No. 02-42

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

FRANCHISE TAX BOARD OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Petitioner,

v.

GILBERT P. HYATT and EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
Respondents.

On Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT GILBERT P. HYATT

MARK A. HUTCHISON
HUTCHISON & STEFFEN
Lakes Business Park
Las Vegas, NV 89117
(702) 385-2500

DONALD J. KULA
RIORDAN & MCKINZIE
300 South Grand Avenue
Twenty-Ninth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3155
(213) 629-4824

H. BARTOW FARR, III
Counsel of Record
FARR & TARANTO
1220 19th Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 775-0184

PETER C. BERNHARD
BERNHARD, BRADLEY & JOHNSON
3980 Howard Hughes Parkway
Suite 550
Las Vegas, NV 89109
(702) 650-6565

WILSON-EPES PRINTING CO., INC. – (202) 789-0096 – WASHINGTON, D. C. 20001

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the Full Faith and Credit Clause requires the Nevada state courts to apply California immunity law, rather than Nevada law, to tort claims alleging intentional misconduct against a Nevada citizen in Nevada, even though Nevada has substantive lawmaking authority over the subject matter of the lawsuit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

No. 02-42

FRANCHISE TAX BOARD OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Petitioner,

v.

GILBERT P. HYATT and EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA
Respondents.

On Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT GILBERT P. HYATT

STATEMENT

The issues in this case arise out of a tort suit brought by respondent Hyatt, a Nevada citizen, in Nevada state court against petitioner Franchise Tax Board of the State of California (the "Board" or "FTB"). In a motion for summary judgment seeking dismissal of all claims, the Board asserted, among other defenses, that the Full Faith and Credit Clause, U.S. Const., art. IV, § 1, compelled the Nevada courts to apply California law to the claims, in particular California law that allegedly shields the Board from liability for both negligent and intentional torts. The state district court denied the motion. On a petition for

mandamus filed by the Board, the Nevada Supreme Court decided, on grounds of comity, to apply California immunity law to the negligence claim, Pet. App. 11-12, but declined to apply California immunity law to the intentional tort claims. Pet. App. 12-13. Noting that Nevada law does not immunize Nevada officials from liability for intentional torts, the court concluded that application of California law to deny redress to injured Nevada plaintiffs would "contravene Nevada's policies and interests in this case." Pet. App. 12.

This tort suit is one of two continuing disputes between respondent and the Board. The other dispute involves a residency tax audit initiated by the Board in 1993 with respect to the 1991 and 1992 tax years. The principal issue in that underlying tax matter turns on the date that respondent, a former California resident, became a permanent resident of Nevada. Respondent contends that he became a Nevada resident in late September 1991, shortly before he received significant licensing income—on behalf of and under contract to U.S. Philips Corporation—from certain patented inventions.[1] For its part, the Board has concluded that respondent became a resident of Nevada six months later. The administrative proceedings relating to this six month dispute are being conducted in California, and are ongoing. *See* FTB Br. at 4.

This suit, in turn, concerns various tortious acts committed by the Board, including fraud, outrageous conduct, disclosure of confidential information, and invasion of privacy. *See generally* Pet. App. 49-90 (First Amended Complaint); J.A. 246-66 (Petition for Rehearing); J.A. 267-97 (Supplement to Petition

---

[1] In suggesting (FTB Br. 3) that the 1991 income in dispute amounts to "$40 million," the Board simply disregards the fact that respondent collected licensing income on behalf of U.S. Philips. The correct figure is less than half that ($17,727,743). *See* Cowan Affidavit Exh. 16 (Hyatt Appendix, Vol. VIII, Exh. 15) (Notice of Proposed Assessment). ("Hyatt Appendix" refers to appendices submitted to the Nevada Supreme Court in connection with the first petition for a writ of mandamus.)

for Rehearing). The evidence introduced at the summary judgment stage shows that Board auditor Sheila Cox, as well as other employees of the Board, went well beyond legitimate bounds in their attempts to extort a tax settlement from Mr. Hyatt. This bad-faith effort relied on two primary courses of action. The first was to create a huge potential tax charge against respondent, largely by making false and unsupported claims and then embellishing them with the threat of large penalties. The second was to put pressure on respondent to settle the inflated claims by, among other things, releasing confidential information, while informing respondent that resistance to settlement would lead to a further loss of privacy and to public exposure.

The Board undertook this campaign against respondent after the State of California urged its tax officials to increase revenues in order to alleviate a pressing financial crisis. *See* J.A. 13 ("the demands for performance and efficiency in revenue production are higher than they have ever been"); *see also id.* 9-13, 15. Auditors knew that prosecution of large tax claims would provide recognition and an opportunity for advancement within the department. *See generally* J.A. 157-58. Indeed, large assessments, in and of themselves, would be advantageous, because the department evaluated its performance by the amount of taxes assessed. Some evidence suggests that California tax officials especially targeted wealthy taxpayers living in Nevada. *See* J.A. 174-75.

The Board also had a policy of using the threat of penalties to coerce settlements. *See* J.A. 164-67, 178-80. A memorandum regarding tax penalties, in fact, placed a picture of a skull and crossbones on its cover. *See* J.A. 16. A former Board employee testified in a deposition that a California tax official showed auditors how to use threatened penalties as "big poker chips" to "close audits" with taxpayers. *See* J.A. 165, 166. The largest, most severe penalty, and thus the biggest chip, was the seldom imposed penalty for fraud. *See* J.A. 158, 177-78.

Against this background Sheila Cox set her sights on Mr. Hyatt. As the evidence shows, her attempts to pursue a tax claim against Mr. Hyatt were, by any measure, extraordinary and offensive. *See* J.A. 161 (auditor Cox "created an entire fiction about [respondent]"). Referring to respondent, the auditor declared that she was going to "get that Jew bastard." J.A. 148, 168. According to evidence from a former Board employee, the auditor freely discussed information about respondent - - much of it false—with persons within and without the office. *See* J.A. 148-52. That information included, among other things, details about members of his family, his battle with colon cancer, a woman that the Board claimed to be his girlfriend, and the murder of his son. *See, e.g.,* J.A. 148, 168, 169, 170, 176; 283. The auditor also committed direct invasions of respondent's privacy. She sought out respondent's Nevada home, *see* J.A. 153, 174, 176, and looked through his mail and his trash. *See* J.A. 172. In addition, she took a picture of one of her colleagues posed in front of the house. *See* J.A. 44, 171. Her incessant discussion of the investigation eventually led the colleague to conclude that she was "obsessed" with the case. *See* J.A. 157.

Within her department Ms. Cox pressed for harsh action, including imposition of the rare fraud penalties. *See* J.A. 161, 162. To bolster this effort, she enlisted respondent's ex-wife and estranged members of respondent's family. *See* J.A. 150, 159. Reflecting her obsession, she created a story about being watched by a "one-armed" man and insisted that associates of Mr. Hyatt were mysterious and threatening. *See* J.A. 151, 152, 161-62. She repeatedly spoke disparagingly about respondent and his associates. *See* J.A. 148, 152, 169-70.

The Board also repeatedly violated its promises of confidentiality, both internally and externally. *See, e.g.*, J.A. 149-50. Although Board auditors had agreed to protect information submitted by respondent in confidence, the Board bombarded people with information "Demand[s]" about respondent and disclosed his address and social security number

to third parties, *see* J.A. 19-43, including California and Nevada newspapers. *See* J.A. 34-36, 39-40, 40-43. Demands to furnish information, naming respondent as the subject, were sent to his places of worship. *See* J.A. 24-27, 29-30. The Board also disclosed its investigation of respondent to respondent's patent licensees in Japan. *See* J.A. 256-57.

The Board was well aware that respondent, like many private inventors, had highly-developed concerns about privacy and security. *See* J.A. 175, 197-206. Far from giving these concerns careful respect, the Board sought to use them against him. In addition to the numerous information "Demand[s]" sent by the Board to third parties, one Board employee pointedly told Eugene Cowan, an attorney representing respondent, that "most individuals, particularly wealthy or famous individuals, compromise and settle with the FTB to avoid publicity, to avoid the individual's financial information becoming public, and to avoid the very fact of the dispute with the FTB becoming public." J.A. 212. In Mr. Cowan's view, "[t]he clear import of her suggestion was that famous, wealthy individuals settle with the FTB to avoid being, rightly or wrongly, branded a 'tax dodger.'" J.A. 212.

These deliberate acts caused significant damage to respondent's business and reputation. Because of the tortious Board actions, the royalty income received by respondent from new licensees "dropped to zero." J.A. 257.

Respondent brought suit against the Board in Nevada state court, alleging both negligent and intentional torts.[2] The Board sought summary judgment, arguing, *inter alia*, that the Full Faith and Credit Clause, U.S. Const., art IV, § 1, required the Nevada courts to apply California law and that, as a result, the

---

[2] In addition to his claims for damages, respondent sought a declaratory judgment that he had become a Nevada resident effective as of September 26, 1991. *See* Pet. App. 62-65. The district court dismissed this claim, and it is no longer part of the case.

Board was immune from liability for all claims. The Nevada trial court rejected this defense, as well as defenses of sovereign immunity and comity, without opinion.

The Board then sought a writ of mandamus from the Nevada Supreme Court, asking that the court order dismissal of the action "for lack of subject matter jurisdiction" or, alternatively, that it limit the action to what the Board termed "the FTB's Nevada acts and Nevada contacts concerning Hyatt." FTB Petition for Mandamus at 43. The Nevada Supreme Court initially granted a writ of mandamus directing the district court to enter summary judgment in favor of the Board, Pet. App. 38-44, concluding (on a ground neither asserted by the Board nor briefed by the parties) that respondent had not presented sufficient evidence to support his claims. Respondent sought rehearing, citing extensive evidence from the record that the Board had committed numerous negligent and intentional torts. *See* J.A. 246-97. After reviewing that evidence, the supreme court granted rehearing and vacated its prior order. *See* Pet. App. 6-7.

