



145

United States Indian Claims Commi:

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



August 13, 1946
September 30, 1978



3953

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 York: Association on American Indian Affairs, 1966), 163.

²Walter Hart Blumenthal, *American Indian Dispossessed: Fraud in Land Cessions Forced upon the Tribes* (Philadelphia: G. S. MacManus Co., 1955), 43.

³Cohen, *Legal Conscience*, 69.

⁴Thomas Jefferson, "Notes on the State of Virginia 1781-85," reprinted in Saul K. Padover, *The Complete Jefferson* (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1942), 623.

⁵Felix S. Cohen. *The Legal Conscience* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), 265.

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 amendatory 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

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

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 Crises," *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.

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 of 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.

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.

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

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 undervaluation 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

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

²⁵U.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, 373-80.

²⁶U.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"

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, 36-70.

³¹ See 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.

r-
e
e
t
?
S
i
-
l

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 accom. 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.

³⁸*Western Cherokee v. U.S.*, 1 Ind. Cl. Comm. 20 (1948), *aff'd*, 116 Ct. Cl. 665; *Blackfeet v. U.S.*, 2 Ind. Cl. Comm. 302 (1952); *Assiniboine Indian Tribe v. U.S.*, 2 Ind. Cl. Comm. 272 (1952). *Federal Indian Law*, 347; *Chickasaw Nation v. U.S.*, 132 F. Supp. 199 (1955); *Choctaw Nation v. U.S.*, 121 F. Supp. 206 (1954), *cert den*, 348 U.S. 863 and 135 F. Supp. 536 (1955).

³⁹A. L. Kroeber, "Nature of the Land-Holding Group," *Ethnohistory*, Vol. 2, No. 4, Fall 1955, 304.

⁴⁰*Federal Indian Law*, 455-63.

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

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 Missouri* case.⁴³

The case of *Otoe and Missouri 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

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 Missouri. A Study of Indian Removal and the Legal Aftermath* (New York: Times Journal Publishing Company, 1965), 250-1.

⁴³For a concise survey of this issue see the *Harvard Law Review*, Vol. 69, 1955, 147-51. *Otoe and Missouri 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. 581 (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 Missouri* 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

⁴⁶*U.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.

⁴⁸*Otoe and Missouri 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 forseen 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 of the Committee on Appropriations, *Hearings on H. R. 6345 for Appropriations for Interior and Related Agencies for 1962*, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 1961, 485-96.

⁵¹All figures of final settlements come from the *Annual Report of the Indian Claims Commission*.

⁵²U. S., Congress, House, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, *Hearings on H. R. 2536 and Related Bills to Terminate the Indian Claims Commission and for other purposes*, 90th Cong., 1st sess., March 1967, 64.

⁵³U. 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.

⁵⁴U. 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.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, S. Rept. 208, and see U. S., Senate, *Congressional Record*, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Feb. 2, 1961, Vol. 107, Pt. 2, 1618-19.

⁵⁶U. 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 Accomp. 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,

⁵⁷77 Stat. 301, Nov. 4, 1963; 80 Stat. 814, Sept. 19, 1966; and P. L. 93-37, May 24, 1973. The fund was raised to \$2.7 million in 1973.

⁵⁸U.S., Congress, Senate, Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, *Hearings on Appropriations for Interior and Related Agencies for 1964*, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, 1217-23.

⁵⁹An analysis of the summary chart giving a breakdown of cases by year from 1947 in the *Annual Report of the Indian Claims Commission* reveals these facts.

⁶⁰U.S., Congress, Senate, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, *Terminating the Existence of the Indian Claims Commission and for other purposes*, 89th Cong., 2nd sess., Sept. 6, 1966, Rept. 1587 to accomp. S. 3068.

⁶¹See note 52, 8.

⁶²See note 53, 8.

⁵⁷Ibid., S. Rept. 208.

⁵⁸75 Stat. 92, June 16, 1961.

⁵⁹*Crow Indians v. U.S.*, Ind. Cl. Comm., Docket 54, May 29, 1961; and *Northern Paiute v. U.S.*, Ind. Cl. Comm., Docket 87, July 3, 1961.

⁶⁰U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, *Establishing A Revolving Fund From Which the Secretary of Interior May Make Loans to Finance the Procurement of Expert Assistance by Indian Tribes in Cases Before the Indian Claims Commission*, 88th Cong., 1st sess., July 1, 1963, Rept. 492 to accomp. H. R. 3306.

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 longstanding 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 filed 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 Government. 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.

⁷³U.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.

⁷²*Annual Report of the Indian Claims Commission*, 1973, 2

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, 1433-30.

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 accomp. 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.

⁸⁷ See note 78, 54.

⁸⁸ See note 84.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ 86 Stat. 114, March 30, 1972.

⁹¹ U.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.

⁹² 87 Stat. 73, May 24, 1973.

⁹³ U.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	140	Opinion holding Commission has jurisdiction	5/2/68	
			Order denying motions for summary judgment	5/2/68	
	188 C.C.	1	Affirmed	6/20/69	
	22	356	Opinion on motion for default judgment & motion to suspend further proceedings	12/23/69	
	22	359	Order denying motions & directing defendant to answer	12/23/69	
Aleut Community of St. Paul Island, Dkt. 352, and Aleut Tribe, Dkt. 369	23	371	Opinion on motions to strike amended petitions	7/29/70	
		375	Order denying motions to strike	7/29/70	
	27	177	Opinion on motions to dismiss	3/24/72	
		186	Order granting motions to dismiss	3/24/72	
	202 C.C.	182	Affirmed as to land claims; reversed as to claims for breach of fair & honorable dealings; remanded	6/20/73	
	202 C.C.	205	Rehearing denied	9/28/73	
	35	21	Opinion in Dkt. 369	10/17/74	
		30	Order denying motion for judgment & for other purposes in Dkt. 369	10/17/74	
		31	Order denying motion for more definite statement in Dkt. 352	10/17/74	
	36	235	Opinion	7/18/75	
		251	Concurring opinion	7/18/75	
		252	Order granting motion to sever from Dkt. 369 claim of St. George Island and consolidating that claim for trial in Dkt. 352	7/18/75	
	42	1	Opinion — Damages	6/9/78	
		42	Findings	6/9/78	
	152	Interlocutory order	6/9/78		
42	526	Order granting plaintiffs' motion for final severance of claims, & for other purposes	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

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

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
Apache, Mescalero, Dkt. 22-G, <i>see also</i> Shoshone Te-Moak Bands, Dkt. 236-A; and Apache, Dkt. 22-B	23	181	Opinion on motion for proper accounting	6/10/70	Transferred to Court of Claims
		188	Order	6/10/70	
	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. 425 U.S. 39	911 239	Rehearing denied Certiorari denied Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	10/3/75 4/5/76 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	Transferred to Court of Claims
	39	239	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	12/15/76	
Apache, Northern Tonto, Yavapai, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 22-J, and Navajo, Dkt. 229	21	223	Opinion — Title	6/27/69	<i>see</i> Apache, San Carlos, Dkt. 22-D, and final award, above
		230	Findings	6/27/69	
		252	Interlocutory order	6/27/69	
Apache, Jicarilla, Dkt. 22-K	33	364	Findings — Compromise	2/21/74	\$7,000,000.00 for accounting
		388	Final award	2/21/74	
Apache, Fort Sill, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 30	1	137	Opinion — Dismissal of 1st cause (imprisonment claim) Order dismissing 1st cause	4/6/49 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	\$521,796.00 awarded in Dkts. 30 & 48, and \$15,967,300.00 in Dkts. 30-A & 48-A for land
	25	352	Opinion — Value	6/9/71	
		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 Order overruling motion for severance & dismissal of three of the petitioners	10/22/51 10/22/51	Dismissed
	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	Appealed to Court of Claims May 1978
		443	Dissenting opinion	9/13/72	
		452	Order granting motion	9/13/72	
	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	Opinion on motions	11/29/72	
		193	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.	525	Appeal dismissed	7/13/73	
	34	81	Opinion — Damages, Group A claims	5/10/74	
		105	Findings	5/10/74	
		120	Interlocutory order	5/10/74	
		121	Order permitting filing of defendant's supplemental memorandum	5/10/74	
	34	204	Order granting motion for severance of claims	6/19/74	
	41	37	Opinion — Recognized title	10/6/77	
		52	Findings	10/6/77	
	72	Interlocutory order	10/6/77		
	41	175	Order denying rehearing	2/8/78	
Apache, Fort Sill, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 182 & 182-A	205 C.C.	805	Appeal partially dismissed	12/18/74	
	209 C.C.	433	Reversed & remanded	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
		154	Interlocutory order	5/6/77	
	40	260	Order denying rehearing	7/21/77	
	41	83	Order certifying & transferring Dkt. 182-A to Court of Claims	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	Additional findings on compromise settlement of offsets	6/27/63	\$3,230,000.00 for land; see prior decisions under Cheyenne- Arapaho, Dkts. 329 and 348
		229	Opinion	6/27/63	
			Final judgment	6/27/63	
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	530	Opinion on motion for summary judgment	4/27/51	Dismissed
			Final order	4/27/51	
	1	573	Per curiam opinion	6/22/51	
			Order for rehearing	6/22/51	
	2	272	Opinion	12/12/52	
		300	Concurring opinion	12/12/52	
			Order dismissing	12/12/52	
128 C.C.	617	Affirmed	6/8/54		
348 U.S.	863	Certiorari denied	10/25/54		
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	576	Findings — Title	5/20/59	\$10,109,003.55 for land
		605	Opinion	5/20/59	
			Interlocutory order	5/20/59	
	20	137	Opinion — value	12/23/68	
		141	Additional findings	12/23/68	
			Second interlocutory order	12/23/68	
	22	372	Opinion on consideration item	1/14/70	
		378	Findings	1/14/70	
		381	Third interlocutory order	1/14/70	
		383	Order denying motion for preliminary adjudication	1/14/70	
24	50	Opinion on motion for rehearing & modification of finding	10/28/70		

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

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

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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	
	39	120	Order on pending motions	10/15/76	
	39	293	Opinion	1/21/77	
	39	298	Dissenting opinion	1/21/77	
	39	299	Order denying motion for admission of evidentiary material	1/21/77	
	41	188	Opinion on motion to strike	2/24/78	
	41	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	
39		120	Order on pending motions	10/15/76	
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	3/1/55	\$383,475.55 for land. Remaining general account- ing claims trans- ferred to Court of Claims.
	4	201	Findings — title	3/8/56	
	4	214	Opinion	3/8/56	
	140 C.C.	63	Interlocutory order	3/8/56	
	8	354	Review denied	10/9/57	
	8	373	Additional findings — Value	12/22/60	
	8	373	Opinion	12/22/60	
	9	557	Interlocutory order	12/22/60	
	9	566	Additional findings — offsets	10/27/61	
	9	566	Opinion	10/27/61	
	19	385	Interlocutory order	10/27/61	
	19	385	Opinion — Offset question	8/30/68	
	19	385	Order reconsidering & denying offset	8/30/68	
	22	181	Opinion — Reinstatement of Counts II & IV	12/5/69	
	22	185	Order	12/5/69	
	27	1	Opinion — Coushatta intervention	1/12/72	
	27	8	Order granting Coushatta motion to intervene	1/12/72	
	27	35	Order granting Wichita motion to intervene	2/2/72	
	27	74	Order granting Tonkawa motion to intervene	3/1/72	
	27	88	Opinion — Cherokee intervention	3/8/72	
	27	92	Order denying Cherokee motion to intervene	3/8/72	
	27	136	Order denying Kickapoo motion to intervene	3/17/72	
	27	138	Order denying Delaware motion to intervene	3/17/72	
	34	287	Order denying motions to consolidate Dkt. 257 w/Dkts. 22-C & 226	7/17/74	
	35	321	Opinion on motions, etc.	1/24/75	
	35	353	Additional findings	1/24/75	
	35	378	Order denying motion to consolidate Dkts. 226 & 22-C	1/24/75	
	35	380	Order denying Wichita motion re exhibits	1/24/75	
35	382	Order granting motion to dismiss complaints in intervention	1/24/75		
35	384	Interlocutory order and order dismissing Counts II & IV of plaintiffs' petition	1/24/75		
209 C.C.	724	Affirmed	3/19/76		
40	266	Opinion on motion to dismiss certain accounting exceptions	8/4/77		
40	286	Order granting motion in part & denying it in part	8/4/77		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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	
	41	298	Final award on land claim under 1835 treaty	8/4/77	
		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	See Dkts. 31 & 37, below
		358	Order overruling motion to dismiss	5/6/49	
	1	366	Findings	12/15/50	
		366	Opinion	12/15/50	
	122 C.C. 344 U.S.	348 856	Order dismissing Reversed & remanded Certiorari denied	12/15/50 5/6/52 10/20/52	
California Indians, Dkt. 37	1	154	Per curiam opinion	5/6/49	See Dkts. 31 & 37, below
		383	Order denying motion to dismiss	5/6/49	
	1	392	Findings	12/21/50	
		392	Opinion	12/21/50	
	122 C.C. 344 U.S.	419 856	Order dismissing on capacity to sue Reversed & remanded Certiorari denied	12/21/50 5/6/52 10/20/52	
California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37	4	147	Per curiam opinion	1/19/56	
		147	Order granting motion to amend	1/19/56	
	6	86	Opinion	1/20/58	
		93	Opinion	1/20/58	
	6	666	Opinion	10/6/58	
		674	Order dividing California into Areas A & B	10/6/58	
	6	674	Opinion	10/6/58	
		674	Order consolidating Dkts. 176, 215 & 233 w/Dkts. 31 & 37 for all purposes, including judgment	10/6/58	
	6	678	Opinion	10/6/58	
		678	Order overruling motion to modify decision of 1/20/58	10/6/58	
	8	1	Findings	7/31/59	
		11	Opinion — Title	7/31/59	
	unnumbered	unnumbered	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	
Order denying Quechan intervention			3/3/64		
167 C.C. 379 U.S.	886 971	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 for land
		513	Opinion	7/20/64	
		513	Final determination or judgment	7/20/64	
California, Pitt River Indians of, <i>et al.</i>	202 C.C. 419 U.S.	988 831	Dismissal of petition attacking 1964 judgment of Ind. Cl. Comm.	10/17/73	
			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					
California Indians, Mission Bands of, Dkt. 80	unnumbered		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	Transferred to Court of Claims
		429	Order granting motion	6/13/73	
	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	
		203	Order admitting intervenor's missing exhibits	12/2/76	
	39	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 with other claims in Dkt. 80-A
		461	Order granting motion to amend petition & denying alternative motion to intervene	6/21/73	
	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 with other claims in Dkt. 80-A
		412	Findings	3/5/76	
		490	Order	3/5/76	
	39	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 for land
		133	Findings	6/18/69	
		141	Interlocutory order	6/18/69	
	25	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 for land
			Order granting partial summary judgment (first claim dismissed)		
	28	237	Opinion — Liability	7/20/72	
			Findings	7/20/72	
			Interlocutory order	7/20/72	
	202 C.C.	1101	Remanded	6/29/73	
	36	75	Opinion	3/27/75	
			Additional findings — Remand	3/27/75	
	36	99	Interlocutory order	3/27/75	
			Order to show cause	4/23/75	
			Findings — Compromise	5/11/78	
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 for land
			Opinion	6/25/56	
			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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
Chehalis, Upper, Dkt. 237 (cont.)	8	436	Findings — Title	3/14/60		
		463	Opinion	3/14/60		
	12	644	Interlocutory order	3/14/60		
		660	Additional findings — Compromise	10/7/63		
		660	Opinion	10/7/63		
Chemehuevi, Dkt. 351	6	86	Final judgment	10/7/63		
		93	Opinion — Capacity to sue	1/20/58		
	6	666	Opinion	1/20/58		
		666	Interlocutory order	1/20/58		
		666	Opinion	10/6/58		
Chemehuevi, Dkts. 351 & 351-A, <i>See also</i> California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37; Mohave Indians, Dkt. 283	14	651	Order separating from California	10/6/58		
		673	Findings — Compromise	1/18/65	\$996,834.81	
		673	Opinion	1/18/65	for land	
Cherokee, Dkt. 173	9	162	Final judgment	1/18/65		
		197	Findings	4/3/61	\$14,364,476.15	
	9	435	Opinion	4/3/61	for land	
		454	Interlocutory order (judgment subject to offsets)	4/3/61		
		454	Additional findings on stipulation for entry of final judgment	9/14/61		
	12	426	Opinion on motion for approval of stipulation	9/14/61		
		436	Final judgment	9/14/61		
		436	Findings — Offsets Compromise	8/8/63		
		436	Opinion	8/8/63		
	Cherokee, Cherokee Freedmen, Intervenor, Dkt. 173-A	17	331	Order approving settlement of offsets	8/8/63	
			331	Per curiam opinion	10/5/66	\$3,887,557.57
22		417	Order denying motion to dismiss petition of intervenor	10/5/66	for land	
		426	Opinion — Value	2/4/70		
		437	Findings	2/4/70		
		438	First interlocutory order	2/4/70		
		438	Order denying intervenor's motion for summary judgment	2/4/70		
195 C.C. 27		39	Affirmed	6/11/71		
		23	Opinion — Offsets	2/2/72		
200 C.C. 27		30	Additional findings	2/2/72		
		33	Final award	2/2/72		
		583	Affirmed on date of valuation; reversed on offset	2/16/73		
Cherokee, Dkt. 190		12	570	Order amending opinion & findings, & amended final award	5/30/73	
			586	Findings	9/25/63	Dismissed
	180 C.C.	181	Opinion	9/25/63		
		181	Final order dismissing	9/25/63		
		181	Affirmed	5/12/67		
	Cherokee, Dkt. 271	20	379	Order dismissing	3/19/69	Dismissed
			380	Order dismissing	3/19/69	Dismissed
	Cherokee Freedmen, Dkt. 123, <i>see also</i> Intervenor in Cherokee Nation, Dkt. 173-A	2	231	Order dismissing	3/19/69	Dismissed
			231	Per curiam opinion	9/9/52	Dismissed
		10	109	Order	9/9/52	
			127	Findings	11/28/61	
161 C.C.		787	Opinion	11/28/61		
		787	Order dismissing plaintiffs' petition	11/28/61		
		787	Affirmed as to dismissal of the Freedmen's petition, but remanded with direction they be allowed intervention in a pending Cherokee Nation case	5/10/63		
13		33	Per curiam opinion	1/6/64		
		33	Order denying motion to intervene in Cherokee Nation, Dkt. 173	1/6/64		
		33	Order granting Freedmen's motion to intervene in Dkt. 173-A	10/12/64		
Cherokee, Dkt. 190	unnumbered	33	Order granting Freedmen's motion to intervene in Dkt. 173-A	10/12/64		
		33	Order granting Freedmen's motion to intervene in Dkt. 173-A	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> Intervenor 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 11/15/48	Dismissed
	116 C.C. 340 U.S.	665 904	Affirmed Certiorari denied	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 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 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 11/15/48	Dismissed
	114 C.C. 2	716 7 22	Reversed & remanded Findings Opinion Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing plaintiffs' petition	11/7/49 2/19/52 2/19/52 2/19/52	
	124 C.C.	127	Affirmed	1/13/53	
Cherokee, Western (Old Settler), Dkt. 3	1 1	20 29	Opinion Concurring opinion Order sustaining motion for summary judgment & dismissing plaintiffs' petition	11/15/48 11/15/48 11/15/48	Dismissed
	116 C.C. 340 U.S.	665 904	Affirmed Certiorari denied	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 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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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		
	10	1 64	Findings - Value Opinion Interlocutory order	11/1/55 12/6/61 12/6/61 12/6/61		
	unnumbered		Order amending findings & opinion	8/2/62		
	unnumbered		Amended interlocutory order	8/2/62		
	unnumbered		Order amending amended interlocutory order	11/13/62		
	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	2/13/64	Dismissed	
	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	12/10/68	Dismissed	
Cheyenne-Arapaho, Dkt. 348	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	12/10/68	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	
	13	1 20	Additional findings - Compromise Opinion Final judgment	11/27/63 11/27/63 11/27/63	\$4,360,886.19 for land	
	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	
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	\$190,934.78 for land	
	132 C.C.	359	Reversed & remanded	6/7/55		
	7	64 79	Findings Opinion Interlocutory order	1/23/59 1/23/59 1/23/59		
	unnumbered		Final order	7/17/59		
	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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	Tribe
Chippewa Cree, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 221-A, <i>see also</i> Sioux, 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 Superi (cont.)
Chippewa Cree, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 221-B, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Little Shell Band, <i>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 Missis
	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	
Regarding Dkt. 191, <i>see also</i> Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113; Chippewa, Red Lake Band, Dkt. 18-A; Sioux, Dkt. 74; & Fort Berthold, Dkt. 350-B						
Chippewa, Little Shell Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 221, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113; Sioux, Dkt. 74; & Fort Berthold, Dkt. 350-B						
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 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 Winibigoshish 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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> [on behalf of the Chippewa Indians of the Mississippi and Lake Superior], Dkt. 18-C (cont.)	32	192	Opinion - Offsets	11/7/73		
		201	Additional findings	11/7/73		
		215	Final award	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	Findings - Title	8/13/68	For land: \$5,677,418.88 for the Chippewas of Lake Superior, and \$2,838,709.44 for the Chippewas of the Mississippi	
		322	Opinion Order granting plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment	8/13/68		
	37	146	Opinion - Value	1/14/76		
		169	Findings	1/14/76		
	41	192	Interlocutory order	1/14/76		
		102	Opinion - Payments on claim	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	Findings - Title	8/20/68	\$529,000 00 for land	
		352	Opinion Order granting plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment	8/20/68		
		25	146	Opinion - Value		8/20/68
157	Additional findings		3/30/71			
28	177	Interlocutory order	3/30/71			
	103	Opinion - Payments on the claim	5/31/72			
	111	Additional findings	5/31/72			
Chippewa, Minnesota, <i>et al.</i> [on behalf of the Chippewas of Lake Superior], Dkt. 18-U	14	360	Findings - Title	12/8/64	\$2,621,174.58 for land	
		368	Opinion Order granting plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment	12/8/64		
		25	55	Opinion - Value		12/8/64
62	Additional findings		3/24/71			
26	82	Interlocutory order	3/24/71			
	137	Order amending finding No. 1	3/24/71			
35	427	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for ruling on defendant's demand for offsets	8/11/71			
	450	Opinion dissenting in part	2/13/75			
	452	Order ruling on legal issues affecting offsets	2/13/75			
	41	249	Opinion - Consideration & gratuitous offsets	2/13/75		
		266	Dissenting opinion	3/30/78		
	267	Additional findings	3/30/78			
293	Final award	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	Opinion in Dkts. 19, 188, 189-A, & 189-C on motion for determination of legal issues	11/29/72	All five dkts. transferred to Court of Claims	
		242	Order of Dkts. 19 & 189-A dismissing certain claims & consolidating these dkts. for all purposes	11/29/72		
	244	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	11/29/72			
	246	Opinion in Dkt. 189-B on defendant's motion for summary judgment and/or dismissal of Dkt. 189-B	11/29/72			
	249	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	11/29/72			
	30	433	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion in the five dkts. to clarify record concerning consolidation of cases	11/29/72		
		436	Order in the five dkts. clarifying record concerning consolidation of cases	6/21/73		
				6/21/73		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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
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	See below	
		584	Opinion	9/17/51		
				Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing plaintiffs' petition		9/17/51
		unnumbered		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	For land: \$1,797,761.74 for Red Lake Band; and \$237,127.82 for Pembina Band.	
		305	Opinion	5/21/58		
	9	315	Interlocutory order	5/21/58		
		336	Additional findings - Consideration	6/15/62		
	9		Opinion	6/15/62		
		457	Order amending previous determination of consideration	6/15/62		
		511	Additional findings - Gratuitous offsets	10/5/61		
	unnumbered		Opinion	10/5/61		
	unnumbered		Final award	10/5/61		
	164 C.C.	389	Order amending findings	6/18/62		
		Amended final award	6/18/62			
unnumbered		Affirmed in part & reversed in part & remanded	1/24/64			
unnumbered		Order adding finding No. 69	4/24/64			
unnumbered		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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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	6/21/73	\$1,859,306.87 for land	
		445	Findings	6/21/73		
		450	Interlocutory order	6/21/73		
	31	87	Order entry interlocutory award of 6/21/73 as a final award	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 refiling in separate petitions	7/13/49	Concluded by separating out all causes of action. They were refiled in Dkts. 13-A through N.	
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-A	unnumbered		Order dismissing first claim	3/9/50	Dismissed	
	32	1	Order dismissing petition	10/17/73		
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; 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., inter- venors), Dkt. 29-D; Six Nations, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 89; Ottawa, Dkts. 133-A & 302; Wyandot, Dkt. 139; Dela- ware, Absentee, Dkt. 202; and Seneca-Cayuga, Dkt. 341-C	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. Dkt. 89, <i>see</i> dismissal under Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G group. Appeal time running against final awards, shown below, in the other dkts. in this group.	
	30	8	Opinion - Title	4/4/73		
		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		
	31	11	Order denying extension of time to move for rehearing in Dkt. 341-C	7/5/73		
	31	13	Order denying motion of Stockbridge-Munsee for rehearing	7/5/73		
	31	359	Opinion on Seneca-Cayuga motions to rehear	7/5/73		
		372	Order admitting exhibits & denying motions for rehearing	9/19/73		
		207 C.C.	958	Affirmed		5/30/75
		207 C.C.	959	Rehearing denied		10/10/75
		425 U.S.	903	Certiorari denied		3/29/76
	29-D	42	264	Opinion - Value & consideration in Dkts. 13-E, 27-E, 29-D, 133-A, 139, 202, & 302		8/10/78
			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		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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	89 140 141 220	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	8/9/73 8/9/73 8/9/73	Dkts. 13-G, 18-M, 40-F & 89 dismissed.
	31 207 C.C.	222 254	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	8/9/73 8/9/73	
	423 U.S.	1015	Three petitions for certiorari denied	6/25/75 12/8/75	
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	5/14/53 4/22/54 4/22/54	
			Final order dismissing all claims	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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-L, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, Dkt. 217						
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-M	6	414	Findings	6/30/58	Dismissed	
		442	Opinion	6/30/58		
			Order dismissing petition	6/30/58		
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	Opinion - Title	4/1/70	Dkt. 18-G dismissed.	
		513	Findings	4/1/70		
		525	Order dismissing petition in Dkt. 18-G & interlocutory order in Dkt. 57	4/1/70		
		526	Order admitting Commission exhibits in evidence	4/1/70		
Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 57	30	295	Opinion - Value & consideration	5/16/73	\$8,117,608.00 for land	
		308	Additional findings	5/16/73		
		336	Second interlocutory order	5/16/73		
		67	Final award	8/1/73		
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., intervenor), Dkt. 29-E; Ottawa, Dkt. 133-B; and Wyandot, Dkt. 140	30	388	Opinion - Title	6/13/73	Dismissed: Dkts. 18-J & 140, & plea in inter- vention in Dkt. 29-E of the Potawatomi of the Huron, <i>et al.</i>	
		404	Concurring opinion	6/13/73		
		405	Findings	6/13/73		
		417	Final order dismissing the claims in Dkts. 18-J & 140, & interlocutory order in Dkts. 59, 29-E, & 133-B	6/13/73		
	207	408	Order denying motion for rehearing	9/19/73	Appeal time running against final awards shown below in Dkts. 29-E, 59, & 133-B.	
	C.C.	960	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	5/30/75		
	41	327	Rehearing denied	10/10/75		
	Note: Regarding pleas in intervention allowed in Dkt. 29-E, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-E	41	351	Opinion - Value & consideration		5/11/78
		42	351	Additional findings		5/11/78
		42	380	Interlocutory order		5/11/78
42		160	Final award in Dkt. 29-E	6/22/78		
42	162	Final award in Dkt. 59	6/22/78	\$2,292,000.00 for land		
42	163	Final award in Dkt. 133-B	6/22/78	\$3,479,308.00 for land \$579,308.00 for land		
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	271	Opinion in dkts. on left & Dkts. 74 & 350-B & C on motion to receive Fort Berthold exhibit Order in same dkts. admitting additional evidence	7/3/68	Pending	
	23	315	Opinion in dkts. on left & Fort Berthold Dkts. 350-B & C on land title issues	7/3/68		
	23	326	Findings in same dkts.	6/30/70		
		338	Order in same dkts.	6/30/70		
		179	Opinion in dkts. on left & Fort Berthold Dkts. 350-B & C, Sioux Dkt. 74, & Chippewa Cree Dkt. 221-A on overlapping claims	6/30/70		
	25	190	Findings in same dkts.	3/30/71		
		212	Final order dismissing claim in Dkt. 350-B & interlocutory order in Dkt. 350-C	3/30/71		
	26	326	Order granting rehearing in same dkts. in which opinion & findings of 3/30/71 were entered	3/30/71		
	26	336	Opinion in same dkts. receiving opinion & findings of 3/30/71	10/13/71		
		354	Amendments to prior findings on title & additional findings	11/11/71		
		360	Order amending findings & interlocutory order of 6/30/71	11/11/71		
		363	Order amending findings & order of 3/30/71	11/11/71		
	29	141	Order in dkts. on left & Fort Berthold Dkts. 350-B & 350-C denying request for modifica- tion of record on appeal	11/9/72		

