

From: [Lenor Blaeser](#)
To: [MJC Legal Counsel Rules](#)
Subject: Fwd: Would like to comment on proposed Rule 10
Date: Friday, March 17, 2017 7:38:50 PM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Thomas Van Norman <Thomas.VanNorman@PuyallupTribe.com>
Date: March 17, 2017 at 5:21:05 PM CDT
To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>
Subject: **Would like to comment on proposed Rule 10**

Greetings from Tom Van Norman in Tacoma, Washington. If you would, could you please forward my comment regarding proposed Court Rule 10? I saw this on Turtle Talk about 2 hours ago for the first time. I can't find any info. on where to submit comments on the Minn. Judicial website. Thanks for working on the issue. Here's my comment:

March 17, 2017

The Honorable Lorie Skjerven Gildea
Chief Justice of the Minnesota Supreme Court
Minnesota Judicial Center
25 Constitution Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Dear Ms. Chief Justice:

This is to comment and support the Amended Petition for Adoption of a Rule of Procedure for the Recognition of Tribal Court Orders and Judgments to be promulgated under the Minnesota General Rules of Practice for the District Courts. The proposed Rule is a vast improvement of existing Rule 10, providing important federal statutes to update the Rule, and being more respectful of Tribal Courts.

However, I would respectfully request that the requirement of reciprocity be eliminated from the proposed Rule as many Tribes have members residing in Minnesota who may be drawn into State Court through Indian Child Welfare Proceedings, and many of those Tribes, like the one I represent (Puyallup Tribe of Indians in Tacoma, Washington), have Tribal Courts

located outside of Minnesota. There are currently 566 federally recognized Tribes across the United States (*see* 81 Federal Register 5019, Friday, January 29, 2016), so their Tribal Court Rules and jurisdictional statutes and or Constitutional limits most likely were geared toward the State they are headquartered in, and may not yet have a provision for recognition of Orders from all other States outside of the territory, although their Tribal Courts may be equally legitimate. By eliminating the reciprocity provision, Minnesota can have the forethought that issues may come up involving Tribal Court Orders from outside of the State which could be recognized provided they meet the other factors first. Otherwise, reciprocity may be a barrier that precludes recognition of a valid Order from Tribes that don't yet have a reciprocity provision for Minnesota State.

Sincerely,

s/

Thomas J. Van Norman, ICW Attorney, WSBA#24291*
Law Office, Puyallup Tribe of Indians
3009 Portland Avenue
Tacoma, WA 98404
Phone: 253-573-7874
Fax: 253-680-5998
Email: Thomas.VanNorman@PuyallupTribe.com

**Also admitted and in good Standing in Colorado and South Dakota, all corresponding Federal Courts, and 11 Tribal Courts*

NOTICE: This email is intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any unauthorized dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is prohibited.