The Nevada Supreme Court then addressed whether the district court should have applied California law, reaching different conclusions based on the nature of respondent's claims. With respect to the one negligence claim made against the Board, the supreme court decided that "the district court should have refrained from exercising its jurisdiction . . . under the comity doctrine . . . ." Pet. App. 11. While the court found that "Nevada has not expressly granted its state agencies immunity for all negligent acts," Pet. App. 12, it noted that "Nevada provides its agencies with immunity for the performance of a discretionary function even if the discretion is abused." Pet. App. 12. It thus concluded that "affording Franchise Tax Board statutory immunity [under California law] for negligent acts does not contravene any Nevada interest in this case." Pet. App. 12.

The Nevada Supreme Court declined, however, to apply California immunity law to respondent's intentional tort claims. With respect to the full faith and credit argument, the court first observed that "the Full Faith and Credit Clause does not require Nevada to apply California's law in violation of its own legitimate public policy." Pet. App. 10. It then determined that "affording Franchise Tax Board statutory immunity for intentional torts does contravene Nevada's policies and interests in this case." Pet. App. 12. The court pointed out that "Nevada does not allow its agencies to claim immunity for discretionary acts taken in bad faith, or for intentional torts committed in the course and scope of employment." Pet. App. 12. Against this background, the court declared that "greater weight is to be accorded Nevada's interest in protecting its citizens from injurious intentional torts and bad faith acts committed by sister states' government employees, than California's policy favoring complete immunity for its taxation agency." Pet. App. 12-13.[3]

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

I. This Court has held that "[t]he Full Faith and Credit Clause does not compel a state to substitute the statutes of other states for its own statutes dealing with a subject matter concerning which it is competent to legislate." *Sun Oil Co. v. Wortman*, 486 U.S. 717, 722 (1988) (internal quotation marks omitted). This longstanding respect for the States' traditional lawmaking authority directly reflects the fact that each State retains 'a residuary and inviolable sovereignty," *Printz v. United States*, 521 U.S. 898, 919 (1997) (internal quotation marks omitted), which includes the sovereign power to address harms occurring within its borders. While a State should properly take account of the interests of its sister States, the fact remains that full faith

[3] In its decision the Nevada Supreme Court apparently assumed that California law, if applicable, would provide immunity for the tortious acts committed by the Board. Pet. App. 10-13. *But see* pages 36-37 *infra* (discussing California law).

and credit doctrine does not "enable one state to legislate for the other or to project its laws across state lines so as to preclude the other from prescribing for itself the legal consequences of acts within it." *Pacific Employers Ins. Co. v. Industrial Accident Comm'n*, 306 U.S. 493, 504-05 (1939). This principle holds even when the law of the sister State would provide immunity for its actions within the forum State. *See Nevada v. Hall*, 440 U.S. 410, 423-24 (1979).

The State of Nevada plainly was "competent to legislate" with respect to the torts at issue in this case. To meet that standard, a "State must have a significant contact or significant aggregation of contacts, creating state interests, such that choice of its law is neither arbitrary nor fundamentally unfair." *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts*, 472 U.S. 797, 818 (1985). Here, Nevada was both the State in which the injuries to respondent took place, *see Carroll v. Lanza*, 349 U.S. 408, 413 (1955), and the State in which respondent was a citizen at the time that the tortious conduct causing his injuries occurred. Moreover, Nevada has significant contacts with the defendant in this case: the Board not only engaged in improper actions that took place directly within Nevada, it conducted a broad tortious scheme that was specifically intended to have its harmful effects there. Nothing in the Full Faith and Credit Clause bars Nevada from applying its own law to that wrongdoing. In doing so, however, the State made a point of treating California as a co-equal sovereign, specifically examining whether Nevada would be liable for similar actions by its own officials and deciding to defer to California law, as a matter of comity, where it would not.

II. The Court should decline to adopt the "new" full faith and credit rule proposed by the Board. This rule—which would bar application of forum law "to the legislatively immunized acts of a sister State" when that law "interferes with the sister State's capacity to fulfill its own core sovereign responsibilities"—would work a wholly unjustified change in the States'

recognized legislative authority within our federal system. *See Bonaparte v. Tax Court*, 104 U.S. 592 (1881). Here, Nevada has decided that the interests in compensating injured tort victims and deterring intentional wrongdoing outweigh the benefits of providing immunity to state agencies, yet the proposed "new rule" would force Nevada to make the opposite choice, simply because California (the defendant in its courts) has done so. This preemption of Nevada law is directly contrary to the basic allocation of lawmaking authority among the several States. *See FERC v. Mississippi*, 456 U.S. 742, 761 (1982) ("having the power to make decisions and to set policy is what gives the State its sovereign nature").

Nothing in the history of the Full Faith and Credit Clause requires this anomalous result. The relevant debates show that the Framers, in providing for full faith and credit, were primarily concerned with the subject of inter-State respect for *judgments* —where the force of the Clause is considerably greater, *see Baker by Thomas v. General Motors Corp.*, 522 U.S. 222, 232-33 (1998)—and the brief discussion regarding other States' *laws* was largely addressed to the issue of congressional power to declare their "effect." This lack of scrutiny to state laws was reinforced by the fact that Congress subsequently enacted legislation specifying the effect of judgments, but not of "public Acts." Similarly, the decisions of this Court, while not always charting a straight path, have now established that the Clause does not strip States of the fundamental authority to apply their own law regarding matters about which they are competent to legislate.

The "new rule" would also raise largely unanswerable questions about interpretation and application. These problems start with the very premise of the rule: although the Board asks this Court to declare that the interest in legislatively conferred sovereign immunity for one State always outweighs another State's interest in protecting its citizens, it offers no judicially cognizable basis for making that constitutional value judgment.

Furthermore, the rule would require essentially standardless determinations about what are "core sovereign responsibilities"—the Board itself admits that "there is no clear definition of what constitutes a core sovereign responsibility" (FTB Br. 32)—and what might "interfere" with a State's "capacity to fulfill" them. To apply the proposed rule would thus lead to just the sort of subjective, unguided decisions that led this Court to abandon the now-discredited "balancing test" in full faith and credit analysis.

It is not apparent, in fact, how the rule would be applied even in this case. Although the Board claims that it needs immunity in order to conduct its tax collection activities, it must acknowledge that, despite the Nevada litigation, the tax proceeding against respondent is continuing without interruption in California. Furthermore, the Nevada Supreme Court has already allowed the Board to assert immunity under California law for negligence and for any good-faith discretionary actions, which would appear to protect virtually all legitimate forms of investigation and enforcement. Other States are able to operate their tax systems without full immunity, and it appears that California itself permits some damage actions against the State for misconduct by its tax officials. *See* Cal. Government Code § 21021. Taking all this into account, it seems implausible for the Board to insist that immunity for intentional torts is critical to effective operation of the California tax system.

Finally, the "new rule" is unnecessary. Principles of comity have long protected States in the courts of other States, and they have continued to do so following the decision in *Nevada v. Hall*. State courts, in fact, have often done what the Nevada courts did here: they have assessed defendant States' claims of sovereign immunity by reference to the immunity of their own States, thereby treating defendant States as co-equal parts of "our constitutional system of cooperative federalism." *Hall*, 440 U.S. at 424 n. 24. Furthermore, if need be, States can obtain additional protection through agreements among

themselves or through legislation by Congress, which retains its express authority to legislate regarding the effect of "public Acts" under the Full Faith and Credit Clause.

III. The Court should reject the invitation of *amici curiae* Florida *et al.* to revisit that part of *Nevada v. Hall* holding that States lack sovereign immunity as of right in the courts of other States. In pressing this question, *amici* seek to raise an issue that is not within the Question Presented in the petition. *See* Pet. i. Rule 14.1(a) of the Rules of this Court precludes consideration of issues not encompassed in the Question Presented except in "the most exceptional cases." *Izumi Seimitsu Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha v. U.S. Philips Corp*., 510 U.S. 27, 32 (1993) (internal quotation marks omitted). This is not such a case.

Amici also have failed to demonstrate a good reason to depart from governing principles of *stare decisis*. *See Hilton v. South Carolina Pub. Rys. Comm'n,* 502 U.S. 197, 202 (1991). Although their entire argument rests upon historical evidence that States accorded immunity to other States at the time of the Convention, this Court has already expressly recognized that fact in *Nevada v. Hall*. The Court also recognized, however, that the States granted this immunity as a matter of comity, not as a matter of absolute right, a fact that *amici* never successfully overcome. And, while *amici* seek to rely on the decision in *Alden v. Maine*, 527 U.S. 706 (1999), the Court in *Alden* explicitly acknowledged the difference between immunity in a sovereign's own courts and immunity in the courts of another sovereign, pointing out that the latter case "'necessarily implicates the power and authority of a second sovereign.'" *Id*. at 738 (quoting *Hall*, 440 U.S. at 416). The Court then reiterated: "the Constitution did not reflect an agreement between the States to respect the sovereign immunity of one another . . . ." *Id*. at 738.

ARGUMENT

The Full Faith and Credit Clause does not require the Nevada courts to apply California law (here, its statutory defense of sovereign immunity) to intentional torts committed by California officials to harm a Nevada citizen in Nevada. Although the Clause provides "modest restrictions on the application of forum law," *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts*, 472 U.S. 797, 818 (1985), this Court has made clear that a State need not subordinate its own law with respect to matters about which it is "competent to legislate." *Sun Oil Co. v. Wortman*, 486 U.S. 717, 722 (1988) (quoting *Pacific Employers Ins. Co. v. Industrial Accident Comm'n*, 306 U.S. 493, 501 (1939)). That test is readily satisfied here. The State of Nevada is fully competent to legislate regarding deliberate tortious acts that are intended to, and do, injure its citizens within its borders.