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>
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 dkt. on left denying defendant's motion to determine issues in respect to date of extinguishment of aboriginal title	1/23/74 3/19/75	
Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band, Dkt. 113, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Red Lake, Pembina, and White Earth Bands, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-A					
Chiricahua Apache, <i>see</i> Apache, Fort Sill					
Chitina, Alaska, Natives of, Dkt. 187	27	133	Order granting defendant's motion to dismiss claim	3/15/72	Dismissed
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	7/14/50 7/14/50 7/14/50 7/14/50	\$2,587,835.47 for land in Dkt. 16, and \$902,008.11 for land in Dkt. 23
	1	356	Per curiam opinion on motion to amend & correct findings Motion denied	10/10/50 10/10/50	
	121 C.C.	41	Affirmed	12/4/51	
Choctaw and Chickasaw, Dkt. 39	1	178	Opinion Order dismissing petition	10/28/49	Dismissed
Choctaw, Dkt. 50	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	4/10/51	Dismissed
Choctaw, Dkt. 51	1	182	Opinion Order dismissing petition	3/2/50 3/2/50	Dismissed
	120 C.C. 343 U.S.	734 955	Affirmed Certiorari denied	10/2/51 5/26/52	
Choctaw Indians East of the Mississippi, Dkt. 52	3	288 293	Findings Opinion Interlocutory order	8/16/54 8/16/54 8/16/54	Dismissed
	unnumbered		Order denying application for leave to intervene by the Choctaw Nation	1/24/55	
	unnumbered		Order denying defendant's motions for rehearing	1/24/55	
	unnumbered		Conclusions of law & final award	2/3/55	
	133 C.C.	643	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	1/31/56 10/8/56	
	352 U.S. unnumbered	841	Certiorari denied Order in compliance with direction of the Court of Claims allowing intervention of the Choctaw Nation, & dismissing plaintiffs' petition	2/7/57	
Choctaw, Dkt. 55	1	553 562	Findings Opinion Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing petition	6/11/51 6/11/51 6/11/51	Dismissed
	128 C.C.	195	Affirmed	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
Choctaw, Dkt. 103	2	581 597	Findings Opinion Final order dismissing petition	3/8/54 3/8/54 3/8/54	Dismissed
	133 C.C. 352 U.C.	207 825	Affirmed Certiorari denied	11/8/55 10/8/56	

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
Choctaw Indians, McGahey Band, Dkt. 201	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	2/12/57	Dismissed	
Choctaw, Dkt. 249	32	286	Opinion	12/6/73	\$250,000.00 for accounting	
		301	Order granting motions for summary judgment dismissing 1st & 4th claims	12/6/73		
	38	441	Findings - Compromise settlement	7/15/76		
		455	Final award	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	Findings — Title	8/26/55	\$4,342,778.03 for land	
		13	Opinion	8/26/55		
			Interlocutory order	8/26/55		
	6	1	Additional findings — Value & consideration	12/3/57		
		38	Opinion	12/3/57		
			Second interlocutory order	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 dkts.	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		
		233	Order denying defendant's motion to dismiss	7/10/75		
	36	425	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for rehearing	8/28/75		
		428	Order vacating order denying defendant's motion to dismiss, & denying said motion without prejudice	8/28/75		
	37	40	Order denying defendant's motion for rehearing	10/30/75		
	39	42	Opinion on plaintiffs' motions for determina- tion of issues of law, for partial summary judgment, & for supplemental accounting, & defendant's motion to determine scope of supplemental accounting	9/23/76		
		71	Interlocutory order	9/23/76		
	42	202	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	7/13/78		
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkts. 177, 181-A & 181-B	18	531	Findings — Compromise settlement	9/7/67		\$3,500,000.00 for land in Dkts. 181-A & B; Dkt. 177 dismissed
		545	Per curiam opinion	9/7/67		
			Final judgment in Dkts. 181-A & 181-B & order dismissing petition in Dkt. 177	9/7/67		
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 178	23	493	Opinion — Compromise settlement	9/17/70	\$5,540,598.00 for accounting through 6/30/51	
		496	Findings on compromise settlement	9/17/70		
			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		
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 178-A	39	122	Opinion on defendant's motion to dismiss	10/22/76	Transferred to Court of Claims	
		126	Order to show cause why claim should not be dismissed	10/22/76		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 178-A (cont.)	39	487	Opinion	2/24/77	
		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 for accounting through 6/30/51
		unnumbered	Order denying motion to dismiss	5/27/52	
		unnumbered	Order granting motion by Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho to intervene as a party plaintiff	2/26/69	
	23	39	Per curiam opinion — Compromise	4/29/70	
		43	Findings on compromise settlement	4/29/70	
		68	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 for land
		187	Opinion	2/29/56	
		unnumbered	Interlocutory order	2/29/56	
	7	187	Additional findings — Value	3/5/59	
		203	Opinion	3/5/59	
	8	420	Second interlocutory order	3/5/59	
Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkts. 181-C & 181-D		429	Findings — Compromise settlement of offsets	3/1/60	
		unnumbered	Opinion	3/1/60	
		unnumbered	Final judgment	3/1/60	
	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, see below
		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		
	unnumbered	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, 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	
	25	99	Opinion — Liability	3/26/71	\$725,000.00 for land (Wallowa Reservation)
		115	Concurring opinion	3/26/71	
		118	Opinion dissenting in part	3/26/71	
		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 petition	7/11/52	Dismissed

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
Cowlitz, Dkt. 218	21	143	Opinion — Title	6/25/69	\$1,550,000.00 for land
		152	Findings	6/25/69	
	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. 30	523	Order admitting exhibit	6/23/71	
		129	Affirmed	10/13/72	
		143	Findings — Compromise settlement	4/12/73	
			Final award	4/12/73	
Cree, <i>see</i> Chippewa Cree					
Creek, Loyal, Dkt. 1	1	122	Opinion	5/6/49	\$600,000.00 for tribal property
		195	Order overruling motion to dismiss	5/6/49	
	1	207	Findings	7/14/50	
		221	Opinion	7/14/50	
		221	Dissenting opinion	7/14/50	
	118 C.C. 342 U.S.	373	Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing petition	7/14/50	
		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, Intervenor, Dkt. 21.	1	546	Per curiam opinion	
546			Order denying motion of Creek Nation, East, to intervene	6/4/51	
122 C.C. 344 U.S.		380	Reversed	5/6/52	
		856	Certiorari denied	10/20/52	
2		66	Findings — Liability	4/22/52	
		98	Opinion	4/22/52	
unnumbered 3		455	Interlocutory order	4/22/52	
		463	Order allowing intervention	12/21/53	
unnumbered 4		140	Additional findings	12/29/55	
		142	Opinion	12/29/55	
6	691	Interlocutory order	12/29/55		
	718	Supplemental findings — Value	11/19/58		
unnumbered		Opinion	11/19/58		
		Interlocutory order	11/19/58		
unnumbered 11	53	Order on offsets as per stipulation & final award	9/28/59		
	91	Order granting rehearing as to value	1/15/60		
unnumbered		Findings — Value rehearing	9/10/62		
		Opinion	9/10/62		
165 C.C. 379 U.S.	479	Interlocutory order	9/10/62		
	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
		54	Order dismissing petition	2/28/63	
	168 C.C. 18	483	Reversed & remanded	12/11/64	
		434	Findings — Liability	7/6/67	
	18	451	Opinion	7/6/67	
		451	Interlocutory order	7/6/67	
	19	127	Opinion on defendant's motion for entry of judgment	4/24/68	
		127	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	
	192 C.C. 25	294	Interlocutory order	6/30/69	
		425	Affirmed in part; reversed in part & remanded	6/12/70	
		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. Petition for certiorari pend- ing before Supreme Court.
		234	Dissenting opinion	4/28/58	
	24	238	Order denying motion for summary judgment	4/28/58	
		253	Opinion — Liability	12/14/70	
		269	Findings	12/14/70	
	39	383	Interlocutory order	12/14/70	
		409	Opinion — Value	2/17/77	
	40	434	Additional findings	2/17/77	
		90	Interlocutory order	2/17/77	
	216 C.C.	—	Final award	4/6/77	
4/4/78	—	Affirmed	4/4/78		
Creek, Dkt. 272	26	410	Opinion — Title	12/8/71	
		458	Findings	12/8/71	
	201 C.C.	489	Interlocutory order	12/8/71	
		386	Affirmed	4/13/73	
	40	175	Opinion — Value	6/15/77	
		190	Dissenting opinion	6/15/77	
	41	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	
	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	
	24	37	Interlocutory order	4/15/70	
		473	Opinion on defendant's motion for rehearing	3/3/71	
	28	481	Order denying rehearing	3/3/71	
		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	
	unnumbered	—	Interlocutory order	12/15/65	
		—	Order amending findings 30 & 32	12/21/65	
	unnumbered	—	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
			Order denying motions for summary judgment	2/28/67	
	31	499	Order in Dkt. 247 (Re: valuation dates & measure of damages that also applies in Dkt. 277)	3/17/76	
	40	231	Opinion on plaintiff's offer of proof	6/22/77	
			Order rejecting offer of proof	6/22/77	
	42	202	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	11/13/69	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	2/19/71	
	197 C.C.	350	Seminole cases (Dkts. 73 & 151) remanded with directive to consolidate them with Dkt. 280 to resolve overlapping claims	2/18/72	
	unnumbered		Order consolidating cases (Seminole Dkts. 73 & 151 w/Dkt. 280) & setting them for trial on issues of aboriginal title to overlap area	3/15/72	
	31	1	Opinion (in Dkts. 73 & 151, & 280) on Creek motion to amend petition & Seminole motion to dismiss & for summary judgment	7/5/73	
		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	2/11/74	
	35	7	Order dismissing claims under Dkt. 280 & severing Dkt. 280 from consolidation w/Dkts. 73 & 151	9/13/74	
	35	117	Order denying motion of Creek Nation East for reconsideration	11/13/74	
	207 C.C.	1009	Commission's order affirmed & appeal by Creeks East dismissed	6/27/75	
	207 C.C.	1009	Rehearing denied	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	
			Final order dismissing all claims	2/18/59	
	152 C.C.	747	Affirmed	3/1/61	
	370 U.S.	157	Affirmed	6/4/62	
	371 U.S.	854	Rehearing denied	10/8/62	
Crow, Dkt. 54	3	147	Findings & explanatory statement	6/11/54	\$10,242,984.70 for land
		155	Opinion	6/11/54	
		179	Concurring opinion	6/11/54	
			Order overruling second, third, & fourth defenses & striking same from defendant's answer	6/11/54	
	6	98	Additional findings	2/12/58	
		112	Opinion	2/12/58	
			Interlocutory order	2/12/58	
			Final judgment	12/8/58	
	151 C.C.	281	Affirmed in part & reversed in part	11/2/60	
	366 U.S.	924	Certiorari denied	5/15/61	
	unnumbered	Amended final judgment	5/29/61		
Delaware, Dkt. 27, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-F					
Delaware, Dkt. 27-A, and Delaware, Absentee, Dkt. 241	2	253	Findings — Right to sue	10/23/52	\$435,873.86 for land
		262	Opinion	10/23/52	
			Interlocutory order	10/23/52	

