2/19/54
13-D	Chippewa, Saginaw	Dismissed	3/9/50
13-E	Chippewa, Saginaw	Award, subject to appeal	8/17/78
13-F	Chippewa, Saginaw	Interlocutory award	9/22/78
13-G	Chippewa, Saginaw	Dismissed	8/9/73
13-H	Chippewa, Saginaw	Dismissed	4/22/54
13-I	Chippewa, Saginaw	Dismissed	5/14/53
13-J	Chippewa, Saginaw	Dismissed	9/19/56
13-K	Chippewa, Saginaw	Dismissed	12/26/73
13-L	Chippewa, Saginaw	Dismissed	11/29/62
13-M	Chippewa, Saginaw	Dismissed	6/30/58
13-N	Chippewa, Saginaw	Dismissed	4/9/69
14	Quapaw	Award	5/7/54
15	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed [all causes being pleaded in separate petitions]	12/27/57
15-A	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	6/2/52
15-B	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award	8/8/55
15-C	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 29-A & 71	6/23/76
15-D	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 29-B & 311, subject to appeal	9/20/78
15-E	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Pending	
15-F	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	11/3/59
15-G	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	11/3/59
15-H	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	6/4/57
15-I	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Interlocutory award with Dkts. 29-G & 308	9/22/78
15-J	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 71-A	2/26/59
15-K	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 217 & 29-J	4/25/73
15-L	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Interlocutory award with Dkts. 216 & 29-I	8/30/78
15-M	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 146 & 29-K	4/19/74
15-N	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 128, 309, 310, 15-O, 15-Q, 15-R, 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P, subject to offsets	9/8/78
15-O	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 128, <i>et al.</i> , subject to offsets	9/8/78
15-P	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 29-N & 306	7/14/78
15-Q	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 128, <i>et al.</i> , subject to offsets	9/8/78
15-R	Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 128, <i>et al.</i> , subject to offsets	9/8/78
16	Choctaw Nation	Award	7/14/50
17	Snake or Piute Indians of former Malheur Reservation, Oregon	Award	12/4/59
18	Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i>	Concluded by separating out all causes of action	7/13/49
18-A	Chippewa, Red Lake, Pembina, & White Earth Bands, <i>et al.</i>	Award with portions of Dkts. 113 & 191	4/24/64
18-B	Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i>	Awards*	7/27/65
18-C	Chippewa	Award	11/7/73
18-D	Chippewa, Bois Forte Band	Award	1/28/77

*On behalf of the Mississippi Bands, and the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands

Index of Indian Claims by Docket Number, September 22, 1978—Continued

<i>Docket No.</i>	<i>Tribe, Band, or Group</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Date</i>
18-E	Bay Mills Community, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 58	3/15/72
18-F	Bay Mills Community, Sault Ste. Marie Bands	Dismissed	10/24/74
18-G	Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	4/1/70
18-H	Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	9/20/72
18-I	Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	11/29/62
18-J	Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	6/13/73
18-K	Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	5/23/73
18-L	Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	4/4/73
18-M	Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	8/9/73
18-N	Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	11/20/64
18-P	Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	12/26/73
18-Q	Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	6/20/57
18-R	Bay Mills Community, Sault Ste. Marie Bands	Award	12/26/73
18-S	Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> [on behalf of the Chippewas of Lake Superior and the Mississippi]	Awards	11/23/77
18-T	Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> [on behalf of the Chippewas of the Mississippi and Lake Superior]	Award	5/31/72
18-U	Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> [on behalf of the Chippewas of Lake Superior]	Award	3/30/78
19	Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i>	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
20	Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	11/12/57
21	Creek Nation [of 1814]	Award	9/10/62
22	Apache Nation, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed [the claims originally presented in Dkt. 22 being pleaded in other dchts.]	5/8/64
22-A	Apache, Jicarilla	Award	4/21/71
22-B	Apache, Mescalero	Award	4/27/67
22-C	Apache, Lipan and Mescalero	Award	2/19/76
22-D	Apache, San Carlos and White Mountain	Award	9/12/72
22-E	Apache, Yavapai, <i>et al.</i>	Award	3/13/69
22-F	Apache, Yavapai, <i>et al.</i>	Award	12/15/76
22-G	Apache, Mescalero	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
22-H	Apache, San Carlos and White Mountain	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
22-J	Apache, Northern Tonto, Yavapai, <i>et al.</i>	Award	9/12/72
22-K	Apache, Jicarilla	Award	2/21/74
23	Chickasaw Nation	Award	7/14/50
24	Cherokee, Western (Old Settler)	Dismissed	4/3/52
25	Creek Freedmen Association	Dismissed	8/4/49
26	Cherokee, Texas	Dismissed	12/28/53
27	Delaware	Interlocutory award	9/22/78
27-A	Delaware	Award with Dkt. 241	11/24/71
27-B	Delaware	Award with Delaware portion of Dkt. 338	12/16/77
27-C	Delaware	Dismissed	12/26/68
27-D	Delaware	Dismissed	8/31/54
27-E	Delaware	Award with Dkt. 202	7/17/78
28	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
29	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Concluded by separating out all causes of action	7/13/49
29-A	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 15-C & 71	6/23/76
29-B	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 15-D & 311, subject to appeal	9/20/78
29-C	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Pending	
29-D	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Award, subject to appeal	8/17/78
29-E	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Award	6/22/78
29-F	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	6/4/57
29-G	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Interlocutory award with Dkts. 15-I & 308	9/22/78
29-H	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	5/8/53
29-I	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Interlocutory award with Dkts. 216 & 15-L	8/30/78
29-J	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 217 & 15-K	4/25/73
29-K	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 146 & 15-M	4/19/74
29-L	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 128, <i>et al.</i> , subject to offsets	9/8/78
29-M	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 128, <i>et al.</i> , subject to offsets	9/8/78
29-N	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 15-P & 306	7/14/78
29-O	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 128, <i>et al.</i> , subject to offsets	9/8/78
29-P	Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 128, <i>et al.</i> , subject to offsets	9/8/78
30	Apache, Fort Sill, Chiricahua, and Warm Springs, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 48	8/25/71
30-A	Apache, Fort Sill, Chiricahua, and Warm Springs, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 48-A.	8/25/71
31	California Indians	Award, concluded claims in Dkts. 31, 37, 176, 215, 333, 80, 80-D, & 347	7/20/64
32	Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache	Award	7/18/57
33	Kaw	Award	5/15/52

Index of Indian Claims by Docket Number, September 22, 1978—Continued

<i>Docket No.</i>	<i>Tribe, Band, or Group</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Date</i>
34	Kaw	Dismissed	5/15/52
35	Kaw	Award	5/15/52
36	Kaw	Dismissed	2/14/50
37	California Indians	Award, see Dkt. 31	7/20/64
38	Kaw	Dismissed	12/19/55
39	Choctaw and Chickasaw	Dismissed	10/28/49
40	Ottawa	Concluded by separating out all causes	7/13/49
40-A	Ottawa	Dismissed	3/9/50
40-B	Ottawa	Dismissed	2/19/54
40-C	Ottawa	Dismissed	11/6/59
40-D	Ottawa	Dismissed	11/6/59
40-E	Ottawa	Dismissed	12/10/59
40-F	Ottawa	Dismissed	8/9/73
40-G	Ottawa	Dismissed	3/9/50
40-H	Ottawa	Dismissed	9/19/56
40-I	Ottawa	Dismissed	12/26/73
40-J	Ottawa	Dismissed	11/29/62
40-K	Ottawa [on behalf of Grand River Band]	Award	3/27/68
41	Cherokee, Western (Old Settler)	Dismissed	12/28/50
42	Cherokee, Eastern (Emigrant)	Dismissed	12/28/50
43	Cherokee, Western (Old Settler)	Dismissed	6/11/51
44	Ute, Uintah of Utah	Award	6/13/60
45	Nooksack	Award	2/9/62
46	Yakima	Award with Dkt. 164	11/14/68
47	Yakima	Award	6/25/65
47-A	Yakima	Dismissed	10/11/72
47-B	Yakima	Award with Dkt. 30	8/25/71
48	Apache, Fort Sill, Chiricahua, and Warm Springs	Award with Dkt. 30-A	8/25/71
48-A	Apache, Fort Sill, Chiricahua, and Warm Springs	Dismissed	9/24/71
49	Apache, Fort Sill, Chiricahua, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	4/10/51
50	Choctaw Nation	Dismissed	3/2/50
51	Choctaw Nation	Dismissed	2/7/57
52	Choctaw East of the Mississippi	Dismissed	4/22/52
53	Seminole Nation	Award	5/29/61
54	Crow	Dismissed	6/11/51
55	Choctaw Nation	Dismissed	7/14/50
56	Choctaw Nation	Award	8/1/73
57	Chippewa, Saginaw	Award with Dkt. 18-E	3/15/72
58	Ottawa and Chippewa of Michigan	Award	6/22/78
59	Chippewa, Saginaw	Dismissed	4/15/59
60	Makah	Pending	
60-A	Makah		
61	Flathead Reservation, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes	Award	8/5/66
62	Assiniboine Indians	Dismissed	12/12/52
63	Shoshone of Wind River Reservation, Wyoming	Award	4/22/57
64	Shawnee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 335 & the Shawnee portion of Dkt. 338	6/3/77
64-A	Shawnee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i>	Interlocutory award	9/22/78
65	Peoria, Kaskaskia, Piankeshaw, Wea	Award	11/13/68
66	Peoria, Kaskaskia	Dismissed	5/6/57
67	Miami, Oklahoma	Award with Dkt. 124	6/30/60
68	Ottawa	Dismissed	1/11/61
69	Navajo	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/27/76
70	Hualapai	Dismissed	4/28/61
71	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 15-C & 29-A	6/23/76
71-A	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 15-J	2/26/59
72	Delaware, Absentee	Award with Dkt. 298	9/10/69
73	Seminole Indians of Florida	Award with Dkt. 151	4/27/76
73-A	Seminole Indians of Florida	Award	4/20/77
73-B	Seminole Indians of Florida	Dismissed	1/16/74
74	Sioux Tribe, <i>et al.</i>	Award, subject to appeal	7/9/78
74-A	Sioux Tribe, <i>et al.</i>	Petition stricken	1/30/62
74-B	Sioux Nation, <i>et al.</i>	After entry of interlocutory award the record was sent to the Court of Claims pursuant to Public Law 95-243, approved 3/13/78 (92 Stat. 153)	4/12/78
75	Emigrant New York Indians	Award	8/11/64
76	Miami, Oklahoma	Dismissed	11/21/61
77	Seneca Nation	Dismissed	6/12/51
78	Sioux Tribe of Lower Brule Reservation, S. D.	Dismissed	10/27/61