The Board does not actually take issue with this basic conclusion. Its sole argument is that this Court should announce a "new rule" under the Full Faith and Credit Clause barring application of forum law—even law that is unquestionably within the legislative jurisdiction of the forum State—"to the legislatively immunized acts of a sister State" when that law "interferes with the sister State's capacity to fulfill its own core sovereign responsibilities." FTB Br. at 13. But this "new rule" finds no basis in the history of the Full Faith and Credit Clause or in the precedent of this Court. Furthermore, in urging the creation of a novel constitutionally binding rule, the Board takes no account of the substantial protection already afforded to State defendants by the willingness of forum States to treat sister States as equal sovereigns, or of the opportunity for States to gain additional protection either through agreements among themselves or through action by Congress, which is given explicit authority to legislate under the Full Faith and Credit Clause. The "new rule" is thus both unsupported and unnecessary.

I. THE DECISION OF THE NEVADA SUPREME COURT NOT TO APPLY CALIFORNIA IMMUNITY LAW TO THE INTENTIONAL TORT CLAIMS IS PLAINLY CONSTITUTIONAL UNDER ESTABLISHED FULL FAITH AND CREDIT PRINCIPLES.

A. The Full Faith And Credit Clause Allows A State To Apply Its Own Law To A Subject Matter About Which It Is Competent To Legislate

Although the Board rests its entire argument on the Full Faith and Credit Clause, it never acknowledges, much less quotes, the governing full faith and credit standard applied by this Court. Just a few Terms ago, however, this Court reiterated what it has long held: that "[t]he Full Faith and Credit Clause does not compel 'a state to substitute the statutes of other states for its own statutes dealing with a subject matter concerning which it is competent to legislate.'" *Baker by Thomas v. General Motors Corp.*, 522 U.S. 222, 232 (1998) (quoting *Pacific Employers*, 306 U.S. at 501); *see Sun Oil*, 486 U.S. at 722 (same). This standard makes clear that, while a forum State may not constitutionally apply its substantive law to matters with which it has only a marginal or inconsequential connection, *see Phillips Petroleum*, 472 U.S. at 818-19, it is free to protect its sovereign interests by applying its law to those matters over which it has legitimate substantive lawmaking authority.

This focus on legislative competence rests upon the recognition of two important principles. The first principle is that, upon formation of the National Government, the States retained "'a residuary and inviolable sovereignty.'" *Printz v. United States*, 521 U.S. 898, 919 (1997) (quoting The Federalist, No. 39, at 245 (J. Madison)). *See Alden v. Maine*, 527 U.S. 706, 713-14 (1999); *Parker v. Brown*, 317 U.S. 341, 359-60 (1943); *Skiriotes v. Florida*, 313 U.S. 69 (1941). As this Court has recently noted, "the founding document 'specifically recognizes the States as sovereign entities,'" *Alden*, 527 U.S. at

713 (quoting *Seminole Tribe of Fla. v. Florida*, 517 U.S. 44, 71 n.15 (1996)), "reserv[ing] to them a substantial portion of the Nation's primary sovereignty, together with the dignity and essential attributes inhering in that status." *Alden*, 527 U.S. at 714. The Tenth Amendment expressly sets forth that understanding, declaring that "[t]he powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." U.S. Const., amdt 10. "'These powers . . . remain after the adoption of the constitution, what they were before, except so far as they may be abridged by that instrument.'" *Cook v. Gralike*, 531 U.S. 510, 519 (2001) (quoting *Sturges v. Crowninshield*, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 122, 193 (1819)).

The second principle is that the States are, in considerable part, defined by their territorial limits. "A State, in the ordinary sense of the Constitution, is a political community of free citizens, occupying a territory of defined boundaries, and organized under a government sanctioned and limited by a written constitution, and established by the consent of the governed." *Texas v. White*, 74 U.S. (7 Wall.) 700, 721 (1869). For the most part, "the jurisdiction of a state is co-extensive with its territory, co-extensive with its legislative power." *Rhode Island v. Massachusetts*, 37 U.S. (12 Pet.) 657, 733 (1838) (internal quotation marks omitted). The sovereignty retained by the States thus leaves them with broad powers to govern with respect to persons and events within those territorial limits. *See Printz*, 521 U.S. at 920 ("[t]he Constitution . . . contemplates that a State's government will represent and remain accountable to its own citizens").

These principles have important consequences for the relations between States in our federal system. This Court has noted the general rule that "[e]very sovereign has the exclusive right to command within his territory . . . ." *Suydam v. Williamson*, 65 U.S. (24 How.) 427, 433 (1860); *see also Healy v. Beer Institute*, 491 U.S. 324, 336 (1989) (recognizing

"autonomy of the individual States within their respective spheres"). Conversely, the Court has acknowledged, again as a general rule, that "[n]o law has any effect, of its own force, beyond the limits of the sovereignty from which its authority is derived." *Hilton v. Guyot*, 159 U.S. 113, 163 (1895). As we discuss later in greater detail, the Full Faith and Credit Clause was not meant to, and did not, change this basic division of lawmaking authority among the States. *See* pages 23-29 *infra*. Thus, as this Court has stated, "[f]ull faith and credit does not enable one state to legislate for the other or to project its laws across state lines so as to preclude the other from prescribing for itself the legal consequences of acts within it." *Pacific Employers*, 306 U.S. at 504-05; *see Nevada v. Hall*, 440 U.S. 410, 423-24 (1979).

These principles, taken together, establish that a State has no obligation to subordinate its legitimate interests to the contrary policies of another State. Although a State should always seek to minimize conflicts with the legal rules of another State, and must defer when its own substantive interests are not genuinely implicated, *see Phillips Petroleum*, 472 U.S. at 818, the Full Faith and Credit Clause does not compel one State to favor the interests of another State over its own interests. *See Sun Oil*, 486 U.S. at 727 (noting that "the forum State and other interested States" should have "the legislative jurisdiction to which they are entitled"). Indeed, the contrary rule, as Chief Justice Stone once observed, "would lead to the absurd result that, whenever the conflict [between the laws of two States] arises, the statute of each state must be enforced in the courts of the other, but cannot be in its own." *Alaska Packers Ass'n v. Industrial Accident Comm'n*, 294 U.S. 532, 547 (1935). The Court has thus declared that "the Full Faith and Credit Clause does not require a State to substitute for its own statute, applicable to persons and events within it, the statute of another State reflecting a conflicting and opposed policy." *Carroll v. Lanza*, 349 U.S. 408, 412 (1955).

The Court has held to these fundamental principles even when the "conflicting and opposed policy" is one that provides sovereign immunity to a defendant State. *See Hall*, 440 U.S. at 421-24. Although acknowledging that "in certain limited situations, the courts of one State must apply the statutory law of another State," *id*. at 421, the Court in *Hall* reiterated that "the Full Faith and Credit Clause does not require a State to apply another State's law in violation of its own legitimate public policy." *Id.* at 422. In that case, the California courts had chosen to apply California law, providing full redress for injuries incurred within its borders, despite efforts by Nevada to invoke the defense of partial sovereign immunity under Nevada law. *See id.* at 421-24. This Court upheld the right of California to choose its own law, noting that California had a "substantial" interest in granting relief to persons injured within its borders. *See id.* at 424 (quoting App. to Pet. for Cert. vii) ("California's interest is the . . . substantial one of providing 'full protection to those who are injured on its highways through the negligence of both residents and nonresidents'").[4]

B. Nevada Is Competent To Legislate To Redress Harms Inflicted On A Nevada Resident In Nevada.

The central full faith and credit question, then, is whether Nevada was "competent to legislate" regarding the torts that are the subject matter of this lawsuit. To answer that question, it is

---

[4] The Court in *Hall* noted that the application of California law "pose[d] no substantial threat to our constitutional system of cooperative federalism" and "could hardly interfere with Nevada's capacity to fulfill its own sovereign responsibilities," 440 U.S. at 424 n.24, adding that it "ha[d] no occasion, in this case, to consider whether different state policies, either of California or of Nevada, might require a different analysis or a different result." *Id.* Although the Board attempts to turn this footnote into a new constitutional restriction on the application of forum-state law, its argument is, as we later discuss, ungrounded in either the relevant history or precedent. *See* pages 21-41 *infra.*

necessary to look at the relationship between Nevada and the "persons and events," *Carroll v. Lanza*, 349 U.S. at 412, that are the basis of the several tort claims. At a minimum, "'for a State's substantive law to be selected in a constitutionally permissible manner, that State must have a significant contact or significant aggregation of contacts, creating state interests, such that choice of its law is neither arbitrary nor fundamentally unfair.'" *Phillips Petroleum*, 472 U.S. at 818 (quoting *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Hague*, 449 U.S. 302, 312-13 (1981) (plurality opinion)). Those contacts and interests are clearly present in this case.

To start with, and most basically, Nevada is the state in which the plaintiff suffered his injuries. Although the Board has claimed (wrongly) that respondent moved to Nevada after the date that he declared for tax purposes, even the Board cannot dispute that respondent was living in Nevada several years later—at the time of the tortious acts that caused the injuries—and that, indeed, respondent has been living there ever since. This Court has frequently noted the strong legislative interest possessed by a forum State that is also the site of the injury to be redressed. *See Carroll v. Lanza*, 349 U.S. at 413 ("[t]he State where the tort occurs certainly has a concern in the problems following in the wake of the injury"); *International Paper Co. v. Ouellette*, 479 U.S. 481, 502 (1987); *Pacific Employers*, 306 U.S. at 503; *Hall*, 440 U.S. at 423. Pointing out the "constitutional authority of [a] state to legislate for the bodily safety and economic protection of employees injured within it," *Pacific Employers*, 306 U.S. at 503, the Court has observed: "Few matters could be deemed more appropriately the concern of the state in which the injury occurs or more completely within its power." *Id.*

This viewpoint is anything but novel or unusual. In tort cases, like this one, traditional conflict-of-laws principles have long placed special emphasis on the law of the place of injury. *See* McDougal, American Conflicts Law § 121 at 449-51 (5th

ed. 2001); Restatement of Conflict of Laws § 377-383 (1934). Chief Judge Posner has recently made the same point, remarking that "[u]nder the *ancien regime* of conflict of laws . . . [t]he rule was simple: the law applicable to a tort suit was the law of the place where the tort occurred, more precisely the place where the last act, namely the plaintiff's injury, necessary to make the defendant's careless or otherwise wrongful behavior actually tortious, occurred." *Spinozzi v. ITT Sheraton Corp.*, 174 F.3d 842, 844 (7th Cir. 1999). More modern conflict-of-laws rules likewise give great, if not decisive weight, to the place of injury. *See* McDougal, American Conflicts Law §§ 124-125; Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws §§ 145, 146-47, 156-60, 162, 164-66 (1971).

