

## APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opinion of the Court of Criminal Appeals, State of Oklahoma (March 18, 2021) .....	1a
District Court of Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law (Signed November 6, 2020, Filed November 12, 2020).....	11a
Agreed Stipulation (September 25, 2020).....	17a
Order of the Court of Criminal Appeals, State of Oklahoma, Remanding for Evidentiary Hearing (August 19, 2020) .....	20a

**OPINION OF THE COURT OF  
CRIMINAL APPEALS, STATE OF OKLAHOMA  
(MARCH 18, 2021)**

---

IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS  
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

---

GRANT N. JACKSON, IV,

*Appellant,*

v.

THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

*Appellee.*

---

Case No. F-2016-453

An Appeal from the District Court of Tulsa County  
the Honorable William D. Lafortune, District Judge

Before: David B. LEWIS, Presiding Judge,  
Dana KUEHN, Vice Presiding Judge,  
Gary L. LUMPKIN, Judge, Robert L. HUDSON,  
Judge, Scott ROWLAND Judge.

---

**ROWLAND, VICE PRESIDING JUDGE:**

Appellant Grant N. Jackson, IV was tried by jury in the District Court of Tulsa County, Case No. CF-2014-5892, and found guilty of Child Abuse by Injury, in violation of 21 O.S.2011, § 843.5(A). The jury assessed punishment at four years imprisonment and the Honorable William D. LaFortune, District

Judge, who presided at trial, sentenced Jackson accordingly. Jackson appeals raising the following issues:

- (1) whether the evidence was sufficient to sustain the verdict;
- (2) whether the cumulative effect of prosecutorial misconduct denied him a fair trial;
- (3) whether he was denied his right to the effective assistance of trial counsel; and
- (4) whether the cumulative effect of the errors deprived him of a fair trial.

Jackson also submits his supplemental pro se brief raising the following issues:

- (1) whether the State of Oklahoma had jurisdiction over this alleged crime;
- (2) whether the prosecutor violated the *Napue/Mooney* Rule when she knowingly used perjured testimony; and
- (3) whether the district court abused its discretion when it failed to nullify the verdict of the jury.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> We allowed the submission of Jackson's supplemental pro se brief, including his jurisdictional challenge, by separate order dated April 6, 2017. Also in that Order, we allowed the State to file a supplemental answer brief. On September 7, 2017, Jackson's appellate counsel sought to file a supplemental brief to present new authority supporting Jackson's pro se jurisdictional claim, namely *Murphy v. Royal*. The State of Oklahoma objected to Jackson's application to file supplemental brief on September 13, 2017. On September 26, 2017, we held Jackson's direct appeal in abeyance pending the resolution of the *Murphy* case without ruling on his application to file supplemental brief. Following the Supreme Court's decision in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452

We find relief is required on Jackson's jurisdictional challenge in Proposition 1 of his Supplemental Brief, rendering his other claims moot. Jackson claims the State of Oklahoma did not have jurisdiction to prosecute him. He relies on 18 U.S.C. § 1153 and *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 591 U.S., 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020).

On August 19, 2020, this Court remanded this case to the District Court of Tulsa County for an evidentiary hearing. The District Court was directed to make findings of fact and conclusions of law on two issues: (a) Jackson's status as an Indian; and (b) whether the crime occurred within the boundaries of the Muscogee Creek Nation Reservation. Our Order provided that, if the parties agreed as to what the evidence would show with regard to the questions presented, the parties could enter into a written stipulation setting forth those facts, and no hearing would be necessary.

On September 25, 2020, the parties appeared before the Honorable Tracy L. Priddy for a status conference and entered a written Agreed Stipulation in which they agreed: (1) that Jackson has some Indian blood; (2) that he was a registered citizen of the Muscogee Creek Nation on the date of the charged offense; (3) that the Muscogee Creek Nation is a federally recognized tribe; and (4) that the charged crime occurred within the Muscogee Creek Nation Reservation. The district court accepted the parties' stipulation.

On November 12, 2020, the District Court filed its Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. The District

---

(2020), the State withdrew its objection to Jackson's application to file supplemental brief and appellate counsel's supplemental brief was accepted.

Court found the facts recited above in accordance with the stipulation. The District Court concluded that Jackson is an Indian under federal law and that the charged crimes occurred within the boundaries of the Muscogee Creek Nation Reservation. The District Court's findings are supported by the record. The ruling in *McGirt* governs this case and requires us to find the State of Oklahoma was without jurisdiction to prosecute Jackson. Accordingly, we grant Jackson's Supplemental Brief Proposition 1.