Index of Indian Claims by Docket Number, September 22, 1978—Continued

<i>Docket No.</i>	<i>Tribe, Band, or Group</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Date</i>
79	Iowa	Award	2/28/66
79-A	Iowa	Award	5/21/69
80	Mission Indians of California, Bands of	Award, see Dkt. 31	7/20/64
80-A	Mission Indians of California, Bands of	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
80-B	Mission Indians of California, Bands of	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
80-C	Mission Indians of California, Bands of	Dismissed	6/18/69
80-D	Mission Indians of California, Bands of	Award, see Dkt. 31	7/20/64
81	Coeur D'Alene	Award	5/6/58
82	Arapaho, Northern	Dismissed	8/15/51
83	Sac and Fox	Award	12/26/73
84	Six Nations, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 300-B, & separate award for Seneca Nation	12/28/73
85	Omaha	Dismissed	12/19/51
86	Quechan of Fort Yuma Reservation, California	Dismissed	8/22/58
87	Paiute Nation, Northern, <i>et al.</i>	Awards: Snake-Paiute Tract Mono & Paviotso Tracts	7/3/61
87-A	Paiute Nation, Northern, <i>et al.</i>	Transferred to Court of Claims	11/4/65
87-B	Paiute, Pyramid Lake Tribe	Award	3/2/78
88	Paiute Nation, Southern, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 330 & 330-A	7/23/75
89	Six Nations, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	1/18/65
90	Hualapai	Award	8/9/73
91	Havasupai	Award	6/18/68
92	Skagit, Upper	Award	8/6/69
93	Snoqualmie, Skykomish	Award	9/23/68
94	Pend d'Oreille, Lower, or Kalispel	Award	9/23/68
95	Sac and Fox	Award	3/21/63
96	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award	9/25/74
97	Suiattle-Sauk	Award	8/27/68
98	Muckleshoot	Dismissed	12/18/52
99	Peoria, Piankeshaw	Award	10/18/63
100	Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians	Award	2/11/70
100-A	Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians	Award	1/31/64
100-B-1	Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians	Award	9/2/69
100-B-2	Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians	Award	12/2/76
100-C	Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians	Pending	
101	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award	10/31/75
102	Papago of Arizona	Dismissed	9/14/64
103	Choctaw Nation	Award with Dkt. 345	7/21/76
104	Sioux of Santee Reservation, Nebraska	Dismissed	3/8/54
105	Osage Nation	Dismissed	10/17/52
106	Osage Nation		
107	Osage Nation		
108	Osage Nation		
109	Duwamish Tribe	Award	9/15/70
110	Lummi	Award	12/11/63
111	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award	10/22/70
112	Schaghticoke of Kent, Connecticut	Award	8/8/55
113	Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band	Dismissed	9/9/58
114	Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. D.	Interlocutory award on remaining claim with Dkts. 246, 191, & 221	9/20/78
115	Sioux Tribe of Crow Creek Reservation, S. D.	Award	6/18/69
116	Sioux Tribe of Lower Brule Reservation, S. D.	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
117	Sioux Tribe of Pine Ridge Reservation, S. D.	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
118	Sioux Tribe of Rosebud Reservation, S. D.	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
119	Sioux Tribe of Standing Rock Reservation, S. D.	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
120	Wyandot	Pending	
121	Seminole Indians, Loyal Group	Dismissed	2/27/58
122	Hualapai	Award with Dkt. 90	6/18/68
123	Cherokee Freedmen	Dismissed	12/28/61
124	Miami, Indiana	Award with Dkt. 67	6/30/60
124-A	Miami, Indiana	Award	5/31/61
124-B	Miami, Indiana	Award with Dkt. 254, subject to offsets	9/8/78
124-C	Miami, Indiana	Award with Dkt. 255	12/3/68
124-D	Miami, Indiana	Award with Dkt. 256	
124-E	Miami, Indiana		12/3/68

Index of Indian Claims by Docket Number, September 22, 1978—Continued

<i>Docket No.</i>	<i>Tribe, Band, or Group</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Date</i>
124-F	Miami, Indiana)	Award with Dkt. 256	12/3/68
124-G	Miami, Indiana	Dismissed	4/24/58
124-H	Miami, Indiana	Dismissed	2/14/74
125	Snohomish	Award	3/30/67
126	Osage Nation	Dismissed	7/30/59
127	Osage Nation	Dismissed	12/11/63
128	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 309, 310, 15-N, 15-O, 15-Q, 15-R, 9/8/78 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P, subject to offsets	4/24/52
129	Menominee	Dismissed	
130	Miami, Indiana	Pending	1/8/70
131	Miami, Indiana	Award with Dkt. 253	10/22/70
132	Squamish	Award	12/26/57
133	Ottawa	Dismissed	
133-A	Ottawa	Award with Dkt. 302, subject to appeal	8/17/78
133-B	Ottawa	Award	6/22/78
133-C	Ottawa	Interlocutory award	9/22/78
134	S'Klallam	Award	11/5/76
135	Iowa	Award	5/7/65
135	Sac and Fox	Award	5/7/65
135-A	Sac and Fox	Dismissed	5/8/61
136	Pueblo de Cochiti	Dismissed	3/27/59
137	Pueblos de Zia, Jemez, and Santa Ana	Award	1/10/74
138	Iowa	Award	3/22/65
138	Omaha	Award	4/14/64
138	Sac and Fox	Award	3/2/65
139	Wyandot	Award	8/17/78
140	Wyandot	Dismissed	6/13/73
141	Wyandot	Interlocutory order	9/22/78
142	Sioux, Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands or Tribes, <i>et al.</i>	Award	7/25/67
143	Sac and Fox	Award	5/19/65
144	Chippewa, Pillager Bands in Minnesota	Award	10/25/73
145	Kickapoo	Award	4/21/66
146	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 15-M & 29-K	4/19/74
147	Yakima	Dismissed	11/14/68
148	Cabazon Band of Mission Indians	Award	6/16/71
149	Twenty-nine Palm Band of California Mission Indians	Dismissed	12/31/58
150	Seminole Nation of Oklahoma	Award	6/4/58
151	Seminole Nation of Oklahoma	Award with Dkt. 73	4/27/76
152	Seminole Nation of Oklahoma	Dismissed	8/22/62
153	Iowa	Award	2/4/70
153	Sac and Fox	Award	2/4/70
154	Kootenai of Idaho	Award	4/25/60
155	Quileute and Hoh Tribes	Award	4/17/63
156	Flathead Reservation, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes	Dismissed	2/24/71
157	Shoshone of Wind River Reservation, Wyoming	Award	2/24/65
158	Iowa	Award	5/12/69
158	Sac and Fox	Award	11/23/73
159	Oneida of Wisconsin	Dismissed	12/6/62
160	Yakima	Dismissed	11/14/68
161	Yakima	Award with Dkts. 222 & 224	4/5/65
162	Yakima	Award	8/31/65
163	Yakima	Dismissed	8/22/58
164	Yakima	Award with Dkt. 47	11/14/68
165	Yakima, Wishram Band	Dismissed	7/19/65
166	Creek Nation	Dismissed	2/13/68
167	Creek Nation	Award	5/26/71
168	Creek Nation	Dismissed	3/18/63
169	Creek Nation	Award	4/6/77
170	Pascagoula, Biloxi, and Mobilian Consolidated Band	Dismissed	12/3/68
171	Tee-Hit-Ton	Dismissed	6/14/68
172	Yuchi (Euchee), <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	5/16/55
173	Cherokee Nation	Award	9/14/61
173-A	Cherokee Nation and Cherokee Freedmen, <i>et al.</i> , Intervenors	Award	5/30/73
174	Pueblo de Pecos, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	12/11/59
175	Nez Perce	Award	8/25/71

Index of Indian Claims by Docket Number, September 22, 1978—Continued

<i>Docket No.</i>	<i>Tribe, Band, or Group</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Date</i>
175-A	Nez Perce	Award	6/17/60
175-B	Nez Perce	Award	11/1/72
176	Yokiah	Award, see Dkt. 31	7/20/64
177	Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes	Dismissed	9/7/67
178	Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes	Award	9/17/70
178-A	Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes	Transferred to Court of Claims	2/24/77
179	Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes as Representatives of the Joseph Band of Nez Perce Tribe	Award	4/29/70
179-A	Nez Perce	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
180	Nez Perce	Dismissed	12/4/57
180-A	Nez Perce	Award	7/5/60
181	Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes	Award	3/1/60
181-A	Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes	Award	9/7/67
181-B	Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes	Mineral claims transferred to Court of Claims Fisheries claims pending	7/13/78
181-C	Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes	Pending	
181-D	Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes	Pending on appeal in the Court of Claims	10/27/77
182	Apache, Fort Sill, <i>et al.</i>	Transferred to Court of Claims	
182-A	Apache, Fort Sill, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	6/8/54
183	Fort Peck Indians of Fort Peck Reservation, Montana	Fort Peck Indians of Fort Peck Reservation Montana	
184	Fort Peck Indians of Fort Peck Reservation Montana	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
185	Colorado River Indian Tribes	Dismissed	4/23/65
186	Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, <i>et al.</i> , on Behalf of Joseph Band of the Nez Perce Tribe	Award	10/31/74
187	Chitina, Alaska, Natives of	Dismissed	3/15/77
188	Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i>	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
189	Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award	8/9/73
189-A	Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i>	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
189-B	Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i>	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
189-C	Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i>	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
190	Cherokee Nation	Dismissed	9/25/63
191	Chippewa, Little Shell Band, <i>et al.</i>	Interlocutory award on remaining claim with Dkts. 113, 191, 221 & 246	9/20/78
192	Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S.D.	Dismissed	3/29/57
193	Kickapoo	Award	2/29/68
194	Kickapoo	Dismissed	3/22/57
195	Sac and Fox	Award	3/10/65
196	Hopi	Award	12/2/76
197	Nisqually	Award	7/31/74
198	Warm Springs Reservation, Confederated Tribes	Award	10/17/73
198-A	Warm Springs Reservation, Confederated Tribes	Dismissed	6/30/70
199	Athabasca Indians of Stevens Village, Alaska	Dismissed	6/4/57
200	Tatitlek Village, Alaska, Natives of	Dismissed	3/15/72
201	Choctaw Indians, McGahey Band	Dismissed	2/12/57
202	Delaware, Absentee, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 27-E	8/17/78
203	Puyallup	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
204	Seminole Nation, Oklahoma	Dismissed	5/31/72
205	Seminole	Dismissed	11/7/63
206	Squaxin	Award	7/31/74
207	Stillaguamish	Award	1/8/70
208	Steilacoom	Award	7/31/74
209	Iowa	Award	5/12/69
209	Sac and Fox	Dismissed	11/23/73
210	Hopi Village of Shungopavi	Dismissed	5/31/57
211	Pueblo de Isleta	Dismissed	6/5/59
212	Wyandot	Transferred to Court of Claims	7/13/68
213	Wyandot	Transferred to Court of Claims	7/13/68
214	San Juan	Dismissed	10/30/57
215	Yana	Award, see Dkt. 31	7/20/64
216	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Interlocutory award with Dkts. 15-L & 29-I	8/30/78
217	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 15-K & 29-J	4/25/73
218	Cowlitz	Award	4/12/73
219	Sac and Fox	Award	9/29/67
220	Sac and Fox	Award	2/14/67
221	Chippewa, Little Shell Band, <i>et al.</i>	Interlocutory award on remaining claim with Dkts. 113, 191, & 246	9/20/78
221-A	Chippewa Cree, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	2/2/78

