

No. 21-484

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

Petitioner,

v.

SONNY RAYE MCCOMBS,

Respondent.

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals**

**BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE
THE CHEROKEE NATION
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT**

FRANK S. HOLLEMAN, IV	SARA HILL
DOUGLAS B. L. ENDRESON	<i>Attorney General</i>
SONOSKY, CHAMBERS, SACHSE, ENDRESON & PERRY, LLP	CHRISSI NIMMO <i>Counsel of Record</i>
1425 K Street, NW, Suite 600 Washington, DC 20005	<i>Deputy Attorney General</i> CHEROKEE NATION P.O. Box 948 Tahlequah, OK 74465 (918) 458-6998 chrissi-nimmo@cherokee.org
PATTI PALMER GHEZZI <i>Attorney at Law</i> P.O. Box 812 Pawhuska, OK 74056	

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae
Cherokee Nation*

October 28, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS</i>	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	2
REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION ...	3
I. The State’s Supposed Practical Impacts are Non-Issues	3
II. The State Cannot Use this Moot Case to Challenge the Cherokee Reservation.....	15
III. The State Proffers No Just Basis For Abandoning <i>Stare Decisis</i> to Revisit <i>McGirt</i>	20
CONCLUSION	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	Page(s)
<i>Awuku-Asare v. Garland</i> , 991 F.3d 1123 (10th Cir. 2021).....	22
<i>B & B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.</i> , 575 U.S. 138 (2015).....	15
<i>Benjamin v. Coughlin</i> , 905 F.2d 571 (2d Cir. 1990)	15
<i>Chafin v. Chafin</i> , 568 U.S. 165 (2013).....	19
<i>Chandler v. Florida</i> , 449 U.S. 560 (1981).....	14
<i>Cherokee Nation v. Perales</i> , No. CRM-21-261 (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. filed Mar. 9, 2021).....	11
<i>Cherokee Nation v. Shriver</i> , No. CRM-21-55 (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. filed Feb. 19, 2021)	11
<i>Cherokee Nation v. Shriver</i> , No. CRM-21-56 (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. filed Feb. 19, 2021)	11
<i>Christian Legal Soc’y v. Martinez</i> , 561 U.S. 661 (2010).....	19
<i>Citizens United v. FEC</i> , 558 U.S. 310 (2010).....	22
<i>City of Tulsa v. Hooper</i> , No. 7470397, slip op. (Tulsa Mun. Crim. Ct. Apr. 5, 2021)	12
<i>Flowers v. Mississippi</i> , 139 S. Ct. 2228 (2019).....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>Franchise Tax Bd. v. Hyatt</i> , 139 S. Ct. 1485, 1499 (2019).....	20, 21, 22
<i>Gamble v. United States</i> , 139 S. Ct. 1960 (2019).....	21
<i>Hogner v. State</i> , 2021 OK CR 4	<i>passim</i>
<i>Hooper v. City of Tulsa</i> , No. 4:21-cv-00165-JED-JFJ (N.D. Okla. filed Apr. 9, 2021).....	12
<i>Janus v. AFSCME, Council 31</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2448 (2018).....	20, 21, 22
<i>Kingdomware Techs., Inc. v. United States</i> , 136 S. Ct. 1969 (2016).....	20
<i>McGirt v. Oklahoma</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Cmty.</i> , 572 U.S. 782 (2014).....	21
<i>New Hampshire v. Maine</i> , 532 U.S. 742 (2001).....	16
<i>Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 21-429	2
<i>Okla. Tax Comm’n v. Chickasaw Nation</i> , 515 U.S. 450 (1995).....	14
<i>Okla. Tax Comm’n v. Citizen Band Potawatomi Indian Tribe of Okla.</i> , 498 U.S. 505 (1991).....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>Penobscot Nation v. Frey</i> , 3 F.4th 484 (1st Cir. 2021).....	22
<i>Ramos v. Louisiana</i> , 140 S. Ct. 1390 (2020).....	20, 21
<i>Rojas v. FAA</i> , 989 F.3d. 666 (9th Cir. 2021).....	22
<i>Sharp v. Murphy</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2412 (2020).....	16, 22
<i>Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.</i> , 564 U.S. 552 (2011).....	19
<i>Spears v. State</i> . 2021 OK CR 7, 485 P.3d 873	2, 18
<i>Sprietsma v. Mercury Marine</i> , 537 U.S. 51 (2002).....	16
<i>State v. United Cook Inlet Drift Ass’n</i> , 895 P.2d 947 (Alaska 1995).....	15
<i>Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Eenvt.</i> , 523 U.S. 83 (1998).....	19-20
<i>United States v. Bragg</i> , No. 4:21-cr-00088-JFH (N.D. Okla. filed Mar. 22, 2021)	11
<i>United States v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 4:20-cr-00255-CVE (N.D. Okla. guilty plea filed Nov. 2, 2020).....	11
<i>United States v. Cottingham</i> , No. 4:20-cr-00209-GKF-1 (N.D. Okla. filed Oct. 5, 2020)	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>United States v. Foster</i> , No. 4:21-cr-00118-CVE (N.D. Okla. filed March 16, 2021)	11
<i>United States v. Jones</i> , 565 U.S. 400 (2012).....	16
<i>United States v. Lara</i> , 541 U.S. 193 (2004).....	1
<i>United States v. Leathers</i> , No. 4:21-cr-00163-CVE-1 (N.D. Okla. filed Mar. 19, 2021).....	11-12
<i>United States v. McCombs</i> , No. 4:20-cr-00262-GKF-1 (N.D. Okla. filed Nov. 3, 2020)	10, 12
<i>United States v. McDaniel</i> , No. 6:21-mj-00372-SPS-1 (E.D. Okla. filed Sept. 22, 2021).....	12, 16
<i>United States v. Sanchez-Gomez</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1532 (2018).....	20
<i>United States v. Spears</i> , No. 4:20-cr-00296-GKF (N.D. Okla. Nov. 18, 2020)	12
<i>United States v. Vaught</i> , No. 4:21-cr-00202-JFH-1 (N.D. Okla. filed Apr. 2, 2021)	12
<i>United States v. Wheeler</i> , 435 U.S. 313 (1978).....	1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>Wood v. Milyard</i> , 566 U.S. 463 (2012).....	16
<i>Worcester v. Georgia</i> , 31 U.S. 515 (1832).....	2
CONSTITUTIONS	
U.S. Const. amend. I	22
Okla. Const. art. 18, § 3(a)	12
STATUTES AND TREATIES	
18 U.S.C. § 1151(a)	17
1866 Treaty of Washington with the Cherokee, July 19, 1866, 14 Stat. 799	1, 18
art. 16	1
art. 17	1
art. 21	1
art. 31	1
Act of Mar. 3, 1893, ch. 209, 27 Stat. 612 ...	1
Curtis Act, ch. 504, § 14, 30 Stat. 499-500 (1898)	12
Treaty of New Echota, Dec. 29, 1835, 7 Stat. 478 1	
art. 1	1
art. 2	1
art. 5	1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
Treaty with the Western Cherokee, Feb. 14, 1833, 7 Stat. 414	1
Okla. Stat. tit. 68 § 346	14
Okla. Stat. tit. 68 § 500.63	14
Tulsa, Okla. Code App. C	12
 TRIBAL INSTRUMENTS	
Cherokee Nation Code:	
tit. 10A.....	8
tit. 21	8
tit. 22, §§ 154-155.....	8
tit. 47	8
Inter-tribal Council of Five Civilized Tribes, Res. No. 21-34 (Oct. 8, 2021), https://bit.ly/3AOnb5Q	8-9
 STATE AND TRIBAL AGREEMENTS	
Addendum to Law Enforcement Agreement Between U.S., Cherokee Nation, and City of Tulsa (Apr. 9, 2014), https://bit.ly/3DsYnSv	13