### **DECISION**

The Judgment and Sentence of the district court is **VACATED** and the matter is **REMANDED WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO DISMISS**. Pursuant to Rule 3.15, *Rules of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals*, Title 22, Ch. 18, App. (2021), the **MANDATE** is **ORDERED** to issue in twenty (20) days from the delivery and filing of this decision.

**AN APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF  
CREEK COUNTY THE HONORABLE  
DOUGLAS W. GOLDEN, DISTRICT JUDGE**

#### **APPEARANCE AT TRIAL**

Kyle Killam  
2017 S. Elm Place, Suite 108  
Broken Arrow, OK 74012

Jenny Proehl-Day  
1408 South Denver  
Tulsa, OK 74119  
Attorneys for Defendant

Benjamin Fu  
Andrea Brown

Asst. District Attorneys  
500 South Denver  
Tulsa, OK 74103  
Attorneys for State

**APPEARANCES ON APPEAL**

Nicollette Brandt  
Appellate Defense Counsel  
P.O. Box 926  
Norman, OK 73070  
Attorney for Appellant

Grant N. Jackson, IV,  
Pro Se, Submitted Through Counsel  
Nicollette Brandt

Mike Hunter  
Attorney General of Oklahoma  
Jay Schniederjan  
Asst. Attorney General  
313 N.E. 21 8t Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
Attorneys for Appellee

**APPEARANCES ON REMAND**

Nicollette Brandt  
Danny Joseph  
General Appeals Division, Oids  
P.O. Box 926  
Norman, OK 73070  
Counsel for Defendant/Appellant

Mike Hunter  
Attorney General of Oklahoma  
Jennifer L. Crabb  
Asst. Attorney General

App.6a

313 N.E. 21st Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
Attorney for State

Erik Grayless  
First Assistant District Attorney of Tulsa County  
500 S. Denver Ave., Suite 900  
Tulsa, OK 74103  
Counsel for State

**OPINION BY: ROWLAND, V.P.J.**

KUEHN, P.J.: Concur  
LUMPKIN, J.: Concur in Result  
LEWIS, J.: Concur  
HUDSON, J.: Specially Concur

**LUMPKIN, JUDGE:  
CONCURRING IN RESULTS**

---

Bound by my oath and the Federal-State relationships dictated by the U.S. Constitution, I must at a minimum concur in the results of this opinion. While our nation's judicial structure requires me to apply the majority opinion in the 5-4 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, U.S. 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020), I do so reluctantly. Upon the first reading of the majority opinion in *McGirt* I initially formed the belief that it was a result in search of an opinion to support it. Then upon reading the dissents by Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Thomas I was forced to conclude the Majority had totally failed to follow the Court's own precedents, but had cherry picked statutes and treaties, without giving historical context to them. The Majority then proceeded to do what an average citizen who had been fully informed of the law and facts as set out in the dissents would view as an exercise of raw judicial power to reach a decision which contravened not only the history leading to the disestablishment of the Indian reservations in Oklahoma, but also willfully disregarded and failed to apply the Court's own precedents to the issue at hand.

My quandary is one of ethics and morality. One of the first things I was taught when I began my service in the Marine Corps was that I had a duty to follow lawful orders, and that same duty required me to resist unlawful orders. Chief Justice Roberts' scholarly and judicially penned dissent, actually following the Court's precedents and required analysis, vividly reveals the failure of the majority opinion to follow the rule of law and apply over a century of precedent and



history, and to accept the fact that no Indian reservations remain in the State of Oklahoma.<sup>2</sup> The result seems to be some form of “social justice” created out of whole cloth rather than a continuation of the solid precedents the Court has established over the last 100 years or more.

The question I see presented is should I blindly follow and apply the majority opinion or do I join with

---

<sup>2</sup> Senator Elmer Thomas, D-Oklahoma, was a member of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. After hearing the Commissioner’s speech regarding the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) in 1934, Senator Thomas opined as follows:

I can hardly see where it (the IRA) could operate in a State like mine where the Indians are all scattered out among the whites and they have no reservation, and they could not get them into a community without you would go and buy land and put them on it. Then they would be surrounded very likely with thickly populated white section with whom they would trade and associate. I just cannot get through my mind how this bill can possibly be made to operate in a State of thickly-settled population. (emphasis added).