The interest possessed by Nevada as the place of injury is reinforced by the fact that plaintiff was (and is) a Nevada citizen. While residence of the plaintiff is not a necessary point of contact, nor perhaps a sufficient one, *see Allstate Ins.*, 449 U.S. at 318-20 (plurality opinion); *id.* at 331 (Stevens, J., concurring in judgment); *id.* at 337 (Powell, J., dissenting), the connection between the State and its citizens does give Nevada an additional interest in assuring compensation whenever those citizens are injured. *See Medtronic, Inc. v. Lohr*, 518 U.S. 470, 475 (1996) ("[t]hroughout our history the several States have exercised their police powers to protect the health and safety of their citizens"). Of course, Nevada has a significant legislative interest in the physical and economic well-being of all persons within its borders, and a sovereign right and duty to protect them, but those concerns are stronger still when the injured party is a Nevada citizen *at the time of injury*, and thus more likely to remain in the State afterwards. Furthermore, insofar as the Board may be consciously singling out and targeting Nevada citizens, *see* page 3 *supra*, the State has an obvious interest in taking appropriate measures to assure their freedom from tortious harassment.

These contacts, by themselves, give Nevada a constitutional basis for applying its own law to the torts committed against respondent there. But, in addition, Nevada has significant contacts with the defendant and with its particular acts of misconduct. Although the Board argues as if its actions were only peripherally connected to Nevada, *see* FTB Br. 33-34 n.16, the evidence demonstrates that the Board deliberately took actions that either occurred in Nevada or were specifically intended to have their harmful effects there. *See* pages 2-5 *supra*. Thus, the Board, through its officials, engaged in bad-faith conduct seeking to exact revenues from a particular taxpayer who, it knew, was living in Nevada at the time, repeatedly disclosing confidential information to third parties within and without Nevada. Furthermore, at least one Board official physically invaded respondent's privacy, going to his Nevada house and looking through his mail and trash. These purposeful acts not only supply a basis for exercising personal jurisdiction over the Board, *see Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz*, 471 U.S. 462 (1985),[5] they strengthen Nevada's territorial interest in assuring redress and give rise to important police power concerns about deterrence of wrongful behavior. Whatever the Board may be free to do in California, it cannot take actions in Nevada, or directly affecting Nevada, without becoming subject to the laws of that State. *See generally* Story, *Commentaries on the Conflict of Laws*, §§ 18-19 (2d ed. 1841).[6]

---

[5] The Board initially sought to quash the complaint in this case for want of personal jurisdiction, but subsequently withdrew its motion. This case thus raises no question about the rules of personal jurisdiction as they might apply to State defendants.

[6] The Board does not, and could not, claim any expectation that Nevada would recognize complete immunity for its actions. More than a decade before, Nevada had made clear that it would allow compensation for individuals injured by certain acts of sister States, relying in part on the decision in *Nevada v. Hall*. *See Mianecki v. District Court*, 658 P.2d 422, 423-25, *cert. dismissed*, 464 U.S. 806 (1983).

These cumulative interests are more than sufficient to satisfy governing full faith and credit standards. But, in holding that Nevada law should be applied to the intentional tort claims, the Nevada Supreme Court took an additional step: it tailored its analysis to account for the fact that the defendant was a sister State. Thus, to determine whether to defer to California law, the supreme court looked, not to whether Nevada law provides for compensation when the injury is caused by private parties, but whether it does so when the injury is caused by Nevada government officials. Finding that Nevada law barred suits based on the discretionary acts of its own officials, the court concluded that, as a matter of comity, Nevada should apply the comparable California law ostensibly providing immunity for negligent acts of California employees. *See* Pet. App. 11-12. However, because Nevada law did not give absolute immunity to its own officials for intentional torts, the Court went on to conclude that "affording Franchise Tax Board statutory immunity for intentional torts does contravene Nevada's policies and interests in this case." Pet. App. 12. More particularly, it decided that "greater weight is to be accorded Nevada's interest in protecting its citizens from injurious intentional torts and bad faith acts committed by sister states' government employees, than California's policy favoring complete immunity for its taxation agency." Pet. App. 12-13.

The Nevada Supreme Court, by engaging in this comparative analysis, thus gave full regard for the fact that California is a sovereign State. In applying full faith and credit principles, its reference point was not the liability of private individuals for tortious conduct, but the liability *of the State itself*. In *Nevada v. Hall*, where the respective position of the two States was reversed, this Court noted with apparent approval that California (the forum State) had looked to its own immunity for similar torts in deciding whether to accord immunity to Nevada (the defendant State) under Nevada law. *See* 440 U.S. at 424. The Full Faith and Credit Clause requires no more.

II. THIS COURT SHOULD DECLINE TO ALTER FULL FAITH AND CREDIT DOCTRINE BY ADOPTING AN UNSUPPORTED NEW CONSTITUTIONAL RULE.

A. The Proposed "New Rule" Is Inconsistent With Full Faith And Credit History And Principles.

The Board dismisses these established full faith and credit principles, arguing that this Court should amend them by adopting a new constitutional rule. This "new rule," however, would work a striking revision of the retained sovereignty of the several States: by requiring immunity for a defendant State, no matter how wrongful its conduct in another State, it would strip away significant legislative authority from the forum States. In the exercise of its lawmaking authority, Nevada has determined that the interests of compensating injured persons and of deterring deliberate wrongdoing are more important than the benefits that might arise from according absolute governmental immunity. *See* Pet. App. 12-13. The "new rule" would order Nevada to make the opposite choice, simply because California (the source of the displacing law) has done so. The result would be to allow California to grant itself a license to act within Nevada's borders without being held accountable under Nevada law.

This redistribution of sovereign power is inconsistent with the most basic understandings of our federal system. That system is based upon a recognition that, having retained all sovereignty not surrendered in the Constitutional plan, *see* pages 13-14 *supra*, the individual States have the sovereign right to decide for themselves how to govern within their territorial boundaries. This Court has observed that "[t]he essence of federalism is that states must be free to develop a variety of solutions to problems and not be forced into a common, uniform mold." *Addington v. Texas*, 441 U.S. 418, 431 (1979); *see also New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann*, 285 U.S. 262, 311 (1932) (Brandeis, J., dissenting). In keeping with that principle, the citizens of a State may decide

that their interests are best served by permitting what other States choose to prohibit, or by prohibiting what other States choose to permit. More particularly, a State may elect to strike a different balance than its neighbors between compensation for individual injury and governmental immunity from liability. "[H]aving the power to make decisions and to set policy is what gives the State its sovereign nature." *FERC v. Mississippi*, 456 U.S. 742, 761 (1982).

This Court has repeatedly acknowledged the importance of this lawmaking power. Indeed, the States' independent legislative role in the federal system is of such stature that, in those areas traditionally subject to state regulation, this Court has adopted a working presumption against preemption of state law. *See, e.g., Medtronic*, 518 U.S. at 485; *Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc.,* 505 U.S. 504, 516 (1992). Although it is accepted that the Federal Government has broad power to restrict state lawmaking, the Court has nonetheless declared that construction of a federal statute begins "with the assumption that the historic police powers of the States [are] not to be superseded . . . unless that [is] the clear and manifest purpose of Congress." *Rice v. Santa Fe Elevator Corp.*, 331 U.S. 218, 230 (1947). Any inquiry into federal preemption of state law is "guided by respect for the separate spheres of governmental authority preserved in our federalist system." *Alessi v. Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc.*, 451 U.S. 504, 522 (1981).

Given this understanding, it would be particularly anomalous to have a newly fashioned constitutional rule mandating preemption of state law *by the law of another State*. This Court has pointed out that "since the legislative jurisdictions of the States overlap, it is frequently the case under the Full Faith and Credit Clause that a court can lawfully apply either the law of one State or the contrary law of another." *Sun Oil*, 486 U.S. at 727; *Phillips Petroleum*, 472 U.S. at 823; *Richards v. United States*, 369 U.S. 1, 15 (1962). It is entirely consistent with that principle, of course, to require a forum State to apply the law of

another State when the forum State has no substantive relationship to the subject matter of the proceeding: in that case, the forum State has no legitimate legislative authority in the first place. But it is very different to tell a State that it must set aside its law in favor of the law of a sister State—law resting on nothing more than a contrary assessment of the relevant interests—even though its own legislative jurisdiction over the matter is unquestioned. As this Court has recently observed, it is not the business of one State to "impose its own policy choice on neighboring States." *BMW of North America, Inc. v. Gore*, 517 U.S. 559, 571 (1996).