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
Delaware, Dkt. 27-A, and Delaware, Absentee, Dkt. 241 (cont.)	2	536	Findings	1/21/54	
		549	Opinion	1/21/54	
	130 C.C.	782	Order dismissing petitions in Dkts. 27-A & 241	1/21/54	
		3	622	Affirmed in part & reversed in part	2/8/55
	8	634	Additional findings — Size of area	8/23/55	
		150	Opinion	8/23/55	
	21	178	Order	8/23/55	
		18	Supplemental findings — Value	12/4/59	
	192 C.C.	30	Opinion	12/4/59	
		38	Interlocutory order	12/4/59	
	26	387	Opinion — Offsets	6/4/59	
		397	Additional findings	6/4/59	
		408	Final order & award	6/4/59	
385		Affirmed in part; reversed in part & remanded	6/12/70		
Delaware, Dkt. 27-B, and Delaware, Absentee, Dkt. 338, <i>see</i> prior 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 for land & breach of land sale agreement
		350	Findings	9/10/69	
		369	Final award	9/10/69	
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</i> prior decisions affecting Dkt. 337 under Miami of Oklahoma, Dkt. 67	5	489	Findings	9/20/57	\$1,627,244.64 for land
	9	346	Interlocutory order & conclusions of law	9/20/57	
		353	Findings — Consideration	6/22/61	
	12	404	Opinion	6/22/61	
		417	Interlocutory order	6/22/61	
	164 C.C. C.C.	749	Additional findings	8/5/63	
				Opinion	8/5/63
			Final judgment	8/5/63	
		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	\$62,000.00 for land
		132	Opinion	3/25/57	
Re allocation of consideration under Point Elliott Treaty, Dkt. 109 & 10 other dkts., <i>see</i> 13 Ind. Cl. Comm. 583, 591 (1964)	7	725	Interlocutory order	3/25/57	
		739	Findings — Value	7/6/59	
10	442	Opinion	7/6/59		
	447	Second interlocutory order	7/6/59		
unnumbered		Findings — Offsets settled	7/20/62		
			Opinion	7/20/62	
		Final judgment	7/20/62		
		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	11/1/57	\$1,313,472.65 for land
			Interlocutory order denying motion to dismiss & adding Oneida Tribe of Wisconsin & Stockbridge-Munsee Community as parties plaintiff	11/1/57	
	5	560	Findings - Title	11/1/57	
		607	Opinion	11/1/57	
			Interlocutory order	11/1/57	
	11	336	Supplemental findings - Value	10/8/62	
		359	Opinion	10/8/62	
			Interlocutory order	10/8/62	
	13	560	Findings - Offsets	8/11/64	
		566	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		
Euclachee, <i>see</i> Yuchi					
Flathead Reservation, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Dkt. 61	8	40	Findings - Title	8/3/59	\$4,431,622.18 for land
		60	Opinion	8/3/59	
			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	
			Final order dismissing petition	11/20/62	
	C.C.		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 & re-filed in Dkts. 350-A through H)
			Order dismissing 1st claim & overruling motion for summary judgment as to other claims	3/24/55	
	unnumbered		Order severing causes of action	1/14/58	
	unnumbered		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 claim in Dkt. 350-E; and
		37	Opinion	10/29/68	Buffalo claim in 350-H
			Interlocutory award, Dkt. 350-A	10/29/68	
	21	92	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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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	
		271	Order defining boundary of the area recognized by Fort Laramie Treaty of September 17, 1851, as belonging to the "Sioux or Dacotah Nation"	8/27/65	
		19	Opinion in Dkts. 350-B & C, <i>et al.</i> , on motion to receive Fort Berthold exhibit	7/3/68	
		23	Order admitting additional evidence	7/3/68	
		236	Opinion in Dkt. 350-D on motions for summary judgment of dismissal or for an order defining issues	6/17/70	
		243	Order denying motions	6/17/70	
		23	315 Opinion in Dkts. 350-B & C, <i>et al.</i> - Chippewa area & overlap	6/30/70	
			326 Findings	6/30/70	
			338 Order	6/30/70	
		23	419 Opinion in Dkts. 350-B & C, <i>et al.</i> - Sioux overlap	8/26/70	
			428 Findings	8/26/70	
			440 Interlocutory order	8/26/70	
		25	179 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	
		25	190 Findings	3/30/71	
			212 Final order dismissing claim in Dkt. 350-B & interlocutory order in Dkt. 350-C	3/30/71	
		26	326 Order granting Fort Berthold motion for rehearing	10/13/71	
		26	336 Opinion in Dkts. 350-B & C, <i>et al.</i>	11/11/71	
			254 Amendments to prior findings & additional findings	11/11/71	
		26	360 Order amending findings & interlocutory order of 6/30/70	11/11/71	
			363 Order amending findings & order of 3/30/71	11/11/71	
		29	141 Order in Dkts. 350-B & C, <i>et al.</i> , denying request for modification of record on appeal	11/9/72	
	203 C.C.		426 Affirmed decisions of 6/30/70 & 3/30/71	1/23/74	
35		269 Opinion in Dkt. 350-C - Date of taking	1/2/75		
		279 Additional findings	1/2/75		
		286 Order amending findings & admitting exhibits	1/2/75		
	37	502 Findings in Dkts. 350-C & D - Compromise settlement	3/17/76		
		518 Final award in Dkt. 350-C	3/17/76		
		519 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 for land	
		371 Opinion	11/4/65		
			Interlocutory order		11/4/65
		17	614 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	5/29/75	Transferred to Court of Claims
			Interlocutory order	5/29/75	
	37	129	Opinion on response to orders to show cause why certain accounting exceptions should not be dismissed	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	Interlocutory order	12/18/75	
		435	Opinion	2/17/77	
		445	Order granting partial summary judgment & supplemental accounting in part		
	39	446	Opinion	2/17/77	
		483	Order denying plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment	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	78	Findings	6/8/54	Dismissed
		133	Opinion	6/8/54	
	132 C.C.	373	Final order dismissing petition	6/8/54	
			Affirmed	6/7/55	
Fort Peck Indians of Fort Peck Reservation, Montana, Dkt. 184	28	171	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for proper & more detailed accounting	6/14/72	Transferred to Court of Claims
		202	Order	6/14/72	
	34	24	Opinion - Accounting exceptions	5/3/74	
		66	Concurring opinion	5/3/74	
		67	Opinion dissenting in part	5/3/74	
	207 C.C.	77	Order	5/3/74	
		1045	Reversed on an interest issue; appeal dismissed as premature on two aspects; remanded for further proceedings regarding productivity of tribal funds		
	39	239	Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	10/30/75	
			12/15/76		
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	210	Opinion - Title (Navajo, Dkt. 299, overlap included)	12/30/68	\$1,240,000.00 for land
		222	Findings	12/30/68	
	21	324	Interlocutory order	12/30/68	
		341	Additional findings - Compromise settlement	8/6/69	
			Final judgment		
Hoh, <i>see</i> Quileute					
Hopi, Dkt. 196	23	277	Opinion - Title (Navajo, Dkt. 229, overlap included)	6/29/70	\$5,000,000.00 for settlement of claims for compensation for land, rent, & for a general accounting
		290	Findings	6/29/70	
		312	Interlocutory order	6/29/70	
	unnumbered		Order granting rehearing as to dates of taking of aboriginal lands	4/28/71	
		31	16	Opinion	
	33	37	Order denying Hopi motion to amend findings	7/9/73	
		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		
	33	74	Opinion relating to claims for accounting in count 9 of plaintiff's petition	1/23/74	
			1/23/74		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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. 36	828 1	Motion to dismiss appeal denied 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 1/30/76		
	208 C.C.	1027	Affirmed & remanded	3/26/76		
	208 C.C.	1028	Rehearing denied	12/7/76		
	429 U.S. 39	1030 204	Petition for certiorari dismissed Findings & conclusions of law on compromise settlement	12/2/76 12/2/76		
		223	Final award			
	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	447 458	Findings - Title Opinion	11/19/62 11/19/62	see below	
		17	Interlocutory order Findings - Value	11/19/62 12/21/66		
		500	Opinion	12/21/66		
		18	382	Second interlocutory order Opinion		12/21/66 5/11/67
				Order denying motion for rehearing & modification of findings		5/11/67
Hualapai, Dkts. 90 & 122	19	161 177	Additional findings - Compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment	6/18/68 6/18/68 6/18/68	\$2,950,000.00 for land in Dkt. 90 & trespass damage claims in Dkt. 122	
	Iowa, Dkt. 79	2	167	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment Order denying motion	5/27/52 5/27/52	Land claims severed out & assigned Dkt. 179-A.
		unnumbered		Order requiring defendant to render complete accounting	7/28/52	
	16	568	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	\$11,394.67 on accounting claims.	
Iowa, Dkt. 79-A	20	308 320 335	Opinion - Value & damages Findings Interlocutory order	2/17/69 2/17/69 2/17/69	\$1,377,207.27 for land	
	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	464 496	Findings - Title Opinion Interlocutory order	7/2/58 7/2/58 7/2/58	\$633,193.77 for Iowa land. \$965,560.39 for Sac and Fox	

Tr
Iov
Dk
(co

Iov
Fo
anc
anc
Dk
Dk

Iow
Dkt

Iow
Dkt

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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	
		263	Opinion	5/7/65	
	179 C.C.	8	Final award	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	
		365	Order on remand & amending findings & opinion	12/10/69	
195 C.C.	365	Affirmed	7/14/71		
404 U.S.	1017	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	
		367	Interlocutory order	7/31/57	
	unnumbered		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	\$1,372,267.50 to the Iowa;
	13	25	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 Omaha;
	unnumbered		Order in Dkts. 138, 11-A & 332-A amending finding 2, Dkts. 11-A & 138 (re Yankton Sioux boundary)	11/25/59	\$1,096,533.42 to the Sac and Fox. For land in Dkt. 11-A:
	13	272	Additional findings on compromise settlement of Otoe & Missouri claims in Dkt. 11-A, & Omaha claims in Dkt. 138	4/14/64	\$1,750,000.00 to the Otoe and Missouri. Sac and Fox petition in Dkt. 232 dismissed by order of 3/2/65.
		289	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	3/2/65	
		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	
	191	Opinion	3/22/65		
		Final judgment on Iowa claims in Dkt. 138 & order dismissing Iowa petition in Dkt. 339	3/22/65	Iowa petition in Dkt. 339 dismissed by order of 3/22/65	
175 C.C.	564	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: \$2,783,700.00 to the Iowa; \$10,601,282.66 to the Sac and Fox
		105	Opinion	2/9/59	
	22	385	Interlocutory order	2/9/59	
		395	Opinion - Value	2/4/70	
		415	Findings	2/4/70	
		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: \$1,340,435.00 to the Iowa; \$3,530,578.21 to the Sac and Fox. For land in Dkt. 209: \$168,555.00 to the Iowa. For land in Dkt. 231: \$286,516.40 to
		438	Opinion	8/2/57	
		438	Interlocutory order	8/2/57	
	10	404	Findings - Title (in Dkt. 209)	6/1/62	
	20	439	Interlocutory order	6/1/62	
		439	Opinion - Value & consideration (in Dkts. 158, 209, & 231)	5/12/69	
		458	Findings	5/12/69	
		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	

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	Tr
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)			Ki
	32	256 270	Opinion 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	11/12/71 11/23/73		Ki
	206 C.C.	897	Affirmed	11/23/73 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						
Karankewa, <i>see</i> Apache, Dkt. 22-C, and Caddo, Dkt. 226, in which the Karankewa of Texas petitioned for intervention						Ki
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 Dkt. 33:	Ki
			Order overruling defendant's demurrer to plaintiffs' evidence	9/26/50	\$1,600,220.02;	
	1	608 617	Findings - Value and consideration Opinion	9/17/51 9/17/51	For land in Dkt. 35:	Ki
			Interlocutory order	9/17/51	\$798,000.00;	
	2	134 144	Additional findings - Offsets Per curiam opinion	5/15/52 5/15/52	Dkt. 34 was dismissed.	
			Conclusions of law & final awards on causes of action in Dkts. 33 & 35, & order dismissing petition in Dkt. 34	5/15/52		Ki
	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			
			Findings on remanded questions	7/13/53		Ki
			Opinion ruling on remanded questions	6/24/54		Ki
	130 C.C.	693	Separate opinion Order denying motion of Arthur B. Honnold for leave to intervene in the appeals & file a motion to dismiss	6/24/54		Ki
130 C.C. C.C.	695	Order dismissing Kaw appeals Order dismissing cross appeals by the United States	2/16/55 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	5/4/62 5/4/62	\$771,441.26 for land
	15	628 650	Interlocutory order Additional findings - Offsets Opinion	5/4/62 8/31/65 8/31/65	
	178 C.C.	527	Interlocutory order	8/31/65	
	18	550 553	Affirmed in part, reversed in part & remanded Supplemental findings Opinion Final award	2/17/67 9/29/67 9/29/67 9/29/67	
Kickapoo, Dkt. 316-A	23	189 197 218	Opinion - Value Findings Interlocutory order	6/10/70 6/10/70 6/10/70	\$125,209.61 for land
	23	509	Final award	9/24/70	
Kickapoo, Dkt. 317	5	180 198	Findings Opinion	6/4/57 6/4/57	\$340,250.00 for land
	10	271	Interlocutory order Findings in Dkts. 317 & 314-C (Peoria) re Kickapoo & Wea lands	6/4/57 3/2/62	
		279	Opinion	3/2/62	
		unnumbered	Interlocutory order Order amending findings & interlocutory order of 3/2/62	3/2/62 3/10/64	
	174 C.C.	550	Affirmed	2/18/66	
	22	186 197	Opinion - Value Supplemental findings	12/5/69 12/5/69	
	22	223 443	Interlocutory order Final award	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	\$6,026.69 for land
	13	583	Interlocutory order Findings on allocation of consideration under Point Elliott Treaty	4/13/59 8/13/64	
		591	Opinion	8/13/64	
	25	83 88	Order Opinion - Value Findings	8/13/64 3/26/71 3/26/71	
	28	98 159 163 167	Interlocutory order Opinion - Gratuitous offsets Additional findings Final award	3/26/71 6/7/72 6/7/72 6/7/72	

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkt. 32	1	505	Findings - Right to recover	4/9/51	\$2,067,166.00 for land	
		520	Opinion	4/9/51		
	4	95	Interlocutory order	4/9/51		
		111	Additional findings - Value	12/13/55		
				Opinion	12/13/55	
	5	72	Second interlocutory order	12/13/55		
		96	Additional findings - Offsets	3/12/57		
	5	297	Opinion	3/12/57		
			Final determination	3/12/57		
			Opinion - Offsets reconsidered	7/18/57		
			Amended final order	7/18/57		
143 C.C.		534	Affirmed	7/16/58		
143 C.C.		545	Motion for reconsideration denied	10/8/58		
359 U.S.		934	Certiorari denied	3/9/59		
Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkt. 257	12	439	Findings - Jicarilla Apache (Dkt. 22-A) overlap	8/26/63	see disposition below	
		470	Opinion	8/26/63		
	24	405	Interlocutory order	8/26/63		
		26	Order granting Wichita's motion to intervene	2/10/71		
			101	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment of recognized title & defendant's motion to dismiss claim for failure to prosecute	8/9/71	
			132	Order admitting exhibits	8/9/71	
			134	Order granting motion for summary judgment of recognized title	8/9/71	
			136	Order denying motion to dismiss	8/9/71	
	202 C.C.		29	Reversed as to summary judgment of recognized title & order allowing Wichita intervention	6/20/73	
				Rehearing denied	9/28/73	
	416 U.S.		936	Certiorari denied	4/15/74	
Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkts. 257 & 259-A, see prior decisions in Dkt. 259-A, below	34	263	Findings on compromise settlement	7/17/74	\$35,060,000.00 for land in Dkts. 257 & 259-A	
		286	Order of consolidation & final award	7/17/74		
		287	Order denying motion to consolidate Dkt. 257 with Dkts. 22-C & 226	7/17/74		
Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkts. 258 & 259	18	640	Findings on compromise settlement	1/29/68	\$6,000,000.00 for settlement of accounting claims	
		658	Opinion	1/29/68		
			Final judgment	1/29/68		
Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkt. 259-A	22	482	Opinion on defendant's motion to dismiss or require plaintiffs to make petition more definite & certain	4/1/70	Disposed of by final award cited above under Kiowa, Comanche and Apache, Dkts. 257 & 259-A	
		503	Order denying motion to dismiss or in the alternative to make more definite & certain	4/1/70		
	24	393	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment	2/10/71		
		401	Order denying motion for summary judgment	2/10/71		
	29	476	Order on motions requiring, <i>inter alia</i> , that defendant supplement its accounting for certain rentals	2/28/73		
Klamath, Modoc and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, Dkt. 100, see reference to this case in opinions of 1/20/58 & 10/6/58 under California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37	2	684	Opinion on plaintiff's procedural motion	4/9/54	\$2,500,000.00 for land	
		unnumbered	Order overruling plaintiff's motion	4/9/54		
				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	5/19/55	
	13	41	Findings - Compromise settlement	1/31/64		
		73	Opinion	1/31/64		
			Final judgment	1/31/64		
	Klamath, Modoc and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, Dkt. 100-A	20	522	Opinion - Value	5/14/69	\$4,162,992.80 for land
528			Findings	5/14/69		
543		Conclusions of law & first interlocutory order	5/14/69			
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 \$18,000,000.00 in Dkt. 100-B-1; \$785,000.00 in Dkt. 100-C	
	37	2	Findings on compromise settlement	10/31/75		
		38	Final award in Dkt. 100-C	10/31/75		
	39	39	Order approving stipulation in Dkt. 100-B-1	10/31/75		
		262	Findings in Dkt. 100-B-1 on compromise settlement	1/21/77		
		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	\$425,000.00 for land	
		464	Opinion	8/9/57		
	8	504	Interlocutory order	8/9/57		
			510	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	\$57,000.00 for land	
			Order denying defense of res judicata	1/30/52		
	unnumbered			Order consolidating cases	5/12/53	
		5	525	Findings - Title	10/30/57	
		543	Opinion	10/30/57		
			Interlocutory order	10/30/57		
	10	286	Additional findings - Value	3/2/62		
		294	Opinion	3/2/62		
			Second interlocutory order	3/2/62		
	13	583	Findings - Consideration	8/13/64		
		591	Opinion	8/13/64		
			Order	8/13/64		
	16	526	Findings - Defendant's motion for judgment	2/18/66		
		530	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		
			Final order dismissing claims	4/15/59		
	151 C.C.	701	Affirmed	12/1/60		
365 U.S.	879	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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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	
		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, <i>see</i> Snake or Piute Indians of former Malheur Reservation, Oregon, Dkt. 17					
Mandan, <i>see</i> Fort Berthold, Dkts. 350, 350-A through H					
Maricopa, <i>see</i> 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	
		407	Order dismissing first cause	9/19/73	
	37	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, <i>see</i> Choctaw Indians, McGahey Band, Dkt. 201					
Menominee, Dkt. 129	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	4/24/52	Dismissed
Mescalero Apache, <i>see</i> Apache, Dkts. 22-B, C, & G					
Methow, <i>see</i> Colville Reservation Confederated Tribes					
Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124, <i>see</i> Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 67, <i>et al.</i>					
Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-A, <i>see</i> Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 251					
Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-B, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, Dkt. 128, <i>et al.</i>					
Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-C, <i>see</i> Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 255					
Miami, Indiana, Dkts. 124-D, E & F, <i>see</i> 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	