Addendum to Law Enforcement Agreement Between U.S., Muscogee (Creek) Nation, and City of Tulsa (May 2, 2006), https://bit.ly/3uY6Lq6	13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
Intergov'l Agreement Between Okla. & Cherokee Nation Regarding Jurisdiction over Indian Children Within the Nation's Reservation (Sept. 1, 2020), https://bit.ly/2Z2KWdA	7-8
 COURT FILINGS	
Br. in Supp. of Mot. to Stay & Abate Proceedings, <i>Russell v. Oklahoma</i> , No. F-2019-892 (Okla. Crim. App. June 24, 2021), https://bit.ly/3jbOhOh	18
Cherokee Nation Unopposed Application for Authorization to File Amicus Brief, <i>Hogner v. State</i> , 2021 OK CR 4 (filed Aug. 3, 2020) (No. F-2018-138), https://bit.ly/3DZkOiK	10-11
Def.'s Remanded Hr'g Br., <i>State v. McCombs</i> , No. CF-2016-6878 (Okla. Dist. Ct. filed Sept. 25, 2020), https://bit.ly/3FXFzwT	17
Docket Entry, <i>State v. McCombs</i> , No. CF-2016-6878 (Okla. Dist. Ct. Oct. 12, 2021), https://bit.ly/3vq7a4N	18
Evidentiary Hr'g Stips., <i>State v. McCombs</i> , No. CF-2016-6878 (Okla. Dist. Ct. filed Oct. 13, 2020).....	17
Ex. 1 to Complaint, <i>Hooper v. City of Tulsa</i> , No. 4:21-cv-00165-JED-JFJ (N.D. Okla. filed Apr. 9, 2021), ECF No. 1-1.....	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
Indictment, <i>United States v. McCombs</i> , No. 4:20-cr-00262-GKF (N.D. Okla. Nov. 3, 2020), ECF No. 2	10
ODAA Amicus Br., <i>Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 21-429	6
Order of Sept. 22, 2021, <i>United States v. McCombs</i> , 4:20-cr-00262-GKF (N.D. Okla. Nov. 3, 2020), ECF No. 47	10
Order of Detention Pending Trial of Apr. 19, 2021, <i>United States v. McCombs</i> , 4:20-cr-00262-GKF (N.D. Okla. Nov. 3, 2020), ECF No. 21	10
Order Granting Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Prosequendum for Cause, <i>United States v. McCombs</i> , 4:20-cr-00262-GKF (N.D. Okla. Nov. 3, 2020), ECF No. 7.....	10
Pet. for a Writ of Cert., <i>Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 21-429	<i>passim</i>
Returned Arrest Warrant, <i>United States v. McCombs</i> , 4:20-cr-00262-GKF (N.D. Okla. Nov. 3, 2020), ECF No. 24.....	10
Suppl. Br. of Appellee after Remand, <i>Foster v. State</i> , No. F-2020-149 (Okla. Crim. App. filed Apr. 19, 2021), https://bit.ly/3jjP67S ...	15
Suppl. Br. of Appellee After Remand, <i>McCombs v. State</i> , No. F-2017-1000 (Okla. Crim. App. filed Dec. 28, 2020), https://bit.ly/3ASkEaP	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
Suppl. Br. of Appellee after Remand, <i>McDaniel v. State</i> , No. F-2017-357 (Okla. Crim. App. filed Mar. 29, 2021), https://bit.ly/3lM1Wgz	15
Tex. Amicus Br., <i>Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 21-429	21
 OTHER AUTHORITIES	
@CherokeeNation, Twitter (Oct. 9, 2021, 9:08 AM), https://bit.ly/3AsaehJ	9
Allison Herrera, “ <i>My Office Will Work Until We Drop</i> ”: Agencies Vow to Work Together on <i>McGirt</i> Cases, KOSU (Aug. 12, 2020, 10:02 AM), https://bit.ly/3DKOhg0	13
Allison Herrera, <i>Trent Shores Reflects on his Time as U.S. Attorney, Remains Committed to Justice for Indian Country</i> , KOSU (Feb. 24, 2021, 4:40 AM), https://bit.ly/3E3gD5x	9
Chad Hunter, <i>Cherokee Nation Marshals, Attorneys Dealing with McGirt Fallout</i> , Cherokee Phoenix (July 19, 2021), https://bit.ly/3mJZM0a	6
Cherokee Nation and Chickasaw Nation Criminal Jurisdiction Compacting Act of 2021, H.R. 3091, 117th Cong. (2021)	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
Curtis Killman, <i>Here’s How Cherokee Tribal Courts Are Handling the Surge in Cases Due to the McGirt Ruling</i> , Tulsa World (updated July 22, 2021), https://bit.ly/3FscfOK	4-5
Drake Johnson, <i>Tulsa County Jail to be Used for City Jail Overflow</i> , Newson6 (Oct. 4, 2021 5:32 PM), https://bit.ly/3vz2DNy	5
Grant D. Crawford, <i>CN Marshal Service Rises to Challenge of McGirt</i> , Tahlequah Daily Press (May 7, 2021), https://bit.ly/3mFbx8g	5, 9
Hicham Raache, <i>Gov. Stitt Says Supreme Court’s McGirt Ruling Created ‘Public Safety Threat’, asks Oklahomans to Share Stories; Cherokee Nation Reacts</i> , KFOR (updated Apr. 16, 2021, 11:52 AM), https://bit.ly/2YV7mwS	14
Janelle Stecklein, <i>Tribes Talk About Inter-governmental Agreements with State Following McGirt Ruling</i> , Tahlequah Daily Press (Oct. 11, 2021), https://bit.ly/3pgZ7qh	6
Joe Tomlinson, <i>Promised Land Recap: AG O’Connor Focused on Challenging SCOTUS Reservation Ruling</i> , NonDoc (Sept. 17, 2021), https://bit.ly/3FOnJMG	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>Legal Status of the Cherokee Nation Reservation</i> , Cherokee Nation Att’y Gen.’s Office (last accessed Oct. 20, 2021)	6
Michael Overall, <i>The Cherokee Nation’s Budget Will Hit a Record \$3 Billion as the Tribe Responds to COVID and McGirt</i> , Tulsa World (Sept. 15, 2021), https://bit.ly/3apJHaj	4
Mike Hunter, Att’y Gen. of Okla., <i>Frequently Asked Questions Related to McGirt v. Oklahoma and the Proposed Legislative Framework Document</i> (n.d.), https://bit.ly/3vuPc1l	7
Press Release, Cherokee Nation, Cherokee Nation Files 1000th Case in Tribal Court Following McGirt Ruling (June 7, 2021), https://bit.ly/3v1g6NX	4
Press Release, Office of Okla. Att’y Gen., Attorney General Hunter Prepares Brief with Court of Criminal Appeals Seeking Guidance on Cases Affected by the McGirt Decision (last visited Oct. 20, 2021), https://bit.ly/3n4S9Si	7
Ray Carter, <i>McGirt Called Threat to State’s Economic Future</i> , Okla. Council of Pub. Affairs (Aug. 16, 2021), https://bit.ly/3vzCs9M	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
Reese Gorman, <i>Cole Continues to Advocate for Tribal Sovereignty on Indigenous Peoples' Day</i> , Norman Transcript (Oct 11, 2021), https://bit.ly/3AK839C	14
Reese Gorman, <i>Cole Encourages State-Tribal Relations Over State Challenges to McGirt</i> , Norman Transcript (July 23, 2021), https://bit.ly/3ANKfBx	7
Restatement (Second) of Judgments (1980)....	15
Samantha Vicent, <i>Cherokee Nation Highlights Expansion of Legal System on Anniversary of McGirt Ruling</i> , Tulsa World (updated Aug. 30, 2021), https://bit.ly/3uXpJxf	4
<i>Tribal Code</i> , Cherokee Nation Office of Att'y Gen., https://bit.ly/3APtTsl (last visited Oct. 20, 2021)	8
<i>Tribal Compacts and Agreements</i> , Okla. Sec'y of State, https://bit.ly/3FRTqoq (last visited Oct. 20, 2021)	6