It is true, of course, that the application of its own law by one State may have an effect on the sovereign responsibilities, even the "core sovereign responsibilities," of another State. But this Court has never held that this fact justifies the displacement of legitimate legislative authority. To the contrary, in *Bonaparte v. Tax Court*, 104 U.S. 592 (1881), the Court expressly rejected an argument that the Full Faith and Credit Clause barred one State from taxing obligations issued by another State, stating: "No State can legislate except with reference to its own jurisdiction. One State cannot exempt property from taxation in another. Each State is independent of all the others in this particular." 104 U.S. at 594. The Court recognized that taxation of State debt obligations might affect the issuing State's ability to "borrow[] money at reduced interest" (*id*. at 595)—surely an "interference" with "core sovereign responsibilities"—but it nevertheless concluded that the Constitution provided no basis for suppressing the taxing power of another State. *See id*. ("States are left free to extend the comity which is sought, or not, as they please"). *See also State of Georgia v. City of Chattanooga*, 264 U.S. 472, 480 (1924) ("[l]and acquired by one state in another state is held subject to the laws of the latter . . . .").

The Full Faith and Credit Clause would be, in fact, an extremely unlikely place to find a significant constitutional

limitation on state legislative authority. Although the Board is correct in saying that the Clause "'altered the status of the States as independent sovereigns,'" FTB Br. 23 (quoting *Estin v. Estin*, 334 U.S. 541, 546 (1948)); *see also Sun Oil*, 486 U.S. at 723 n.1, that general observation—which could be made about a number of constitutional provisions—says nothing about the particular way in which it did so. This Court has made clear, however, that the principal effect of the Full Faith and Credit Clause on the States as "independent sovereigns" was to require them to recognize other state *judgments*, not to reallocate their respective legislative powers. As a consequence, the Court has consistently made a distinction between "the credit owed to laws (legislative measures and common law) and to judgments." *Baker by Thomas*, 522 U.S. at 232. While emphasizing that "[r]egarding judgments . . . the full faith and credit obligation is exacting," 522 U.S. at 233, the Court has found a far less demanding obligation with respect to state laws, holding to the established principle that a State may apply its own law to matters on which it is competent to legislate. *See id.* at 232.[7]

This difference in treatment is well-grounded in the historical record. At the time that the Full Faith and Credit Clause was drafted, the attention of the Framers was primarily on the respect to be given to judgments of sister States. *See Nadelmann, Full Faith and Credit to Judgments and Public Acts: A Historical-Analytical Reappraisal*, 56 Mich. L. Rev. 33, 53-59 (1957); Whitten, *The Constitutional Limitations on State Choice of Law: Full Faith and Credit*, 12 Memphis State U. L. Rev. 1, 33-39 (1981); *see generally* Jackson, *Full Faith and Credit—The Lawyer's Clause of the Constitution*, 45 Colum. L.

[7] The obligation to respect sister-State judgments may, of course, impinge to some extent upon the legislative interests of a forum State. As we discuss, however, that more limited intrusion is supported by the relevant constitutional history combined with the ensuing legislation enacted by Congress pursuant to its powers under the Full Faith and Credit Clause. *See* pages 24-28 *infra*.

Rev. 1 (1945). This was the principal question that the States had confronted during colonial times and during the period governed by the Articles of Confederation (which contained its own full faith and credit provision), with various States having arrived at various solutions. *See* Nadelmann, 56 Mich. L. Rev. at 34-54; Whitten, 12 Memphis State U. L. Rev. at 19-31. The constitutional debate thus took place against a background of indecision about whether other-State judgments were to have only an assigned evidentiary value, or to be given the more authoritative status of domestic judgments. *See* Whitten, 12 Memphis State U. L. Rev. at 31-33.

The treatment of full faith and credit for state laws occupied a distinctly secondary position. The issue appears not to have caused any great controversy during the years preceding the Convention, and discussion of the "public acts" language in the draft Full Faith and Credit Clause was brief and largely unilluminating. *See* Nadelmann, 56 Mich. L. Rev. at 53-59; Whitten, 12 Memphis State U. L. Rev. at 33-39. The most directly relevant piece of the legislative record—a statement by James Wilson of Pennsylvania that "if the Legislature were not allowed to *declare the effect* the provision would amount to nothing more than what now takes place among all independent Nations" (3 M. Farrand, The Records of the Federation Convention of 1787, at 488 (1911))—is, on its face, addressed to the question whether Congress should be given the power to prescribe the "effect" of the "public Acts, Records, and Judicial proceedings" covered by the draft Clause. William Samuel Johnson of Connecticut then observed that the proposed language "would authorize the Genl. Legislature to declare the effect of Legislative acts of one State, in another State." *Id.* The principal opposition to the proposal, raised unsuccessfully by Edmond Randolph of Virginia, addressed the same point about congressional authority, objecting that this "definition of the powers of the [National] Government was so loose as to give opportunities of usurping all the State powers." *Id.*

Wholly absent in the course of this discussion is any indication that the Full Faith and Credit Clause would necessarily "usurp[]" significant State powers by requiring the States to subordinate their otherwise-applicable substantive laws to the contrary laws of another State.[8]

The brevity (and opacity) of this debate is wholly out of keeping with the theory that, in the Full Faith and Credit Clause, the States were permanently ceding to each other part of their traditional, jealously guarded legislative authority. Furthermore, it appears that the Clause generated no subsequent debate among the States during the process of ratification. *See* Sumner, *The Full Faith and Credit Clause—Its History and Purpose*, 34 Oregon L. Rev. 224, 235 (1955). Having contended at great length over their surrender of certain legislative powers to the federal government, it is utterly implausible to think that the States would agree, in almost total silence, to accept a provision that required them to engage in subservience to the laws of their neighbors. This is especially so in light of the fact that the States had just endured a period in which distrust among the several States, and concern about the unfairness of certain state laws, had been widespread and, for the most part, well-warranted. *See generally* Amar, *Of Sovereignty and Federalism*, 96 Yale L. J. 1425, 1447-48 (1987) (discussing the States' fractious relations under the Articles of Confederation); Sumner, 34 Oregon L. Rev. at 241 ("[a]t the time that the

[8]Professor Whitten has argued that the historical evidence provides no basis for concluding that the Full Faith and Credit Clause ever compels States to subordinate their own laws. *See* Whitten, 12 Memphis State U. L. Rev. at 62-69. In his view, "the original meaning of the Full Faith and Credit Clause as applied to conflict-of-laws problems was a very narrow one: the clause directly required the states to admit the statutes of other states into evidence only as conclusive proof of their own existence and contents; it did not require the states to enforce or apply the laws of other states; Congress, however, was given exclusive authority under the second sentence of article IV, section 1 to establish nationwide choice-of-law rules for the states." *Id.* at 62-63.

delegates to the Constitutional Convention met there was no unity among the states. The states considered each other as foreign countries").

The Framers, of course, had some familiarity with conflict-of-laws principles, which had gradually become a part of the law of nations. *See generally*, Juenger, *A Page of History,* 35 Mercer L. Rev. 419 (1984). But, even if those emerging principles were properly looked to for an understanding of domestic full faith and credit doctrine, they would not support the "new rule" proposed by the Board: at the time of the Convention, no one would have seriously thought that the law of nations provided grounds for the forced displacement of legitimate forum-State law by the law of another State. The most noted early American commentator, Joseph Story, stressed, as "[t]he first and most general maxim or proposition" underlying the field of conflict of laws, "that every nation possesses an exclusive sovereignty and jurisdiction within its own territory." Story, *Commentaries on the Conflict of Laws*, § 18, at 25. This maxim, in turn, gave rise to another: "that whatever force and obligation the laws of one country have in another, depend solely upon the laws and municipal regulations of the latter; that is to say, upon its own proper jurisprudence and polity, and upon its own express or tacit consent." *Id.* § 23, at 30. Based on these maxims, Story reasoned that, while application of the law of another sovereign was often necessary to advance international commerce and relations, "[n]o nation can be justly required to yield up its own fundamental policy and institutions, in favour of those of another nation." *Id.* § 25, at 31. *See also* Nadelmann, 56 Mich. L. Rev. at 75-81.[9]

---

[9] The influential Dutch jurist, Ulrich Huber, likewise recognized that "a sovereign may refuse to recognize 'rights acquired' abroad if they would prejudice the forum's 'power or rights.'" Juenger, 35 Mercer L. Rev. at 435. Huber, in turn, had a great influence on English choice-of-law principles. *See id.* at 440.

It is thus not surprising that Congress, having been given express authority in the Full Faith and Credit Clause to declare the effect of properly authenticated "public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings," promptly enacted a statute that declared the effect of records and judicial proceedings, but *not* of public acts. *See* Act of May 26, 1790, 1 Stat. 122 (1790); Nadelmann, 56 Mich. L. Rev. at 60-61. This reticence, too, hardly fits with the notion that the Framers intended the Full Faith and Credit Clause to be a wide-ranging vehicle for limiting the States' capacity to establish and enforce their own laws within their own borders. Indeed, for more than 150 years, the federal statute continued to make no mention of the effect of "public Acts." *See* Nadelmann, 56 Mich. L. Rev. at 81-82. And, while the 1948 revision of the United States Code finally changed that, *see* Act of June 25, 1948, 62 Stat. 947 (1948); 28 U.S.C. § 1738, the generally accepted view is that this modification was not intended to reflect any substantive change, but was simply the result of a blunder by the revisers. *See* Whitten, 12 Memphis State U. L. Rev. at 61 ("[t]he revisers obviously did not have any idea what they were doing"); Currie, *The Constitution and the Choice of Law: Governmental Interests and the Judicial Function*, 26 U. Chi. L. Rev. 9, 19 (1958) ("a notably footless piece of draftsmanship").