Index of Indian Claims by Docket Number, September 22, 1978—Continued

<i>Docket No.</i>	<i>Tribe, Band, or Group</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Date</i>
221-B	Chippewa Cree, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	4/5/74
221-C	Chippewa Cree, <i>et al.</i>	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
222	Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes as Representatives of the Palouse Bands, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 161 & 224	4/5/65
223	San Carlos of Arizona	Dismissed	8/23/63
224	Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes as Representatives of the Moses Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 161 & 222	4/5/65
225	Omaha	Dismissed	10/6/53
225-A	Omaha		
225-B	Omaha		
225-C	Omaha		
225-D	Omaha		
226	Caddo	Award	2/11/60
227	Pueblo of Laguna	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
228	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Award	12/11/70
229	Navajo	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
230	Cayuga	Transferred to Court of Claims	2/15/78
231	Iowa	Dismissed	9/22/71
231	Sac and Fox	Award	5/12/69
232	Sac and Fox	Award	11/23/73
233	Swinomish	Dismissed	3/2/65
234	Chinook	Award	7/6/72
235	Maricopa-Ak Chin Reservation Indians	Award	11/4/70
236	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Transferred to Court of Claims	7/13/78
236-A	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Dismissed	2/26/69
236-B	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Award	9/30/76
236-C	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Award	9/30/76
236-D	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Transferred to Court of Claims	7/13/78
236-E	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Transferred to Court of Claims	7/13/78
236-F	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Pending in Court of Claims on appeal from final award of 4/5/76	7/13/78
236-G	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
236-H	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Dismissed	9/30/74
236-I	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Dismissed	3/24/71
236-J	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
236-K	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Dismissed	6/27/69
236-L	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Dismissed	12/12/68
236-M	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Dismissed	12/12/68
236-N	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
237	Chehalis	Award	10/7/63
238	Kalapuya, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	11/17/54
239	Tillamook, <i>et al.</i>	Award	6/17/58
240	Tillamook Band of Tillamooks, <i>et al.</i>	Award	8/27/62
241	Delaware, Absentee	Award with Dkt. 27-A	11/24/71
242	Quinault and Queets	Award	4/17/63
243	Winnebago Tribe and Nation		
244	Winnebago Tribe and Nation	Award	9/3/70
245	Winnebago Tribe and Nation		
246	Chippewa, Pembina, <i>et al.</i>	Interlocutory award with Dkts. 113, 191 & 221	9/20/78
247	Seminole	Transferred to Court of Claims	7/13/78
248	Seminole Nation, Oklahoma	Award	12/23/74
249	Choctaw Nation	Award	7/15/76
250	Fort Belknap Indian Community	Dismissed	11/20/62
250-A	Fort Belknap	Pending	
251	Miami, Oklahoma	Award	5/31/61
251-A	Miami, Oklahoma	Award	1/9/69
252	Miami, Oklahoma	Pending	
253	Miami, Oklahoma	Award with Dkt. 131	1/8/70
254	Miami, Oklahoma	Award with Dkt. 124-B, subject to offsets	9/8/78
255	Miami, Oklahoma	Award with Dkt. 124-C	12/3/68
256	Miami, Oklahoma	Award with Dkts. 124-D, E, & F	12/3/68
257	Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache	Award with Dkt. 259-A	7/17/74
258	Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache		
259	Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache	Award with Dkt. 257	1/29/68
259-A	Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache	Dismissed	3/30/53
260	Skokomish, <i>et al.</i>	Award	10/6/71
261	Samish	Dismissed	1/13/58
262	Tulalip Tribes, Inc.	Award	6/7/72
263	Kikiallus	Award	
264	Umatilla Reservation, Confederated Tribes	Award	2/11/66

Index of Indian Claims by Docket Number, September 22, 1978—Continued

Docket No.	Tribe, Band, or Group	Disposition	Date
264-A	Umatilla Reservation, Confederated Tribes	Award	2/11/66
264-B	Umatilla Reservation, Confederated Tribes		
265	Coos Bay	Dismissed	7/11/52
266	Pueblo de Acoma	Award	6/17/70
267	Chickasaw	Dismissed	9/16/57
268	Chickasaw	Dismissed	4/20/62
269	Chickasaw	Award	7/17/59
270	Chickasaw	Dismissed	1/16/69
271	Cherokee	Dismissed	3/19/69
272	Creek	Award, subject to appeal	9/22/78
273	Creek	Award	3/14/73
274	Creek	Dismissed	11/5/68
275	Creek Nation of Oklahoma	Award	8/23/72
276	Creek Nation	Award	8/17/66
277	Creek Nation	Transferred to Court of Claims	7/13/78
278	Tlingit and Haida, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	6/7/72
278-A	Tlingit and Haida and Angoon Tribe	Dismissed	6/7/72
278-B	Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes	Award	11/26/73
279	Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes	Dismissed	12/10/68
279-A	Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes	Award	8/23/68
279-A	Sioux of Fort Peck, Intervenor	Award	8/23/68
279-A	Assiniboine of Fort Belknap and Fort Peck, Intervenor	Award	6/30/69
279-B	Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes	Dismissed	8/16/65
279-C	Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes	Pending	
279-D	Blackfeet	Pending	
280	Creek Nation East of the Mississippi	Dismissed	9/13/74
281	Creek Nation East of the Mississippi	Dismissed	9/10/68
282	Cherokee, Eastern Band	Dismissed	2/20/59
282-A	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
282-B	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
282-C	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
282-D	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
282-E	Cherokee, Eastern Band	Award	9/11/72
282-F	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
282-G	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
282-H	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
282-I	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
282-J	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
282-K	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
282-L	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
283	Mohaves of Colorado River Tribes, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 295	9/26/73
283-A	Colorado River Indian Tribes, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	4/23/65
283-B	Colorado River Indian Tribes, <i>et al.</i>	Transferred to Court of Claims	7/13/78
284	Gambell, Native Village of	Dismissed	3/22/72
285	Unalakleet, Native Village of, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	8/16/72
286	Shungnak, Native Village of	Dismissed	8/16/72
287	Nisgah	Dismissed	9/7/72
288	Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California	Award	12/2/70
289	Peoria, Piankeshaw	Award	2/24/71
289	Delaware, Absentee, <i>et al.</i>	Award	2/24/71
290	Oneida of Wisconsin	Dismissed	6/30/67
291	Pima-Maricopa, Salt River	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
292	Creek	Dismissed	2/18/59
293	Swinomish Tribal Community	Dismissed	6/25/71
294	Skagit, Lower (Whidbey Island Skagits)	Award	10/13/71
295	Mohave Tribe of Arizona, California, and Nevada, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 283	10/26/73
295-A	Mohave Tribe of Arizona, California, and Nevada, <i>et al.</i>		
296	Skokomish	Award	9/18/75
297	Cherokee	Award	5/24/63
298	Delaware	Dismissed	3/19/69
299	Navajo	Award with Dkt. 72	9/10/69
300	Stockbridge Munsee Community, <i>et al.</i>	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/27/76
300-A	Stockbridge Munsee Community, <i>et al.</i>	Award	5/30/73
300-B	Stockbridge Munsee Community, <i>et al.</i>	Pending	
301	Oneida Nation of New York, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 84	12/28/73
302	Ottawa	Pending	
303	Ottawa	Award with Dkt. 133-A, subject to appeal	8/17/78
		Award	2/11/65

Index of Indian Claims by Docket Number, September 22, 1978—Continued

<i>Docket No.</i>	<i>Tribe, Band, or Group</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Date</i>
304	Ottawa	Award	4/25/73
305	Ottawa	Award	4/25/73
306	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 15-P & 29-N	7/14/78
307	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	5/11/59
308	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Interlocutory award with Dkts. 15-I & 29-G	9/22/78
309	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 128, <i>et al.</i> , subject to offsets	9/8/78
310	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 128, <i>et al.</i> , subject to offsets	9/8/78
311	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 15-D & 29-B, subject to appeal	9/20/78
312	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	12/22/66
313	Peoria, Kaskaskia	Award, subject to appeal	9/20/78
314			
Amended			
314-A	Peoria, Wea	Award	7/29/63
314-B	Peoria, Wea	Award, subject to appeal	9/20/78
314-C	Peoria, Wea	Interlocutory award	9/8/78
314-D	Peoria, Wea	Award	1/28/70
314-E	Peoria, Wea	Award	1/8/70
315	Kickapoo	Award, subject to offsets	7/18/67
316	Kickapoo	Award	8/25/78
316-A	Kickapoo	Award	9/29/67
317	Kickapoo	Award	9/24/70
318	Kickapoo	Award	2/11/70
319	Quechan of Fort Yuma Reservation, California	Award	6/11/69
320	Quechan of Fort Yuma Reservation, California	Transferred to Court of Claims	8/5/65
321	Tuscarora	Award	12/15/76
322	Ponca	Award	2/21/73
323	Ponca	Award	9/8/71
324	Ponca	Award	8/23/72
325	California Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians	Award	8/27/65
326	Shoshone of Wind River Reservation, Wyoming	Dismissed	3/28/55
326-A	Shoshone, Western Identifiable Group (Represented by Temoak Bands)	Closed [all causes having been severed out]	7/3/68
326-B	Shoshone, Goshute	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
326-C	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho	Award with Dkt. 326-J	11/5/75
326-D	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
326-E	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho		
326-F	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho	Award in Dkts. 326-D, 326-E, 326-F, 326-G, 326-H, 366, & 367	2/13/68
326-G	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho		
326-H	Shoshone Tribe		
326-I	Shoshone, Lemhi	Award	3/8/71
326-J	Shoshone, Goshute	Award with Dkt. 326-B	11/5/75
326-K	Shoshone, Western Identifiable Group (Represented by Temoak Bands)	Pending in Court of Claims on appeal from, <i>inter alia</i> , award of 8/15/77	
327	Ute Indians, Confederated Bands of		
328	Ute, Southern Tribe or Band	Award	2/18/65
329	Cheyenne-Arapaho	Dismissed	7/14/71
329-A	Cheyenne and Arapaho (Southern, <i>et al.</i>)	Dismissed	12/10/68
329-B	Cheyenne and Arapaho (Southern, <i>et al.</i>)		
329-C	Cheyenne Indians, Northern	Award	10/18/65
329-D	Cheyenne and Northern Arapaho	Award	11/27/63
330	Paiute Nation, Southern, <i>et al.</i>	Award	6/27/63
330-A	Paiute Nation, Southern, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 88 & 330-A	1/18/65
331	Spokane	Award with Dkts. 88 & 330	1/18/65
331-A	Spokane	Award	2/21/67
332	Sioux, Yankton	Dismissed	9/30/60
332-A	Sioux, Yankton	Award	1/28/69
332-B	Sioux, Yankton	Award	9/8/72
332-C	Sioux, Yankton	Award, subject to appeal	8/31/78
332-D	Sioux, Yankton	Transferred to Court of Claims	7/13/78
333	Shasta	Award, see Dkt. 31	7/20/64
334	Shawnee, Absentee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i>	Award	5/29/61
334-A	Shawnee, Absentee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	3/22/63
334-B	Shawnee, Absentee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i>	Award	5/19/71
335	Shawnee, Eastern of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 64 and the Shawnee portion of Dkt. 338	6/3/77
336	Shawnee, Eastern of Oklahoma and Shawnee, Absentee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	11/26/68
337	Delaware	Award	8/5/63