Tr
M
M
M
D
M
P
D
th
D
Pr
P
D
D
C

M

M
D
D
D
P
K
P
D
H
D

M
D
w
D
D

M

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 130, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G, <i>et al.</i>						
Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 131, <i>see</i> Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 253, <i>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	617 635	Findings - Overlapping claims Opinion	3/26/54 3/26/54	\$4,647,467.67 for land to the Miami plaintiffs in Dkts. 67 & 124, as repre- sentatives of the Miami Tribe of 1818	
	4	346 398	Interlocutory order Supplemental findings - Value Opinion	3/26/54 9/17/56 9/17/56		
	5	494 500 517	Interlocutory order Findings - Offsets Opinion Final award	9/30/57 9/30/57 9/30/57 9/30/57		
	146 C.C.	421	Affirmed on title & offsets; remanded on value	7/13/59		
	9	1 3 19	Amended & additional findings Opinion Dissenting opinion	6/30/60 6/30/60 6/30/60		
	9	108	Conclusions of law & final award Additional dissenting opinion	6/30/60 4/3/61		
	159 C.C.	593	Order denying defendant's motion for rehearing (one Commissioner dissenting) Affirmed	4/3/61 11/16/62		
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	513 552	Findings Opinion Order dismissing petitions in Dkts. 251 & 124-A	7/14/58 7/14/58 7/14/58		For land & accrued interest: \$349,193.59 to Miami of Oklahoma, Dkt. 251; \$64,738.80 to Miami of Indiana, Dkt. 124-A
	150 C.C.	725	Affirmed in part, & reversed in part	7/15/60		
	366 U.S. unnumbered	924	Certiorari denied Final judgment	5/15/61 5/31/61		
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
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 252, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-G						
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, <i>et al.</i> , 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, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-H; & Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-F. Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 253, <i>et al.</i> , con- tinued below.
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 253, consolidated with: Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 131; Peoria, Wea, Dkt. 314-D	22	92 136 179 unnumbered	Opinion - Value Additional findings on value Final award Order amending conclusions of law & opinion Amended final award	11/26/69 11/26/69 11/26/69 1/8/70 1/8/70	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	
	22	469	Opinion on Miami motion for severance & reconsideration	3/18/70		
		480	Order denying motion for severance & reconsideration	3/18/70		
	23	490	Order denying motion by plaintiffs in Dkt. 131 for an extension of time for filing an appeal	9/9/70		
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 254 <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Prairie Band, Dkt. 15-D, and Potawatomi, Citizen Band, Dkt. 128						

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 255, consolidated with Miami, Indiana, Dkt. 124-C	20	97	Findings - Compromise settlement	12/3/68	\$66,966.00 for land in Dkts. 255 & 124-C
		110	Opinion	12/3/68	
			Final judgment	12/3/68	
Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 256, consolidated with Miami, Indiana, Dkts. 124-D, E & F	14	375	Findings - Liability, value, & consideration	12/18/64	\$1,373,000.00 for land in settlement of claims in Dkts. 256, 124-D, E & F
		434	Opinion	12/18/64	
			Interlocutory order	12/18/64	
	15	195	Final judgment	4/1/65	
		17	427	Opinion on motion of Miamis of Indiana that consideration for Kansas lands be charged solely against Miamis of Oklahoma	11/29/66
	20	113	Order denying motion	11/29/66	
		127	Findings - Compromise settlement	12/3/68	
		Per curiam opinion	12/3/68		
			Final judgment	12/3/68	
Mission Indians of California, <i>see</i> California Indians, Mission Bands of, Dkt. 80; California Indians, Baron Long, <i>et al.</i> , 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, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 80-B, California Indians, Bands of Mission Indians, Dkt. 80-C; California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37, <i>et al.</i> (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, <i>see</i> Otoe and Missouri, Dkts. 11 & 11-A					
Mobilier, <i>see</i> Pascagoula, Biloxi and Mobilian Consolidated Bands, Dkt. 170					
Modoc, <i>see</i> Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin					
Mohave, <i>see</i> Colorado River Indian Tribes, Dkts. 185, 283-A, & 283-B					
Mohave-Apache Community (Fort McDowell), <i>see</i> 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	219	Findings - Title	3/19/59	\$468,358.07 for land in Dkts. 283 & 295
		245	Opinion	3/19/59	
			Interlocutory order	3/19/59	
	23	87	Opinion - Value	5/13/70	
		93	Findings	5/13/70	
	26	106	Interlocutory order	5/13/70	
		563	Opinion - Offsets	12/29/71	
		570	Findings	12/29/71	
	28	582	Final award	12/29/71	
		232	Order denying motion for rehearing	7/6/72	
	31	357	Interlocutory order approving compromise settlement & stipulation for entry of final judgment & suspending further proceedings pending dismissal of appeal		
		203 C.C.	709	Order granting motion to dismiss appeal	9/13/73
			410	Findings on compromise settlement	9/14/73
			425	Final award	9/26/73
			425	Final award	9/26/73
Mohave Tribe of Arizona, California, and Nevada, Dkt. 295-A	23	346	Opinion - Right to sue & liability	6/30/70	\$550,000.00 for land
		351	Findings	6/30/70	
	25	356	Interlocutory order	6/30/70	
		409	Opinion on defendant's motion for rehearing	6/16/71	
	36	413	Order denying motion	6/16/71	
		452	Findings on compromise settlement	9/18/75	
		471	Final award	9/18/75	
Muckleshoot, Dkt. 98	2	424	Findings on special defenses	5/14/53	\$80,377.00 for land
		429	Opinion	5/14/53	
	3	658	Order denying special defenses	5/14/53	
		669	Findings - Title	8/25/55	
	6	669	Opinion	8/25/55	
		608	Interlocutory order	8/25/55	
		624	Additional findings - Value	7/17/58	
	12	624	Opinion	7/17/58	
		743	Interlocutory order	7/17/58	
		751	Additional findings - Settlement of offsets	10/18/63	
		751	Opinion	10/18/63	
				Final judgment	10/18/63

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>
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	All claims transferred to Court of Claims
	34	432 438 439	Opinion Order modifying previous order & for supplemental accounting Order denying motions to dismiss & vacating order to show cause	7/25/73 8/23/74 8/23/74	
	35	305 311 312 313 315	Opinion Order separating consolidated accounting claims in Dkts. 69, 299, & 353 from remaining claims in Dkt. 69 Order denying plaintiff's motion for leave to amend its petitions Order denying plaintiff's motion for rehearing	8/23/74 1/23/75 1/23/75 1/23/75	
	36	108 112 113 114	Order in Dkt. 69 granting motion to amend petition (as to Claims 1 through 6) & denying defendant's motion for final judgment 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 Order in Dkts. 69, 299, & 353 separating accounting claims from other claims in Dkt. 69 Order (in accounting claims) sustaining plaintiff's objections to defendant's interrogatories	1/23/75 1/23/75 1/23/75 5/28/75 5/28/75 5/28/75	
	36	181	Order (in accounting claims) denying defendant's motion for partial summary judgment	5/28/75	
	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	6/11/75 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 32	Opinion (in accounting claims) Findings Order granting in part & denying in part defendant's motion for partial summary judgment, & for other purposes	9/1/76 9/1/76 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	9/1/76 11/10/76	
	39	252 257 260	Opinion (in accounting claims) Dissenting opinion Order granting plaintiff's motion for an up-to-date accounting as to miscellaneous agency expenses	11/10/76 12/27/76 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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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	244	Opinion - Title	6/29/70	Transferred to Court of Claims
		256	Findings	6/29/70	
		276	Interlocutory order	6/29/70	
	41	85	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary determination	11/2/77	
		96	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	11/2/77	
	41	130	Opinion on plaintiff's motion to amend petition & for severance	11/23/77	
		138	Order denying plaintiff's motion	11/23/77	
	41	140	Opinion on government's motions to quash subpoena duces tecum & for protective order	12/2/77	
		144	Order granting government's motions	12/2/77	
	41	187	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	2/15/78	
New York Emigrant Indians, <i>see</i> Emigrant New York Indians, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 75					
Nez Perce, Dkt. 175	18	1	Findings - Title	3/21/67	\$3,550,000.00 for land
		119	Opinion	3/21/67	
		429	Interlocutory order	3/21/67	
	24	449	Opinion	2/18/71	
			Order granting in part & denying in part plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment	2/18/71	
	26	177	Findings - Compromise settlement	8/25/71	
	192	Final award	8/25/71		
Nez Perce, Dkt. 175-A	8	220	Findings - Value, reservation land	12/31/59	\$4,157,605.06 for land
		271	Opinion	12/31/59	
		759	Interlocutory order	12/31/59	
	8	777	Additional findings - Compromise settlement	6/17/60	
		Opinion	6/17/60		
		Final judgment	6/17/60		
Nez Perce, Dkt. 175-B	13	184	Findings	4/7/64	\$1,387,911.00 for land
		238	Opinion	4/7/64	
			Final order dismissing petition	4/7/64	
	176 C.C.	815	Affirmed in part & reversed in part	7/15/66	
	386 U.S.	984	Certiorari denied	3/26/67	
	386 U.S.	1015	Motion to clarify certiorari denial order denied	4/24/67	
	22	53	Opinion - Value	11/14/69	
		70	Opinion dissenting in part	11/14/69	
		74	Opinion dissenting in part	11/14/69	
		76	Order amending findings & entering conclusions of law	11/14/69	
	22	78	Final award	11/14/69	
	194 C.C.	490	Reversed as to interest question & remanded	3/19/71	
	404 U.S.	872	Certiorari denied	10/12/71	
	29	127	Opinion	11/1/72	
		138	Order amending findings & conclusions of law	11/1/72	
	140	Final award	11/1/72		
Nez Perce of Idaho, Dkt. 179-A, <i>see</i> also Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 179	39	127	Order denying defendant's motion to dismiss & setting time to file exceptions to accounting report	10/22/76	Transferred to Court of Claims
	39	239	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	12/15/76	
Nez Perce, Dkt. 180	2	193	Per curiam opinion on defendant's motion to dismiss	6/4/52	Dismissed (after viable claims severed out)
			Order dismissing defendant's motion	6/4/52	
	2	245	Per curiam opinion	10/17/52	
		Order dismissing petition	10/17/52		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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	\$3,000,000.00
		582	Opinion	8/10/55	for gold removed
		618	Opinion agreeing in part & disagreeing in part	8/10/55	from reservation
	8	300	Additional findings	12/31/59	land & other
		338	Opinion	12/31/59	related uses of
		unnumbered	Interlocutory order & award	12/31/59	the land by white
	153 C.C.	697	Final judgment Affirmed	7/5/60 5/12/61	intruders
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	\$80,013.07
		179	Findings	6/25/69	for land
		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	\$49,383.50 for land
	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	
		unnumbered	Interlocutory order	5/9/55	
	6	578	Additional findings	7/17/58	
		596	Opinion	7/17/58	
		unnumbered	Interlocutory order	7/17/58	
	6	681	Opinion	10/20/58	
		unnumbered	Order denying motions for rehearing & amending finding No. 35	10/20/58	
	10	219	Additional findings	2/9/62	
	225	Opinion	2/9/62		
	unnumbered	Final judgment	2/9/62		
	162 C.C.	712	Affirmed	7/12/63	
	375 U.S.	993	Certiorari denied	1/20/64	
Okanogan, <i>see</i> Colville Reservation, Confederated Tribes					
Omaha, Dkt. 85	1	683	Opinion Order dismissing petition	12/19/51 12/19/51	Dismissed
Omaha, Dkt. 138, <i>see</i> Iowa, Omaha, Sac and Fox, Dkt. 138; and Otoe and Missouriia, 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	For settlement of land, accounting, trespass & other damage claims, \$2,900,000.00
		365	Opinion	10/19/54	
		unnumbered	Interlocutory order	10/19/54	
	4	627	Findings — Title & consideration in Dkt. 225-A	1/18/57	
		662	Opinion	1/18/57	
	unnumbered	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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	Tri
Omaha, Dkts. 225-A, 225-B, 225-C, & 225-D (cont.)		unnumbered	Order sustaining in part & overruling in part defendant's motion to dismiss petition in Dkt. 225-C	12/27/57		Os (co
		6	730	Order in Dkt. 225-A amending findings & interlocutory order of 1/18/57	2/6/58	
			751	Findings in Dkt. 225-A on value	11/28/58	
				Opinion	11/28/58	
			unnumbered	Interlocutory order	11/28/58	
		7	573	Conclusions of law & final award in Dkt. 225-A in net sum of \$2,735,833.86	5/6/59	
			unnumbered	Opinion on orders disallowing a claimed offset credit of \$374,465.02 in Dkt. 225-A	5/13/59	
				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	Os
		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
			407	Opinion	2/11/60	10
				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 dkts.	2/11/60	Os
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
			Opinion	12/6/62		
			Final order denying each asserted claim	12/6/62		
165 C.C. 379 U.S.	487 946	Affirmed	4/17/64			
		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		
			Dissenting opinion	2/26/69		Os
			Order denying defendant's motion	2/26/69		
	26	583	Opinion	12/29/71		
			Dissenting opinion	12/29/71		
			Findings	12/29/71		Os
	37	624	Interlocutory order	12/29/71		
			Opinion	3/19/76		Os
			Dissenting opinion	3/19/76		Tr
	217 C.C.	617	Additional findings	3/19/76		
			Interlocutory order	3/19/76		
			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 dismissed at request of the plaintiffs	
			Findings	8/18/71		
	201 C.C.	163	Interlocutory order	8/18/71		
			Affirmed in part, remanded in part	5/11/73		
			Order dismissing claim 8	1/16/74		
	41	391	Opinion on petition to intervene of counties of Madison & Oneida, New York	6/8/78		
			Concurring opinion	6/8/78		
	395	Order denying motion to intervene	6/8/78			
Osage Nation, Dkt. 9	1	43	Findings	12/30/48	\$864,107.55 for land	
		54	Opinion	12/30/48		
		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

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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. prefixed with No. 40
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-A		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	3/9/50	Dismissed
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
		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	
		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	
		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	
		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 2/19/54	
		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition		
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-C	2	461 469	Findings Opinion Order	8/6/53 8/6/53 8/6/53	Dismissed
		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	11/6/59	
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-D	2	461 469	Findings Opinion Order	8/6/53 8/6/53 8/6/53	Dismissed
		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	11/6/59	
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-E	2	461 469	Findings Opinion Order	8/6/53 8/6/53 8/6/53	Dismissed
		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	12/10/59	
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
	31	220	Final order dismissing claims	8/9/73	
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-G		unnumbered	Order dismissing petition	3/9/50	Dismissed
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-H	4	409 460	Findings Opinion Order dismissing petition	9/19/56 9/19/56 9/19/56	Dismissed
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-I	32	400 413 428	Opinion Findings Order dismissing petition	12/26/73 12/26/73 12/26/73	Dismissed
Ottawa, Dkt. 40-J	11	641 693	Findings Opinion Final order dismissing case	11/29/62 11/29/62 11/29/62	Dismissed
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	95 102	Additional findings on compromise settlement of offsets Opinion Final judgment	3/27/68 3/27/68 3/27/68	\$932,620.01 for land

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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	8/21/53	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	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	831 874	Findings Opinion	6/29/60 6/29/60	\$406,166.19 for land & accountings for trust funds
	9	98	Interlocutory order Opinion on defendant's motion for rehearing	6/29/60 3/10/61	
	11	550 566	Order admitting additional evidence & denying motion for rehearing Findings — Damages & offsets Opinion	3/10/61 11/26/62 11/26/62	
	166 C.C.	373	Final award	11/26/62	
	379 U.S.	929	Reversed in part	6/12/64	
	14	677	Certiorari denied Amended final award	12/7/64 2/11/65	
Ottawa, Dkt. 304	25	1 10 20	Opinion — Value Findings Interlocutory order	3/17/71 3/17/71 3/17/71	\$182,610.00 for land
	30	206	Final award	4/25/73	
Ottawa, Dkt. 305	27	98 115 131	Opinion — Value Findings Interlocutory order	3/15/72 3/15/72 3/15/72	\$80,585.76 for land
	28	251 254	Opinion on defendant's motion for rehearing Order amending findings entered 3/15/72	7/26/72 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	288 293	Findings Order directing certain persons & their attorneys to show cause why they should not be instructed to assume prosecution of this case	5/9/73	\$25,461.92 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	5/9/73 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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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 judgments shown below, which represent compensation for land	
		381	Opinion	3/24/59		
	7	615	Interlocutory order	3/24/59		
			Additional findings on dates of taking of the Oregon & Nevada portions of claimants' aboriginal lands	6/4/59		
	unnumbered		Interlocutory order	6/4/59		
			Order, entered on plaintiffs' motion, amending findings of fact & interlocutory order of 3/24/59	6/4/59		
	9	417	Additional findings of fact on compromise settlement of the "Snake-Paiute Tract [Oregon land] claim"	7/3/61		
		429	Statement & opinion of the Commission	7/3/61		
			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	\$3,650,000.00	
	16	215	Additional findings on valuation of the Mono & Paviotso tracts	11/4/65		
		289	Opinion	11/4/65		
			Order approving stipulation of settlement of offsets	11/4/65		
			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)	11/4/65	\$935,000.00	
	183 C.C.	321	Affirmed	4/19/68	\$15,790,000.00	
	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 Reservation & Walker River Reservation	2/16/72	Transferred to Court of Claims
		45	Order fixing dates of establishment of the Pyramid Lake Reservation & the Walker River Reservation	2/16/72		
28		256	Opinion on motion for determination of defendant's liability for resources removed from Nevada portion of the Paviotso Tract	8/1/72		
		263	Order finding defendant liable to plaintiffs for resources removed from Nevada portion of the Paviotso Tract	8/1/72		
30		210	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for interlocutory order pertaining to issues of liability on claim for depriving Pyramid Lake of water	4/25/73		
		219	Order	4/25/73		
203 C.C.		468	Order of 8/1/72 reversed & the cause remanded	1/23/74		
			Rehearing denied	4/24/74		
34		414	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for a complete & proper accounting	8/14/74		
		426	Interlocutory order	8/14/74		
35		11	Order relieving defendant of requirement of supplementing its accounting as to certain matters	9/18/74		
36		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		
41		222	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	3/2/78		
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 for deprivation of water
			270	Final award	7/23/75	

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition		
Paiute Nation, Southern, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 88, 330 & 330-A, <i>see</i> mention of Dkts. 88 & 330 in opinions of 1/20/58 & 10/6/58 under California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37	14	618	Findings — Compromise settlement	1/18/65	\$7,253,165.19 for settlement of aboriginal land, & accounting claims		
		647	Opinion	1/18/65			
			Final judgment	1/18/65			
Pala and Pauma Bands of Mission Indians, <i>see</i> California Indians, Baron Long, <i>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	Opinion	11/16/71	Concluded with an award in consolidation with Dkt. 345, <i>see</i> below		
		370	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 accounting report dated 7/24/70 in certain respects	11/16/71			
		35	316	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment		1/23/75	
		319	Order denying defendant's motion & setting a pretrial hearing	1/23/75			
Papago of Arizona, Dkt. 345	19	394	Findings — Title	9/10/68	Concluded with an award in consolidation with Dkt. 102, <i>see</i> below		
		424	Opinion	9/10/68			
		21	403	Interlocutory order		9/10/68	
			406	Additional findings		10/1/69	
			407	Interlocutory order on date of taking		10/1/69	
unnumbered		Order amending interlocutory order dated 9/10/68	10/1/69				
unnumbered		Report of the Commissioner	2/22/71				
Papago of Arizona, Dkts. 102 & 345	38	542	Findings on compromise settlement	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		
		559	Final award	7/21/76			
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	Findings	7/14/50	\$7,316,097.70, of which amount some \$7,315,800.00 was for land & the balance for small sums owing, one in the amount of \$31.90 with interest		
		245	Opinion	7/14/50			
			Interlocutory order re 6th & 7th causes of action	7/14/50			
			Final order dismissing 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, & 8th causes of action	7/14/50			
		124 C.C.	324	Affirmed in part, reversed in part		2/3/53	
		5	224	Findings — Title		6/17/57	
			268	Opinion		6/17/57	
				Interlocutory order		6/17/57	
			7	721		Opinion — Admissibility of exhibits	6/26/59
			8	648		Order	6/26/59
			8	718		Additional findings — Value	6/14/60
			Opinion	6/14/60			
	9	82	Third interlocutory order	6/14/60			
		85	Additional findings — Offsets	1/31/61			
			Opinion	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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
Pawnee, Oklahoma, Dkt. 10 (cont.)	9	94	Supplemental opinion	2/7/61		
			Order amending interlocutory order of 1/31/61	2/7/61		
			Amended conclusions of law & final award	2/7/61		
	157 C.C.	134	Reversed in part & remanded	4/4/62		
	370 U.S.	918	Certiorari denied	6/11/62		
	unnumbered	Order amending findings	7/6/62			
	unnumbered	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	
	12	141	Interlocutory order	6/9/58		
		157	Additional findings on compromise settlement	3/21/63		
		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, result- ing from breach of treaty provision	
	15	123	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	
		142	Findings	3/17/65		
		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	5/6/68		
	20	62	Opinion	11/13/68		
			Order substituting finding, vacating final award of 8/4/65, & final award	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 pleaded 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	
		unnumbered	Interlocutory order	4/4/66		
		22	186	Report of the Commissioner	1/21/69	
			197	Opinion — Value	12/5/69	
		22	223	Supplemental findings	12/5/69	
		442	Interlocutory order	12/5/69		
			Final award	2/11/70		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
Peoria, Piankeshaw; and Delaware, Absentee, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 289	19	107	Findings — Title	3/27/68	For land: \$1,501,294.35 to the Peoria plaintiffs on behalf of the Piankeshaw Tribe; & \$1,497,246.11 to the Delaware plaintiffs on behalf of the Delaware Tribe
		118	Opinion, Interlocutory order	3/27/68 3/27/68	
	24	unnumbered	Report of the Commissioner	12/2/69	
		179	Opinion — Value	12/11/70	
	24	186	Findings	12/11/70	
		195	Interlocutory order	12/11/70	
		468	Final award	2/24/71	
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
			Order granting in part & denying in part plaintiffs' motion for partial summary judg- ment	8/5/60	
	9	274	Explanatory statement & findings —	4/18/61	
			289	Consideration and other offsets Opinion	4/18/61 4/18/61
	12	392	Interlocutory order	4/18/61	
			398	Additional findings — Value of 1832 grant claimed as an offset	7/29/63 7/29/63
169 C.C.	1009	Opinion	7/29/63		
15	266	Final order (& award) Modified & affirmed Order amending final order	3/12/65 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 for land
		279	Opinion	3/2/62	
	unnumbered		Interlocutory order	3/2/62	
			Order amending findings & interlocutory order of 3/2/62	3/10/64	
	174 C.C.	550	Affirmed	2/18/66	
	22	186	Opinion — Value	12/5/69	
		197	Supplemental findings	12/5/69	
	22	223	Interlocutory order	12/5/69	
384		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 for land
		473	Opinion	7/18/67	
			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 Court of Claims
		311	Findings	12/17/70	
		337	Interlocutory order	12/17/70	