John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, *Memorandum of Explanation* (regarding S. 2755), p. 145, hearing before the United States Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, February 27, 1934. Senator Morris Sheppard, D-Texas, also on the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, stated in response to the Commissioner’s speech that in Oklahoma, he did not think “we could look forward to building up huge reservations such as we have granted to the Indians in the past.” *Id.* at 157. In 1940, in the Foreword to Felix S. Cohen, *Handbook of Federal Indian Law* (1942), Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes wrote in support of the IRA, “[t]he continued application of the allotment laws, under which Indian wards have lost more than two-thirds of their reservation lands, while the costs of Federal administration of these lands have steadily mounted, must be terminated.” (emphasis added).

Chief Justice Roberts and the dissenters in *McGirt* and recognize “the emperor has no clothes” as to the adherence to following the rule of law in the application of the *McGirt* decision?

My oath and adherence to the Federal-State relationship under the U.S. Constitution mandate that I fulfill my duties and apply the edict of the majority opinion in *McGirt*. However, I am not required to do so blindly and without noting the flaws of the opinion as set out in the dissents. Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Thomas eloquently show the Majority’s mischaracterization of Congress’s actions and history with the Indian reservations. Their dissents further demonstrate that at the time of Oklahoma Statehood in 1907, all parties accepted the fact that Indian reservations in the state had been disestablished and no longer existed. I take this position to adhere to my oath as a judge and lawyer without any disrespect to our Federal-State structure. I simply believe that when reasonable minds differ they must both be reviewing the totality of the law and facts.

**HUDSON, J., SPECIALLY CONCURS**

---

Today's decision dismisses convictions for endangering others while eluding/attempting to elude a police officer, possession of controlled dangerous substance and various misdemeanor crimes from the District Court of Okmulgee County based on the Supreme Court's decision in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020). This decision is unquestionably correct as a matter of *stare decisis* based on the Indian status of Petitioner and the occurrence of the crimes on the Creek Reservation. Under *McGirt*, the State has no jurisdiction to prosecute Petitioner for the crimes in this case. Instead, Petitioner must be prosecuted in federal court. I therefore as a matter of *stare decisis* fully concur in today's decision. Further, I maintain my previously expressed views on the significance of *McGirt*, its far-reaching impact on the criminal justice system in Oklahoma and the need for a practical solution by Congress. See *Bosse v. State*, 2021 OK CR 3, \_\_\_ P.3d \_\_\_ (Hudson, J., Concur in Results); *Hogner v. State*, 2021 OK CR 4, (Hudson, J., Specially Concur); and *Krafft v. State*, No. F-2018-340 (Okl. Cr., Feb. 25, 2021) (Hudson, J., Specially Concur) (unpublished).

**DISTRICT COURT OF TULSA COUNTY,  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA, FINDING OF FACTS  
AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW  
(SIGNED NOVEMBER 6, 2020,  
FILED NOVEMBER 12, 2020)**

---

IN THE DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR TULSA  
COUNTY STATE OF OKLAHOMA

GRANT N. JACKSON, IV,

*Appellant,*

v.

THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

*Appellee.*

---

Tulsa County District Court Case No. CF-2014-5892

Court of Criminal Appeals Case No. F-2016-453

Before: Tracy L. PRIDDY, District Judge

---

This matter came on for a status conference on September 25, 2020 pursuant to the remand order of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals (“OCCA”) issued August 19, 2020. Nicollette Brandt appeared on behalf of Appellant, Grant N. Jackson, whose appearance was waived. Assistant Attorney General Jennifer Crabb appeared for Appellee. Tulsa County First Assistant District Attorney Erik M. Grayless also appeared. An evidentiary hearing was not held

pursuant to the parties' announcement that they had agreed and stipulated to facts supporting the issues to be determined by this Court.

The Appellant, in Proposition 1 of his Supplemental Pro Se Brief filed April 6, 2017 and Proposition 1 of his Supplemental Brief tendered for filing on September 7, 2017 asserted a claim that the District Court lacked jurisdiction to try him as he is a citizen of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation and that his crime occurred within the boundaries of the Creek Reservation. Appellant's claim raises two questions: (a) his Indian status, and (b) whether the crime occurred on the Creek Reservation. These issues require fact-finding to be addressed by the District Court per the OCCA Order Remanding.

