Law Office of Joseph W. Geldhof

Telephone: (907) 723-9901 [Mobile]

Counsel for Plaintiff Eric Forrer

2 Marine Way, Suite # 207

E mail: joeg@alaskan.com

Juneau, Alaska 99801

3

4

5 6

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Eric Forrer vs. State of Alaska, et al



2020 MAY 20 PM 2: 05

CLERK TRIAL COURTS

SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT AT JUNEAU

ERIC FORRER)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
VS.)	
)	
STATE OF ALASKA)	
and LUCINDA MAHONEY,)	1JU-20- 00644 Civil
Commissioner of the Alaska)	
Department of Revenue)	
in her capacity as an official of)	
the State of Alaska.)	
Defendants.)	
	_)	

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF AND PROSPECTIVE **EQUITABLE RELIEF**

Plaintiff, Eric Forrer ("Forrer"), for his cause of action alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This lawsuit is brought by Forrer in the interest of the public seeking declaratory relief pertaining to the failure by the Alaska Legislature to enact valid appropriations for the expenditure of money received from the federal government and other sources as required by Article IX, Section 13 of the Alaska Constitution. Forrer also seeks prospective equitable relief in the form of a permanent injunction Amended Complaint

requiring the Alaska Department of Revenue to make payments of funds received by the State of Alaska from all sources in accordance with appropriations made by the Alaska Legislature consistent with Article IX, Section 13 and as authorized by law.

PARTIES

- 2. Plaintiff, Eric Forrer, is a citizen and registered voter of Alaska who has made his home in Alaska since 1962; Forrer presently resides in the City and Borough of Juneau.
- 3. The State of Alaska is a sovereign state within the republic of the United States of America and governed according to the Alaska Constitution.
- 4. Lucinda Mahoney is currently the Commissioner of the Alaska Department of Revenue, an exempt position appointed by the Governor of the State of Alaska and confirmed by the Alaska Legislature. Ms. Mahoney is sued in her official capacity as Commissioner of Revenue in order to obtain injunctive relief requiring the Department of Revenue to receive funds from all legal sources but not withdraw funds from the treasury except to the extent such payment of money is authorized by an appropriation enacted by the Alaska Legislature or otherwise sanction by valid authorization enacted by the legislature.

JURISDICTION

5. The Superior Court has jurisdiction to hear this dispute according to AS 22.10.020.

FACTS

6. Article IX, Section13 of the Alaska Constitution provides:

Expenditures – No money shall be withdrawn from the treasury except in accordance with appropriations made by law. No obligation for the payment of money shall be incurred except as authorized by law. Unobligated appropriations outstanding at the end of the period of time specified by law shall be void.

- 7. The ability to make appropriations and obligate the expenditure of money by the Alaska Legislature are established and constrained by the provisions of the Alaska Constitution, including the provision referenced in paragraphs 6, above.
- 8. The ability to obligate the expenditure of money by the administrative branch of the State of Alaska are established and constrained by the provisions of the Alaska Constitution, including the provision referenced in paragraphs 6, above.
- 9. The Congress of the United States has enacted legislation generally referred to as the "CARES Act" in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 10. The CARES Act provides funding to various jurisdictions, including the State of Alaska, for various purposes related to ameliorating the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 11. The State of Alaska is in receipt of federal funds provided through the CARES Act.

- 12. The State of Alaska is believed to be in receipt of approximately \$1.5 billion from the federal government through the CARES Act.
- 13. The State of Alaska is intent on allocating federal funds received through the CARES Act to various agencies for multiple purposes.
- 14. For example, the State of Alaska is seeking to disburse funds received from the federal government through the CARES Act for the following purposes:
 - a. \$381 million in Health and Social Services costs, including about \$50 million targeted for nonprofits;
 - b. \$125 million for various education, public safety, transportation and programs associated with the University of Alaska;
 - . \$52 million for two specific transportation projects focused on airport support and the Whittier Tunnel;
 - d. \$10 million for homeless programs;
 - e. \$100 million in fishing industry assistance;
 - f. \$290 in small business relief;
 - g. \$568 million in municipal assistance allocated as follows:
 - i. \$257 million for the existing Community Assistance (revenue sharing) program, and;
 - ii. an additional \$311 million to all cities and boroughs as well as many unincorporated communities.

28

15. The proposal by the State of Alaska to obligate the payment of the money describe in paragraph 14, infra, was adopted by the Alaska Legislature on May 20, 2020, essentially adopting the Revised Program Legislative Request procedures utilized by the Legislative Budget & Audit Committee on May 11, 2020, typically referred to as the "RPL" process.

- 16. The Alaska Legislature convened on May 18, 2020, took up two acts related to allocation of the federal CARES Act funds before adopting an act purporting to ratify the allocation made by LB&A on May 11, 2020.
- 17. The act adopted by the Alaska Legislature on May 20, 2020, seeking to ratify the allocation of public funds provided to the State of Alaska under the CARES Act is inconsistent with Article IX, Section 13 of the Alaska Constitution requiring moneys in the Alaska treasury be expended according to an appropriation.
- 18. The allocation of at least a portion of the CARES Act funds specified by the LB&A on May 11, 2020, cannot be ratified by an act of the Alaska Legislature.