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>	<i>Tri</i>	
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkt. 228 (cont.)	27	11	Opinion — Dates of taking	1/20/72		Pir	
		17	Additional findings	1/20/72		Riv	
	28	21	Interlocutory order	1/20/72		Pir	
		170	Order denying plaintiffs' motion for rehearing on date of taking	6/7/72		Riv	
	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		Pir Riv	
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkt. 236	unnumbered		Order dismissing	2/26/69	Dismissed (after all causes removed & assigned other dkt. nos.)	Pir Riv see	
Pima-Maricopa, Gila River, Dkts. 236-A & 236-B	unnumbered		Report of Commissioner (Dkt. 236-A)	11/20/68	Additional compensation for use of reservation land during World War II & damages for diminution in the value of the land related to such use: \$1,569,396.20 in Dkt. 236-A; & \$6,069.70 in Dkt. 236-B	Pir Riv M	
		25	250	Opinion — Liability			4/28/71
		260	Findings	4/28/71			
		278	First interlocutory order (Dkt. 236-A)	4/28/71			
		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	Pir Dk	
		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.	Pir Riv (
		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	Pir Riv Po	

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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, see also 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	
			Order dismissing petitions	12/12/68	Dismissed	
	190 C.C. 400 U.S.	790 819	Affirmed Certiorari denied	2/20/70 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	Order dismissing certain exceptions	12/2/76		
		39	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	
		274	Opinion	8/13/75		
	36	279	Order requiring the submission of information and denying defendant's motion to dismiss exceptions 8 & 9	8/13/75		
		39	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	12/15/76		
Pitt River, Dkt. 347, see other decisions involving Dkt. 347 under California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37, et al.	6	86	Opinion	1/20/58	Concluded with other cases by award under California Indians, Dkts. 31 & 37, et al.	
		93	Opinion	1/20/58		
	6	666	Opinion	10/6/58		
			Order dividing California into Areas A & B	10/6/58		
		7	815	Findings — Title		7/29/59
			850	Opinion		7/29/59
		unnumbered		Interlocutory order Order denying petition to file a belated appeal from, or to set aside or modify a judgment of the Indian Claims Commission		7/29/59 11/1/72
Piute, see 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 for land	
		293	Opinion	7/26/63		
			Interlocutory order	7/26/63		
	20	272	Opinion — Value & consideration	2/4/69		
		281	Additional findings	2/4/69		
			Secondary interlocutory order	2/4/69		
	26	203	Opinion — Offsets	9/8/71		
		209	Additional findings	9/8/71		
		217	Final award	9/8/71		
	27	10	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 for land	
			Order dismissing Count II of the petition	6/19/58		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
	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	
			Additional findings	12/30/70	
		349	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	Dismissed
		6	Final order dismissing petition	4/14/64	
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, Hannahville, <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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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	414	Findings — Title	6/30/58	\$2,296,870.70 to Potawatomi plaintiffs in Dkts. 146, 15-M, & 29-K, for land. <i>See</i> disposition of Dkt. 40-K under Ottawa, Dkt. 40-K	
		442	Opinion	6/30/58		
		14	329	Interlocutory order		6/30/58
			341	Opinion accompanying order denying plaintiffs' motion in Dkt. 29-K, & for other purposes		12/2/64
				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		12/2/64
				Order denying motion by Dkt. 29-K plaintiffs to amend findings dated 6/30/58		12/2/64
				Order dismissing the petition in Dkt. 29-K, & for other purposes		12/2/64
		14	518	Additional findings — Value & consideration (Dkts. 146, 15-M, & 40-K)		12/23/64
			549	Opinion		12/23/64
				Second interlocutory order [and interlocutory award to plaintiffs in Dkts. 146 & 15-M]		12/23/64
			Second interlocutory order [and interlocutory award to plaintiffs in Dkt. 40-K]	12/23/64		
	180 C.C.	477	Commission's decisions of 6/30/58 & 12/2/64 reversed (as to the Potawatomi cases) & remanded	6/9/67		
	34	1	Final award (Dkts. 146, 15-M, & 29-K)	4/19/74		
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	400	Opinion — Title	12/26/73	Dkts. 13-K, 18-P, & 40-I dismissed	
		413	Findings on title	12/26/73		
		428	Final order dismissing claims in Dkts. 13-K, 18-P, & 40-I, & for other purposes	12/26/73		
		unnumbered		Order in Dkts. 216, 15-L, & 29-I approving & adopting the parties' stipulation in respect to value of Royce Area 78		8/6/75
		42	524	Interlocutory order [and interlocutory award] in Dkts. 216, 15-L, & 29-I		8/30/78

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	Tri.
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 217;	11	641	Findings — Title, value & consideration	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
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-K;		693	Opinion	11/29/62		Ha
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29-J; Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-L;	15	232	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		Pot
Chippewa, Red Lake Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 18-I; Ottawa, Dkt. 40-J,	15	234	Order amending Commission's findings, opinion, & interlocutory order of 11/29/62	4/15/65		Ba
<i>see also</i> Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; & under consolidated		237	Supplemental findings on offsets	4/15/65		Pot
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P	179 C.C.	473	Opinion	4/15/65		anc
opinions & order dated 10/14/64 relating to Dkt. 29-J		477	Final award in Dkts. 217, 15-K, & 29-J	4/15/65		Pot
	180 C.C.	477	Commission's determinations of 11/29/62 & 4/15/65 on the Potawatomi claims affirmed in part, reversed in part, & remanded	4/14/67		13-
	389 U.S.	1046	Commission's determinations of 11/29/62 & 4/15/65 on the Potawatomi claims reversed & remanded	6/9/67		Pot
	390 U.S.	957	Certiorari denied [Dkt. 217 plaintiffs as to 179 C.C. 473]	1/15/68		Ha
	30	144	Certiorari denied [Dkt. 29-J plaintiffs as to 179 C.C. 473]	3/4/68		Dk
		171	Opinion	4/25/73		<i>see</i>
		172	Concurring opinion	4/25/73		1
		203	Supplemental findings	4/25/73		I
		204	Order vacating & amending findings	4/25/73		I
			Final award	4/25/73		e
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						r
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	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition	5/11/59	Dismissed <i>see</i> prior partial dismissal at 5 Ind. Cl. Comm. 180, 198	2
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 308, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-F; and Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity						3
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 309, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 128						f
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 310, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 128						c
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						u
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 312	17	536	Order dismissing petition with prejudice	12/22/66	Dismissed	S
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
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 28	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	1/25/49	Partially dismissed. Transferred to Court of Claims.	Dk
<i>see</i> orders in the group of Hannahville Dkts. immediately below	115 C.C.	823	Appeal dismissed on appellant's motion	1/3/50		Pot
	unnumbered		Order directing plaintiffs to file their exceptions to defendant's accounting reports	9/1/76		10/
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	5/8/78		str
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
	unnumbered		Order denying plaintiffs' motion for rehearing & reconsideration	12/1/64		et
	173 C.C.	1186	Appeal dismissed	11/19/65		29-

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 29	unnumbered		Order directing separation of all causes of action in plaintiffs' petition & the refileing 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	204 219	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	10/14/64 10/14/64	<i>See</i> final award in Dkt. 29-D under Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-E.
	180 C.C.	477	Reversed & remanded	10/14/64 4/9/67	<i>See</i> final award in Dkt. 29-E under Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 59
	38	456	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	7/15/76	
		467	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	7/15/76	
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	172	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	10/14/64 10/14/64	Special grouping to consider plaintiffs' motion. <i>See</i> Dkts. 29-L, M, O, & P, below.
		189	Dissenting opinion	10/14/64	
	173 C.C.	1186	Order denying admission of additional evidence in Dkts. 29-I, 29-J, & 29-K Appeal dismissed	10/14/64 11/19/65	
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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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; & Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-A, B, C, D, E, G, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, & P	27	187	Opinion	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
		252	Findings	3/28/72	
		325	Order denying defendant's motion to dismiss petitions in Dkts. 29-D & 29-E, reinstating petition in Dkt. 29-K, granting petition of the Potawatomi Indians of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., to intervene as plaintiffs in Dkts. 29-D, 29-E, 29-J, & 29-K, & for other purposes	3/28/72	
		328	Dissenting opinion	3/28/72	
	29	419	Order denying motion by Citizen & Prairie Bands for rehearing & amendment of findings, & for other purposes, two Commissioners dissenting	1/24/73	
	205 C.C.	765	Affirmed	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	Findings on the merits	6/5/52	Dismissed
		219	Opinion	6/5/52	
	125 C.C.	60	Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing petition	6/5/52	
			Affirmed	4/7/53	
Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-B; & Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 111	3	10	Statement & findings	4/23/54	For land: \$126,306.24 to the Prairie Band, Dkt. 15-B; & \$233,154.36 to the Citizen Band, Dkt. 111
		40	Opinion	4/23/54	
	3	540	Interlocutory order	4/23/54	
		547	Additional findings - Offsets	8/8/55	
			Opinion	8/8/55	
			Conclusions of law & final award	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	Opinion - Title	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. Dkt. 18-H dismissed.
		469	Findings	9/20/72	
		496	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]		
		498	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part	9/20/72	
	33	394	Opinion on denying plaintiffs' motion regarding pretrial determination of basis for valuation of "Exchange Land"	9/20/72	
		407	Order denying plaintiffs' motion	3/20/74	
		128	Opinion - Value & consideration	3/20/74	
		231	Findings	5/26/76	
		341	Interlocutory order	5/26/76	
		389	Final award	5/26/76	
<i>see also</i> Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity	215 C.C.	1	Affirmed	6/23/76	
				10/10/77	

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
Pottawatomi, 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, Pankishaw, 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	Opinion - Title	4/4/73	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 Pottawatomi, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-P.	
		82	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part	4/4/73		
		85	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part	4/4/73		
		86	Findings	4/4/73		
		124	Order [including, <i>inter alia</i> , an order dismissing from this proceeding the claims in Dkts. 99, 124-H, & 254]	4/4/73		
		31	330	Opinion on granting defendant's motion to file out of time, & denying defendant's motion for rehearing		8/29/73
			346	Order granting defendant's motion to file out of time & denying defendant's motion for rehearing		8/29/73
		32	232	Opinion on denying defendant's motion to continue consolidation or to reconsolidate		11/21/73
			239	Order denying defendant's motion to continue consolidation or to reconsolidate		11/21/73
		205 C.C.	765	Affirmed [30 Ind. Cl. Comm. 42, & 27 Ind. Cl. Comm. 187, on Potawatomi political structure]		12/18/74
Pottawatomi, 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	Opinion - Value & consideration	8/25/78		
		434	Findings on value & consideration	8/25/78		
		521	Order setting awards subject to offsets	8/25/78		
Pottawatomi, 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>						
Pottawatomi, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 15-F & 15-G, <i>see</i> opinion and order of 7/15/76 under Potawatomi, Hannahville, <i>et al.</i> , Dkts. 29-D & 29-E	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition in Dkt. 15-F	11/3/59	Dkts. 15-F & 15-G dismissed	
	unnumbered		Order dismissing petition in Dkt. 15-G	11/3/59		
Pottawatomi, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-H, <i>see</i> order dismissing this case and related findings and opinion under Miami, Oklahoma, Dkt. 253						
Pottawatomi, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-I, <i>see</i> Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity; and Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-F						
Pottawatomi, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-J; Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 71-A	4	409	Findings on general issues	9/19/56	\$3,288,974.90 in Dkts. 15-J & 71-A for land	
		460	Opinion on general issues	9/19/56		
			Interlocutory order [and award subject to offsets]	9/19/56		
		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		9/19/56
				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		2/26/59
			Conclusions of law & final award	2/26/59		
Pottawatomi, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-K, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 217						
Pottawatomi, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-L, <i>see</i> Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 216						

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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;	41	399	Opinion - Value & consideration	6/8/78	\$1,809,552.57 in Dkts. 15-P, 29-N & 306 for land
		445	Findings	6/8/78	
Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 306; Potawatomi of Indiana and Michigan, Inc., intervenors in Dkts. 15-P, 29-N, & 306	42	508	Interlocutory order	6/8/78	
		205	Final award	7/14/78	
<i>See</i> prior decision in Dkts. 15-P, 29-N, & 306 on land title issues under Pottawatomie, Prairie Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 15-D. <i>See also</i> Potawatomi Indians, political structure or entity.					
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	Findings - Laguna (Dkt. 227) & Navajo (Dkt. 229) overlaps	2/28/67	\$6,107,157.00 for land
		666	Opinion	2/28/67	
			Interlocutory order	2/28/67	
	18	154	Findings - Title, Laguna & Navajo overlaps included	3/31/67	
		202	Opinion	3/31/67	
	19	152	Interlocutory order	3/31/67	
	23	219	Order amending findings of fact & opinion	5/2/68	
	235	235	Additional findings - Compromise settlement Final judgment	6/17/70 6/17/70	
Pueblo de Cochiti, Dkt. 136	7	422	Findings on the merits	3/27/59	Dismissed
		437	Opinion	3/27/59	
			Final order dismissing petition	3/27/59	
Pueblo de Isleta, Dkt. 211	7	619	Findings on the merits	6/5/59	Dismissed
		642	Opinion	6/5/59	
			Final order dismissing petition	6/5/59	
	152 C.C. 368 U.S.	866 822	Affirmed Certiorari denied	3/10/61 10/9/61	
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	Findings on title, including Acoma (Dkt. 266) & Navajo (Dkt. 229) overlaps	2/28/67	\$900,000.00 for land
		666	Opinion	2/28/67	
			Interlocutory order	2/28/67	
	18	366	Order amending opinion	4/20/67	
	18	380	Order amending opinion	5/4/67	
	19	154	Order amending findings & opinion	5/7/68	
	24	197	Findings - Compromise settlement	12/11/70	
		207	Final award	12/11/70	
Pueblo of Nambe, Dkt. 358	16	393	Findings - Title	11/9/65	Transferred to Court of Claims
		408	Opinion	11/9/65	
			Interlocutory order	11/9/65	
	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	
	39	34	Opinion on motion for rehearing	9/16/76	
		41	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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
Pueblo de Pecos, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 174	4	130	Per curiam opinion	12/13/55	Dismissed
			Order sustaining claimant's motion to amend P. overruling defendant's motion to dismiss	12/13/55	
	8	195	Findings	12/11/59	
		209	Opinion	12/11/59	
			Final order dismissing petition	12/11/59	
	152 C.C.	865	Affirmed	3/10/61	
	368 U.S.	821	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	
		282	Interlocutory order	5/9/73	
	206 C.C.	649	Affirmed	4/16/75	
	39	34	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for rehearing on order of 2/10/71 denying summary judgment	9/16/76	
		38	Order denying motion for rehearing	9/16/76	
	41	304	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	
		286	Interlocutory order	5/9/73	
	206 C.C.	649	Affirmed	4/16/75	
	39	34	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for rehearing on order of 2/10/71 denying summary judgment	9/16/76	
		40	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	
		284	Interlocutory order	5/9/73	
	206 C.C.	649	Affirmed	4/16/75	
	39	34	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for rehearing on order of 2/10/71 denying summary judgment	9/16/76	
		39	Order denying motion for rehearing	9/16/76	
	39	241	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for summary judgment for Fifth Amendment taking of certain land	12/22/76	
		251	Order denying motion for summary judgment	12/22/76	
	40	101	Opinion on motion for rehearing	4/18/77	
		105	Order denying rehearing & calling conference	4/18/77	
	42	306	Opinion on question of eastern boundary	8/17/78	
	319	Additional findings	8/17/78		
	345	Interlocutory order	8/17/78		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition		
Pueblo of Taos, Dkt. 357	15	666	Findings - Title & related issues	9/8/65	Transferred to Court of Claims		
		688	Opinion	9/8/65			
	21	342	Interlocutory order & interlocutory award on claim relating to land in town of Taos	9/8/65			
			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, in principal & interest for 926 acres of land in town of Taos, N.M.
		24	413	Order denying motion for summary judgment		2/10/71	
414			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			
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			
207 C.C.		119	Findings	2/4/74			
		127	Interlocutory order [& interlocutory award]	2/4/74			
37		53	Affirmed	5/14/75			
		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	Findings - Title	9/11/62	\$749,083.75 for land		
		147	Opinion	9/11/62			
	165 C.C.	501	Final order dismissing petition	9/11/62			
		509	Reversed & remanded	4/17/64			
	19	56	Amendment of remand directive	1/22/65			
		67	Additional findings - Dates of taking	3/7/68			
	19	94	Opinion	3/7/68			
			Interlocutory order	3/7/68			
	21	316	Order correcting opinion of 3/7/68	3/26/68			
			Opinion on defendant's motion for a pretrial determination of the basis for the appraisal of gratuitous offsets of real property	7/23/69			
	unnumbered	321	Order determining basis for the appraisal of gratuitous offsets of real property	7/23/69			
			Report of Commissioner	9/3/69			
	24	270	Opinion - Value	12/17/70			
		284	Additional findings	12/17/70			
	26	300	Interlocutory order	12/17/70			
		218	Opinion - Offsets	9/15/71			
	200 C.C.	243	Additional findings	9/15/71			
		264	Final award	9/15/71			
	C.C.	601	Affirmed in part, reversed in part, & remanded	2/16/73			
		1	Order amending amount of offset	4/27/73			
33	16	Findings - Compromise settlement	1/10/74				
	16	Order amending opinion & findings, & amended final award	1/10/74				
Puyallup, Dkt. 203	17	1	Findings - Title	4/25/66	Transferred to Court of Claims		
		16	Opinion	4/25/66			
	41	304	Interlocutory order	4/25/66			
			Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	5/8/78			