## **I. Appellant's Status as an Indian**

To determine the Indian status of the Appellant, the OCCA directed the District Court to make findings of fact as to whether (1) Jackson has some Indian blood, and (2) is recognized as an Indian by a tribe or the federal government.<sup>1</sup> The Court finds as follows:

### **Findings of Fact**

1. Grant N. Jackson is the named Defendant/Appellant in the above-entitled matter.
2. The parties hereto stipulated and agreed that Mr. Jackson has 17/128 Indian blood and has been a

---

<sup>1</sup> *United States v. Diaz*, 679 F. 3d 1183, 1187 (10th Cir. 2012); *United States v. Prentiss*, 273 F. 3d 1277, 1280-81 (10th Cir. 2001). *Generally Goforth v. State*, 1982 OK CR 48, 116, 644 P.2d 114, 116.

member of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation since July 23, 1998.<sup>2</sup>

3. The Muscogee (Creek) Nation is a federally recognized tribe.<sup>3</sup>

4. Verification of Mr. Jackson's tribal membership and blood quantum are attached to this stipulation as Exhibit A and the parties agree they should be admitted into the record of this case.<sup>4</sup>

### **Conclusions of Law**

Regarding the first determination, the Court answers the first inquiry in the affirmative. The Court adopted the Agreed Stipulation of the parties, including the attached documentation filed on September 25, 2020 and made findings of fact thereon. Grant N. Jackson, IV has 17/128 Indian blood. The Agreed Stipulation does not specifically identify Appellant's Indian bloodline, and the two prong test utilized by state and federal courts for the purpose of determining Indian status does not seem to contemplate a specific bloodline be named, but the attached Exhibit A of the Agreed Stipulation, Mr. Jackson's Muscogee (Creek) Nation Citizenship ID, indicates a blood quantum of 17/128.<sup>5</sup> Although the term "Indian" is not statutorily

---

<sup>2</sup> Exhibit 1, Agreed Stipulation 1a.

<sup>3</sup> Exhibit 1, Agreed Stipulation 1b.

<sup>4</sup> Exhibit 1, Agreed Stipulation 1c.

<sup>5</sup> See *United States v. Bruce*, 394 F.3d 1215 (9th Cir. 2005)

defined and various terms such as “sufficient”<sup>6</sup>, “substantial”<sup>7</sup>, “significant percentage of”<sup>8</sup> or “some”<sup>9</sup> have been used by courts in an attempt to define the quantity of Indian blood required to satisfy this inquiry, the OCCA mandate ordered this Court to determine “whether the victim had some Indian blood.”<sup>10</sup> Thus, according to the term used by the OCCA in its Order, this Court concludes Grant N. Jackson, IV has some Indian blood.

Additionally, the Court answers the second part of the inquiry in the affirmative. The Court adopted the Agreed Stipulation including the attached documentation and made findings of fact thereon. Grant N. Jackson, IV was enrolled as a citizen of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation on July 23, 1998 and was recognized as a citizen of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation at the time of the offense. The Muscogee (Creek) Nation is federally recognized tribe. Therefore, Grant N. Jackson, IV is recognized as an Indian by a tribe or the federal government.

Having answered both inquiries in the affirmative, this Court concludes Grant N. Jackson, IV in an Indian.

---

<sup>6</sup> *United States v. LaBuff*, 658 F. 3d 873, 874-75 (9th Cir. 2011)

<sup>7</sup> *Vialpando v. State*, 640 P.2d 77, 79-80 (Wyo. 1982).

<sup>8</sup> *Goforth v. State*, 1982 OK CR 48, ¶6, 644 P.2d 114, 116.

<sup>9</sup> *United States v. Diaz*, 679 F.3d 1183, 1187 (10th Cir. 2012).

<sup>10</sup> Order Remanding for Evidentiary Hearing August 19, 2020.