INTEREST OF *AMICUS*¹

Amicus Cherokee Nation (“Nation”) is a federally-recognized Indian tribe, residing on a reservation in Oklahoma, on which it protects public safety and prosecutes Indian offenders in the exercise of its inherent sovereign authority. *United States v. Wheeler*, 435 U.S. 313 (1978); *United States v. Lara*, 541 U.S. 193 (2008). Under the Treaty of New Echota, Dec. 29, 1835, 7 Stat. 478, the Nation ceded its lands east of the Mississippi, *id.* art. 1, in exchange for a new homeland in present-day Oklahoma, *id.* art. 2 (incorporating Treaty with the Western Cherokee, Feb. 14, 1833, 7 Stat. 414), on which it was guaranteed the right to self-government under federal supervision, *id.* art. 5; see 1866 Treaty of Washington with the Cherokee, art. 31, July 19, 1866, 14 Stat. 799.² The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals (“OCCA”) upheld the existence of the Nation’s Reservation, *Hogner v. State*, 2021 OK CR 4, analyzing the Nation’s unique history and treaties in light of *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020). The State did not seek certiorari in *Hogner*—in fact, the State once accepted *Hogner* as settling the Reservation’s existence.

¹ No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part. No one other than the Nation made a monetary contribution to fund preparation or submission of this brief. The parties’ counsels of record received notice of the Nation’s intent to file more than ten days before the date for filing and consented thereto.

² The boundaries of the Reservation, as established by the 1833 Treaty, the 1835 Treaty, and a December 31, 1838 fee patent to the Nation, were modified by the 1866 Treaty, arts. 16, 17, 21, and the Act of Mar. 3, 1893, ch. 209, § 10, 27 Stat. 612, 640-43. See Pet’r’s App. 17a-24a.

The Nation has fundamental interests in protecting the treaty promises under which the Nation, as the sole tribal signatory of those treaties, resides on and governs the Reservation. Accordingly, even before *Hogner* was decided the Nation began a comprehensive enhancement of its criminal justice system, growing its capacity and redoubling coordination with other governments to meet the expanded responsibilities that it anticipated the law would place on it. And that effort continues today, under the rule of law set forth in *Hogner*.

Now, however, Oklahoma seeks reconsideration and reversal of *McGirt*, boldly declaring it is wrong and challenging the OCCA's decisions upholding the United States' treaty promises to the Nation. To protect those rights and to aid the Court in its disposition of this petition, the Nation turns to this Court—as it has before, *Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515 (1832)—and submits this brief to show that certiorari should be denied to protect the Nation's rights and the rule of law on its Reservation.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The petition should be denied for three reasons.³ First, *McGirt* has been implemented successfully on the Cherokee Reservation by the Nation and the

³ To state its argument against *McGirt* in this case, the State seeks to incorporate its attack on *McGirt* from its petition in *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429 (“*Castro-Huerta Pet.*”), see Pet. 6-7. The Nation responds here to that argument, mindful that the Court may not accept the State's practice, which hangs attacks on all Five Tribes' Reservations on a Cherokee Reservation case and diverts attention from the OCCA's analyses of the Cherokee Reservation's status in its published decisions in *Hogner* and *Spears v. State*, 2021 OK CR 7, 485 P.3d 873.

federal government. A balanced and accurate description of how the Nation is addressing *McGirt* disproves the State's argument that *McGirt* is unworkable. Second, the State waived its right to seek reversal of *McGirt* or the overthrow of the Cherokee Reservation by not challenging the Reservation's existence in the court below and expressly accepting it in other cases. And the District Court has since dismissed the charges against Respondent, mooting this case. Finally, the State provides no basis for discarding *McGirt*. The cases on which it relies are worlds apart from this situation, where *McGirt* has provided a workable standard that is being applied by the courts below, both in the Oklahoma Indian reservation context and elsewhere, the facts and law underlying the decision have not changed, and the opinion was a well-reasoned one that has established reliance interests by the governments that are implementing it.

REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION

I. The State's Supposed Practical Impacts are Non-Issues.

The State's claim that *McGirt* caused criminal justice issues that justify revisiting that decision does not support certiorari because those supposed issues are either non-existent or overblown. The tribal and federal judicial systems are capably managing the jurisdictional changes effected by *McGirt* and the OCCA's follow-on cases recognizing the Reservations of the other Five Tribes (collectively, "Nations"). Their success is evidenced by their need for more resources to prosecute those crimes and the State's reduced need. *McGirt* anticipated that shift, noting "it doesn't take a lot of imagination to see how things could work out in the end." 140 S. Ct. at 2480. Here, the Nation illus-

trates how the transition is being made in an orderly way that protects the public and that the Nation is confident will be successful for all stakeholders.

Even before *McGirt* was decided, the Nation began preparations to exercise criminal jurisdiction throughout its Reservation. Those preparations accelerated after *McGirt* and came to fruition after *Hogner*. In response to those rulings, Principal Chief Chuck Hoskin Jr. committed the Nation to “building up the largest criminal justice system in our tribe’s history in record speed. . .to provide a blanket of protection within the Cherokee Nation Reservation for all citizens.” Michael Overall, *The Cherokee Nation’s Budget Will Hit a Record \$3 Billion as the Tribe Responds to COVID and McGirt*, *Tulsa World* (Sept. 15, 2021) (“Overall”)⁴.

The Nation is meeting that commitment. Last fiscal year, the Nation spent \$10 million to expand its justice system, including seating two new district court judges, appointing six new prosecutors, and hiring additional victim advocates. *See* Press Release, Cherokee Nation, Cherokee Nation Files 1000th Case in Tribal Court Following McGirt Ruling (June 7, 2021).⁵ This fiscal year, the budgets for the Nation’s court system, Attorney General’s office, and Marshal Service more than doubled. *See* Overall. The Nation is also opening two new courts, *see* Samantha Vicent, *Cherokee Nation Highlights Expansion of Legal System on Anniversary of McGirt Ruling*, *Tulsa World* (Aug. 30, 2021),⁶ which will add to the well-established Cherokee Nation courts at the W.W. Keeler Tribal Complex, *see* Curtis

⁴ <https://bit.ly/3apJHaj>

⁵ <https://bit.ly/3v1g6NX>

⁶ <https://bit.ly/3uXpJxf>

Killman, *Here's How Cherokee Tribal Courts Are Handling the Surge in Cases Due to the McGirt Ruling*, Tulsa World (July 22, 2021).⁷

This effort also significantly relies on local cooperation. The Nation has entered into agreements with counties under which defendants are housed in adult or juvenile detention facilities while they await trial or serve their sentences. *Id.* Those agreements benefit both signatories. As the director of the Cherokee Nation Marshall Service (“CNMS”) explains:

The jails have the same people still in them. The only difference is that the tribe pays for the Native Americans in the jail. The jails aren't being overcrowded because of this. Quite frankly, the jails are getting more benefit now, because before McGirt, they had these people in the jails, but the tribe wasn't paying \$42 [per inmate] a day to the jail.

Grant D. Crawford, *CN Marshal Service Rises to Challenge of McGirt*, Tahlequah Daily Press (May 7, 2021) (alteration in original) (“Crawford”).⁸ Such agreements are not uncommon—the City of Tulsa has one with the County of Tulsa, for instance. *See* Drake Johnson, *Tulsa County Jail to be Used for City Jail Overflow*, Newson6 (Oct. 4, 2021 5:32 PM), <https://bit.ly/3vz2DNy>. The Nation has also continued its long-standing policy of entering into cross-deputization agreements with other governments on the Reservation, under which local and state law enforcement may enforce tribal law and tribal law enforcement may enforce local and state law. Before *McGirt*, the Nation

⁷ <https://bit.ly/3FscfOK>

⁸ <https://bit.ly/3mFbx8g>

had entered twenty-one agreements with over fifty municipalities, counties, and local and state agencies in the Reservation. Since then, the Nation has entered into fifty-eight more such agreements.⁹

The Nation has also entered into agreements with municipalities on the Reservation, whereby the Nation donates revenue from the fines and fees paid under tribal law for traffic and misdemeanor citations and retains a modest processing fee equal to the assessment that would be paid to the State if the citation were issued off-Reservation.¹⁰ See Chad Hunter, *Cherokee Nation Marshals, Attorneys Dealing with McGirt Fallout*, Cherokee Phoenix (July 19, 2021);¹¹ Janelle Stecklein, *Tribes Talk About Intergovernmental Agreements with State Following McGirt Ruling*, Tahlequah Daily Press (Oct. 11, 2021).¹²

The Nation hopes for similar tribal-state agreements, and supports Congressman Tom Cole's proposed legislation that would allow the State and Nation to negotiate tribal-state compacts to define state and

⁹ All agreements are on file in the Oklahoma Secretary of State's office. See *Tribal Compacts and Agreements*, Okla. Sec'y of State, <https://bit.ly/3FRTqoq> (last visited Oct. 20, 2021) (enter "Cherokee" into "Doc Type" searchbar and press "Submit"). The State's *amici* call these agreements into question, see ODAA Amicus Br. at 16-17, *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 210429, but only offer speculation against their effectiveness, which is defeated by our quarter-century of experience with them and the dozens of agreements we have entered.

¹⁰ Municipal agreements are available on Cherokee Nation's website. See *Legal Status of the Cherokee Nation Reservation*, Cherokee Nation Att'y Gen.'s Office (last accessed Oct. 20, 2021) (follow hyperlinks under "Municipal Agreements").