This Court, likewise, has generally been careful not to construe the Full Faith and Credit Clause to limit the legislative jurisdiction of the States. Without recounting that history in detail, it suffices to say that, prior to the early 20th century, the Court had largely regarded the Clause as a provision mandating respect for judgments, not as a command for States to defer to sister-State laws. *See* Jackson, 45 Colum. L. Rev. 7 (noting that "cases as to judgments . . . constitute the bulk of full faith and credit litigation"). Furthermore, even after the Court undertook to order forum States to apply the law of other States (under both the Full Faith and Credit Clause and the Due Process Clause), it did so infrequently, and primarily in cases reflecting

(if not stating) the basic proposition that a State *without* legislative jurisdiction may not apply its substantive law in preference to that of a State with legislative jurisdiction. *See* Currie, 26 U. Chi. L. Rev. at 76-77; *see also id.* at 19-76 (reviewing cases).

To be sure, the Court did not always avoid interference with the legislative authority of a forum State. Perhaps the most striking example was the decision in *Bradford Electric Co. v. Clapper*, 286 U.S. 145 (1932), where the Court held that the Full Faith and Credit Clause required a New Hampshire federal court to apply Vermont law in a tort suit filed by the estate of a Vermont worker killed in New Hampshire. That decision—which effectively barred New Hampshire from providing redress for an accidental death within its borders—seemingly did limit its authority with respect to an occurrence over which it undoubtedly had lawmaking power. But *Clapper* did not stand the test of time. Just seven years later, the Court in *Pacific Employers* "limited its holding to its facts," *Hall*, 440 U.S. at 423 n. 23, while announcing that a State need not "substitute the statutes of other states for its own statutes dealing with a subject matter concerning which it is competent to legislate." 306 U.S. at 501. That remains the standard recognized by this Court to the present day. *See Baker by Thomas*, 522 U.S. at 232; *Sun Oil*, 486 U.S. at 722; pages 13-16 *supra*.

B. The Proposed Rule Would Require Courts To Make Subjective, Largely Standardless Judgments.

The "new rule" proposed by the Board not only is ungrounded in history and precedent, but would raise a host of largely unanswerable questions. Although the Board seemingly has abandoned its position (FTB Reply to Brief in Opposition 4-6) that the Court should apply a "balancing test" to decide whether Nevada must apply California law, its current stance—by asking the Court to make a constitutional value judgment

about the benefits of state immunity versus the benefits of compensating individuals and deterring wrongful behavior—is really just a call for balancing in a different guise. Furthermore, the rule is open-ended in a way that will require elaborate, and essentially standardless, inquiries into what is to be categorized as "interfer[ence] [with a] sister State's capacity to fulfill its own core sovereign responsibilities."

The essential premise of the "new rule" is evident from its carefully constructed terms: that, under the Full Faith and Credit Clause, laws providing sovereign immunity for core sovereign actions must always trump the laws of States providing compensation for unlawful acts within their borders. But there is simply no basis on which to elevate *legislatively conferred* sovereign immunity into a position of constitutional supremacy. In *Nevada v. Hall*, of course, this Court held that the States have no inherent right to sovereign immunity in the courts of another State, finding that such immunity was neither recognized as a matter of right at common law, nor provided to States (at the expense of other sovereign interests) in the plan of the Convention. *See* 440 U.S. at 414-21, 424-27; *see also Alden*, 527 U.S. at 738-40. In light of that holding—which the Board has not challenged in either its petition or in its brief on the merits—it is totally implausible to think that the Framers, while making no grant of inter-State immunity as a matter of right, nevertheless intended to force States into recognizing legislatively created immunity defenses through the backdoor mechanism of the Full Faith and Credit Clause.[10] Unsurprisingly, the brief debates about the meaning and effect of the

[10]A group of States, appearing as *amici curiae*, does urge the Court to overrule *Nevada v. Hall* insofar as it held that the States do not have inherent immunity in the courts of other States. *See* Brief *Amici Curiae* Florida *et al.* at 1-19. As we discuss, *see* pages 41-45 *infra*, this issue is not within the Question Presented in this case, and, in any event, *amici* have provided no good reason either for disregarding *stare decisis* or for thinking that *Nevada v. Hall* was wrongly decided.

Clause contain no mention of sovereign immunity at all, much less compelled sovereign immunity in the courts of another State.

The Board also provides no authority from which the Court could declare that the interest in protecting States from liability is somehow intrinsically and invariably superior to the competing sovereign interests in compensating persons for their injuries and in deterring intentional torts. As a general matter, of course, the citizens of each individual State may decide for themselves that immunity for governmental misconduct is needed in order to fulfill the State's "core sovereign responsibilities," thereby subordinating claims for injuries suffered at government hands. The citizens of other States, however, are free to take a different view, concluding that immunity not only would leave injured persons without an effective remedy, but would remove an important incentive for government officials to refrain from acts of wrongdoing. The task of sorting out those competing interests is one that legislatures commonly undertake on a state-by-state basis, but there are no judicial tools available for determining, as a matter of constitutional law, which interest, or combination of interests, is more important.

This absence of judicially manageable standards, in fact, serves to explain why the Court no longer employs a balancing test as part of its general full faith and credit analysis. At one time, in cases decided during roughly a thirty-year period, the Court occasionally indicated that it would decide which of several state laws should apply, as a constitutional matter, "by appraising the governmental interests of each jurisdiction, and turning the scale of decision according to their weight." *Alaska Packers Ass'n v. Industrial Accident Comm'n of California*, 294 U.S. 532, 547 (1935); *see also Watson v. Employers Liability Assurance Corp.*, 348 U.S. 66, 73 (1954); *Hughes v. Fetter*, 341 U.S. 609 (1951). This forced selection of a particular state law, of course, is inconsistent with the now-accepted understanding

that more than one State can constitutionally exercise legislative jurisdiction over a particular matter. *See Phillips Petroleum*, 472 U.S. at 823; *Sun Oil*, 486 U.S. at 727. Even more basically, however, the balancing approach suffered from the fact that there is no such thing as a constitutional "scale of decision" that can measure the "weight" of competing legitimate state interests. *See* Weinberg, *Choice of Law and Minimal Scrutiny*, 49 U. Chi. L. Rev. 440, 472-73 (1982); *see also* Kirgis, *The Roles of Due Process and Full Faith and Credit in Choice of Law*, 62 Cornell L. Rev. 94, 112 (1976) (expressing concern that balancing courts "might simply assign weights, without any determinable standard, to justify the results of cases decided on other premises"). Thus, by the time of the decision in *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Hague*, the practice had fallen into disuse, and all eight participating Justices in that case, speaking in three different opinions, explicitly acknowledged that the Court had "abandoned the weighing-of-interests requirement." *Id.* at 308 n.10 (plurality opinion); *id.* at 322 n.6 (Stevens, J., concurring in judgment); *id.* at 339 n.6 (Powell, J., dissenting). Even in the reconfigured form of a "new rule," there is no reason to breathe life back into that "discredited practice." *See id.* at 339 n.6 (Powell, J., dissenting).

The terms of the proposed rule raise other troublesome questions as well. To begin with, it is not self-evident why the rule requires full faith and credit for "legislatively immunized acts," but not for other state laws that might bear on "core sovereign responsibilities." If the Full Faith and Credit Clause were meant to protect the activities of one State from interference by the laws of another State, it would seem to follow that the rule would extend beyond "legislatively immunized acts," to any acts important to state operations. The Board, in fact, seems to say so itself. *See* FTB Br. 37 (suggesting that its rule would apply to "any number of various programs that are vital to state interests"). That, of course, would raise several problems. First, it would cut an even wider

swath through the legislative jurisdiction of the several States, blocking them from applying their own laws in an ever-expanding number of cases. Second, it would seemingly require the overruling of *Bonaparte v. Tax Court*, where, as we have noted (*see* page 23 *supra*), the Court held that the Full Faith and Credit Clause does not require a State to defer to laws of another State making its debt obligations immune from taxation, even though its refusal to do so would obviously raise the borrowing costs to the issuing State and thereby interfere with the sovereign responsibility of obtaining necessary funds. *See* 104 U.S. at 595. At the very least, therefore, unless the "new rule" has been fashioned simply to fit this case, defendant States may regard it as just a first step towards displacement of any laws that they consider inhospitable to the conduct of their government operations.

It also seems that the proposed rule would permit state legislatures to confer binding immunity, not just on the State itself and its agencies, but on individual state officials and subdivisions, such as counties and cities. The terms of the rule are certainly broad enough to encompass such immunity, and, if the touchstone of the rule is to prevent interference with "core sovereign responsibilities," it rationally could apply to any official or entity designated to carry out important State functions, at least while acting under authority delegated from the State. It is true, of course, that the Eleventh Amendment and related doctrines of sovereign immunity do not typically extend protection to individuals and local governments, *see, e.g., Buckhannon Bd. and Care Home, Inc. v. West Virginia Dept. of Health and Human Resources*, 532 U.S. 598, 609 n.10 (2001), but the rule proposed by the Board does not—indeed, after *Nevada v. Hall*, could not—find a basis in historic doctrines of sovereign immunity. Rather, it rests on whatever immunity a state legislature chooses to grant with respect to "core sovereign responsibilities," a potentially far-reaching basis for nullifying other States' laws.

These uncertainties are modest, however, compared to the most basic problem with the "new rule": that, even if one can figure out what kinds of laws and entities are covered generally, there is still no standard by which to judge what might constitute "core sovereign responsibilities" or what might be thought sufficient to "interfere[]" with a State's "capacity to fulfill" them. *See* FTB Br. 32 ("there is no clear definition of what constitutes a core sovereign responsibility . . . ."). Every State possesses broad police powers, which are exercised in hundreds of ways, ranging from criminal investigations to state aid programs. Any action in furtherance of those powers could be thought, in one sense or another, to be necessary to the exercise of "core sovereign responsibilities," so that *any* threat of litigation with respect to *any* of them would be regarded as inhibiting state employees from carrying out their jobs. *See* FTB Br. 37 (complaining that "widespread application" of the decision below "could (and perhaps would) interfere with (and likely cripple) the States' ability to conduct any number of various programs that are vital to state interests, *each of which is a core sovereign responsibility*") (emphasis added). Alternatively, a State could argue that any significant award of damages would deprive the State of funds needed to meet its responsibilities, regardless of the particular state action (for example, a traffic accident) that gave rise to the lawsuit in question. If those kinds of arguments are to be accepted, it will mean that a State, just by granting itself immunity, could effectively do whatever it pleased within the borders of other States, without the prospect of being held to account, so long as it was somehow acting within one of its recognized powers. On the other hand, if the rule is to depend on a case-by-case examination of each State activity, and a further inquiry into the extent of possible interference caused by each lawsuit (or class of lawsuits) with respect to that activity, the courts applying the rule would face intractable questions of line-drawing comparable to, if not worse than, those presented by the now-departed weighing-of-interests test.