T
P
Q

Q
R
D

Q
R
D

Q

Q

Q

R
R
R
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>	
Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of the Pyramid Lake Reservation, <i>see</i> Paiute, Pyramid Lake Tribe, Dkt. 87-B						
Quapaw, Dkt. 14	1	469	Findings	3/15/51	\$927,668.04 for land in 2d cause; remaining 1st cause dismissed	
		474	Opinion	3/15/51		
	1	644	Interlocutory order [& award on 2d cause]	3/15/51		
		652	Additional findings - Offsets	12/6/51		
	128 C.C. unnumbered	45	Opinion Conclusions of law & final award Reversed in part & remanded Amended final award [on cause 2, cause 1 dismissed]	12/6/51 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	86	Opinion	1/20/58	\$520,000.00 for land	
		93	Opinion	1/20/58		
	6	666	Opinion	10/6/58		
			Order dividing California into Areas A & B	10/6/58		
	8	111-A	Findings - Title	9/30/59		
		138	Opinion	9/30/59		
	158 C.C.	13	714	Interlocutory order	9/30/59	
			89	Appeal & cross appeal withdrawn Opinion on issue remanded by Court of Claims Order determining issue remanded by Court of Claims	3/23/62 3/3/64	
	15		489	Additional findings - Compromise settlement	3/3/64	
			512	Opinion Final judgment	8/5/65 8/5/65	
Quechan of Fort Yuma Reservation, California, Dkt. 320	26	15	Opinion on plaintiff's motion to reopen record & to vacate order staying further proceedings	7/21/71	Transferred to Court of Claims	
		20	Order granting plaintiff's motion to vacate order staying further proceedings & conditionally denying plaintiff's motion to reopen the record			
	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	Findings - Title	12/1/58	\$112,152.60 for land	
		49	Opinion	12/1/58		
	unnumbered		Interlocutory order	12/1/58		
			Order amending findings of fact & interlocutory order of 12/1/58	7/2/59		
	158 C.C.	10	701	Appeal dismissed		7/6/62
			427	Findings - Compromise settlement		7/9/62
	unnumbered		438	Opinion		7/9/62
			Final determination or judgment Amended final determination or judgment	7/9/62 4/17/63		
Quinaielt, Dkt. 242	7	1	Findings — Title	12/1/58	\$205,172.40 for land	
		17	Opinion	12/1/58		
	unnumbered		Interlocutory order	12/1/58		
			Order amending findings of fact & interlocutory order of 12/1/58	6/29/59		
	158 C.C.	10	702	Appeal dismissed		7/6/62
			411	Findings — Compromise settlement		7/9/62
	unnumbered		423	Opinion		7/9/62
			Final determination or judgment Amended final determination or judgment	7/9/62 4/17/63		
Red Lake, <i>see</i> Chippewa, Red Lake Band						
Ridaught, Horace G., <i>see</i> Choctaw, Ridaught Band, Dkt. 346						
Rincon 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, Baron Long, <i>et al.</i> , 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 for land	Sac			
		7	675 708	Order denying 3d defense Findings — Title Opinion			11/17/54 6/12/59 6/12/59		
	161 C.C. 375 U.S.	189	189	Interlocutory order	6/12/59		Sac		
		921	921	Affirmed	4/5/63				
	18	548	548	Certiorari denied	11/18/63				
		19	159	Order granting defendant's motion to amend answer	9/7/67				
	25	414	414	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				
		423	423	Opinion on boundary & acreage issues	6/16/71				
	32	429	429	Additional findings	6/16/71		Sac		
		320	320	Interlocutory order	6/16/71				
	206 C.C.	348	348	Opinion — Value	12/26/73		Sac		
		398	398	Additional findings	12/26/73				
	206 C.C.	898	898	Final award	12/26/73		Sac (co)		
		898	898	Affirmed	4/25/75				
	Sac and Fox, Dkt. 95	26	513	Rehearing denied	6/27/75	\$20,421.78 for accounting de- ficiencies. In compliance with the remand directive of the Court of Claims, the Commis- sion's final award also ordered that the Sac and Fox (of Miss. in Iowa) recover as a separate award a balance stand- ing to its credit in a Treasury trust account, but no new funds were appropriated to pay this separate award.	Sag Sal San San San Dkt		
520			Opinion -- Accounting liability	12/27/71					
202 C.C.		1088	1088	Findings Interlocutory order & award of \$20,421.78, less any allowable gratuitous offsets	12/27/71				
		1090	1090	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				
34		189	189	Rehearing denied	10/17/73				
		196	196	Opinion on remand	6/19/74				
35		200	200	Dissenting opinion	6/19/74				
		12	12	Interlocutory order	6/19/74				
				Final award, one Commissioner dissenting	9/25/74				
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				
	159 C.C.		247	Final order dismissing petition	5/8/61				
			Affirmed	11/7/62		San			
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 138, <i>see</i> Iowa, Omaha, Sac and Fox, Dkt. 138 (consolidated with Otoe and Missouriia, Dkt. 11-A)									
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 143	15	381	Findings - Value & consideration	5/19/65	\$1,789,201.45 for land	San et a Indi			
		409	Opinion	5/19/65					
				Final order [and judgment]			5/19/65		
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 153, <i>see</i> Iowa, Sac and Fox, Dkt. 153									
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 158, <i>see</i> Iowa, Sac and Fox, Dkts. 158, 209, & 231									
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 195	13	295	Findings - Value & consideration	5/1/64	\$192,000.00 for land to Missouri Sac and Fox	San San			
		313	Opinion	5/1/64					
		15	120	Interlocutory order & award			5/1/64		
			Final judgment	3/10/65		San Mis			
Sac and Fox, Dkt. 209, <i>see</i> dismissal of this claim under Iowa, Sac and Fox, Dkts. 158, 209, & 231									
						Sau			

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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 Missouri, 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	3/11/58 3/11/58	\$5,754.96 for land
	13	583 591	Interlocutory order Findings on allocation of consideration under Point Elliott Treaty Opinion Order relating to allocation of Point Elliott Treaty consideration	3/11/58 8/13/64 8/13/64	
	26	61 67 75	Opinion — Value Findings Interlocutory order	8/13/64 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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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	4/22/52 4/22/52	Dismissed
	125 C.C.	375	Conclusions of law & final order dismissing petition 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— <i>see</i> disposition of these cases below
	137 C.C.	161	Appeal dismissed	4/8/55 12/5/56	
	355 U.S.	843	Certiorari denied	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 Affirmed	5/8/64 6/9/67	
	19	179 187	Additional findings - Boundaries Opinion	6/28/68 6/28/68	
	unnumbered		Second interlocutory order 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>	8/13/68	
			Interlocutory order & order denying Miccosukee motion to intervene	9/17/68	
	23	108 115 134	Opinion - Value Additional findings Order [and interlocutory award]	9/17/68 5/13/70 5/13/70 5/13/70	
	24	1 14 17 20	Opinion - Offsets Dissenting opinion Additional findings Final award	10/22/70 10/22/70 10/22/70 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	

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition		
Seminole Indians of Florida, Dkt. 73-A, <i>see</i> prior decisions 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	22	448 450	Opinion on defendant's motion to strike Order directing that documents be filed by plaintiff	2/18/70	\$50,000.00 for difference in value of some 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		
	25	25 39 53	Opinion on title & related issues Findings 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	2/18/70 3/24/71 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 Rehearing denied		1/18/73 4/27/73	
		33	70	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	107 125	Additional findings on compromise settlement Final award		4/20/77 4/20/77	
		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		1/16/74	
		206 C.C. 206 C.C.	876 876	Affirmed Rehearing denied		3/14/75 4/25/75	
	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		1/16/74	Dismissed
	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		2/27/58	Dismissed
	Seminole Nation, Oklahoma, Dkt. 150	4	66 77 87	Findings Opinion Dissenting opinion		12/5/55 12/5/55 12/5/55	\$34,053.66 for the value of 320 acres of land in excess of the amount for which the Government sold these acres for the Indians
6		336 345	Interlocutory order [& award] Additional findings - Offsets Opinion	12/5/55 6/4/58 6/4/58			
		146 C.C.	171	Conclusions of law & final award Affirmed	6/4/58 6/3/59		
		10	450 461	Findings Opinion Final order dismissing this suit	8/22/62 8/22/62 8/22/62		
		17	67 76	Findings - Liability Opinion Interlocutory order	6/24/66 6/24/66 6/24/66		
Seminole Nation, Oklahoma, Dkt. 204	26	7	Order denying motion to dismiss the claim, one Commissioner dissenting	7/7/71	Dismissed		
	28	117 130	Opinion by two Commissioners Opinion by one Commissioner concurring in the result	5/31/72 5/31/72			
				5/31/72			

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition		
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			
	171 C.C.	477	Final order dismissing petition Affirmed	11/7/63 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			
	Seminole Nation, Oklahoma, Dkt. 248	14	484	Findings		12/23/64	\$63,680.00 additional compensation for oil & gas lease covering 320 acres of land
		505	Opinion	12/23/64			
			Final award	12/23/64			
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	
		26	625	Opinion - Liability	12/29/71	\$43,215.58 in principal & interest recovered on accounting claims in Dkts. 341-A & B	
			635	Findings	12/29/71		
				Interlocutory order	12/29/71		
29		262	Opinion - Accounting claims	12/7/72			
	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				
	170	Findings on final award	6/11/75				
	180	Final award	6/11/75				
Seneca-Cayuga of Oklahoma, Dkt. 341-C, see Chippewa, Saginaw, Dkt. 13-E					Dismissed		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
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	755 780	Findings - Liability Opinion	10/24/63 10/24/63	\$5,466,615.04 in Dkts. 342-A & 368-A for land
	173 C.C.	917	Final order dismissing petitions Affirmed in part, reversed in part & remanded	10/24/63 12/17/65	
	28	12 42	Opinion - Value & consideration Findings	5/3/72 5/3/72	
		90	Order vacating finding of fact [entered on 10/24/63], & interlocutory order	5/3/72	
	28	233	Order denying motion for rehearing	7/6/72	
	29	169	Final award	11/22/72	
	18	412	Order sustaining defendant's motion to dismiss for lack of prosecution, & dismissing the petitions in Dkts. 342-B, 342-C, 342-D, & 368	5/11/67	
	18	424	Order setting aside order of 5/11/67 dismissing petitions & allowing plaintiffs to file proposed findings of fact & brief	6/19/67	
	20	177	Opinion in Dkts. 342-B, C, & D, & Dkt. 368 on title & related issues	12/30/68	
		186	Findings in same dkts. Interlocutory order in Dkts. 342-B & D, & 368, & order dismissing the petition in Dkt. 342-D	12/30/68 12/30/68	
Seneca Nation, Dkts. 342-B, C, D, E, F, & I; and Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians, Dkt. 368	28	12	Opinion on value & consideration issues in, among others, the dkts. on the left, except 342-D	12/30/68	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
		42	Findings in same dkts.	5/3/72	
		92	Interlocutory order [and award] in Dkts. 342-B, C, & 368	5/3/72	
		94	Final order dismissing claim in Dkt. 342-E	5/3/72	
		95	Interlocutory order [and award] in Dkt. 342-F	5/3/72	
	28	96	Order denying motion to dismiss petition in Dkt. 342-I	5/3/72	
		97	Interlocutory order [and award] in Dkt. 342-I	5/3/72	
	33	390	Final award in Dkts. 342-B, C, & 368	3/13/74	
		392	Final award in Dkt. 342-F	3/13/74	
		393	Final award in Dkt. 342-I	3/13/74	
Seneca Nation, Dkt. 342-G	39	355	Findings on compromise settlement	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
		369	Final award	2/3/77	
Seneca Nation, Dkt. 342-H	12	552 563	Findings - Liability Opinion	8/30/63 8/30/63	Dismissed
		173 C.C.	Final order dismissing petition Affirmed	8/30/63 12/17/65	
		912			

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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	Findings on compromise settlement	6/3/77	\$1,745,146.86 in settlement of Shawnee Dkts. 64 & 335, & Shawnee portion of Dkt. 338—for land	
		173	Final award	6/3/77		
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	Findings	6/19/58	\$1,269,338.02 for land	
		395	Opinion	6/19/58		
			Interlocutory order [and award]	6/19/58		
			Final judgment	7/27/59		
			Modified & affirmed	11/2/60		
	151 C.C.	700	Certiorari denied	5/15/61		
	366 U.S.	924	Amended final judgment	5/29/61		
	unnumbered					
Shawnee, Absentee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 334-A	12	161	Findings	3/22/63	Dismissed	
		174	Opinion	3/22/63		
			Final order dismissing petition	3/22/63		
			Affirmed (Appeal No. 6-63)	4/17/64		
	165 C.C.	510				
Shawnee, Absentee of Oklahoma, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 334-B	12	180	Findings	3/29/63	\$300,000.00 for land	
		191	Opinion	3/29/63		
			Final order dismissing petition	3/29/63		
			Affirmed in part, reversed in part & remanded (Appeal No. 7-63)	4/17/64		
		165 C.C.	510			
		2	18	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for determination of certain issues		11/13/69
			25	Additional findings		11/13/69
			27	First interlocutory order		11/13/69
		25	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	1/2/51	\$433,013.60 for land	
			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]			
	3	313	Findings	1/2/51		
		333	Opinion	8/20/54		
			Interlocutory order [and award]	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	\$120,000.00 for gold removed from reservation land	
		393	Dissenting opinion	11/8/54		
			Order on defendant's motion for summary judgment, etc.	11/8/54		
		14	729	Findings on compromise settlement		2/24/65
			744	Opinion		2/24/65
			Final judgment	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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
Shoshone of Wind River Reservation, Wyoming, Dkt. 326, & Shoshone Nation or Tribe, Dkt. 367 (cont.)		417	Opinion	10/16/62	decisions in these dockets & the disposition of Dkt. 367 below.
	unnumbered		Interlocutory order	10/16/62	
			Order closing Dkt. 326 [all claims having been severed out of Dkt. 326 & assigned Dkts. 326-A through K]	7/3/68	
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; see findings, opinion, & interlocutory order of 10/16/62 under Dkts. 326 & 367, above	19	3	Findings on compromise settlement	2/13/68	\$15,700,000.00 for settlement of an accounting claim in Dkt. 326-D & land claims in the remaining consolidated dockets
		34	Opinion	2/13/68	
Shoshone, Western (Temoak Bands suing on behalf of), Dkt. 326-A; Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho, Dkt. 326-C	23	70	Opinion in Dkt. 326-A on plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment in respect to certain accounting exceptions	4/29/70	Dkts. 326-A & 326-C were transferred to the Court of Claims
		86	Order in Dkt. 326-A	4/29/70	
	31	427	Opinion in Dkts. 326-A & 22-G (Mescalero Apache) regarding, <i>inter alia</i> , obligation to make Indian trust funds productive	10/4/73	
		545	Concurring opinion	10/4/73	
		551	Dissenting opinion	10/4/73	
		557	Order in Dkt. 326-A	10/4/73	
		559	Order in Dkt. 22-G	10/4/73	
	unnumbered		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		
	33	417	Opinion in Dkt. 326-A on plaintiff's motion for rehearing	1/16/74	
		435	Order in Dkt. 326-A denying motion for rehearing	4/4/74	
	207 C.C.	369	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	
	207 C.C.	369	Rehearing denied	7/11/75	
	425 U.S.	911	Certiorari denied	10/3/75	
	39	239	Order certifying & transferring Dkt. 326-C to Court of Claims	4/5/76	
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring Dkt. 326-A to Court of Claims	12/15/76	
Shoshone, Goshute, Dkt. 326-B	33	130	Opinion	5/8/76	Settled with Dkt. 326-J, see below
		141	Order partially granting plaintiff's motion for supplemental accounting & denying defendant's motion to dismiss	2/14/74	
	unnumbered		Order suspending further action pending completion of settlement negotiations	5/7/75	
Shoshone, Goshute, Dkt. 326-J, see 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	unnumbered		Report to the Commissioner	10/13/69	Settled with Dkt. 326-B, see below
	31	225	Opinion on date of extinguishment of aboriginal title & value	8/9/73	
		252	Concurring opinion	8/9/73	
		256	Findings	8/9/73	
		307	Interlocutory order	8/9/73	
	32	230	Order denying defendant's motion for rehearing	11/14/73	
	206 C.C.	401	Affirmed	3/19/75	

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
Shoshone, Goshute, Dkts. 326-B & 326-J	37	41	Findings on compromise settlement	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 removed therefrom prior to extinguishment of claimant's aboriginal title	
		58	Final award	11/5/75		
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	482	Per curiam opinion on compromise settlement	3/8/71	\$4,500,000.00 for land	
		485	Findings	3/8/71		
		498	Final award	3/8/71		
		80	Order dismissing "Petition in Intervention"	8/5/71		
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	5	Opinion - Valuation issues	10/11/72	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 therefrom before July 1, 1872	
		60	Additional findings on value	10/11/72		
		124	Interlocutory order	10/11/72		
		472	Order denying defendant's motion for rehearing	2/21/73		
	35	457	Opinion on petition by Western Shoshone Legal Defense & Education Association, an unincorporated group, & Frank Temoke, for a stay of the proceedings & for leave to present an amended claim	2/20/75		
		478	Order denying petition to stay proceedings & present an amended claim & for other purposes	2/20/75		
	209 C.C.	43	Affirmed	2/18/76		
			Rehearing denied	4/23/76		
	429 U.S.	885	Certiorari denied	10/12/76		
			Order denying motions to stay proceedings & for other purposes	8/15/77		
	40	311	Opinion	8/15/77		
			Order granting leave to file & denying defendant's second motion for rehearing	8/15/77		
	40	318	Opinion - Offsets	8/15/77		
		388	Additional findings	8/15/77		
453		Final award	8/15/77			
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	646	Findings	4/5/54	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	
		671	Opinion	4/5/54		
			Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing petition	4/5/54		
		146 F. Sup.	229	Affirmed		11/7/56
		182 C.C.	912	Opinion of 11/7/56 vacated & case remanded to the Commission (as indicated in the Court's summary of proceedings, published in 1968)		11/5/58
		15	577	Findings in Dkts. 74, 350-B & C, 322-A & 221-A		8/27/65
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 Dacotah Nation"	8/27/65			