¹¹ <https://bit.ly/3mJZM0a>

¹² <https://bit.ly/3pgZ7qh>

tribal criminal jurisdiction within the Reservation to their mutual benefit. *See* Cherokee Nation and Chickasaw Nation Criminal Jurisdiction Compacting Act of 2021, H.R. 3091, 117th Cong. (2021). However, Oklahoma’s Governor opposes that legislation because it would acknowledge the existence of Indian Reservations. Reese Gorman, *Cole Encourages State-Tribal Relations Over State Challenges to McGirt*, Norman Transcript (July 23, 2021).¹³ In contrast, Oklahoma’s former elected Attorney General accepted *McGirt*, *see* Press Release, Office of Okla. Att’y Gen., Attorney General Hunter Prepares Brief with Court of Criminal Appeals Seeking Guidance on Cases Affected by the McGirt Decision (last visited Oct. 20, 2021),¹⁴ and sought to implement it by “working with federal and tribal partners to make sure criminals are still being arrested and prosecuted,” Mike Hunter, Att’y Gen. of Okla., *Frequently Asked Questions Related to McGirt v. Oklahoma and the Proposed Legislative Framework Document 1* (n.d.).¹⁵ The new Attorney General, recently appointed by the Governor, is staunchly opposed to acknowledging or implementing *McGirt*. Joe Tomlinson, *Promised Land Recap: AG O’Connor Focused on Challenging SCOTUS Reservation Ruling*, NonDoc (Sept. 17, 2021).¹⁶ Nevertheless, the Nation still engages with willing state partners. Shortly after *McGirt* was decided, the Nation entered into an agreement with the State Department of Human Services which recognizes the Nation’s Reservation and permits the State and Nation to exercise concurrent jurisdic-

¹³ <https://bit.ly/3ANKfBx>

¹⁴ <https://bit.ly/3n4S9Si>

¹⁵ <https://bit.ly/3vuPc1l>

¹⁶ <https://bit.ly/3FOnJMG>

tion over Indian child custody on the Reservation. *See* Intergovernmental Agreement Between Okla. & Cherokee Nation Regarding Jurisdiction over Indian Children Within the Nation's Reservation (Sept. 1, 2020).¹⁷ The Nation is also negotiating with the Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse to reach a mutually beneficial agreement to provide additional resources for mental health treatment on the Reservation.

The Nation has also revised its laws to aid an orderly criminal justice transition by amending or enacting provisions that track state law. *See Tribal Code*, Cherokee Nation Office of Att'y Gen. (last visited Oct. 20, 2021).¹⁸ That includes new traffic, criminal, and juvenile codes that define offenses and crimes similarly to state law. Cherokee Nation Code tits. 10A,¹⁹ 21,²⁰ 47.²¹ The Nation also amended its statute of limitations, so that the limitation period tolls when the State initiated prosecution but then dismissed a prosecution or conviction for lack of jurisdiction. Cherokee Nation Code tit. 22, §§ 154-155.²²

These investments are delivering justice daily. As of September 30, 2021, the Nation had prosecuted 2,031 felony and misdemeanor cases since the *Hogner* ruling and had issued 1,263 traffic citations. *See* Inter-Tribal Council of Five Civilized Tribes, Res. No.

¹⁷ <https://bit.ly/2Z2KWdA>

¹⁸ <https://bit.ly/3APtTsl>

¹⁹ <https://bit.ly/3jko3jk>

²⁰ <https://bit.ly/3DTe6dQ>

²¹ <https://bit.ly/3G5nKfw>

²² <https://bit.ly/2Xj23XA>

21-34 (Oct. 8, 2021)²³; @CherokeeNation, Twitter (Oct. 9, 2021, 9:08 AM).²⁴ These arrests and prosecutions are being undertaken with a respect for the rule of law and the needs of the entire community: “We protect the tribe, we protect the community,’ [CNMS Director] said. . . . ‘You’ll hear a lot in the media about the world coming to an end,’. . . . ‘It really isn’t.” Crawford. The role that tribal justice systems play in punishing criminals rebuts the notion, repeated by Oklahoma, *see Castro-Huerta* Pet. 20, that the federal government’s declination of cases results in criminals going free. As the outgoing United States Attorney for the Northern District of Oklahoma explained:

[S]ome of those cases that people were describing as declinations were actually cases that were being referred to tribal attorneys general to be prosecuted. And I think that when a tribal attorney general decides to prosecute a case that’s actually a great exercise of tribal sovereignty and [the] tribal justice system. So, I don’t consider that case a declination where justice wasn’t pursued. . . . And, I think the tribal court should get our full faith and credit for being the great justice systems that they are.

Allison Herrera, *Trent Shores Reflects on his Time as U.S. Attorney, Remains Committed to Justice for Indian Country*, KOSU (Feb. 24, 2021, 4:40 AM).²⁵

That commitment also includes the handling of cases where offenders have already been prosecuted by the state and jurisdiction has shifted to the United

²³ <https://bit.ly/3AOnb5Q>

²⁴ <https://bit.ly/3AsaehJ>

²⁵ <https://bit.ly/3E3gD5x>

States or the Nation. In those cases, the Nation and federal government are acting swiftly to keep offenders off the street and make sure they are brought to justice in the proper forum. For instance, Respondent is a Muscogee (Creek) citizen who committed crimes on the Cherokee and Creek Reservations in 2016. *McGirt* was decided on July 9, 2020, during the pendency of Respondent's direct appeal of his criminal convictions. On November 3, 2020, the federal government indicted Respondent for robbery in Indian country. See Indictment, *United States v. McCombs*, No. 4:20-cr-00262-GKF (N.D. Okla. Nov. 3, 2020), ECF No. 2. On March 11, 2021, the OCCA issued its decision in *Hogner*, acknowledging the existence of the Cherokee Reservation. On March 30, the federal district court ordered Respondent to be transferred to federal custody, Order Granting Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Prosequendum for Cause, ECF No. 7, which occurred on April 6, Returned Arrest Warrant, ECF No. 24. Respondent remains in federal custody, Order of Detention Pending Trial of Apr. 19, 2021, ECF No. 21, and his trial is currently scheduled for January 2022, Order of Sept. 22, 2021, ECF No. 47.