Index of Indian Claims by Docket Number, September 22, 1978—Continued

<i>Docket No.</i>	<i>Tribe, Band, or Group</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Date</i>
338	Delaware, Absentee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 27-B	12/16/77
338	Shawnee, Eastern and Absentee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 64 & 335	6/3/77
338	Peoria of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i>	Pending	
338	Kickapoo of Kansas and Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i>	Pending	
338	Ottawa of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i>	Pending	
338	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Pending	
339	Iowa	Dismissed	3/22/65
340	Tuscarora	Dismissed	3/9/65
341	Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma	Dismissed	9/4/58
341-A	Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma	Award	6/11/75
341-B	Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma	Dismissed	
341-C	Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma	Dismissed	4/4/73
341-D	Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma	Dismissed	5/23/73
341-E	Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma	Dismissed	9/4/58
342	Seneca Nation	Dismissed	10/3/60
342-A	Seneca Nation	Award with Dkt. 368-A	11/22/72
342-B	Seneca Nation	Award with Dkt. 368	3/13/74
342-C	Seneca Nation	Dismissed	
342-D	Seneca Nation	Dismissed	12/30/68
342-E	Seneca Nation	Dismissed	5/3/72
342-F	Seneca Nation	Award	3/13/74
342-G	Seneca Nation	Award	2/3/77
342-H	Seneca Nation	Dismissed	8/30/63
342-I	Seneca Nation	Award	3/13/74
343	Cayuga	Award	5/11/78
344	Six Nations, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	3/1/63
345	Papago of Arizona	Award with Dkt. 102	7/21/76
346	Choctaw, Ridaught Band	Dismissed	8/22/68
347	Pitt River	Award, see Dkt. 31	7/20/64
348	Cheyenne-Arapaho	Dismissed	3/13/64
349	Ute Tribe of Uintah and Ouray Reservation, on Behalf of Uncompahgre Band of Ute Indians	Award	2/18/65
350	Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes	Dismissed	12/10/68
350-A	Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes	Award with Dkts. 350-E & H	6/18/69
350-B	Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes	Dismissed	3/30/71
350-C	Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes	Award	3/17/76
350-D	Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes	Award	3/17/76
350-E	Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes	Award with Dkts. 350-A & H	6/18/69
350-F	Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes	Award	8/23/72
350-G	Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes	Transferred to Court of Claims	2/17/77
350-H	Fort Berthold, Three Affiliated Tribes	Award with Dkts. 350-A & E	6/18/69
351	Chemehuevi	Award	1/18/65
351-A	Chemehuevi		
352	Aleut Community of St. Paul Island	Award with Dkt. 369-A, subject to appeal	8/30/78
353	Navajo	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/27/76
354	Pueblo of San Ildefonso	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
355	Pueblo of Santo Domingo	Pending	
356	Pueblo of Santa Clara	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
357	Pueblo of Taos	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
357-A	Pueblo of Taos	Award	3/17/76
358	Pueblo of Nambe	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
359	Sioux, Lower Indian Community, <i>et al.</i>	Awards for the Sisseton & Wahpeton Tribes, and the Medawakanton & Wahpakoota Tribes	7/25/67
360	Sioux, Lower Indian Community, <i>et al.</i>	Award for the Medawakanton Tribe	7/25/67
361	Sioux, Lower Indian Community, <i>et al.</i>	Award for the Medawakanton Tribe	7/25/67
362	Sioux, Lower Indian Community, <i>et al.</i>	Award for the Medawakanton & Wahpakoota Tribes	7/25/67
363	Sioux, Lower Indian Community, <i>et al.</i>	Award for the Medawakanton & Wahpakoota Tribes and dismissal of remaining claims in Dkt. 363, except the "Second Claim"	7/25/67
363	Sioux, Lower Indian Community, <i>et al.</i> (Second Claim, Act of 1904)	Award for the Sisseton & Wahpeton Bands	2/27/74
363	Sioux, Lower Indian Community, <i>et al.</i> (Second Claim, 1867 Treaty and 1872 Agreement)	Award for the Sisseton & Wahpeton Bands	9/14/77
363	Sioux, Lower Indian Community, <i>et al.</i> (Second Claim, 1867 Treaty and 1872 Agreement)	Additional award for the Sisseton & Wahpeton Bands	12/1/77

Index of Indian Claims by Docket Number, September 22, 1978—Continued

<i>Docket No.</i>	<i>Tribe, Band, or Group</i>	<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Date</i>
363	Sioux, Lower Indian Community, <i>et al.</i> (Remaining part of the second claim consisting of claims for an accounting of money and for the misuse or mismanagement of money)	Transferred to the Court of Claims	12/15/76
364	Ottawa-Chippewa Tribe of Michigan	Award	4/1/77
365	Natchez, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	2/24/54
366	Bannack	Award, <i>see</i> Dkt. 326-D, <i>et al.</i>	2/13/68
367	Shoshone Nation or Tribe	Award, <i>see</i> Dkt. 326-D, <i>et al.</i>	2/13/68
368	Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians	Award with Dkts. 342-B & 342-C	3/13/74
368-A	Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians	Award with Dkt. 342-A	11/22/72
369	Aleut Tribe, <i>et al.</i>	By order of 8/30/78 the claim of Aleut Community of St. George Island was finally severed from Dkt. 369, given Dkt. No. 369-A, and consolidated with Dkt. 352. Remaining claims in Dkt. 369 were pending on date hereof.	
369-A	Aleut Community of St. George Island	Award with Dkt. 352, subject to appeal	8/30/78
370	Palmer, Alaska, Natives of	Dismissed	3/15/72
371*	Wichita Indian Tribe and its Affiliated Bands and Groups, namely the Keechi, Tawakonie, and Waco	Transferred to Court of Claims	6/8/78
372*	Wichita Indian Tribe and its Affiliated Bands and Groups, namely the Keechi, Tawakonie, and Waco	Pending	
373*	Wichita Indian Tribe and its Affiliated Bands and Groups, namely the Keechi, Tawakonie, and Waco	Pending	
374*	Wichita Indian Tribe and its Affiliated Bands and Groups, namely the Keechi, Tawakonie, and Waco	Pending	
375*	Wichita Indian Tribe and its Affiliated Bands and Groups, namely the Keechi, Tawakonie, and Waco	Pending	

*Petition received after August 13, 1951, pursuant to Public Law 95-247, approved March 21, 1978.

Note: Public Law 94-465, approved October 8, 1976 (90 Stat. 1990) provides for transfer to the United States Court of Claims of all cases before the Commission not completely adjudicated by September 30, 1978.

Sets of the Commission's decisions (opinions, findings of fact, and orders), including indexes thereto, and decisions in particular cases are available from:

Clearwater Publishing Company, Inc., 1995 Broadway, New York, New York 10023. (This firm can supply both microfiche and printed copies of the decisions, and it can also supply copies of briefs, transcripts of oral testimony, expert witness reports, and other materials.)

National Indian Law Library of the Native American Rights Fund, 1506 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado 80302. (Mrs. Diana Lim Garry is the librarian.)

Testimony and written reports in Indian Claims Commission cases by anthropologists, ethnologists, and other experts, compiled and edited by Dr. David Agee Horr, formerly Professor of Anthropology, Brandeis University, now with Peabody Museum, Harvard University, are available in printed volumes from: Garland Publishing, Inc., 545 Madison Avenue, New York, New York, 10022.

Fiscal Year Totals of Dockets Completed and Awards¹

Fiscal Year	Number of Dockets Completed		Number of Awards	Total Amount of Awards	Cumulative Total of Awards
	By Dismissals	By Awards			
1947	—	—		\$ —	\$ —
1948	—	—		—	—
1949	7	—		—	—
1950	12	—		—	—
1951	7	2	2	3,489,843.58	3,489,843.58
1952	8	3	3	2,998,220.02	6,488,063.60
1953	7	—	—	—	6,488,063.60
1954	8	1	1	927,668.04	7,415,731.64
1955	4	1	1	864,107.55	8,279,839.19
1956	1	3	3	1,515,494.95	9,795,334.14
1957	12	1	1	433,013.60	10,228,347.74
1958	10	4	4	6,860,238.54	17,088,586.28
1959	12	2	1	3,288,974.90	20,377,561.18
1960	7	13	8	21,588,007.51	41,965,658.69
1961	5	5	5	14,926,255.11	56,891,823.80
1962	5	2	3	18,063,859.65	74,955,683.45
1963	9	8	9	18,319,187.20	93,274,870.65
1964	7	9	11	15,796,254.69	109,071,125.34
1965	7	27	17	57,019,352.93	166,090,478.27
1966	2	12	11	38,701,569.58	204,792,047.85
1967	2	7	6	21,497,766.74	226,289,814.59
1968	3	23	16	43,576,732.73	269,866,547.32
1969	23	24	20	32,025,817.01	301,892,364.33
1970	2	14	13	44,254,099.43	346,146,463.76
1971	4	20	16	46,621,560.61	392,768,024.37
1972	11	14	10	33,078,111.56	425,846,135.93
1973	11	32	18	40,837,122.35	466,683,258.28
1974	11	24	20	46,409,564.06	513,092,822.34
1975	3	9	7	35,945,458.57	549,038,280.91
1976	—	15	11	63,055,867.25	612,094,148.16
Jul-Sep '76	—	5	4	27,825,465.90	639,919,614.06
1977	—	11	12	67,604,270.07	707,523,884.13
1978	4	31	24	110,648,722.51	818,172,606.64
	204	342	274		

¹ This tabulation includes final awards and dismissals entered by the Commission through September 30, 1978. The 342 dockets shown as completed by awards include 20 dockets not reported to the Congress as concluded. Seventeen of these dockets have final awards entered totaling \$88,137,342.21 on which appeal time is running (Dkts. 13-E; 15-D, 29-B and 31-L; 15-L, 29-I and 216; 74; 133-A and 302; 272; 313; 314-A; 314-B; 332-C; and 352 and 369-A); two having final awards totaling \$31,596,419.79 are pending before the Court of Claims on appeals from the Commission's determinations (Dkts. 236-E and 326-K); and one having a final award of \$1,115,706.20 affirmed by the Court of Claims is pending on a petition to the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims (Dkt. 169). Appeal time is running from orders dismissing three of the 204 dockets shown completed by dismissals (Dkts. 120, 130 and 252).

²The first Commissioners took their oaths of office on April 10, 1947.

Index to the Map Indian Land Areas Judicially Established

*Introduction**

For scores of years, American Indian tribes have been litigating claims against the United States Government, seeking damages for various categories of wrongs done them. Perhaps the most common type of claim has been that land owned by an Indian tribe under the doctrine of "Indian title" was taken from the tribe without adequate compensation being paid. One step in a tribe's proving such a claim is demonstrating that a particular tract was indeed owned by it by Indian title: that the tribe had exclusively occupied and used a tract for a long time. The "Indian Land Areas Judicially Established" map summarizes the results of all such successful claims and depicts the tracts to which Indian ownership was established through a judicial proceeding. Thus the map joins two themes: the first that of Indian history, showing where the various tribes were originally located, and the second that of Indian legal history, where the reality of Indian history has been filtered through an Anglo-Saxon adversary judicial process.¹

A. Indian Claims: The Judicial Process

The legal rule has always been that the United States as a sovereign cannot be sued without its consent, and that consent has not been freely given in our history. The United States Court of Claims was established in 1855 as a general forum before which citizens could present claims against the

United States, but its jurisdiction was limited and specifically excluded Indian tribes as litigants. Over the years some Indian tribes made compelling arguments to Congress that their claims demanded justice. Individual jurisdictional acts were passed allowing named tribes to sue the United States in the Court of Claims on causes defined in the statute.² Some of these acts were drafted broadly enough to allow claims based on loss of Indian title lands, and resulted in decisions defining the extent of a tribe's lands.³ These results are mapped here.

Eventually the volume and variety of requests to Congress for special jurisdictional acts became so great that in 1946 Congress devised a general solution: the Indian Claims Commission.⁴ This became the forum to receive all Indian tribal claims accruing before 1946. Many of the claims filed were for compensation for Indian title lands lost by treaty or otherwise, and thus began a large volume of litigation to prove the one-time existence of the tribes' Indian title to the appropriate tracts. In general, the cases proceeded by the attorneys for the parties (the Indian tribe on one side and the U.S. Department of Justice on the other) presenting, at a trial before the Commission, the testimony of expert witnesses such as anthropologists, historians, and ethnohistorians. The witnesses' often-differing opinions as to tribal locations and their extent were reconciled by the Commission in its decision announcing what had been proved, and delineating the boundaries of the Indian title tract.⁵

*This introduction was prepared by Richard W. Yarborough, Commissioner, who also edited the map and directed the compilation of data for it, and accepts responsibility for any errors that may occur. Compiling the data for the Indian Claims Commission were J. William Nutter, Laurence A. Davis, Deputy Counsel, Donald Hyde, Senior Attorney, Harmon S. Maxson, Kathleen A. McKee, James Roberson, former staff attorneys. Consultant: Guy M. Lovell, Bureau of Indian Affairs (ret.).