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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		
			Order admitting additional evidence	7/3/68		
		unnumbered	Order in Dkts. 74 & 74-B setting questions for determination	10/29/68		
		21	371	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion to modify Fort Laramie boundary determination of 8/27/65	9/10/69	
			381	Order amending findings & interlocutory order	9/10/69	
		22	344	Opinion in Dkt. 332-C on motion by plaintiffs in Dkt. 74 to intervene	12/17/69	
			354	Interlocutory order granting in part & denying in part the motion to intervene	12/17/69	
		23	358	Opinion on scope & meaning of articles 11 & 16 of the Treaty of April 29, 1868	7/8/70	
				Interlocutory order	7/8/70	
		23	369	Opinion (in Dkts. 74, 221-A, 350-B & C) - Teton & Yanktonai Sioux aboriginal title area	8/26/70	
			419	Findings	8/26/70	
			428	Interlocutory order	8/26/70	
		24	98	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 74-B on plaintiffs' motions for, <i>inter alia</i> , modification of order of 7/8/70	11/30/70	
			105	Order amending interlocutory order & denying other motions	11/30/70	
		24	147	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C on respective interests of the Teton & Yankton Sioux divisions in Fort Laramie treaty land	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 in Dkt. 332-C 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 plaintiffs 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	1/6/71	
			373	Order denying motions for rehearing & modification of order	1/6/71	
		25	179	Opinion in Dkts. 74, 350-B & C, <i>et al.</i> , - Fort Berthold overlap	3/30/71	
			191	Findings	3/30/71	
			212	Final order dismissing claim in Dkt. 350-B, & interlocutory order in Dkt. 350-C	3/30/71	
		27	49	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C on motion for rehearing	3/1/72	
			58	Order denying motion for rehearing	3/1/72	
		27	79	Opinion on plaintiffs' motion for leave to amend petition	3/8/72	
			87	Order granting leave to amend petition	3/8/72	
		28	204	Opinion in Dkts. 74 & 332-C	6/23/72	
			215	Order denying Dkts. 332-C plaintiffs' motion to strike notices of appeal	6/23/72	
			217	Order denying defendant's motion to dismiss Dkt. 74	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		
	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		
	38	469	Opinion - Value	7/15/76		
		487	Additional findings	7/15/76		
		532	Interlocutory order & award	7/15/76		
	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		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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		Order striking the petition	1/30/62	Disposed of by striking
		unnumbered		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	5/20/76		
		unnumbered	Order holding defendant's motion for final judgment in abeyance	11/10/76		
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		
			Interlocutory order	4/26/56		
	9	538	Additional findings - Offsets	10/27/61		
		544	Opinion	10/27/61		
			Final order finding a balance in defendant's favor of \$85,656.83 & plaintiffs 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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
Sioux of Santee Reservation, Nebraska, Dkt. 104	2	237	Per curiam opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment dismissing the petition	10/17/52	Dismissed
			Order sustaining motion for summary judgment & dismissing plaintiffs' petition	10/17/52	
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	8/29/63	\$1,300,000.00 for settlement of accounting claim
			Order in same dkts. 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	
			Findings on compromise settlement	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	21	52 66	Final judgment	6/18/69	Transferred to Court of Claims
			26	92 98	
	Order in same dkts. granting in part plaintiffs' motions to file amended exceptions, & denying plaintiffs' motions to file amendments to their accounting petitions	8/6/71			
	35	194 206	Opinion	11/22/74	
			Concurring opinion	11/22/74	
	37	207 114	Interlocutory order	11/22/74	
			Order vacating determination [at 35 Ind. Cl. Comm. 194] of Commission concerning expenditure of tribal funds for educational purposes	12/11/75	
	37	127	Order for supplemental accounting	12/11/75	
			41	304	
	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			
Order			8/6/71		
35	175 191	Opinion	11/22/74		
		Concurring opinion	11/22/74		
37	192 116	Interlocutory order	11/22/74		
		Order vacating determination of Commission [at 35 Ind. Cl. Comm. 175] concerning expenditure of tribal funds for educational purposes	12/11/75		
41	304	Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	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
35	152 172	Opinion			11/22/74
		37	173 118	Concurring opinion	11/22/74
Interlocutory order	11/22/74				
37	128	Order vacating determination of Commission [at 35 Ind. Cl. Comm. 152] concerning expenditure of tribal funds for educational purposes	12/11/75		
		Order for supplemental accounting	12/11/75		
37	624	Order denying plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on exception No. 14	3/25/76		
		39	79	Order granting plaintiff's motion to file amended exception 14	9/23/76
41	304			Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	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				
35	123 149	Opinion	11/22/74		
		Concurring opinion	11/22/74		
37	150 120	Interlocutory order	11/22/74		
		Order vacating determination of Commission [at 35 Ind. Cl. Comm. 123] concerning expenditure of tribal funds for educational purposes	12/11/75		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
Sioux Tribe of Rosebud Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 118,	37	625	Order denying plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on exception No. 14	3/25/76	
<i>see</i> opinion & order of 8/29/63 under Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 114, above (cont.)	39	80	Order granting plaintiff's motion to file amended exception 14	9/23/76	
	41	304	Order certifying & transferring case to Court of Claims	5/8/78	
Sioux Tribe of Standing Rock Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 119,	26	92	Opinion	8/6/71	Transferred to Court of Claims
<i>see</i> opinion & order of 8/29/63 under Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. D., Dkt. 114, above	34	98	Order	8/6/71	
		230	Opinion	7/11/74	
		252	Concurring opinion	7/11/74	
	37	253	Interlocutory order	7/11/74	
		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" in Dkt. 363, concluded by final judgments in settlement of claims for additional compensation for land, as follows: <i>Dkt. 142</i> , to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Tribes of Sioux Indians \$5,097,575.00; <i>Dkt. 359</i> , to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Tribes of Sioux Indians \$776,464.50; to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians \$776,464.50; <i>Dkt. 360</i> , to the Medawakanton Tribe of Sioux Indians \$1,129,359.00; <i>Dkt. 361</i> , & to the Medawakanton Tribe of Sioux Indians \$64,680.00;
		178	Opinion	1/12/62	
		199	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part	1/12/62	
			Interlocutory order	1/12/62	
	163 C.C.	329	Reversed in part & remanded	12/13/63	
	163 C.C. unnumbered	329	Rehearing denied	3/13/64	
			Order amending Commission's interlocutory order of 1/12/62	6/11/64	
	15	451	Per curiam opinion in Dkt. 363 on plaintiffs' "Motion for Findings in Accordance with Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Proposed Finding 16-A"	6/21/65	
			Order denying plaintiffs' motion	6/21/65	
	unnumbered		Order in Dkt. 359 granting motion of Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands for leave to intervene in Dkt. 359 & for other purposes	6/21/65	
	16	678	Opinion in Dkts. 142 & 362 regarding plaintiffs' motion for determination of questions of law, etc.	4/22/66	
			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	
	16	688	Order in Dkt. 359 granting Sisseton and Wahpeton intervenors' motion for summary judgment of title	4/22/66	
	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	5/13/66	
	18	427	Interlocutory order approving compromise settlement & entry of final judgments subject to dismissal of appeal No. 8-66 in the Court of Claims	6/29/67	
	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	7/25/67	

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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.)		523	Opinion	7/25/67	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.	
	18	639	Final judgments in Dkts. 142, 359 through 363, except the general accounting claim in Dkt. 363	7/25/67		
			Order amending Indian Claims Commission's findings & opinion approving compromise settlement	9/8/67		
Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S.D., Dkt. 192, See Dkt. 114, of this claimant, above	2	201	Opinion on defendant's motion for summary judgment of dismissal	6/4/52	Dismissed	
			Order denying defendant's motion	6/4/52		
	5	165	Findings	3/29/57		
		173	Opinion	3/29/57		
		unnumbered	Final order dismissing petition Order denying motion for rehearing	3/29/57 8/10/59		
Sioux Tribe of Fort Peck Reservation, Montana, intervenor in Dkt. 279-A, see 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	25	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	\$1,250,000.00 for land (Yankton interest in Royce Area 151)	
		unnumbered	Order in Dkts. 138, 11-A & 332-A amending finding 2, Dkts. 11-A & 138 re Yankton Sioux boundary	11/25/59		
		10	137	Findings in Mississippi Sioux Dkts. 142, <i>et al.</i> , & Dkt. 332-A		1/12/62
			178	Opinion		1/12/62
			199	Opinion concurring in part & dissenting in part		1/12/62
				Interlocutory order in Mississippi Sioux dkts., & order dismissing Yankton Sioux claim for Royce Area 289		1/12/62
		175 C.C.	564	Affirmed order of 11/25/59, reversed order of 1/12/62		5/13/66
		19	131	Opinion on plaintiff's motion for summary judgment		4/24/68
			unnumbered	Order granting plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on issue of title as to Royce Area 151		4/24/68
		20	252	Order severing Royce Area 410 (N.D. & S.D. 1) from Dkt. 332-A & designating it Dkt. 332-C		12/10/68
		255	Opinion on compromise settlement	1/28/69		
			Findings on compromise settlement	1/28/69		
			Final judgment	1/28/69		
Sioux, Yankton, Dkt. 332-B	28	367	Findings on compromise settlement	9/8/72	\$4,750,000.00 in settlement of accounting claims through 6/30/51; remaining claims severed out & assigned Dkt. 332-D	
		385	Final award	9/8/72		
	29	143	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	11/9/72		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
Sioux, Yankton, Dkt. 332-C 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).	15	577	Findings in Dkts. 74, 350-B & C, 332-A & 221-A	8/27/65	On the date hereof appeal	
		599	Opinion on Dkt. 74 Sioux motion for determination of certain title matters	8/27/65	time was running from a final award in Dkt. 332-C of	
		22	344	Opinion on motion by Dkt. 74 plaintiffs to intervene	8/27/65	\$15,269,924.83 representing additional com- pensation for the Yankton Sioux interest in lands ceded under the Treaty of April 19, 1858, 11 Stat. 743
			354	Interlocutory order granting in part & denying in part motion to intervene	12/17/69	
		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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
Sioux, Yankton, Dkt. 332-D (cont.)	39	149	Opinion	11/12/76	
		157	Order making show cause order absolute & dismissing post-1951 accounting claim	11/12/76	
	42	158	Order striking plaintiff's motion for a call for documents	11/12/76	
		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 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
		231	Order	12/10/69	
	30	463	Opinion — Valuation & damage issues	6/30/73	
		498	Findings	6/30/73	
		533	Interlocutory order	6/30/73	
	33	51	Opinion on payments on the claim	1/16/74	
		63	Amendment to & additional findings	1/16/74	
		66	Order that the parties show cause why a final judgment may not be entered	1/16/74	
		68	Order admitting exhibits	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.
		231	Order	10/10/69	
	26	267	Opinion	9/22/71	
		270	Order granting plaintiffs' motion for leave to amend first amended petition, second claim	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 I	10/22/75	
	37	491	Opinion on motions	3/12/76	
	41	1	Findings on compromise settlement	9/8/77	
		16	Order approving compromise settlement	9/8/77	
	C.C.		Order, entered on joint motion, dismissing appeal No. 2-76 & remanding cause to the Commission	9/12/77	
41	18	Final award	9/14/77		
41	139	Additional final award	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) <i>See</i> paragraph 6 of stipulation at 41 Ind. Cl. Comm. 4 in findings of 9/8/77, under the Dkt. 363 claim immediately above.	36	295	Opinion — Accounting	8/22/75	Transferred to Court of Claims
		414	Order relating to accounting exceptions	8/22/75	
	39	239	Order certifying & transferring to the Court of Claims	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)

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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: \$29,930.25 to plaintiffs in both dcts.; & to the Seneca Nation, one of the plain- tiffs in Dkt. 84, an additional sum of \$25,399.50	
		387	Findings	8/11/70		
	32	401	Interlocutory order & award	8/11/70		
		440	Opinion on offsets	12/28/73		
		453	Additional findings	12/28/73		
		460	Final award	12/28/73		
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		
		173 C.C.	Final order dismissing this suit in its entirety	3/1/63		
Skagit, Upper, Dkt. 92	8	475	Findings — Title	3/25/60	\$385,471.42 for land	
		492	Opinion	3/25/60		
		492	Interlocutory order	3/25/60		
	13	583	Findings on allocation of consideration under Point Elliott Treaty	8/13/64		
		591	Opinion	8/13/64		
		591	Order	8/13/64		
	19	496	Final judgment [entered pursuant to stipulation for compromise settlement]	9/23/68		
		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 for land
			313	Opinion	3/20/59	
313			Interlocutory order	3/20/59		
22		28	Opinion on value	11/13/69		
		35	Additional findings on value	11/13/69		
26		51	Order & interlocutory award	11/13/69		
		325	Final award	10/13/71		
S'Klallam, Dkt. 134	5	680	Findings — Title	12/2/57	\$385,820.00 for land	
		697	Opinion	12/2/57		
		697	Interlocutory order	12/2/57		
	unnumbered	unnumbered	Order reopening the record	3/15/68		
		23	510	Opinion — Value		10/1/70
		23	519	Additional findings		10/1/70
	28	530	Interlocutory order & award	10/1/70		
		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 for land	
		152	Opinion	3/6/58		
		152	Interlocutory order	3/6/58		
	9	359	Additional findings — Value	6/30/61		
		390	Opinion	6/30/61		
	12	197	Second interlocutory order	6/30/61		
		197	Findings on compromise settlement	5/24/63		
		208	Opinion	5/24/63		
		208	Final determination or judgment	5/24/63		
		208	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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
Snake or Piute Indians of former Malheur Reservation in Oregon, Dkt. 17	1	422	Findings — Liability	12/29/50	\$567,000.00 for land	
		436	Opinion Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing petition	12/29/50		
	125 C.C.	241	Reversed & remanded	6/2/53		
		4	571a 608	Amended findings — Title Opinion	12/28/56 12/28/56	
		unnumbered	Interlocutory order Order amending finding No. 3 as to description of claimed area	12/28/56 2/4/57		
	7	526	Additional findings — Value	4/15/59		
		555	Opinion	4/15/69		
		unnumbered	Second interlocutory order Final judgment	4/15/59 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 for land
564			Opinion Interlocutory order	11/21/56 11/21/56		
7			768 783	Additional findings — Value Opinion	7/23/59 7/23/59	
13		583	Second interlocutory order Findings on allocation of consideration under Point Elliott Treaty	7/23/59 8/13/64		
		591	Opinion Order	8/13/64 8/13/64		
		15	243 245	Additional findings Opinion	4/29/65 4/29/65	
18		134	Third interlocutory order	4/29/65		
		144	Additional findings on compromise settlement Opinion Final judgment	3/30/67 3/30/67 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 for land
			41	Opinion Interlocutory order	6/30/60 6/30/60	
	13	583	Findings on allocation of consideration under Point Elliott Treaty	6/30/60 8/13/64		
		591	Opinion Order	8/13/64 8/13/64		
		15	267	Per curiam opinion on plaintiff's motion to modify Commission's findings & order of 6/30/60 Order denying plaintiff's "Motion to Modify Commission's Findings and Order," & with- drawing the Commission's findings, opinion & interlocutory order of 6/30/60 & substituting in lieu thereof the findings, opinion, & inter- locutory order entered 5/7/65	5/7/65 5/7/65	
	15	282	Findings	5/7/65		
		308	Per curiam opinion Interlocutory order	5/7/65 5/7/65		
	178 C.C.	570	Affirmed in part, reversed in part, & remanded	2/17/67		
		19	498	Final judgment [entered pursuant to stipula- tion 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, <i>et al.</i>						
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 for settlement of a claim in Dkt. 331 for	
		254	Opinion in Dkt. 331 Interlocutory order in Dkt. 331	4/17/61 4/17/61		
	163 C.C.	58	Affirmed in part, reversed in part, & remanded	10/11/63		

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

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

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
Suquamish, Dkt. 132 (cont.)	7	747	Additional findings — Value	7/10/59		
		760	Opinion	7/10/59		
	13	583		Second interlocutory order	7/10/59	
				Findings on allocation of consideration under Point Elliott Treaty	8/13/64	
		591	Opinion	8/13/64		
	16	479	Additional findings on consideration	1/21/66		
		481	Opinion	1/21/66		
	24	34		Third interlocutory order	1/21/66	
				Opinion — Offsets	10/22/70	
		39	Additional findings	10/22/70		
	197 C.C.	775		Final judgment	10/22/70	
				Affirmed	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		
			Order	8/13/64		
	26	371	Opinion — Title	11/18/71		
		377	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 25		Order striking parts of petition	5/19/55	Dismissed	
		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	21 186 C.C.	420	Order dismissing petition	6/14/68	Dismissed	
		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	\$416,240.85 for land	
		57	Opinion	11/23/55		
	unnumbered			Interlocutory order [and award]	11/23/55	
				Order amending findings of fact, overruling plaintiffs' motion for final judgment & granting defendant extension of time	2/5/57	
	unnumbered			Order of final judgment [entered upon joint motion pursuant to stipulation for entry of judgment]	6/17/58	
Tillamook Band of Tillamooks, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 240	3	526	Findings — Title	6/10/55	For land: \$72,162.50 to Nehalem Band of Tillamooks, & \$97,025.00 to Tillamook Band of Tillamooks	
		533	Opinion	6/10/55		
	11	1	Interlocutory order	6/10/55		
		26		Additional findings — Value & offsets		8/27/62
				Opinion		8/27/62
		Final award	8/27/62			
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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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 inter- locutory 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 bombard- ment	
		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	\$91,428.80 for reversionary interest in land	
		152	Findings	5/14/70		
		164	Order	5/14/70		
	29	194	Opinion — Value	11/29/72		
		204	Additional findings	11/29/72		
	29	210	Interlocutory order	11/29/72		
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 for settlement of: claims in Dkt. 264 for additional compensation for land; claims relating to fishing rights in Dkt. 264-A; and a claim in Dkt. 264-B for com- pensation for lands excluded from claimants' reservation by survey error	
		540	Opinion in Dkt. 264	6/10/60		
		unnumbered	Interlocutory order in Dkt. 264	6/10/60		
	14	14	Order in Dkt. 264 denying plaintiffs' motion for rehearing & vacating Commission's find- ings, opinion, & interlocutory order of 6/10/60	9/28/64		
			Findings in Dkt. 264 (revised)	9/28/64		
			Opinion in Dkt. 264 (revised)	9/28/64		
	C.C.	16	Interlocutory order in Dkt. 264 (revised)	9/28/64		
			Order dismissing appeal No. 1-65	1/21/66		
			Findings on compromise settlement	2/11/66		
	16	484	Opinion	2/11/66		
			510	Final judgment		2/11/66
	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
	28	333	359	Order denying motions & granting other relief		12/23/69
Order granting defendant's motion to dismiss			8/16/72			

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
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	Findings in Dkt. 44 on title issues	2/21/57	\$7,700,000.00 in settlement of claims for compensation for land	
		20	Opinion in Dkt. 44	2/21/57		
	5	47	Interlocutory order in Dkt. 44	2/21/57		
		59	Findings in Dkt. 45 on title issues	2/21/57		
	8	620	Opinion in Dkt. 45	2/21/57		
		638	Interlocutory order in Dkt. 45	2/21/57		
Ute Indians, Confederated Bands of, Dkt. 327	11	180	Findings — Value & payment on claim	9/14/62	\$7,908,586.16 for land	
		263	Opinion	9/14/62		
	14	679	Interlocutory order	9/14/62		
		704	Additional findings on settlement of offsets	2/18/65		
	17	28	Opinion	2/18/65		
		42	Final judgment	2/18/65		
Ute, Southern Tribe or Band, Dkt. 328	17	28	Findings — Liability	5/6/66	Dismissed	
		42	Opinion	5/6/66		
	C.C.			First interlocutory order		5/6/66
				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	Additional findings	5/15/67		
		276	Order transmitting findings to the Court of Claims	6/27/69		
	191 C.C. 400 U.S. 402 U.S. 195 C.C.	1	Affirmed	6/27/69		
		915	Certiorari granted	3/20/70		
		159	Reversed	11/16/70		
	26	10	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		
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	Findings on compromise settlement	2/18/65	\$300,000.00 in settlement of claim arising from breach of promise to provide a reservation for the Uncompahgree Band	
		725	Opinion	2/18/65		
			Final judgment	2/18/65		
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	Findings — Title	6/10/60	\$1,225,000.00 in settlement of claims for additional compensation for interest in land	
		585	Opinion	6/10/60		
	12	664	Interlocutory order	6/10/60		
		712	Findings — Title rehearing	10/10/63		
			Opinion	10/10/63		
			Interlocutory order	10/10/63		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition	
Warm Springs Reservation, Confederated Tribes, Dkt. 198 (cont.)	177 C.C. 18	184	Reversed & remanded	10/14/66		
		354	Opinion on remand	4/4/67		
	29	324	Order amending findings & interlocutory order of 10/10/63	4/4/67		
		344	Opinion — Value & consideration	12/18/72		
		369	Dissenting opinion	12/18/72		
	32	406	Additional findings	12/18/72		
		7	Interlocutory order [& award]	12/18/72		
31		Findings on compromise settlement	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	86	Opinion	1/20/58	\$4,959,350.00 for land	
		93	Opinion	1/20/58		
	6	666	Opinion	10/6/58		
		666	Order dividing California into Areas A & B	10/6/58		
	7	266	Findings — Title	3/20/59		
		282	Opinion	3/20/59		
	7	792	Interlocutory order	3/20/59		
			Additional findings — Date of taking	7/24/59		
	21	447	Interlocutory order	7/24/59		
			Opinion — Value	10/31/69		
			Findings	10/31/69		
	24	490	Interlocutory order	10/31/69		
			492	Interlocutory order granting plaintiff's motion to amend plaintiff's proposed findings & brief	10/31/69	
107			Opinion — Offsets	12/2/70		
117			Additional findings	12/2/70		
		121	Final award	12/2/70		
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, Tawakonie, 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	78	Findings — Title	8/10/59	\$4,600,000.00 in settlement of claims for addi- tional compensa- tion for land	
		100	Opinion	8/10/59		
	16	81	Interlocutory order	8/10/59		
		81	Additional findings — Value	10/13/65		
		117	Opinion	10/13/65		
	181 C.C. 23	1202	Second interlocutory order	10/13/65		
		464	Affirmed	12/18/67		
467		Opinion on compromise settlement	9/3/70			
		482	Findings on compromise settlement	9/3/70		
			Final judgment	9/3/70		
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	Opinion — Values	8/5/76	Transferred to Court of Claims	
		583	Findings	8/5/76		