That response was no one-off and resulted from an extensive effort by the Nation to ensure that *McGirt* was brought to bear on cases arising on the Reservation in a responsible, orderly manner. In the month after the *McGirt* decision, the Nation assisted the OCCA's consideration of appeals raising *McGirt*-based jurisdictional arguments. It did so by tendering an amicus briefs and appendix in *Hogner* less than a month after *McGirt* was decided and identifying nine then-pending appeals raising the claim that the Cherokee Reservation is intact. Cherokee Nation Unopposed Application for Authorization to File Amicus Br., *Hogner v. State*, 2021 OK CR 4 (filed Aug. 3, 2020) (No.

F-2018-138).²⁶ In each case, the Nation confirmed the location of the offenses and the Indian status of the defendants and victims. Less than two weeks later, the OCCA remanded those cases for evidentiary hearings. As in this case, the State presented no evidence or argument at those hearings that the Reservation was disestablished or that *McGirt* should be overruled. The Nation appeared and participated at the hearings, filing amicus briefs, exhibits, historical documents, and proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. Each trial court determined the Reservation is intact.

Based on the evidentiary records and trial courts' findings, the Nation anticipated the OCCA would vacate convictions and began to coordinate, sometimes in advance of the OCCA opinions, to ensure defendants would be lawfully prosecuted in federal or tribal courts. That effort has been successful. Today, the OCCA has vacated twelve state convictions in Cherokee Reservation cases on direct appeal. In every case, federal or tribal prosecution is proceeding. *See Cherokee Nation v. Perales*, No. CRM-21-261 (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. filed Mar. 9, 2021); *Cherokee Nation v. Shriver*, No. CRM-21-55 (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. filed Feb. 19, 2021); *Cherokee Nation v. Shriver*, No. CRM-21-56 (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. filed Feb. 19, 2021); *United States v. Bragg*, No. 4:21-cr-00088-JFH (N.D. Okla. filed Mar. 22, 2021); *United States v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 4:20-cr-00255-CVE (N.D. Okla. guilty plea Nov. 2, 2020); *United States v. Cottingham*, No. 4:20-cr-00209-GKF-1 (N.D. Okla. filed Oct. 5, 2020); *United States v. Foster*, No. 4:21-cr-00118-CVE (N.D. Okla. filed Mar. 16, 2021); *United States v. Leathers*, No. 4:21-cr-00163-CVE-1 (N.D. Okla. filed

²⁶ <https://bit.ly/3DZkOiK>

Mar. 19, 2021); *McCombs*, No. 4:20-cr-00262-GKF-1; *United States v. McDaniel*, No. 6:21-mj-00372-SPS-1 (E.D. Okla. filed Sept. 22, 2021); *United States v. Spears*, No. 4:20-cr-00296-GKF (N.D. Okla. filed Nov. 18, 2020); *United States v. Vaught*, No. 4:21-cr-00202-JFH-1 (N.D. Okla. filed Apr. 2, 2021).

The State worries about “civil jurisdiction of non-Indian municipal courts in eastern Oklahoma under the Curtis Act, ch. 504, § 14, 30 Stat. 499-500 (1898),” citing one pending case. *Hooper v. City of Tulsa*, No. 4:21-cv-00165-JED-JFJ (N.D. Okla. filed Apr. 9, 2021). *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 25. *Hooper*—dealing with *criminal* jurisdiction—arose from a decision of the Municipal Criminal Court of the City of Tulsa, which is located mostly on the Creek and Cherokee Reservations. The municipal court concluded that under the Curtis Act,²⁷ municipalities on the Creek Reservation which incorporated under that Act before Oklahoma statehood can enforce municipal criminal ordinances against both Indians and non-Indians. *City of Tulsa v. Hooper*, No. 7470397, slip op. at 5-10 (Tulsa Mun. Crim. Ct. Apr. 5, 2021).²⁸

The Nation disagrees with that decision. Tulsa is organized under Oklahoma state law pursuant to a charter adopted *after* statehood. See Tulsa, Okla. Code App. C,²⁹ Okla. Const. art. 18, § 3(a). In any event, under existing cross-deputization agreements with Tulsa, tribal and municipal law enforcement officers can

²⁷ The Curtis Act was one of the statutes passed by Congress to coerce the Five Tribes into agreeing to allotment of their lands. See *McGirt*, 140 S. Ct. at 2465.

²⁸ Exhibit 1 to Complaint, *Hooper v. City of Tulsa*, No. 4:21-cv-00165-JED-JFJ (N.D. Okla. filed Apr. 9, 2021), ECF No. 1-1.

²⁹ <https://bit.ly/3nejTDZ>

enforce applicable tribal, local, and federal laws and refer those cases to the appropriate prosecutors. *See* Addendum to Law Enforcement Agreement Between U.S., Cherokee Nation, and City of Tulsa (Apr. 9, 2014);³⁰ Addendum to Law Enforcement Agreement Between U.S., Muscogee (Creek) Nation, and City of Tulsa (May 2, 2006).³¹ Such agreements are available to any other municipality on a reservation. And since *McGirt*, inter-governmental cooperation with Tulsa police has been intensive. *See* Allison Herrera, “*My Office Will Work Until We Drop*”: Agencies Vow to Work Together on *McGirt* Cases, KOSU (Aug. 12, 2020, 10:02 AM).³² The Nation is doing all it can to ensure Indians and non-Indians in Tulsa are held accountable to the law.

Finally, the State’s suggestion that lurking “[q]uestions” about tribal civil authority are of concern has no basis in fact within the Nation’s knowledge. *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 25. The Nation has made no effort to exercise civil jurisdiction over anyone on terms that were not already available before *McGirt*, and no such cases are pending in the Nation’s courts. The State provides no evidence that challenges to the State’s civil jurisdiction elsewhere are even remotely serious. *See id.* at 24-26. If serious disputes were to arise over civil jurisdiction, they should be resolved in those cases, not this criminal case. Resolution of such issues is also available through tribal-state agreement, as the tribes and State have done time and time again, even when the Supreme Court has found the State has overstepped its authority in Indian country. *See, e.g.,*

³⁰ <https://bit.ly/3DsYnSv>

³¹ <https://bit.ly/3uY6Lq6>

³² <https://bit.ly/3DKOhg0>

Okla. Stat. tit. 68 § 500.63 (authorizing the State and tribes to enter agreements to share motor fuel tax revenues after *Oklahoma Tax Commission v. Chickasaw Nation*, 515 U.S. 450 (1995)); *id.* § 346 (authorizing State and tribes to enter agreements to share tobacco tax revenues after *Oklahoma Tax Commission v. Citizen Band Potawatomi Indian Tribe of Oklahoma*, 498 U.S. 505 (1991)). That this model works is shown by the Nation’s recent child custody agreement with the State. *See supra* at 7-8.