The tracts were bounded and colored by John E. Roberts, Cartographer, Bureau of Land Management.

The map was compiled and produced by the U.S. Geological Survey.

¹Any mapping of Indian lands must draw on the results of the prodigious industry of Charles C. Royce. His massive compilation, published as *Indian Land Cessions in the United States*, 18th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, Part 2 (1899), depicts on a series of maps the Indian lands ceded piece by piece by the many Indian treaties of cession. His translation of the often-vague treaty calls into precise boundaries created an indispensable reference for all subsequent students of Indian land areas; many "Royce Areas" will be found intact on this map.

Thus mapping the cessions, however, is a subtractive process, and often the cession did not match the true ownership of the land. This map is a positive expression of land determined to have been owned, without special reference to the cession or extinguishment process. The area numbers on this map do not correspond to the Royce Area numbers.

²For a general review of the Court of Claims cases, see the article by Glen A. Wilkinson, *Indian Tribal Claims Before the Court of Claims*, 55 Georgetown L. J. 511 (1966).

³Citations to those Court of Claims cases will be found in the index under areas 50, 83, 84, 86, 107 and 108. (But see Section C, below.)

One successful case is not mapped because the lands are located in Alaska, *Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska v. United States*, 147 Ct. Cl. 315 (1959). That decision is the only one establishing Indian title in Alaska.

For examples of unsuccessful cases see *Duwamish Tribe, et. al. v. United States*, 79 Ct. Cl. 530 (1934); *Wichita Indians, et al. v. United States*, 89 Ct. Cl. 378 (1939).

⁴60 Stat. 1049 (1946), 25 U.S.C. 70a-v (1976).

⁵The decisions of the Indian Claims Commission are collected serially in a set now running from Vols. 1 to 43. Many leading libraries have assembled sets of the decisions as issued. The decisions have also been collected and issued in a microfiche format by the Clearwater Publishing Co., Inc. 1995 Broadway, New York, N.Y., 10023, which firm has also issued microfiche collections of the expert testimony delivered before the Commission, and the legal briefs filed there. Copies of individual decisions may be obtained from the National Indian Law Library, 1506 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado 80302.

It was not firmly established until 1955 that Indian title lands could form the basis for compensation under the Indian Claims Commission Act, but that category of case came to provide probably the largest part of the Commission's business.⁶ By 1978, the final year of the Commission, decisions in cases requiring a finding of Indian title had been entered in every such claim filed before the Commission, and the results are mapped here. In that respect the Commission's work and the map of Indian Land Areas Judicially Established are complete.⁷

Each map area enclosed by a solid line represents a case, usually a docket of the Indian Claims Commission, with an identification number referenced to this Index. A dashed line around an area is used when the case was settled favorably to the plaintiffs before exact boundaries were established.⁸

B. Indian Title

However often ignored in practice, the legal doctrine of every European colonizer of the Americas acknowledged that the Indians had certain rights to the peaceful possession of their land. England acknowledged such Indian rights, and in general her American colonies expanded through purchase of lands from the tribe claiming them.⁹ The United States took no different view, and Chief Justice John Marshall firmly nailed the doctrine of Indian title into American Constitutional law.¹⁰

Indian title, original Indian title, or aboriginal title refers to the possessory right of an Indian tribe to occupy and use the area of land it has traditionally used.¹¹ It is conceived of as a title superior to all but the sovereign; neither settler nor state could take it away.¹² However, the United States as sovereign is deemed to have the power to extinguish or terminate

Indian title at will.¹³ An Indian title is held not to be properly protected against confiscation without just compensation by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.¹⁴

It must be observed that Indian title as used in our legal system is completely a creation of our legal system, and American Indians may properly disclaim having had any choice in creating it or defining it. Indian title as developed in the American courts is a very rough compromise between a system of titles dependent on written instruments and surveyed lines and a system that in simpler times may well have rejected the notion that land can be "owned" at all.¹⁵

Three factual elements appear in the usual formulation of the requirements for proving a valid Indian title: the extent of the use and occupancy, the exclusiveness of the use and occupancy, and whether the use continued "for a long time." Since a title that is based on use alone might at its most expansive be argued to give a tribe title to all land that any member of the tribe had ever wandered over, these elements provide some focus for sorting out what is one tribe's rather than another's. The extent of the use and occupancy usually coincides with what is shown to be the area used for subsistence by all the members of the tribe.¹⁶ Not only agricultural use, but religious use, hunting and gathering use, even sporadic irregular hunting use, may, if not in conflict with another tribe's use, bring an area within the compass of a tribe's Indian title lands.¹⁷

At some time or another a particular tract may have seen members of more than one tribe hunting over it. Our legal prejudices have strained at allowing there to be "ownership" of an area apparently free for use by all. Therefore, a tribe asserting Indian title must show exclusive use: that the tract was its alone.¹⁸ The tribe does not have to show formal political hegemony over an area, or assertion and exercise of power to exclude all members of other

⁶*Otoe and Missouria Tribe v. United States*, 131 Ct. Cl. 593 (1955), aff'd in part, rev'd in part, 2 Ind. Cl. Comm. 335 (1953).

⁷In most cases, a final money judgment for the tribe based on an unconscionable consideration paid for the subject lands has resulted. However, not all of the Commission's boundary decisions as yet have been tested on appeal or have progressed otherwise to the point where it can be said that the map's boundaries are beyond possible future modification.

⁸During 1978, Congressional approval was given to two additional tribes, the Wichita and Zuni, to file claims based on original Indian title. Future action by the Court of Claims in those cases may result in additional boundaries to be drawn.

⁹E.g., Area 133, Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, which was a case settled before the possible outer boundary of the claim could be foreseen clearly. In some other cases settled at a similarly early stage, Area 37, Cherokee, and Area 118, Indians of California, the possible outer limit of the claim could be marked more precisely.

¹⁰See the Introduction by Cyrus Thomas to Royce, *Indian Land Cessions in the United States*, *supra*; Felix S. Cohen, *Handbook of Federal Indian Law*, Washington, D.C. (1942).

¹¹*Johnson and Graham's Lessee v. M'Intosh*, 8 Wheat. 543 (1823); *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, 5 Pet. 1 (1831); *Worcester v. Georgia*, 6 Pet. 515 (1832).

¹²*Otoe and Missouria Tribe v. United States*, *supra*; Cohen, *Original Indian Title*, 32 Minn. L. Rev. 28 (1947).

¹³*Johnson and Graham's Lessee v. M'Intosh*, *supra*.

¹⁴¹⁵Extinguishment of Indian title based on aboriginal possession is of course a different matter. The power of Congress in that regard is supreme. The manner, method and time of such extinguishment raise political not justiciable issues. *Buttz v. Northern P. R. Co.*, *supra*. As stated by Chief Justice Marshall in *Johnson v. M'Intosh*, *supra*, the exclusive right of the United States to extinguish Indian title has never been doubted. And whether it be done by treaty, by the sword, by purchase, by the exercise of complete dominion adverse to the right of occupancy, or otherwise, its justness is not open to inquiry in the courts. *Beecher v. Wetherby*, 95 U.S. 517, 525. ¹⁶*United States v. Santa Fe Pacific R. Co.*, 314 U.S. 339, 347 (1941).

¹⁷*United States v. Alcea Band of Tillamooks*, 341 U.S. 48 (1951); *Tee-Hit-Ton Indians v. United States*, 348 U.S. 272 (1955).

¹⁸"... No tribe has the right to sell, even to each other, much less to strangers ... Sell a country! Why not sell the air, the great sea, as well as the earth? Did not the Great Spirit make them all for use of his children? Tecumseh, as quoted in Armstrong, *I Have Spoken*, 191.

¹⁹See *United States v. Seminole Indians*, 180 Ct. Cl. 375 (1968), aff'd 13 Ind. Cl. Comm. 326 (1964).

²⁰Even inaccessible mountain crests on the borders or within used areas may be subject to Indian title. *Tlinget and Haida Indians v. United States*, 147 Ct. Cl. 315 (1959).

²¹*Hualapai Indians v. United States*, 11 Ind. Cl. Comm. 447 (1962).

tribes. Usually a more intensive and persistent use of an area as compared to a casual and incidental use by another tribe will be sufficient for Indian title.¹⁹ Raiding into a tribe's Indian title area will not defeat its title, nor will its raids create title.²⁰ A tribe may permit guests to use its lands without defeating its title.²¹ But since often the only evidence of title is the observation of use by individual Indians, common use tends to defeat title. The decisions have not looked with favor on arguments that common use implies a joint ownership.²² Joint Indian title by two or more tribes is a theoretical possibility, and has been discovered once,²³ but mere common use allows too many other inferences to be drawn (owner? guest? passing through?) to allow title to be decreed in one tribe or the other or both. From the map, one may observe that this requirement seems often to have led to the finding of "buffer zones" between tribes, while in other cases the evidence has allowed the drawing of more precise boundaries.

Indian title also requires use of the area "for a long time." The decisions reflect an unwillingness to find ownership of a specific tract in a nomadic tribe wandering over many areas; some degree of continuous association with an area has been required. However, no example comes to mind of a tribe so nomadic that it was denied having Indian title lands located somewhere.²⁴ Perhaps 20 to 50 years seems judicially acceptable as "a long time" under appropriate circumstances.²⁵

C. Indian vs. Recognized Title

Along with the power of Congress to terminate Indian title at will goes the power of Congress to invest a tribe with a more secure title. When Congress by treaty or statute acknowledged that a particular tract belonged to a certain tribe, a "recognized" or "reservation" title was created giving that tribe a full beneficial interest as private property protected by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.²⁶ Commonly the Indian treaties provided for a cession of

a tribe's Indian title lands and confirmed to it a smaller tract as a reservation, within or without the former Indian title lands.²⁷ This map does not attempt to chart the diminished reservations created in that manner, but does show large areas of land judged to be held by recognized title where the tracts were originally occupied by the tribes as in Indian title.

Some treaties negotiated with Indian tribes promised large areas not ceded by the treaty would be left to the tribes as "their permanent home." (Of course, cessions later were obtained of most such areas when the tides of settlers seemed to require it.) Courts later concluded that such treaties created recognized title to the unceded areas, but sometimes which tribe owned which tract could only be determined by subsequent treaties of cession. Three such treaties affecting large areas were the Treaty of Greeneville in 1795 (lands in the Old Northwest),²⁸ the Treaty of Prairie du Chien in 1825 (Sioux and Chippewa lands in the upper Mississippi area),²⁹ and the Treaty of Fort Laramie in 1851 (Northern Great Plains).³⁰ The great advantage to those tribes as litigants was that their aboriginal use of every quarter of the claimed area did not have to be proved as in an Indian title case.³¹

These areas have been included in this map since they are the areas of original occupancy of the tribes. Even though mapping these areas derogates the purity of concept of having an "Indian Title Map," it is necessary to show the existence of considerable Indian lands (and legal activity involving large areas of the United States) based on the original homes of the tribes.