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

Tribe	Vol.	Page	Decision	Date	Disposition
Wyandot, Dkts. 212 & 213 (cont.)		615	Interlocutory order [& award on land claims, subject to gratuitous offsets]	8/5/76	
	39	370	Opinion — Procedural matters	2/9/77	
		374	Order	2/9/77	
	42	202	Order certifying & transferring to Court of Claims	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 judgment: awarded \$2,100,000.00 for settlement of claims in Dkt. 47 for the value of land reserved to the Yakima Tribe by treaty, which was excluded from the Tribe's reservation, & for land within the reservation patented in error to white settlers, & the claim in Dkt. 164 for the value of lands allotted to persons not members of the tribe & for reimbursement 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
		433	Opinion in Dkt. 47	5/29/53	
	2	481	Interlocutory order in Dkt. 47	5/29/53	
			Amended findings in Dkt. 47	11/6/53	
	5	636	Amended interlocutory order in Dkt. 47	11/6/53	
			Amended & supplemental findings in Dkt. 47 on some valuation issues	11/29/57	
			Opinion in Dkt. 47	11/29/57	
			Interlocutory order in Dkt. 47	11/29/57	
	158 C.C.	672	Affirmed in part, reversed in part & remanded	10/3/62	
	16	536	Findings in Dkt. 47 on remanded issues	2/25/66	
		553	Opinion in Dkt. 47	2/25/66	
		Order in Dkt. 47	2/25/66		
18	426	Order in Dkt. 47 re Tract D	6/19/67		
20	76	Statement & additional findings on compromise settlement	11/14/68		
		Final judgment	11/14/68		
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, Confederated Tribes of Colville Reservation, <i>et al.</i> , intervenor in Dkt. 161; Confederated Tribes of Colville Reservation as representatives of the Palouse Band, <i>et al.</i> , Dkt. 222; and Confederated 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 the Yakima Tribe and the Confederated Tribes of Colville Reservation for the benefit of the Yakima Nation of 1855 in settlement of claims in Dkts. 161, 222, & 224 for additional compensation for ceded lands
		805	Opinion in Dkts. 161 & 224	7/28/59	
			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		
	12	301	Additional findings on title issues	7/28/59	
		362	Opinion	7/29/63	
			Interlocutory order	7/29/63	
	15	196	Findings on compromise settlement	4/5/65	
	225	Opinion	4/5/65		
		Final judgment	4/5/65		

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>
Yakima, Dkt. 162	4	269	Findings — Value & consideration	6/5/56	\$49,000.00 for land
		294	Opinion	6/5/56	
	15	617	Interlocutory order & award	6/5/56	
			Additional findings	8/31/65	
		625	Opinion	8/31/65	
		Final award	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	Findings	5/16/55	Dismissed
		515	Opinion	5/16/55	
				Conclusions of law & judgment dismissing petition	5/16/55
	136 C.C.	433	Affirmed	10/2/56	
	352 U.S.	1016	Certiorari denied	2/25/56	
353 U.S.	948	Rehearing denied	4/29/57		

Zane, Lawrence, *see* Wyandot

Zia, Pueblo de, *see* Pueblo de Zia

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' fee and expenses	654-657	9/29/78
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims:		
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	658-660	9/29/78
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims:		
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	661-666	9/29/78
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims:		
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	667-668	9/29/78
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims:		
Dkt. 279-C, Blackfeet and Gros Ventre Tribes } Dkt. 250-A, Fort Belknap Indian Community } Dkt. 279-D, Blackfeet }	669-670	9/29/78
Order certifying and transferring the following cases to the United States Court of Claims:		
Dkt. 352, Aleut Community of St. Paul Island } Dkt. 369-A, Aleut Community of St. George Island } Dkt. 369, Aleut Tribe, et al. }	671-672	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. 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. } Consolidated	673-674	9/29/78
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, Pottawatomi, Prairie Band, et al. Dkt. 29-C, Potawatomi, 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, Pottawatomi, 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, Pottawatomi, 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
Pottawatomi, 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., interveners		
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	11/15/48
4	Ottawa & Chippewa of Michigan	Dismissed	3/25/49
5	Cherokee, Eastern (Emigrant)	Dismissed	11/15/48
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 & Missouriia	Award	2/17/56
11-A	Otoe & Missouriia	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

Docket No.	Tribe, Band, or Group	Disposition	Date
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 dkts.]	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>		
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

Docket No.	Tribe, Band, or Group	Disposition	Date
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			
46	Nooksack	Award	2/9/62
47	Yakima	Award with Dkt. 164	11/14/68
47-A	Yakima	Award	6/25/65
47-B	Yakima	Dismissed	10/11/72
48	Apache, Fort Sill, Chiricahua, and Warm Springs	Award with Dkt. 30	8/25/71
48-A	Apache, Fort Sill, Chiricahua, and Warm Springs	Award with Dkt. 30-A	8/25/71
49	Apache, Fort Sill, Chiricahua, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	9/24/71
50	Choctaw Nation	Dismissed	4/10/51
51	Choctaw Nation	Dismissed	3/2/50
52	Choctaw East of the Mississippi	Dismissed	2/7/57
53	Seminole Nation	Dismissed	4/22/52
54	Crow	Award	5/29/61
55	Choctaw Nation	Dismissed	6/11/51
56	Choctaw Nation	Dismissed	7/14/50
57	Chippewa, Saginaw	Award	8/1/73
58	Ottawa and Chippewa of Michigan	Award with Dkt. 18-E	3/15/72
59	Chippewa, Saginaw	Award	6/22/78
60	Makah	Dismissed	4/15/59
60-A	Makah	Pending	
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

Docket No.	Tribe, Band, or Group	Disposition	Date
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 11/4/65
87-A	Paiute Nation, Northern, <i>et al.</i>	Transferred to Court of Claims	3/2/78
87-B	Paiute, Pyramid Lake Tribe	Award	7/23/75
88	Paiute Nation, Southern, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 330 & 330-A	1/18/65
89	Six Nations, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	8/9/73
90	Hualapai	Award with Dkt. 122	6/18/68
91	Havasupai	Award	8/6/69
92	Skagit, Upper	Award	9/23/68
93	Snoqualmie, Skykomish	Award	9/23/68
94	Pend d'Oreille, Lower, or Kalispel	Award	3/21/63
95	Sac and Fox	Award	9/25/74
96	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award	8/27/68
97	Suiattle-Sauk	Dismissed	12/18/52
98	Muckleshoot	Award	10/18/63
99	Peoria, Piankeshaw	Award	2/11/70
100	Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians	Award	1/31/64
100-A	Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians	Award	9/2/69
100-B-1	Kalmath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians	Award	12/2/76
100-B-2	Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians	Pending	
100-C	Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians	Award	10/31/75
101	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	9/14/64
102	Papago of Arizona	Award with Dkt. 345	7/21/76
103	Choctaw Nation	Dismissed	3/8/54
104	Sioux of Santee Reservation, Nebraska	Dismissed	10/17/52
105	Osage Nation	} Award	9/15/70
106	Osage Nation		
107	Osage Nation		
108	Osage Nation		
109	Duwamish Tribe	Award	12/11/63
110	Lummi	Award	10/22/70
111	Potawatomi, Citizen Band, <i>et al.</i>	Award	8/8/55
112	Schaghticoke of Kent, Connecticut	Dismissed	9/9/58
113	Chippewa, Turtle Mountain Band	Interlocutory award on remaining claim with Dkts. 246, 191, & 221	9/20/78
114	Sioux Tribe of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. D.	Award	6/18/69
115	Sioux Tribe of Crow Creek Reservation, S. D.	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
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	12/3/68
124-E	Miami, Indiana		

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

Docket No.	Tribe, Band, or Group	Disposition	Date
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, 29-L, 29-M, 29-O, & 29-P, subject to offsets	9/8/78
129	Menominee	Dismissed	4/24/52
130	Miami, Indiana	Pending	
131	Miami, Indiana	Award with Dkt. 253	1/8/70
132	Suquamish	Award	10/22/70
133	Ottawa	Dismissed	12/26/57
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> , Intervenor	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

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

Docket No.	Tribe, Band, or Group	Disposition	Date
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	Award	2/11/60
225-B	Omaha		
225-C	Omaha		
225-D	Omaha		
226	Caddo	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
227	Pueblo of Laguna	Award	12/11/70
228	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
229	Navajo	Transferred to Court of Claims	2/15/78
230	Cayuga	Dismissed	9/22/71
231	Iowa	Award	5/12/69
231	Sac and Fox	Award	11/23/73
232	Sac and Fox	Dismissed	3/2/65
233	Swinomish	Award	7/6/72
234	Chinook	Award	11/4/70
235	Maricopa-Ak Chin Reservation Indians	Transferred to Court of Claims	7/13/78
236	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Dismissed	2/26/69
236-A	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Award	9/30/76
236-B	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Award	9/30/76
236-C	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Transferred to Court of Claims	7/13/78
236-D	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Transferred to Court of Claims	7/13/78
236-E	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Pending in Court of Claims on appeal from final award of 4/5/76	7/13/78
236-F	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
236-G	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Dismissed	9/30/74
236-H	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Dismissed	3/24/71
236-I	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
236-J	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Dismissed	6/27/69
236-K	Pima-Maricopa, Gila River	Dismissed	12/12/68
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	Quinaiaelt and Queets	Award	4/17/63
243	Winnebago Tribe and Nation	Award	9/3/70
244	Winnebago Tribe and Nation		
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	Award	1/29/68
259	Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache		
259-A	Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache		
260	Skokomish, <i>et al.</i>	Dismissed	3/30/53
261	Samish	Award	10/6/71
262	Tulalip Tribes, Inc.	Dismissed	1/13/58
263	Kikiallus	Award	6/7/72
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
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	}	Award
282-B	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
282-C	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
282-D	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
282-E	Cherokee, Eastern Band		
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>	Award	9/18/75
296	Skokomish	Award	5/24/63
297	Cherokee	Dismissed	3/19/69
298	Delaware	Award with Dkt. 72	9/10/69
299	Navajo	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/27/76
300	Stockbridge Munsee Community, <i>et al.</i>	Award	5/30/73
300-A	Stockbridge Munsee Community, <i>et al.</i>	Pending	
300-B	Stockbridge Munsee Community, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkt. 84	12/28/73
301	Oneida Nation of New York, <i>et al.</i>	Pending	
302	Ottawa	Award with Dkt. 133-A, subject to appeal	8/17/78
303	Ottawa	Award	2/11/65

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

Docket No.	Tribe, Band, or Group	Disposition	Date
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	Peoria, Wea	Award	7/29/63
314-A	Peoria, Wea	Award, subject to appeal	9/20/78
314-B	Peoria, Wea	Interlocutory award	9/8/78
314-C	Peoria, Wea	Award	1/28/70
314-D	Peoria, Wea	Award	1/8/70
314-E	Peoria, Wea	Award	7/18/67
315	Kickapoo	Award, subject to offsets	8/25/78
316	Kickapoo	Award	9/29/67
316-A	Kickapoo	Award	9/24/70
317	Kickapoo	Award	2/11/70
318	Kickapoo	Award	6/11/69
319	Quechan of Fort Yuma Reservation, California	Award	8/5/65
320	Quechan of Fort Yuma Reservation, California	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
321	Tuscarora	Award	2/21/73
322	Ponca	Award	9/8/71
323	Ponca	Award	8/23/72
324	Ponca	Award	8/27/65
325	California Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians	Dismissed	3/28/55
326	Shoshone of Wind River Reservation, Wyoming	Closed [all causes having been severed out]	7/3/68
326-A	Shoshone, Western Identifiable Group (Represented by Temoak Bands)	Transferred to Court of Claims	5/8/78
326-B	Shoshone, Goshute	Award with Dkt. 326-J	11/5/75
326-C	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho	Transferred to Court of Claims	12/15/76
326-D	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-E	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho		
326-F	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, Idaho		
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	Award	2/18/65
328	Ute, Southern Tribe or Band	Dismissed	7/14/71
329	Cheyenne-Arapaho	Dismissed	12/10/68
329-A	Cheyenne and Arapaho (Southern, <i>et al.</i>)	Award	10/18/65
329-B	Cheyenne and Arapaho (Southern, <i>et al.</i>)		
329-C	Cheyenne Indians, Northern		
329-D	Cheyenne and Northern Arapaho		
330	Paiute Nation, Southern, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 88 & 330-A	1/18/65
330-A	Paiute Nation, Southern, <i>et al.</i>	Award with Dkts. 88 & 330	1/18/65
331	Spokane	Award	2/21/67
331-A	Spokane		
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

Docket No.	Tribe, Band, or Group	Disposition	Date
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		
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		
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

Docket No.	Tribe, Band, or Group	Disposition	Date
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
	<u>204</u>	<u>342</u>	<u>274</u>		

¹This 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 311; 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 Counsels, 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 Missouri Tribe v. United States*, 131 Ct. Cl. 593 (1955), aff'g in part, rev'g 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 Missouri 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.

¹⁴Extinguishment 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. *United States v. Santa Fe Pacific R. Co.* 314 U.S. 339, 347 (1941).

¹⁵*United States v. Alcea Band of Tillamooks* 341 U.S. 48 (1951); *Tee-Hit-Ton Indians v. United States*, 348 U.S. 272 (1955).

¹⁶... 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*, 19 1.

¹⁷See *United States v. Seminole Indians*, 180 Ct. Cl. 375 (1968), aff'g 13 Ind. Cl. Comm. 326 (1964).

¹⁸Even 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).

¹⁹*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'g 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'g 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*.

²⁸Stat. 49. See *Miami Tribe v. United States*, 146 Ct. Cl. 421 (1959), aff'g (on title) 2 Ind. Cl. Comm. 617 (1954).

²⁹Stat. 272. See *Minnesota Chippewa Tribe v. United States*, 161 Ct. Cl. 258 (1963), rev'g 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.

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 Pottawatomie 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.

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.

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 1832	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 & Missouri (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 & Missouriia	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-ney (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	Suquamish	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	Quinaielt	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	82,83
Alsea (Tillamooks)	107	Affiliated Tribes of	
Apache	133,134,135 136,137,138 139,140,141	Fox, Sac &	55,56,57,58, 59,60,61,64
Apache, Chiricahua	138	Goshute	120
Apache, Chiricahua	139	Grand River Band (Ottawa)	20
Apache, Jicarilla	134	Gros Ventre, Blackfeet &	86
Apache, Kiowa, Comanche & A.	133	Havasupai	142
Apache, Lipan	137	Hidatsa	82,83
Apache, Mescalero	135	Hopi	123
Apache, Mescalero	136	Hualapai	143
Apache, Tonto	141	Iowa	60,62,63,64
Apache, Western	140	Indians of California	118
Arapaho, Cheyenne	112	Jemez	127
Arapaho, Northern	112	Jicarilla Apache	134
Arikara	82,83	Kalispel	92
Assiniboine	84	Kaskaskia (Peoria)	36
Blackfeet and Gros Ventre	86	Kickapoo	28,29,32,33
Bois Forte Band (Chippewa)	45	Kikiallus	156
Caddo	73	Kiowa, Comanche & Apache	133
California, Indians of	118	Klamath	113
Cayuse (Umatilla)	95	Kootenai	89
Chehalis, Lower	173	Laguna	126
Chehalis, Upper	174	Lake Superior Bands	42,43,44,47
Chemehuevi	145	(Chippewa)	
Cherokee	37	Lake Tribe (Colville)	100
Chetco (Tillamook)	108	Lake Winnibigoshish, and	48
Cheyenne & Arapaho	112	Pillager Bands (Chippewa)	
Cheyenne, Northern	112	Lemhi (Shoshone)	110
Chinook	176	Lipan Apache	137
Chippewa	2,7,16,17, 18,19,42,43 44,45,46,47 48,49,50,51	Lower Chehalis	173
Chippewa, Boise Forte Band	45	Lower Skagit	155
Chippewa, Lake Superior Bands	42,43,44,47	Lummi	151
Chippewa, Mississippi Bands	42,43,46,47	Makah	158
Chippewa, Ottawa	17	Mandan	82,83
Chippewa, Pembina Band	51,52	Maricopa, Pima	147
Chippewa, Pillager Band	48,49	Medawakanton Band (Sioux)	74
Chippewa, Pillager and Lake	48	Mescalero Apache	135,136
Winnibigoshish Bands		Methow (Colville)	103
Chippewa, Red Lake Band	50,51	Miami	21,22,23,24
Chippewa, Sault St. Marie	16	Mississippi Bands (Chippewa)	25,26
Band		Mississippi or Eastern Sioux	42,43,46,47
Chiricahua Apache	138,139	Missouria, Otoe &	75
Clatsop	105	Modoc	64,67
Coeur D'Alene	91	Mohave	114
Colville	99,100,101, 102,103	Muckleshoot	144
Colville, Lake Tribe	100	Nambe	169
Colville, Methow	103	Navajo	130
Colville, Okanogan	102	Nespelem, Sanpoil (Colville)	124
Colville, Sanpoil-Nespelem	101	Nez Perce	101
Comanche, Kiowa, Comanche & Apache	133	Nisqually	90
Coquille (Tillamook)	108	Nooksack	172
Cowlitz	175	Northern Arapaho	150
Creek	38,39,40	Northern Arapaho	112
Crow	85	Northern Cheyenne	112
Dahcotah (Sioux) Nation	81	Northern Paiute	116
Delaware	2,4,5,25,31	Okanogan (Colville)	116
Duwamish	166	Omaha	102
Eastern or Mississippi Sioux	75	Osage	64,65
Eel River	24	Otoe & Missouri	69,70,71
Flathead	87	Ottawa	64,67
		Ottawa Chippewa	2,3,4,7
		Ottawa, Grand River Band	17,20
		Paiute, Northern	17
		Paiute, Southern	20
			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	77
Peoria, Kaskaskia	36	(Sioux)	
Peoria, Piankeshaw	35	Skagit, Lower	155
Piankeshaw (Peoria)	31,35	Skagit, Upper	153
Pillager and Lake	48	S'Kallam	159
Winnibigoshish Bands		Skokomish	162
(Chippewa)		Skykomish	163
Pillager Band (Chippewa)	49	Spokane	93
Pima-Maricopa	147	Snake	109
Pitt River	115	Snohomish	160
Ponca	66	Snoqualmie	164
Potawatomi	2,7,8,9,10	Southern Paiute	122
	11,12,13,14	Squaxin	168
	15,21,22,27	Steilacoom	171
	28,32,53	Stillaguamish	157
Puyallup	170	Suquamish	165
Quapaw	72	Swinomish	154
Quechan	148	Teton and Yanktonai (Sioux)	79
Quileute	161	Tillamook	106,107,108
Quainaielt	167	Tillamook (Alcea)	107
Red Lake Band (Chippewa)	50,51	Tillamook Coquille, Chetco	108
Sac & Fox	55,56,57,58	Too-too-to-ney	
	59,60,61,64	Tonto Apache	141
Saginaw Chippewa	18,19	Too-too-to-ney (Tillamook)	108
Samish	152	Uintah Ute	121
San Ildefonso	129	Umatilla	95,96,97
Sanpoil-Nespelem (Colville)	101	Umatilla, Cayuse	95
Santa Ana	127	Umatilla, Walla Walla	96
Santa Clara	131	Upper Chehalis	174
Santo Domingo	128	Upper Pend D'Oreille	88
Sault St. Marie Band	16	Upper Skagit	153
(Chippewa)		Ute, Uintah	121
Seminole	41	Wahpeton, Sisseton & Wahpeton	77
Seneca	1	Bands (Sioux)	
Shawnee	4,6	Walla Walla (Umatilla)	96
Shoshone	111	Warm Springs	104
Shoshone, Lemhi	110	Washoe	117
Shoshone, Western	119	Wea	26,27,28
Sioux	74,75,76		29,30
	77,78,79	Western Apache	140
	80,81	Western Shoshone	119
Sioux (Dahcotah) Nation	81	Winnebago	54
Sioux, Eastern or Mississippi	75	Wyandot	2,4
Sioux, Medawakanton Band	74	Yakima	98
Sioux, Sisseton	78	Yankton (Sioux)	76,80
Sioux, Sisseton & Wahpeton	77	Yanktonai, Teton & Yanktonai (Sioux)	79
Bands		Yavapai	146
Sioux, Teton and Yanktonai	79	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	