This case presents an example of just some of these difficulties. Although the Board emphasizes that States have a strong interest in conducting their tax programs, it does not explain, for purposes of understanding its rule, just what programs the States would not have a strong interest in conducting. Moreover, and in any event, this assertion about the importance of tax operations goes to only part of the proposed inquiry: the question, then, is whether the law of Nevada, if applied here, would seriously impede the capacity of California to collect its tax revenues. That seems unlikely if only because the California tax proceeding against respondent remains ongoing in California. Furthermore, the Nevada Supreme Court expressly held that the Board should be allowed immunity under California law for any negligent or good-faith discretionary acts, Pet. App. 11-12, a fact that the Board conspicuously ignores. As a result, Nevada law leaves California free to investigate and prosecute taxpayers in Nevada without any genuine concern that it will face liability for mere misjudgments or for actions amounting to nothing more than an abuse of discretion. The ultimate issue thus comes down, not to whether California can engage in the "normal procedures at its disposal," FTB Br. 33, but to whether California must have the latitude to commit intentional torts, or perhaps to have "breathing space" with respect to the commission of intentional torts, in order to operate its system of tax assessment and collection.

This idea is hard to credit for several reasons. First of all, many States are able to operate their tax systems without across-the-board immunity. While the Board cites to certain States that extend broad protection, FTB Br. 12 n.5, other States provide immunity that stops well short of shielding all misconduct. *See, e.g.*, ARIZ. REV. STAT. § 12.820.01 (2002); OHIO REV. CODE ANN. 2743.02 (Anderson 2002); WASH. REV. CODE § 4.92.090 (2002). Furthermore, many States allow personal suits against state officials for intentional or malicious wrongdoing. *See, e.g.*, ARK. CODE ANN. § 19-10-305(a) (2002); FLA. STAT.

§ 768.28 (2002); MD. CODE ANN., CTS. & JUD. PROC. § 5-522(b) (2002). The existence of that liability, which obviously acts as a deterrent to tortious acts by State employees, strongly suggests that the States do not regard such behavior as essential to their operations. *See Biscoe v. Arlington County*, 738 F.2d 1352, 1360-61 (D.C. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1159 (1985) (recognition of personal liability for individual officials casts doubt on justification for governmental immunity).

An equally compelling reason to doubt the need for total immunity is that California itself allows actions against the State for misconduct by its tax officials. Thus, the curiously worded immunity statute relied on by the Board, California Government Code § 860.2 (Pet. Br. App. 1-2), applies only to "instituting" proceedings and actions and to acts with respect to the "interpretation or application of any law relating to a tax." *Id.* The California Supreme Court has not construed this language, but even broadly construed, it would hardly seem to cover all operational torts committed by state tax officers. More importantly, other sections of the Code expressly allow a taxpayer to "bring an action for damages," *see* California Government Code § 21021 (FTB Br. App. 11), whenever Board employees have recklessly disregarded published procedures. *Id.* As the Board recognizes, FTB. Br. 11 n.4, this statute would be meaningless if the California immunity statute barred all tax-related claims.[11] Taken as a whole, therefore, the tolerance of various damage actions under the laws of many States, combined with the availability of state-law actions even under

[11] This provision also demonstrates that, contrary to the theory of *Amici Curiae* National Governors Association, *et al.*, an action for damages is not a "collateral[]attack" on administrative tax proceedings. *Id.* at 11. As previously noted, the tax case against respondent is continuing unabated in California. *See* page 2 *supra*; FTB Br. 4.

California law, severely undercuts the Board's position that total immunity is necessary to operation of an effective tax system.[12]

Finally, we note that the "new rule" urged by the Board is utterly boundless: the rule would compel Nevada to recognize immunity for any acts related to core sovereign responsibilities—no matter how despicable or abusive—as long as California was willing to immunize them. Under the terms of the rule, California officials would be able to assert immunity for assaulting Nevada citizens as part of a police investigation, or subjecting those under investigation to libel in Nevada newspapers. Indeed, while the behavior in this case is bad enough, the rule would permit Board auditors, instead of just going through respondent's mail and garbage, to enter his house and rummage through his drawers and files, all without concern that Nevada could order the State to provide compensation for those acts. Or investigators could expressly threaten respondent with further disclosure of his personal and professional information if he persisted in his unwillingness to settle the inflated tax claims, again without fear of exposing the Board to liability. Perhaps the Board thinks this is all well and good, but it is a truly remarkable proposition that, in the face of such actions, the Constitution would render Nevada powerless to apply its own laws and provide relief.

C. The Proposed Rule Is Unnecessary.

The rule proposed by the Board rests, at bottom, on a simple policy argument: that, unless this Court reads its proposed rule into the Full Faith and Credit Clause, state courts will seriously

---

[12] If the Board is ultimately advancing only a right to require observance of California law with respect to the *forum*, its full faith and credit argument grows weaker still. This Court has held that the Clause does not bar a State from disregarding a forum selection provision, even when the court is applying the substantive law of another State. *See Crider v. Zurich Ins. Co.*, 380 U.S. 39 (1965).

interfere with the fundamental operations of sister States. The Board disregards, however, the many sources of protection already available to shield States from genuine disruption.

In the first place, principles of comity, as they have for centuries, continue to provide strong assurance that private suits will not unduly interfere with government operations. Because States have never had immunity as of right in the courts of other States, *see Hall*, 440 U.S. at 414-21, it is the doctrine of comity—both before and after formation of the Republic—that has given them protection in state courts other than their own. *Id.* As has long been the case among sovereign nations, *see Hilton v. Guyot*, 159 U.S. at 163-66, sovereign States have traditionally applied the doctrine of comity with a healthy regard for the sovereignty of their sister States. *See Hall*, 440 U.S. at 417-18. This tendency is naturally reinforced by a well-developed self-interest, grounded in the awareness that other States, as equal sovereigns, have the power to grant or withhold comity in their own right.

This regard for the sovereignty of sister States has continued even after the decision in *Nevada v. Hall*. Although many States then expressed concern about uncertainties arising from that decision, *see* Brief of West Virginia *et al. Amici Curiae* in Support of Petition for Rehearing, No. 77-1337 (Oct. Term 1977), at 2-10, recent history shows that state courts have continued to dismiss suits against their sister States. *See, e.g., Reed v. University of North Dakota*, 543 N.W.2d 106 (Minn. Ct. App. 1996); *University of Iowa Press v. Urrea*, 440 S.E.2d 203 (Ga. Ct. App. 1993). Moreover, in cases where state courts have agreed to hear claims against another State, the forum court has often done what the Nevada Supreme Court did below: looked to the immunity of the forum State in determining what acts of the defendant State would be subject to suit. *See, e.g., McDonnell v. Illinois*, 748 A.2d 1105, 1107 (N.J. 2000); *Struebin v. Iowa*, 322 N.W.2d 84, 86 (Iowa), *cert. denied*, 459 U.S. 1087 (1982); *Morrison v. Budget Rent A Car*

Systems, 230 A.D.2d 253, 268 (N.Y. App. Div. 1997); *see also Head v. Platte County*, 749 P.2d 6, 10 (1988) (suit against municipality with state-law immunity). This practice, of course, makes it highly improbable that a defendant State would be exposed to liability that genuinely imperils legitimate government activity. While the States grant themselves different degrees of immunity for government actions, few States are likely to subject themselves to state-law suits that will prevent them from carrying out critical governmental functions.

This history of consideration for defendant States also addresses the concern, expressed by the dissenting Justices in *Hall*, that a forum State would treat a defendant State "just as it would treat any other litigant." *Nevada v. Hall*, 440 U.S. at 428 (Blackmun, J., dissenting). Under traditional principles of comity, and certainly under a practice of looking to forum-State immunity, it will simply not be the case that "State A can be sued in State B on the same terms as any other litigant can be sued." *Id.* at 429 (Blackmun, J., dissenting). As the cases cited by the Board themselves demonstrate, and the decision below confirms, state courts are fully capable of recognizing the sovereign interests of other States, using their own sovereign interests as a benchmark. *See Guarini v. New York*, 521 A.2d 1362 (N.J. Super. 1986), *aff'd*, 521 A.2d 1294, *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 817 (1987); *Xiomara Mejia-Cabral v. Eagleton School*, Mass. Super. LEXIS 353, 10 Mass. L. Rep. 452 (Mass. Sup. Ct. 1999). By regarding state defendants as sovereigns of equal stature, not as private litigants, States are thereby according them the respect to which they are entitled in "our constitutional system of cooperative federalism." *Hall*, 440 U.S. at 424 n.24.

The States also have more formal methods of assuring protection for themselves. If two States have concerns about possible liability in each other's courts, they may arrange between themselves to provide immunity on a reciprocal basis. (This kind of agreement would not alter the federal-state balance and should not require approval by Congress. *See Cuyler v.*

Adams, 449 U.S. 433, 440-41 (1981)). Or, if a number of States share the same overall viewpoint about the need for immunity, they may enter into a larger multi-State agreement, similar to the agreement that established the Multistate Tax Commission. *See generally United States Steel Corp. v. Multistate Tax Comm'n,* 434 U.S. 452 (1978). These agreements would have the advantage of allowing the signatory States to decide for themselves what legislative authority they are willing to surrender within their borders in return for recognition of more expansive sovereign immunity in the courts of other States. At the same time, the agreements would not force unwilling States to give up their legislative authority, as the constitutional rule advocated by the Board necessarily would do.