The treaties involving these areas of recognized title often took cessions from two or more tribes, acknowledged occupants as well as any possible claimants. The result was to create areas of joint title, and judicial problems in sorting out the extent of the interests of the tribes.³² The striping on the map is used to portray such joint title areas, with the stripes applied so as to indicate the approximate proportional ownership of each tribe.

One large tract, Area 53, is distinctively striped to indicate that title to that tract has been found independently to be in the Potawatomi and in the

¹⁹*United States v. Seminole Indians, supra; Spokane Tribe of Indians v. United States*, 163 Ct. Cl. 58 (1963).

²⁰*Papago Tribe v. United States*, 19 Ind. Cl. Comm. 394 (1968); *Omaha Tribe v. United States*, 4 Ind. Cl. Comm. 627 (1957).

²¹*Creek Nation v. United States*, 23 Ind. Cl. Comm. 1 (1970).

²²*Iowa and Sac and Fox v. United States*, 195 Ct. Cl. 365 (1971), aff'd 22 Ind. Cl. Comm. 232 (1969).

²³*United States v. Pueblos of San Ildefonso, Santo Domingo and Santa Clara*, 206 Ct. Cl. 649 (1975), aff'd 30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 234 (1973).

²⁴But see *Wichita Indians v. United States*, 89 Ct. Cl. 378 (1939).

²⁵*United States v. Seminole Indians, supra; Sac and Fox Tribe v. United States*, 179 Ct. Cl. 8 (1967).

²⁶*Shoshone Tribe v. United States*, 299 U.S. 476 (1937); *United States v. Creek Nation*, 295 U.S. 103 (1935).

²⁷See Royce, *supra*.

²⁸7 Stat. 49. See *Miami Tribe v. United States*, 146 Ct. Cl. 421 (1959), aff'd (on title) 2 Ind. Cl. Comm. 617 (1954).

²⁹7 Stat. 272. See *Minnesota Chippewa Tribe v. United States*, 161 Ct. Cl. 258 (1963), rev'd 8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 781 (1960).

³⁰11 Stat. 749. See *Fort Berthold Indians v. United States*, 71 Ct. Cl. 308 (1930).

³¹See *Miami Tribe v. United States, supra*.

³²See, e.g., *Chippewa Tribe, et al. v. United States*, 30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 337 (1973), aff'd 207 Ct. Cl. 959 (1975) (Map Area 4).

Menominee.³³ In a few cases where the determined tract boundaries apparently overlap, both tract boundaries are shown and the overlap area appropriately counter-colored (e.g., the north boundary of Area 77).

D. Tribal Names

The tribal names shown on the map are those, sometimes in shortened form, of the original tribal owners of the land. This name may differ from the present-day reservation name of the plaintiffs who brought the suit and under whose name the case will be styled.³⁴

Some tribal names were placed on the map even though those tribes, for one reason or another, did not ever receive an Indian title adjudication. Their selection was somewhat arbitrary but was designed to show the general original location of tribes prominent in the literature, legal and otherwise.

All the tracts of a single tribe have the same color, but similarly named tribes may have different colors assigned if they were distinct land-owning entities.

However, the lands of the Potawatomi, Chippewa, Sioux and Apache were each given the same color throughout regardless of the legal distinctness of the component entities. Otherwise, the colors were assigned arbitrarily and no relationship is implied between tracts of the same color except where adjacent.

E. Dates

Often the homeland of a tribe would shift over time. Every area mapped here is tied to a specific date, given in the Index, when that area was the tribe's by Indian title. The date usually coincides with the time when any of the title was first extinguished, by treaty of cession or otherwise. In general, the dates increase from east to west at the pace the country was settled.

F. Citations

The citations given in the Index are to the title decisions only: the phase of an Indian Claims Commission case where the boundaries of the owned land are determined. Other indexes must be used to trace the full legal history of the cases and find the ultimate results.

G. Other Map Features

A selection of prominent treaty sites and forts are located on the map for reference purposes and the convenience of the reader.

³³Compare *Emigrant New York Indians v. United States*, 5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 560 (1957), aff'd 177 Ct. Cl. 263 (1966) and *Prairie Band of Potawatome Indians v. United States*, 28 Ind. Cl. Comm. 454 (1972).

³⁴The tribe or band is usually conceived of as the land-owning entity in whose name the suit is prosecuted, but no one rationale will explain all the cases. An aboriginal entity based on kinship, an entity created by a treaty, or an entity created by forcible placement on a reservation may all be found as plaintiffs in the cases. Perhaps the most unusual situation is that of the Indians of California (Area 118) comprising most of the many small tribes of that state. The holding that this entity is an "other identifiable group" entitled to present a land claim rests mostly on a history of previous litigation as a group, *Thompson v. United States*, 122 Ct. Cl. 348 (1952). This claim was settled before other tracts than those shown on the map were defined.

Map Area Index

<i>Map Area No.</i>	<i>Tribal Owner</i>	<i>Docket or Case Number</i>	<i>Date Existed</i>	<i>Title Citations</i>
1	Seneca	342-A, 368-A, 342-B, C, 368	1797	12 Ind. Cl. Comm. 755 (1963) rev'd 173 Ct. Cl. 917 (1965) 20 Ind. Cl. Comm. 177 (1968) 28 Ind. Cl. Comm. 12 (1972)
2	Delaware (1/5) Wyandot (1/5) Potawatomi (1/5) Ottawa (1/5) Chippewa (1/5)	27-E, 202 139 29-D 133-A, 302 13-E	1805	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 8 (1973) aff'd 207 Ct. Cl. 958 (1975)
3	Ottawa	133-B	1808	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 388 (1973) aff'd 207 Ct. Cl. 960 (1975)
4	Delaware (1/10) Ottawa (3/10) Shawnee (1/10) Wyandot (5/10)	27 133-C 64-A 141	1819	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 337 (1973) aff'd 207 Ct. Cl. 959 (1975)
5	Delaware	27-B	1795	31 Ind. Cl. Comm. 89 (1973) aff'd in part, rev'd in part, 207 Ct. Cl. 254 (1975)
6	Shawnee	64	1795	31 Ind. Cl. Comm. 89 (1973) aff'd in part, rev'd in part, 207 Ct. Cl. 254 (1975)
7	Potawatomi (1/3) Ottawa (1/3) Chippewa (1/3)	29-G 133-C 13-F	1819	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 337 (1973) aff'd 207 Ct. Cl. 959 (1975)
8	Potawatomi	29-E	1807	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 388 (1973) aff'd 207 Ct. Cl. 960 (1975)
9	Potawatomi	15-M	1821	6 Ind. Cl. Comm. 414 (1958)
10	Potawatomi	15-N	1827	32 Ind. Cl. Comm. 461 (1973) aff'd 206 Ct. Cl. 867 (1975)
11	Potawatomi	15-P, 29-N, 306	1832	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 42 (1973) aff'd 205 Ct. Cl. 765 (1974)
12	Potawatomi	15-L, 29-I, 216	1816	32 Ind. Cl. Comm. 400 (1973)
13	Potawatomi	15-E, 29-C, 338	1795	31 Ind. Cl. Comm. 89 (1973)
14	Potawatomi	15-K, 29-J, 217	1829	11 Ind. Cl. Comm. 641 (1962) rev'd in part 179 Ct. Cl. 473 (1967)
15	Potawatomi	15-C, 29-A, 71	1833	28 Ind. Cl. Comm. 454 (1972)
16	Sault St. Marie Band (Chippewa)	18-R	1821	22 Ind. Cl. Comm. 85 (1969) aff'd 206 Ct. Cl. 850 (1975)
17	Ottawa Chippewa	58 18-E	1820	7 Ind. Cl. Comm. 576 (1959)
18	Saginaw Chippewa	57	1820	22 Ind. Cl. Comm. 504 (1970)

Map Area Index—Continued

<i>Map Area No.</i>	<i>Tribal Owner</i>	<i>Docket or Case Number</i>	<i>Date Existed</i>	<i>Title Citations</i>
19	Saginaw Chippewa	59	1808	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 388 (1973)
20	Grand River Band (Ottawa)	40-K	1821	6 Ind. Cl. Comm. 414 (1958)
21	Miami (1/2) Potawatomi (1/2)	124-B, 254 15-N	1818	32 Ind. Cl. Comm. 461 (1973) aff'd 206 Ct. Cl. 867 (1975)
22	Miami (7/10) Potawatomi (3/10)	124-B, 254 15-N	1827	32 Ind. Cl. Comm. 461 (1973) aff'd 206 Ct. Cl. 867 (1975)
23	Miami	67	1818	2 Ind. Cl. Comm. 617 (1954) aff'd 146 Ct. Cl. 421 (1959)
24	Miami Eel River	131, 253	1809	5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 180 (1957)
25	Miami (1/2) Delaware (1/2)	67 337	1818	2 Ind. Cl. Comm. 617 (1954) aff'd 146 Ct. Cl. 421 (1959)
26	Miami (3/4) Wea (1/4)	131, 253 314	1809	5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 180 (1957)
27	Potawatomi (1/2) Wea (1/2)	15-D 314-A	1818	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 42 (1973) aff'd 205 Ct. Cl. 765 (1974)
28	Potawatomi (1/3) Wea (1/3) Kickapoo (1/3)	15-D 314-A 315	1818	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 42 (1973) aff'd 205 Ct. Cl. 765 (1974)
29	Wea (1/2) Kickapoo (1/2)	314-C 317	1810	10 Ind. Cl. Comm. 271 (1962) 20 Ind. Cl. Comm. 186 (1969)
30	Wea	314	1818	2 Ind. Cl. Comm. 617 (1954)
31	Delaware (1/2) Piankeshaw (1/2)	289 289	1804	19 Ind. Cl. Comm. 107 (1968)
32	Potawatomi (1/2) Kickapoo (1/2)	15-P 315	1819	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 42 (1973) aff'd 205 Ct. Cl. 765 (1974)
33	Kickapoo	315	1819	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 42 (1973) aff'd 205 Ct. Cl. 765 (1974)
35	Piankeshaw (Peoria)	99	1805	16 Ind. Cl. Comm. 574 (1966)
36	Kaskaskia (Peoria)	313	1803	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 42 (1973) aff'd 205 Ct. Cl. 765 (1974)
37	Cherokee	282-A thru L	1785-1835	28 Ind. Cl. Comm. 386 (1972) (compromised)
38	Creek	275	1816	23 Ind. Cl. Comm. 1 (1970)
39	Creek	272	1832	26 Ind. Cl. Comm. 410 (1971) [see 77 Ct. Cl. 226 (1933)] aff'd 201 Ct. Cl. 386 (1973)
40	Creek	21	1814	2 Ind. Cl. Comm. 66 (1952) aff'd 165 Ct. Cl. 479 (1964)
41	Seminole	73, 151	1823	13 Ind. Cl. Comm. 326 (1964) aff'd 180 Ct. Cl. 375 (1967)
42	Lake Superior Bands Mississippi Bands (Chippewa)	18-S	1843	19 Ind. Cl. Comm. 319 (1968)