## **II. Whether the Crime Occurred on the Creek Reservation**

The OCCA further ordered the District Court to determine whether the crime occurred on the Creek Reservation, referred to as Indian Country.<sup>11</sup> The Court finds as follows:

### **Findings of Fact**

1. The parties hereto stipulated that the crime occurred at 9712 S. 93rd Ave. East, Tulsa, OK 74133.<sup>12</sup>
2. The parties further stipulated that this address is within the boundaries of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation.<sup>13</sup>

### **Conclusions of Law**

The final inquiry is answered in the affirmative. This Court adopted the parties' Agreed Stipulation as well as the attached documentation and made findings of fact thereon. The crime occurred at a location identified by a specific address that is within the boundaries of the Creek Reservation. These boundaries were established through a series of treaties between the Muscogee (Creek) Nation and the United States Government, and are explicitly recognized as a reservation defined by 18 U.S.C. § 1151(a). Based upon the Supreme Court's ruling in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452, 207 L.Ed.2d 985 (2020), this Court concludes that the

---

<sup>11</sup> *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct.2452 (2020); 18 U.S.C. §§ 1152, 1153.

<sup>12</sup> Exhibit 1, Agreed Stipulation 2a.

<sup>13</sup> Exhibit 1, Agreed Stipulation 2a.



crime occurred on the Creek Reservation which is Indian Country.

WHEREFORE, this Court finds that Grant N. Jackson, IV is an Indian and that the crime for which he was convicted occurred in Indian Country for purposes of the General Crimes Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1152 and the Major Crimes Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1153.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 6th day of November, 2020.

/s/Tracy L. Priddy

District Judge

**AGREED STIPULATION  
(SEPTEMBER 25, 2020)**

---

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF TULSA COUNTY  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

---

GRANT N. JACKSON, IV,

*Appellant,*

v.

THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

*Appellee.*

---

Case Nos. F-2016-453  
CF-2014-5892

---

---

The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals remanded this matter for an evidentiary hearing pursuant to the recent decision in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, No. 18-9526 (U.S. July 9, 2020) to determine Mr. Jackson's (a) Indian status and (b) whether the crime occurred on the Muscogee (Creek) Reservation. The parties have reached the following stipulations:

1. As to Mr. Jackson's Indian status, the parties hereby stipulate and agree as follows:
  - a. Mr. Jackson has 17/128 Indian blood and has been a member of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation since July 23, 1998.

- b. The Muscogee (Creek) Nation is a federally recognized tribe.
- c. Verification of Mr. Jackson's tribal membership and blood quantum are attached to this stipulation as Exhibit A and the parties agree they should be admitted into the record of this case.

2. As to the location of the crime, the parties hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

- a. The crime occurred at 9712 S. 93rd Ave. East, Tulsa, OK 74133, which lies within the Muscogee (Creek) Reservation boundaries.

The parties therefore request that this Court accept the stipulations.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Nicollette Brandt  
Nicollette Brandt, No. 30996  
Danny Joseph, No. 32812  
General Appeals Division  
Oklahoma Indigent Defense System  
PO Box 926  
Norman, Oklahoma 73070  
(405) 801-2727



**ORDER OF THE COURT OF CRIMINAL  
APPEALS, STATE OF OKLAHOMA,  
REMANDING FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING  
(AUGUST 19, 2020)**

---

IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS  
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

---

GRANT N. JACKSON, IV,

*Appellant,*

v.

THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

*Respondent.*

---

Case No. F-2016-453

Before: David B. LEWIS, Presiding Judge,  
Dana KUEHN, Vice Presiding Judge,  
Gary L. LUMPKIN, Judge, Robert L. HUDSON,  
Judge, Scott ROWLAND Judge.

---

Appellant Grant N. Jackson, IV was tried by jury and convicted of Child Abuse by Injury in the District Court of Tulsa County, Case No. CF-2014-5892. In accordance with the jury's recommendation, the Honorable William D. LaFortune sentenced Jackson to four years imprisonment. Jackson must serve 85% of his sentence before he is eligible for parole consideration. Jackson appeals his Judgment and Sentence.

In Proposition 1 of his Supplemental Pro Se Brief filed April 6, 2017 and Proposition 1 of his Supplemental Brief tendered for filing on September 7, 2017, Jackson claims the District Court lacked jurisdiction to try him.<sup>1</sup> Jackson argues that he is a citizen of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation and that his crime occurred within the boundaries of the Creek Reservation. Jackson relies on jurisdictional issues addressed in *Murphy v. Royal*, 875 F.3d 896 (10th Cir. 2017), which was affirmed by the United States Supreme Court in *Sharp v. Murphy*, 591 U.S., 140 S. Ct. 2412 (2020) for the reasons stated in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 591 U.S., 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020).<sup>2</sup>