The State’s reliance on exaggeration is of a piece with the Oklahoma Governor’s attempts to stoke hysteria and sensationalism in the media. *See* Hicham Raache, *Gov. Stitt Says Supreme Court’s McGirt Ruling Created ‘Public Safety Threat’, asks Oklahomans to Share Stories; Cherokee Nation Reacts*, KFOR (Apr. 16, 2021, 11:52 AM)³³; Ray Carter, *McGirt Called Threat to State’s Economic Future*, Okla. Council of Pub. Affairs (Aug. 16, 2021)³⁴; Reese Gorman, *Cole Continues to Advocate for Tribal Sovereignty on Indigenous Peoples’ Day*, Norman Transcript (Oct 11, 2021) (“Stitt spokesperson Carly Atchinson said, ‘McGirt is the biggest issue that’s ever hit any state since the Civil War. . . .’”).³⁵ That provides no ground for certiorari. Furthermore, rewarding this strategy could threaten the fair adjudication of criminal cases arising on Indian country in Oklahoma in the future. *See Flowers v. Mississippi*, 139 S. Ct. 2228, 2254 (2019) (Thomas, J., dissenting); *Chandler v. Florida*, 449 U.S. 560, 580 (1981).

³³ <https://bit.ly/2YV7mwS>

³⁴ <https://bit.ly/3vzCs9M>

³⁵ <https://bit.ly/3AK839C>

II. The State Cannot Use this Moot Case to Challenge the Cherokee Reservation.

The State’s effort to undo the Cherokee Reservation is a starkly new position. The State once *affirmatively accepted* the Cherokee Reservation in other cases, Suppl. Br. of Appellee after Remand at 3, *McDaniel v. State*, No. F-2017-357 (Okla. Crim. App. filed Mar. 29, 2021) (“The State further accepts, in light of this Court’s ruling in *Hogner v. State*, . . . that the crimes occurred within the boundaries of the Cherokee Nation Reservation.”)³⁶; Suppl. Br. of Appellee after Remand at 6, *Foster v. State*, No. F-2020-149 (Okla. Crim. App. filed Apr. 19, 2021) (noting the State stipulated in that case that, under *Hogner* the Cherokee Reservation exists).³⁷ In line with its avowed acceptance of *Hogner*, the State said nothing to challenge the Reservation below.³⁸

But now, under the direction of a newly appointed Attorney General, the State contends that “[u]nder the correct framework. . . Congress disestablished the Creek territory in Oklahoma, as well as the territories of the rest of the Five Tribes,” and that *McGirt* is incorrect. *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 18.³⁹ That framework, the State

³⁶ <https://bit.ly/3lM1Wgz>

³⁷ <https://bit.ly/3jjP67S>

³⁸ The State’s decision to accept *Hogner* and not seek certiorari there also suggests its effort to challenge the Reservation is barred by non-mutual collateral estoppel. *See* Restatement (Second) of Judgments § 29 (1980); *B & B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.*, 575 U.S. 138, 148 (2015) (quoting Restatement (Second) for collateral estoppel principles); *see also State v. United Cook Inlet Drift Ass’n*, 895 P.2d 947, 951-52 (Alaska 1995); *Benjamin v. Coughlin*, 905 F.2d 571, 576 (2d Cir. 1990).

³⁹ *McGirt* addressed only the Creek Reservation, not all the Five Tribes’ Reservations. 140 S. Ct. at 2479.

insists, requires “[c]onsideration of history. . .because the effect on reservation status of statutes targeting Indian land ownership is inherently ambiguous.” *Id.* Having taken the contrary position in *McDaniel* to avoid the burden of litigating the existence of the Reservation, and the OCCA having accepted that position, the State is barred from raising that argument for the first time here as part of an unfair appellate ambush. *See New Hampshire v. Maine*, 532 U.S. 742, 750-51, 755-56 (2001).

Moreover, the State’s attack is barred by its conduct in *this* case. When a party does not raise an argument below, and the lower court does not rule on it, it is waived. *See Sprietsma v. Mercury Marine*, 537 U.S. 51, 56 n.4 (2002). “Waiver is the intentional relinquishment or abandonment of a known right,” *Wood v. Milyard*, 566 U.S. 463, 474 (2012), which is exactly what the State did here. And an argument waived below is forfeited before this Court. *United States v. Jones*, 565 U.S. 400, 413 (2012).

After *McGirt* and *Sharp v. Murphy*, 140 S. Ct. 2412 (2020) (per curiam), were decided, the OCCA remanded for an evidentiary hearing and directed the District Court to “follow the analysis set out in *McGirt*” to determine if the Reservation had been disestablished. Pet’r’s App. 28a. In that order, the OCCA made clear the State should develop evidence below on Reservation status: “Recognizing the historical and specialized nature of this remand for evidentiary hearing, we request the Attorney General and District Attorney to work in coordination to effect uniformity and completeness in the hearing process.” *Id.* at 27a.

Nevertheless, before the District Court the State presented no evidence on whether the Reservation exists, although Respondent extensively briefed the

Reservation's existence, Def.'s Remanded Hr'g Br., *State v. McCombs*, No. CF-2016-6878 (Okla. Dist. Ct. filed Sept. 25, 2020).⁴⁰ Instead of presenting its own case, the State stipulated that some of Respondent's crimes occurred within the "boundaries set forth in" the Nation's treaties, Evidentiary Hr'g Stips. ¶¶ 2.b-c, e (filed Oct. 13, 2020),⁴¹ and that "if the Court determines that the treaties referenced herein established a reservation for the Cherokee Nation, and if the Court also concludes that Congress never explicitly erased those boundaries and disestablished the reservation, then the crimes occurred within Indian Country as defined by 18 U.S.C. § 1151(a)," *id.* ¶ 2.f.

The District Court then issued its decision, repeating the stipulations, Pet'r's App. 13a-16a, making extensive findings of fact and conclusions of law on Reservation status, *id.* at 18a-23a, and noting "[n]o evidence or argument was presented by the State specifically regarding disestablishment or boundary erasure of the Cherokee Reservation," *id.* at 23a. The District Court then found the Reservation exists, holding that:

the crimes were committed at locations identified to be within the . . .the historical boundaries of the Cherokee Nation as established by the 1835 and 1866 Treaties with the Cherokee and. . .those boundaries have not been erased and disestablished by Congress.