Map Area Index—Continued

<i>Map Area No.</i>	<i>Tribal Owner</i>	<i>Docket or Case Number</i>	<i>Date Existed</i>	<i>Title Citations</i>
43	Lake Superior Bands Mississippi Bands (Chippewa)	18-C	1838	19 Ind. Cl. Comm. 514 (1968)
44	Lake Superior Bands (Chippewa)	18-U	1855	14 Ind. Cl. Comm. 360 (1964)
45	Bois Forte Band (Chippewa)	18-D	1866	21 Ind. Cl. Comm. 254 (1969)
46	Mississippi Bands (Chippewa)	18-B	1855	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 781 (1960) rev'd 161 Ct. Cl. 258 (1963) 13 Ind. Cl. Comm. 77 (1964) (as amended)
47	Lake Superior Bands Mississippi Bands (Chippewa)	18-T	1848	19 Ind. Cl. Comm. 341 (1968)
48	Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands (Chippewa)	18-B	1855	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 781 (1960) rev'd 161 Ct. Cl. 258 (1963) 13 Ind. Cl. Comm. 77 (1964) (as amended)
49	Pillager Band (Chippewa)	144	1848	19 Ind. Cl. Comm. 500 (1968) aff'd 192 Ct. Cl. 698 (1970)
50	Red Lake Band (Chippewa)	H-76	1863	80 Ct. Cl. 410 (1935)
51	Red Lake Band (2/3) Pembina Band (1/3) (Chippewa)	18-A	1863	6 Ind. Cl. Comm. 247 (1958) aff'd 164 Ct. Cl. 389 (1964)
52	Pembina Band (Chippewa)	113	1905	23 Ind. Cl. Comm. 315 (1970) aff'd 203 Ct. Cl. 426 (1974)
53	Potawatomi	15-C	1833	28 Ind. Cl. Comm. 454 (1972)
54	Winnebago	243, 244, 245	1829	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 78 (1959) aff'd 181 Ct. Cl. 1202 (1967)
55	Sac & Fox	83	1805	7 Ind. Cl. Comm. 675 (1959)
56	Sac & Fox	158	1832	5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 367 (1957)
57	Sac & Fox	143	1831	15 Ind. Cl. Comm. 381 (1965)
58	Sac & Fox	153	1842	7 Ind. Cl. Comm. 98 (1959)
59	Sac & Fox	231	1837	20 Ind. Cl. Comm. 439 (1969)
60	Iowa (1/2) Sac & Fox (1/2)	158	1838	5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 367 (1957)
61	Sac & Fox	135	1824	6 Ind. Cl. Comm. 464 (1958) 22 Ind. Cl. Comm. 232 (1969) (as amended) aff'd 195 Ct. Cl. 365 (1971)
62	Iowa	153	1838	7 Ind. Cl. Comm. 98 (1959)
63	Iowa	135	1824	6 Ind. Cl. Comm. 464 (1958) 22 Ind. Cl. Comm. 232 (1969) (as amended) aff'd 195 Ct. Cl. 365 (1971)
64	Otoe & Missouria (1/4) Iowa (1/4) Omaha (1/4) Sac & Fox (1/4)	11-A 138	1825	5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 316 (1957)

Map Area Index—Continued

<i>Map Area No.</i>	<i>Tribal Owner</i>	<i>Docket or Case Number</i>	<i>Date Existed</i>	<i>Title Citations</i>
65	Omaha	225-A	1854	4 Ind. Cl. Comm. 627 (1957)
66	Ponca	322	1858	12 Ind. Cl. Comm. 265 (1963)
67	Otoe & Missouria	11	1833	2 Ind. Cl. Comm. 335 (1953) aff'd in part; rev'd in part, 131 Ct. Cl. 593 (1955)
68	Pawnee	10	1833	5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 268 (1957)
69	Osage	107	1825	19 Ind. Cl. Comm. 447 (1968)
70	Osage	105	1810	11 Ind. Cl. Comm. 733 (1962)
71	Osage	106	1819	19 Ind. Cl. Comm. 447 (1968)
72	Quapaw	14	1824	1 Ind. Cl. Comm. 469 (1951)
73	Caddo	226	1835	4 Ind. Cl. Comm. 201 (1956)
74	Medawakanton Band (Sioux)	360	1837	10 Ind. Cl. Comm. 137 (1962)
75	Eastern or Mississippi Sioux	142, 362	1851	10 Ind. Cl. Comm. 137 (1962)
76	Yankton (Sioux)	332-A	1825	10 Ind. Cl. Comm. 137 (1962)
77	Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands (Sioux)	363	1872	36 Ind. Cl. Comm. 472 (1975)
78	Sisseton (Sioux)	363	1872	36 Ind. Cl. Comm. 472 (1975)
79	Teton and Yanktonai (Sioux)	74	1869	23 Ind. Cl. Comm. 419 (1970)
80	Yankton (Sioux)	332-C	1859	24 Ind. Cl. Comm. 208 (1970)
81	Sioux (Dahcotah) Nation	74	1851	21 Ind. Cl. Comm. 371 (1969)
82	Arikara Mandan Hidatsa (The Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation)	350-C	1870	25 Ind. Cl. Comm. 179 (1971) (aff'd & modified) 203 Ct. Cl. 426 (1974)
83	Arikara Mandan Hidatsa	B-449 (350-D)	1851	71 Ct. Cl. 308 (1930) (see also 23 Ind. Cl. Comm. 236 (1970))
84	Assiniboine	J-31	1851	77 Ct. Cl. 347 (1933)
85	Crow	54	1868	6 Ind. Cl. Comm. 98 (1958)
86	Blackfeet & Gros Ventre	E-427	1855	81 Ct. Cl. 101 (1935)
87	Flathead	61	1855	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 40 (1959)
88	Upper Pend D'Oreille	61	1855	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 40 (1959)
89	Kootenai	61	1855	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 40 (1959)
90	Nez Perce	175	1859	18 Ind. Cl. Comm. 1 (1967)
91	Coeur D'Alene	81	1887	4 Ind. Cl. Comm. 1 (1955)

Map Area Index—Continued

<i>Map Area No.</i>	<i>Tribal Owner</i>	<i>Docket or Case Number</i>	<i>Date Existed</i>	<i>Title Citations</i>
92	Kalispel	94	1887	6 Ind. Cl. Comm. 353 (1958)
93	Spokane	331	1892	9 Ind. Cl. Comm. 236 (1961) rev'd in part 163 Ct. Cl. 58 (1963) (as amended) 17 Ind. Cl. Comm. 612 (1967)
94	Palus	161	1859	12 Ind. Cl. Comm. 301 (1963)
95	Cayuse (Umatilla)	264	1859	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 513 (1960)
96	Walla Walla (Umatilla)	264	1859	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 513 (1960)
97	Umatilla	264	1859	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 513 (1960)
98	Yakima	161	1859	12 Ind. Cl. Comm. 301 (1963)
99	Colville	181	1872	4 Ind. Cl. Comm. 151 (1956)
100	Lake Tribe (Colville)	181	1872	4 Ind. Cl. Comm. 151 (1956)
101	Sanpoil-Nespelem (Colville)	181	1872	4 Ind. Cl. Comm. 151 (1956)
102	Okanogan (Colville)	181	1872	4 Ind. Cl. Comm. 151 (1956)
103	Methow (Colville)	181	1872	4 Ind. Cl. Comm. 151 (1956)
104	Warm Springs	198	1859	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 557 (1960) rev'd 177 Ct. Cl. 184 (1966) (as amended) 18 Ind. Cl. Comm. 354 (1967)
105	Clatsop	234	1851	6 Ind. Cl. Comm. 177 (1958) aff'd 196 Ct. Cl. 780 (1970)
106	Tillamook	240	1851	3 Ind. Cl. Comm. 526 (1955)
107	Tillamook (Alcea)	45230	1855	103 Ct. Cl. 494 (1945)
108	Coquille Chetco Too-too-to-neyn (Tillamook)	45230	1855	103 Ct. Cl. 494 (1945)
109	Snake	17	1879	4 Ind. Cl. Comm. 571 (1956) (as amended)
110	Lemhi (Shoshone)	326 (326-I)	1875	11 Ind. Cl. Comm. 387 (1962)
111	Shoshone	326 (326-H)	1869	11 Ind. Cl. Comm. 387 (1962)
112	Cheyenne & Arapaho Northern Cheyenne Northern Arapaho	329	1865	4 Ind. Cl. Comm. 30-G (1955) (Interlocutory Order)
113	Klamath	100	1870	13 Ind. Cl. Comm. 41 (1964)
114	Modoc	100	1870	13 Ind. Cl. Comm. 41 (1964)
115	Pitt River	347	1853	7 Ind. Cl. Comm. 815 (1959)
116	Northern Paiute	87	1853	7 Ind. Cl. Comm. 322 (1959)

Map Area Index—Continued

<i>Map Area No.</i>	<i>Tribal Owner</i>	<i>Docket or Case Number</i>	<i>Date Existed</i>	<i>Title Citations</i>
117	Washoe	288	1853	7 Ind. Cl. Comm. 266 (1959)
118	Indians of California	31	1851	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 1 (1959) aff'd 167 Ct. Cl. 886 (1964)
119	Western Shoshone	326 (326-K)	1868	11 Ind. Cl. Comm. 387 (1962)
120	Goshute	326 (326-J)	1875	11 Ind. Cl. Comm. 387 (1962) aff'd 206 Ct. Cl. 401 (1975)
121	Uintah Ute	44	1865	5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 1 (1957)
122	Southern Paiute	88, 330, 330-A	1880	14 Ind. Cl. Comm. 618 (1965) (compromise)
123	Hopi	196	1882	23 Ind. Cl. Comm. 277 (1970)
124	Navajo	229	1868	23 Ind. Cl. Comm. 244 (1970)
125	Acoma	266	1858	18 Ind. Cl. Comm. 154 (1967)
126	Laguna	227	1858	17 Ind. Cl. Comm. 615 (1967)
127	Zia Jemez Santa Ana	137	1912	11 Ind. Cl. Comm. 131 (1962) rev'd 165 Ct. Cl. 501 (1964) 19 Ind. Cl. Comm. 56 (1968)
128	Santo Domingo	355	1905	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 259 (1973) 42 Ind. Cl. Comm. 306 (1978)
129	San Ildefonso	354	1905	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 259 (1973)
130	Nambe	358	1905	16 Ind. Cl. Comm. 393 (1965)
131	Santa Clara	356	1905	30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 259 (1973)
133	Kiowa, Comanche & Apache	257, 259-A	1865-1900	34 Ind. Cl. Comm. 263 (1974) (compromise)
134	Jicarilla Apache	22-A	1883	12 Ind. Cl. Comm. 439 (1963)
135	Mescalero Apache	22-B	1873	17 Ind. Cl. Comm. 100 (1966)
136	Mescalero Apache	22-C	1873	36 Ind. Cl. Comm. 7 (1975)
137	Lipan Apache	22-C	1856	36 Ind. Cl. Comm. 7 (1975)
138	Chiricahua Apache	30-A, 48-A	1886	19 Ind. Cl. Comm. 212 (1968)
139	Chiricahua Apache	30, 48	1886	22 Ind. Cl. Comm. 533 (1970)
140	Western Apache	22-D	1873	21 Ind. Cl. Comm. 189 (1969)
141	Tonto Apache	22-J	1873	21 Ind. Cl. Comm. 223 (1969)
142	Havasupai	91	1882	20 Ind. Cl. Comm. 222 (1968)
143	Hualapai	90	1883	11 Ind. Cl. Comm. 447 (1962)
144	Mohave	295, 283	1853, 1865	7 Ind. Cl. Comm. 219 (1959)
145	Chemehuevi	351, 351-A	1853	14 Ind. Cl. Comm. 651 (1965)
146	Yavapai	22-E	1873	15 Ind. Cl. Comm. 68 (1965)
147	Pima-Maricopa	228	1883	24 Ind. Cl. Comm. 301 (1970)
148	Quechan	319	1853, 1884	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 111 (1959)
149	Papago	345	1916	19 Ind. Cl. Comm. 394 (1968)
150	Nooksack	46	1855	3 Ind. Cl. Comm. 479 (1955)