In addition to these avenues, the Full Faith and Credit Clause itself provides another: the possibility of legislative action by Congress, declaring the "effect" of state immunity laws in other States. *See Sun Oil*, 486 U.S. at 729 ("it can be proposed that Congress legislate to that effect under the second sentence of the Full Faith and Credit Clause"). The Clause, of course, contains an express grant of power to Congress to declare the "effect" of public acts in state courts. As the national legislative body, Congress is well-positioned to consider the competing interests of all States, including (but not limited to) the interest of defendant States in avoiding burdens on their government operations. *See generally Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority*, 469 U.S. 528 (1988). Moreover, unlike a constitutional holding that would freeze the rights of forum and defendant States, any congressional legislation addressing inter-State immunity could thereafter be amended, if and when circumstances so dictated.

These alternative methods offer significant safeguards for State defendants, all without permitting one State to unilaterally preempt the legislative jurisdiction of another State merely by passing a law to immunize itself. This Court has previously declined the invitation to "embark upon the enterprise of

constitutionalizing choice-of-law rules, with no compass to guide us beyond our own perceptions of what seems desirable." *Sun Oil Co.,* 486 U.S. at 727-28. It should decline that invitation here as well.

III. THIS COURT SHOULD REJECT THE INVITATION OF *AMICI CURIAE* TO OVERRULE *NEVADA V. HALL*.

The Florida *et al*. *amici curiae* brief raises an issue that the Board does not raise: that the States have inherent sovereign immunity in the courts of other States and that this Court should overrule that part of *Nevada v. Hall* holding to the contrary. This question is not set out in the Question Presented in the petition, nor is it fairly included therein. *See* Sup. Ct. Rule 14.1(a). Rule 14.1(a) of the Rules of this Court plainly states that "[o]nly the questions set out in the petition, or fairly included therein, will be considered by the Court," and this Court has said that it will depart from the rule "'only in the most exceptional cases.'" *Izumi Seimitsu Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha v. U.S. Philips Corp.*, 510 U.S. 27, 32 (1993) (quoting *Yee v. Escondido*, 503 U.S. 519, 535 (1992)). *See also Taylor v. Freeland & Krontz*, 503 U.S. 638, 646 (1992) (Rule 14.1(a) "helps to maintain the integrity of the process of certiorari"). Here, the Board could not have been more clear, in setting forth the Question Presented, that the only question it was raising was whether the Full Faith and Credit Clause required the Nevada courts to apply Section 860.2 of California Government Code. *See* Pet. i. This is a very different question, answered by reference to wholly different historical materials and case law, than the question *amici* now seek to raise. *Amici* may believe that the Board presented the wrong question, but they are not free to redraw the case to their liking.[13]

---

[13] The issue that *amici* now want to raise was not, in fact, included in the Question Presented in the States' own *amici curiae* brief filed at the certiorari stage. *See* Brief *amici curiae* of Oregon *et al.* at i.

We nonetheless will briefly address their arguments, which fall far short of making a case for reconsidering, let alone overruling, *Nevada v. Hall*. "Time and time again, this Court has recognized that 'the doctrine of *stare decisis* is of fundamental importance to the rule of law.'" *Hilton v. South Carolina Pub. Rys. Comm'n*, 502 U.S. 197, 202 (1991) (quoting *Welch v. Texas Dep't of Highways*, 483 U.S. 468, 494 (1987)). Because "[a]dherence to precedent promotes stability, predictability, and respect for judicial authority," 502 U.S. at 202, the Court has emphasized that it "will not depart from the doctrine of *stare decisis* without some compelling justification." *Id.* There is no "compelling justification" here.

The principal argument made by *amici* is based on historical evidence that, at the time of the Convention, independent sovereigns traditionally accorded immunity to other sovereigns in their courts. *See* Brief *Amici Curiae* Florida, *et al*. 5-12. But this argument offers nothing new: this Court explicitly recognized this practice of granting immunity in *Nevada v. Hall*, discussing the same principal authority (*The Schooner Exchange v. McFaddon*, 11 U.S. (7 Cranch) 116 (1812)) that *amici* now address. *See* 440 U.S. at 417. What the Court in *Hall* also pointed out, however, and what *amici* only briefly try to refute, is the unimpeachable evidence that sovereigns extended this immunity, not as a matter of absolute right, but as a matter of comity. *See* 440 U.S. at 416-17. Chief Justice Marshall made this plain in *The Schooner Exchange* itself (11 U.S. (7 Cranch) at 136), and this Court has held to that view ever since. *See Verlinden B.V. v. Central Bank of Nigeria*, 461 U.S. 480, 486 (1983) ("[a]s *The Schooner Exchange* made clear, . . . foreign sovereign immunity is a matter of grace and comity on the part of the United States, and not a restriction imposed by the Constitution"). Moreover, as further proof that immunity among co-equal sovereigns is extended as a matter of comity not right, it is unquestioned that the United States (the sovereign

extending immunity in *The Schooner Exchange*) has since significantly, and unilaterally, *reduced* the amount of immunity that it grants to foreign sovereigns, exercising its own sovereign right to decide the legal consequences of acts within the scope of its legislative competence. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1602 *et seq*.; *Alfred Dunhill of London, Inc. v. Republic of Cuba*, 425 U.S. 682 (1976); *see also Argentine Republic v. Amerada Hess Shipping Corp.*, 488 U.S. 428 (1989). All this history and experience is simply incompatible with an attempt to revive the already-rejected theory that immunity in the courts of other sovereigns could be demanded as a matter of absolute privilege.

Amici also rely heavily on the *Alden* decision, which held that States have sovereign immunity in their own courts even with respect to certain federal claims. *See* 527 U.S. at 711-61. But *amici* simply disregard the parts of the decision that undermine their position. Thus, *amici* do not deal with, or even acknowledge, the fact that the Court in *Alden* expressly distinguished the absolute right of a sovereign to immunity in its own courts from its lack of sovereign immunity in the courts of another sovereign. 527 U.S. at 738-40. Quoting (rather than rejecting) *Nevada v. Hall*, the Court recognized that a claim of immunity in another State "'necessarily implicates the power and authority of a second sovereign.'" *Id.* at 738 (quoting *Hall*, 440 U.S. at 416). For that reason, the Court said, "its source must be found either in an agreement, express or implied, between the two sovereigns, or in the voluntary decision of the second to respect the dignity of the first as a matter of comity.'" *Id.* The Court then reiterated what it had previously determined: that "the Constitution did not reflect an agreement between the States to respect the sovereign immunity of one another . . . ." 527 U.S. at 738.[14]

---

[14] This statement in *Alden* addresses the proper question: whether the Constitution *granted* States a right to absolute immunity in other States'

The Court in *Alden*, in fact, placed great emphasis on just the point that we make here: that, after formation of the Union, the individual States retained much of their preexisting sovereignty. 527 U.S. at 713-15. Whatever else that sovereignty encompasses, it naturally includes, first and foremost, the residual lawmaking authority necessary for the sovereign to govern within its sovereign limits. As the Court noted in *The Schooner Exchange*, 11 U.S. (7 Cranch) at 136, "[a]ny restriction upon [the jurisdiction of a nation within its own territory], deriving validity from an external source, would imply a diminution of its sovereignty to the extent of the restriction . . . ." Reflecting this understanding, and the terms of the Tenth Amendment, the Court has quite correctly expressed its "reluctance to find an implied constitutional limit on the power of the States . . . ." *Alden*, 527 U.S. at 739.

To be sure, the decision in *Alden* detailed considerable evidence that the States, at the time of the Convention, had great concerns about their vulnerability to suit in the newly created federal courts. But that concern cannot be extrapolated wholesale into an equivalent concern about suits in the courts of other States. The States' worries about suit in the courts of the National Government were based, not just on the fact that it was to be a new sovereign with its own system of courts, but on the fact that, under the constitutional plan, it was to be a *superior* one. As a consequence, the principles of mutual comity that had traditionally assured reciprocal immunity among co-equal sovereigns—like the States themselves—would be out of balance: at common law, a superior sovereign had immunity *as of right* in the courts of a lesser one. *See Hall*, 440 U.S. at 414-15. That problem, arising out of the particular problem caused

---

courts. In so doing, it effectively disposes of the back portion of *amici's* argument, which is based on the erroneous notion that sovereign immunity as of right did exist before formation of the Union, and thus asks whether it was *abrogated* in the Constitutional plan. *See* Brief *amici Curiae* Florida *et al.* at 12-18.

by creation of a federal sovereign imbued with supremacy over State sovereigns, had nothing to do with the terms of the States' continuing sovereign relations with one another.

In short, *amici* are treading old ground. The States did not have immunity as of right in each other's courts, and nothing in the Constitution, or the plan of the Convention, mandated it by diminishing the States' legislative sovereignty within their own borders. *See Alden*, 527 U.S. at 738. Even if the question were properly before the Court, therefore, there is no reason to revisit *Nevada v. Hall*.

CONCLUSION

The judgment of the Supreme Court of Nevada should be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

MARK A. HUTCHISON
HUTCHISON & STEFFEN
Lakes Business Park
Las Vegas, NV 89117
(702) 385-2500

DONALD J. KULA
RIORDAN & MCKINZIE
300 South Grand Avenue
Twenty-Ninth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3155
(213) 629-4824

H. BARTOW FARR, III
Counsel of Record
FARR & TARANTO
1220 19th Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 775-0184

PETER C. BERNHARD
BERNHARD, BRADLEY & JOHNSON
3980 Howard Hughes Parkway
Suite 550
Las Vegas, NV 89109
(702) 650-6565