Jackson's claim raises two separate questions: (a) his Indian status and (b) whether the crime occurred on the Creek Reservation. These issues require fact-finding. We therefore REMAND this case to the District Court of Tulsa County, for an evidentiary hearing

---

<sup>1</sup> On April 6, 2017, we granted Jackson's request to file a supplemental brief with three pro se propositions of error, including his jurisdictional challenge, and we allowed the State to file a supplemental answer brief. On September 7, 2017, Jackson's appellate counsel sought to file a supplemental brief to present new authority supporting Jackson's pro se jurisdictional claim, namely *Murphy v. Royal*. The State of Oklahoma objected to Jackson's application to file supplemental brief on September 13, 2017. On September 26, 2017, we held Jackson's direct appeal in abeyance pending the resolution of the *Murphy* case without ruling on his application to file supplemental brief.

<sup>2</sup> Following the Supreme Court's decision in *McGirt*, the State withdrew its objection to Jackson's application to file supplemental brief and asked for time to file a second supplemental answer brief to respond to Jackson's jurisdictional claim. In light of the present order, there is no need for an additional response from the State at this time.

to be held within sixty (60) days from the date of this Order.

Recognizing the historical and specialized nature of this remand for evidentiary hearing, we request the Attorney General and District Attorney work in coordination to effect uniformity and completeness in the hearing process. Upon Jackson's presentation of *prima facie* evidence as to his legal status as an Indian and as to the location of the crime in Indian Country, the burden shifts to the State to prove it has subject matter jurisdiction.

The hearing shall be transcribed, and the court reporter shall file an original and two (2) certified copies of the transcript within twenty (20) days after the hearing is completed. The District Court shall then make written findings of fact and conclusions of law, to be submitted to this Court within twenty (20) days after the filing of the transcripts in the District Court. The District Court shall address only the following issues:

First, Jackson's status as an Indian. The District Court must determine whether (1) Jackson has some Indian blood, and (2) is recognized as an Indian by a tribe or the federal government.<sup>3</sup>

Second, whether the crime occurred within the boundaries of the Creek Reservation. In making this determination the District Court should consider any

---

<sup>3</sup> See *United States v. Diaz*, 679 F.3d 1183, 1187 (10th Cir. 2012); *United States v. Prentiss*, 273 F.3d 1277, 1280-81 (10th Cir. 2001). See generally *Goforth v. State*, 1982 OK CR 48, ¶ 6, 644 P.2d 114, 116.

evidence the parties provide, including but not limited to treaties, statutes, maps, and/or testimony.

The District Court Clerk shall transmit the record of the evidentiary hearing, the District Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law, and any other materials made a part of the record, to the Clerk of this Court, and counsel for Appellant, within five (5) days after the District Court has filed its findings of fact and conclusions of law. Upon receipt thereof, the Clerk of this Court shall promptly deliver a copy of that record to the Attorney General. A supplemental brief, addressing only those issues pertinent to the evidentiary hearing and limited to twenty (20) pages in length, may be filed by either party within twenty (20) days after the District Court's written findings of fact and conclusions of law are filed in this Court.

Provided however, in the event the parties agree as to what the evidence will show with regard to the questions presented, they may enter into a written stipulation setting forth those facts upon which they agree and which answer the questions presented and provide the stipulation to the District Court. In this event, no hearing on the questions presented is necessary. Transmission of the record regarding the matter, the District Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law and supplemental briefing shall occur as set forth above.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the State's request for additional time to respond to Jackson's Supplemental Brief is **DENIED** and Jackson's request to file Supplemental Brief is **GRANTED**. The Clerk of this Court is directed to file Appellant's Supplemental Brief tendered for filing on September 7, 2017. The Clerk of this Court shall transmit copies of the



following, with this Order, to the District Court of Tulsa County: Appellant's Supplemental Pro Se Brief filed April 6, 2017; Appellee's Supplemental Brief filed June 13, 2017; and Appellant's Supplemental Brief tendered for filing September 7, 2017.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**WITNESS OUR HANDS AND THE SEAL OF THIS COURT** this 19th day of August, 2020.

/s/ David B. Lewis  
Presiding Judge

/s/ Dana Kuehn  
Vice Presiding Judge

/s/ Gary L. Lumpkin  
Judge

/s/ Robert L. Hudson  
Judge

/s/ Scott Rowland  
Judge

ATTEST:

/s/ John D. Hadden  
Clerk