Map Area Index—Continued

<i>Map Area No.</i>	<i>Tribal Owner</i>	<i>Docket or Case Number</i>	<i>Date Existed</i>	<i>Title Citations</i>
151	Lummi	110	1859	5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 525 (1957)
152	Samish	261	1859	6 Ind. Cl. Comm. 159 (1958)
153	Upper Skagit	92	1859	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 475 (1960)
154	Swinomish	233	1859	26 Ind. Cl. Comm. 371 (1971)
155	Lower Skagit	294	1859	7 Ind. Cl. Comm. 292 (1959)
156	Kikiallus	263	1859	7 Ind. Cl. Comm. 456 (1959)
157	Stillaguamish	207	1859	15 Ind. Cl. Comm. 1 (1965)
158	Makah	60-A	1859	23 Ind. Cl. Comm. 165 (1970) aff'd 195 Ct. Cl. 539 (1971)
159	S'Klallam	134	1859	5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 680 (1957)
160	Snohomish	125	1855	4 Ind. Cl. Comm. 549 (1956)
161	Quileute	155	1859	7 Ind. Cl. Comm. 31 (1958)
162	Skokomish	296	1859	6 Ind. Cl. Comm. 135 (1958)
163	Skykomish	93	1859	9 Ind. Cl. Comm. 25 (1960) aff'd in part, rev'd in part, 178 Ct. Cl. 570 (1967)
164	Snoqualmie	93	1859	9 Ind. Cl. Comm. 25 (1960) aff'd in part, rev'd in part, 178 Ct. Cl. 570 (1967)
165	Squamish	132	1859	5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 140 (1957) aff'd 197 Ct. Cl. 775 (1972)
166	Duwamish	109	1859	5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 117 (1957) see also 79 Ct. Cl. 530 (1934)
167	Quinault	242	1859	7 Ind. Cl. Comm. 1 (1958)
168	Squaxin	206	1855	21 Ind. Cl. Comm. 295 (1969)
169	Muckleshoot	98	1859	3 Ind. Cl. Comm. 658 (1955)
170	Puyallup	203	1855	17 Ind. Cl. Comm. 1 (1966)
171	Steilacoom	208	1855	11 Ind. Cl. Comm. 304 (1962) aff'd 208 Ct. Cl. 1033 (1976)
172	Nisqually	197	1855	21 Ind. Cl. Comm. 173 (1969) aff'd 208 Ct. Cl. 1029 (1976)
173	Lower Chehalis	237	1855	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 436 (1960)
174	Upper Chehalis	237	1855	8 Ind. Cl. Comm. 436 (1960)
175	Cowlitz	218	1855	21 Ind. Cl. Comm. 143 (1969)
176	Chinook	234	1851	6 Ind. Cl. Comm. 177 (1958) aff'd 196 Ct. Cl. 780 (1971)

Alphabetical Tribal Index

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Map Area</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Map Area</i>
Acoma	125	Fort Berthold Res., Three Affiliated Tribes of	82,83
Alcea (Tillamooks)	107	Fox, Sac &	55,56,57,58,
Apache	133,134,135 136,137,138 139,140,141	Goshute	59,60,61,64
Apache, Chiricahua	138	Grand River Band (Ottawa)	120
Apache, Chiricahua	139	Gros Ventre, Blackfeet &	20
Apache, Jicarilla	134	Havasupai	86
Apache, Kiowa, Comanche & A.	133	Hidatsa	142
Apache, Lipan	137	Hopi	82,83
Apache, Mescalero	135	Hualapai	123
Apache, Mescalero	136	Iowa	143
Apache, Tonto	141	Indians of California	60,62,63,64
Apache, Western	140	Jemez	118
Arapaho, Cheyenne	112	Jicarilla Apache	127
Arapaho, Northern	112	Kalispel	134
Arikara	82,83	Kaskaskia (Peoria)	92
Assiniboine	84	Kickapoo	36
Blackfeet and Gross Ventre	86	Kikiallus	28,29,32,33
Bois Forte Band (Chippewa)	45	Kiowa, Comanche & Apache	156
Caddo	73	Klamath	133
California, Indians of	118	Kootenai	113
Cayuse (Umatilla)	95	Laguna	89
Chehalis, Lower	173	Lake Superior Bands (Chippewa)	126
Chehalis, Upper	174	Lake Tribe (Colville)	42,43,44,47
Chemehuevi	145	Lake Winnibigoshish, and Pillager Bands (Chippewa)	100
Cherokee	37	Lemhi (Shoshone)	48
Chetco (Tillamook)	108	Lipan Apache	110
Cheyenne & Arapaho	112	Lower Chehalis	137
Cheyenne, Northern	112	Lower Skagit	173
Chinook	176	Lummi	155
Chippewa	2,7,16,17, 18,19,42,43 44,45,46,47 48,49,50,51	Makah	151
Chippewa, Boise Forte Band	45	Mandan	158
Chippewa, Lake Superior Bands	42,43,44,47	Maricopa, Pima	82,83
Chippewa, Mississippi Bands	42,43,46,47	Medawakanton Band (Sioux)	147
Chippewa, Ottawa	17	Mescalero Apache	74
Chippewa, Pembina Band	51,52	Methow (Colville)	135,136
Chippewa, Pillager Band	48,49	Miami	103
Chippewa, Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands	48	Mississippi Bands (Chippewa)	21,22,23,24
Chippewa, Red Lake Band	50,51	Mississippi or Eastern Sioux	25,26
Chippewa, Sault St. Marie Band	16	Missouria, Otoe &	42,43,46,47
Chiricahua Apache	138,139	Modoc	64,67
Clatsop	105	Mohave	114
Coeur D'Alene	91	Muckleshoot	144
Colville	99,100,101, 102,103	Nambe	169
Colville, Lake Tribe	100	Navajo	130
Colville, Methow	103	Nespelem, Sanpoil (Colville)	124
Colville, Okanogan	102	Nez Perce	101
Collville, Sanpoil-Nespelem	101	Nisqually	90
Comanche, Kiowa, Comanche & Apache	133	Nooksack	172
Coquille (Tillamook)	108	Northern Arapaho	150
Cowlitz	175	Northern Cheyenne	112
Creek	38,39,40	Northern Paiute	112
Crow	85	Okanogan (Colville)	116
Dahcotah (Sioux) Nation	81	Omaha	102
Delaware	2,4,5,25,31	Osage	64,65
Duwanish	166	Otoe & Missouria	69,70,71
Eastern or Mississippi Sioux	75	Ottawa	64,67
Eel River	24	Ottawa Chippewa	2,3,4,7
Flathead	87	Ottawa, Grand River Band	17,20
		Paiute, Northern	20
		Paiute, Southern	116
			122

Alphabetical Tribal Index—Continued

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Map Area</i>	<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Map Area</i>
Palus	94	Sioux, Yankton	76,80
Pawnee	68	Sisseton (Sioux)	78
Pembina Band (Chippewa)	51,52	Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands (Sioux)	77
Peoria, Kaskaskia	36	Skagit, Lower	155
Peoria, Piankeshaw	35	Skagit, Upper	153
Piankeshaw (Peoria)	31,35	S'Klallam	159
Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands (Chippewa)	48	Skokomish	162
Pillager Band (Chippewa)	49	Skykomish	163
Pima-Maricopa	147	Spokane	93
Pitt River	115	Snake	109
Ponca	66	Snohomish	160
Potawatomi	2,7,8,9,10 11,12,13,14 15,21,22,27 28,32,53	Snoqualmie	164
Puyallup	170	Southern Paiute	122
Quapaw	72	Squaxin	168
Quechan	148	Steilacoom	171
Quileute	161	Stillaguamish	157
Quinalt	167	Squamish	165
Red Lake Band (Chippewa)	50,51 55,56,57,58 59,60,61,64	Swinomish	154
Sac & Fox	18,19	Teton and Yanktonai (Sioux)	79
Saginaw Chippewa	152	Tillamook	106,107,108
Samish	129	Tillamook (Alcea)	107
San Ildefonso	101	Tillamook Coquille, Chetco Too-too-to-ney	108
Sanpoil-Nespelem (Colville)	127	Tonto Apache	141
Santa Ana	131	Too-too-to-ney (Tillamook)	108
Santa Clara	128	Uintah Ute	121
Santo Domingo	16	Umatilla	95,96,97
Sault St. Marie Band (Chippewa)	41	Umatilla, Cayuse	95
Seminole	74,75,76 77,78,79 80,81	Umatilla, Walla Walla	96
Seneca	1	Upper Chehalis	174
Shawnee	4,6	Upper Pend D'Oreille	88
Shoshone	111	Upper Skagit	153
Shoshone, Lemhi	110	Ute, Uintah	121
Shoshone, Western	119	Wahpeton, Sisseton & Wahpeton Bands (Sioux)	77
Sioux	81	Walla Walla (Umatilla)	96
Sioux (Dahcotah) Nation	75	Warm Springs	104
Sioux, Eastern or Mississippi	74	Washoe	117
Sioux, Medawakanton Band	78	Wea	26,27,28
Sioux, Sisseton	77	Western Apache	140
Sioux, Sisseton & Wahpeton Bands	79	Western Shoshone	119
Sioux, Teton and Yanktonai		Winnebago	54
		Wyandot	2,4
		Yakima	98
		Yankton (Sioux)	76,80
		Yanktonai, Teton & Yanktonai (Sioux)	79
		Yavapai	146
		Zia	127

Court of Claims Reports to West Reporting System Citator
(Court of Claims cases cited in the Introduction and Index)

71 Ct. Cl. 308	
77 Ct. Cl. 226	
79 Ct. Cl. 530	
80 Ct. Cl. 410	
89 Ct. Cl. 378	
103 Ct. Cl. 494	59 F. Supp. 934
122 Ct. Cl. 348	
131 Ct. Cl. 593	131 F. Supp. 265
146 Ct. Cl. 421	175 F. Supp. 926
147 Ct. Cl. 315	177 F. Supp. 452
161 Ct. Cl. 258	315 F.2d 906
163 Ct. Cl. 58	
164 Ct. Cl. 389	
165 Ct. Cl. 479	
165 Ct. Cl. 501	
167 Ct. Cl. 886	
173 Ct. Cl. 917	
177 Ct. Cl. 184	
178 Ct. Cl. 570	372 F.2d 951
179 Ct. Cl. 8	383 F.2d 991
179 Ct. Cl. 473	391 F.2d 614
180 Ct. Cl. 375	
181 Ct. Cl. 1202	
192 Ct. Cl. 698	428 F.2d 1274
195 Ct. Cl. 365	
195 Ct. Cl. 539	
196 Ct. Cl. 780	
197 Ct. Cl. 775	
201 Ct. Cl. 386	476 F.2d 1290
203 Ct. Cl. 426	490 F.2d 935
205 Ct. Cl. 765	507 F.2d 852
206 Ct. Cl. 401	512 F.2d 1398
206 Ct. Cl. 649	513 F.2d 1383
206 Ct. Cl. 850	
206 Ct. Cl. 867	
207 Ct. Cl. 254	518 F.2d 556
207 Ct. Cl. 958	
207 Ct. Cl. 959	
207 Ct. Cl. 960	
208 Ct. Cl. 1029	
208 Ct. Cl. 1033	