ALLEGATIONS

19. This lawsuit is brought by Forrer in the interest of the public to enforce the obvious and express provisions of the Alaska Constitution, including the provisions requiring that expenditures of money in the treasury of the State of Alaska be allocated and withdrawn in accordance with appropriations made by law.

25 26

27 28

20. Statutory provisions in Alaska purport to give limited legal authority to the State of Alaska to obligate and expend money in Alaska's treasury provided that valid pre-existing appropriations or authorizations (including an enactment by the Alaska Legislature authorizing an expenditure according to pre-existing receipt authority to spend federal funding), are established in law.

- 21. Utilization of the RPL process to encumber or obligate payment of all of the proposed expenditures in paragraph 14, supra, is inconsistent with Article IX, Section 13 of the Alaska Constitution.
- 22. Allocation and expenditures of items e, f & g in paragraph 14, supra, are particularly susceptible to constitutional challenge as no valid authorization for the proposed expenditures exists in Alaska law.
- The requirement that expenditures made from the treasury must be made in accord with lawful authorization are constitutional in nature and require that the Alaska Legislature to adhere to substantive and procedural requirements related to law making by the legislative branch, including an opportunity for the citizens of Alaska to be heard on how funds in the treasury should be expended.
- The failure by the Alaska Legislature to provide for proper legal authorization to make all of the proposed expenditures set out in paragraph 14, supra, is an abdication of the legislature's constitutional power and a violation of the separation of powers implicit in the Alaska Constitution.

28

25. The statute purportedly used by the Alaska Legislature to make the RPL allocations is unconstitutional because the legislature is the appropriating authority under Article 9, Section 13, and the governor's budgetary control authority lies merely in his veto authority to "strike or reduce" legislative appropriations under Article 2, Section 15.

26. Under Article 2, Section 14, of the Alaska Constitution, the legislature must bring forward an actual bill for appropriations, which must be subject to the constitutionally mandated procedures of enactment—including three readings and a public process.

- 27. The statute the Alaska Legislature purportedly relies on to make the expenditures that are at the heart of this dispute is unconstitutional under the case law of the Alaska Supreme Court, State v. Fairbanks North Star Borough, 736 P.2d 1140 (1987).
- The acts and omissions by the Alaska Legislature and the 28. administrative branch of government in seeking to make expenditures without a lawful appropriation conflict with the following constitutional doctrines: The appropriations power, separation of powers, checks and balances.
- 29. The acts and omissions by the Alaska Legislature and the administrative branch of government in seeking to make expenditures without a lawful appropriation constitute an unconstitutional delegation of the legislature's

power of appropriation and result in an unconstitutional concentration of power in the executive.

- 30. The enactment of a bill by the Alaska Legislature on May 20, 2020, purporting to ratify the allocation of CARES Act funds rendered by the Governor and LB&A on May 11, 2020 is constitutionally flawed.
- 31. At least for a portion of the allocation of CARES Act funds proposed by the LB&A on May 11, 2020, have no valid pre-existing authorization or other validly enacted law by which the Alaska Legislature could ratify the expenditure of funds.
- 32, In this public interest lawsuit, Forrer seeks to require that Alaska Legislature adhere to the Alaska Constitution requirements specified in Article IX, Section 13 and that expenditure of public funds take place in accordance with the appropriation procedures expressly provided for in the constitution.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests the following relief:

- A. Declaratory relief holding that The Alaska Legislature's ratification of the so-called RPL allocation specified by the LB&A on May 11, 2020 is inconsistent with express terms of the Alaska Constitution;
- B. Declaratory relief holding that to the extent the Alaska Legislature may ratify recommendations or spending sanctioned by the LB&A deliberations,

including action taken according to the RPL process, the allocations must be based on valid pre-existing authorization or appropriation authority lawfully enacted by the Alaska Legislature.

C. Equitable relief in the form of a permanent injunction prospectively requiring Lucinda Mahoney and the State of Alaska from withdrawing money from the treasury except in accordance with appropriations or valid authorization made by law;

D. An award of costs and reasonable fees associated with maintaining this public interest lawsuit, and;

E. Any other relief necessary to protect the rights of the Plaintiff and the citizens of Alaska under the Alaska Constitution.

DATED this 20th day of May, 2020 at Juneau, Alaska.

LAW OFFICE OF JOSEPH W. GELDHOF

Joseph W. Geldhof Alaska Bar # 8111097

Certification

I certify that a copy of this Amended Complaint was hand-delivered to the Office of the Alaska Attorney General on the sixth floor of the Dimond Courthouse in Juneau, Alaska with a request that the document be sent by electronic transmission to Margaret Patton-Walsh, Assistant Attorney General in the Attorney General's Anchorage Office who on information and belief is believed to be counsel of record for the State of Alaska and Commissioner Lucinda Mahoney in this case.

I further certify that a copy of this Amended Complaint was sent by via U.S.P.S. to Attorney General Clarkson at the following address:

1031 West 4th Street, Suite # 200 Anchorage, Alaska 99501

DATED: MAY 20, 2020

Joseph W. Geldhof

Amended Complaint Eric Forrer vs. State of Alaska, et al