Pet'r's App. 23a-24a.

Back before the OCCA, the State repeated its stipulation that if the Reservation was not diminished,

⁴⁰ <https://bit.ly/3FXFzwT>

⁴¹ <https://bit.ly/3jjobsG>

the crimes occurred on Indian country and the District Court's conclusion that some of Respondent's offenses occurred within the Cherokee Reservation. *See* Suppl. Br. of Appellee After Remand at 5-6, *McCombs v. State*, No. F-2017-1000 (Okla. Crim. App. filed Dec. 28, 2020).⁴² The State reiterated that it "takes no position as to the existence, or absence, of a Cherokee Nation Reservation," *id.* at 7 n.2, and asked the OCCA to stay any order reversing the conviction so the federal government could take custody of Respondent, *id.* at 6. The OCCA then granted relief to Respondent as the evidence established that the Cherokee Reservation had not been "expressly disestablished by Congress." Pet'r's App. 3a. "Therefore, the District Court concluded, and [the OCCA] agree[d], that the crimes occurred in Indian Country." *Id.* (citing *McGirt*, 140 S. Ct. at 2468; *Spears*; *Hogner*). Following that ruling, on October 12, 2021, the District Court dismissed the case against Respondent and vacated the state law judgment and sentence against him. Docket Entry, *State v. McCombs*, No. CF-2016-6878 (Okla. Dist. Ct. Oct. 12, 2021).⁴³

Thus, the State forfeited its anti-Reservation position. The OCCA ordered a hearing on the Reservation's existence and requested that the State help develop a record on that question. The State chose not to do so, nor to challenge *McGirt*.⁴⁴ Instead, it took no position

⁴² <https://bit.ly/3ASkEaP>

⁴³ <https://bit.ly/3vq7a4N>.

⁴⁴ The State began attempting to reserve its right to challenge *McGirt* after the former Attorney General left office, thereby implicitly acknowledging its earlier waivers. *See, e.g.*, Br. in Supp. of Mot. to Stay & Abate Proceedings at 5 n.3, *Russell v. Oklahoma*, No. F-2019-892 (Okla. Crim. App. filed June 24, 2021), <https://bit.ly/3jbOhOh>. Of course, an attempt to preserve

and presented no evidence. In its post-remand briefing, the State raised no challenge to the District Court’s reservation ruling. By knowingly waiving every opportunity to challenge the Cherokee Reservation below, the State forfeited its right to do so here, by attacking *McGirt* or otherwise. In short, the State’s effort to reverse its earlier decisions not to challenge the existence of the Cherokee Reservation “comes too late in the day,” to be considered. *See Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.*, 564 U.S. 552, 563 (2011).

Nor can it back out of its stipulation now. Litigants “are entitled to have their case tried upon the assumption that facts, stipulated into the record, were established” and “[t]his entitlement is the bookend to a party’s undertaking to be bound by the factual stipulations it submits.” *Christian Legal Soc’y v. Martinez*, 561 U.S. 661, 676-77 (2010) (cleaned up); *accord id.* at 715 (Alito, J., dissenting). “This Court has accordingly refused to consider a party’s argument that contradicted a joint stipulation entered at the outset of the litigation.” *Id.* at 677 (cleaned up).

If more were needed, the District Court’s dismissal of the criminal charges mooted this case by ending the controversy between the State and Respondent. Any decision this Court issues on the State’s ability to bring the now-dismissed charges in this case will not give any party any relief, *Chafin v. Chafin*, 568 U.S. 165, 172 (2013), and would only be advisory, *see Steel*

an argument, regardless of whether it could prevent waiver, cannot succeed if the argument is estopped or *already* waived.

Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env't, 523 U.S. 83, 101 (1998).⁴⁵ Thus, the Court should deny the petition.⁴⁶

III. The State Proffers No Just Basis For Abandoning *Stare Decisis* to Revisit *McGirt*.

The State claims this is a “paradigmatic” example of when *stare decisis* should yield but relies on cases that are worlds apart from this one. *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 28 (citing *Janus v. AFSCME, Council 31*, 138 S. Ct. 2448 (2018); *Franchise Tax Bd. v. Hyatt*, 139 S. Ct. 1485, 1499 (2019); *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 140 S. Ct. 1390 (2020)). When the “factors to consider” in deciding whether to overturn precedent are applied to this case, namely “the quality of the decision’s reasoning; its consistency with related decisions; legal developments since the decision; and reliance on the decision,” *Hyatt*, 139 S. Ct. at 1499, *McGirt* does not yield.

The cases the State cites were ones in which the Court overturned prior constitutional precedents, acknowledging that *stare decisis* “is at its weakest when we interpret the Constitution.” *Janus*, 138 S. Ct. at 2478; *Hyatt*, 139 S. Ct. at 1492; *Ramos*, 140 S. Ct. at 1404-08. Here *stare decisis* is most potent, as Congress has plenary authority to revisit what the Court has done and, exercising its primary authority over Indian affairs, to reverse or modify the Court’s

⁴⁵ The only exception to mootness that the Court has recognized—capable of repetition yet evading review—is inapplicable in this case, which deals with the validity of a criminal conviction, not a transient injury too short to be litigated but likely to be repeated. See *United States v. Sanchez-Gomez*, 138 S. Ct. 1532, 1540 (2018); *Kingdomware Techs., Inc. v. United States*, 136 S. Ct. 1969, 1976 (2016).

⁴⁶ For the same reasons, the State also cannot challenge the Creek Reservation in this case.

decisions. *Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Cmty.*, 572 U.S. 782, 799 (2014).⁴⁷ Yet, in this case the State asks the Court to do Congress’s business by accepting its view of funding and policy debates. The political nature of this attack is underscored by its timing, which follows the appointment of a new Attorney General. That is a call for prospective legislation, not grounds for certiorari.

McGirt is also well-reasoned, in clear contrast to the decisions overruled in *Hyatt*, 139 S. Ct. at 1499, *Janus*, 138 S. Ct. at 2463-65, 2483, and *Ramos*, 140 S. Ct. at 1404-08. *McGirt* rests on a comprehensive analysis of law and history—despite the State’s claim to the contrary, *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 18-19—and its ruling is based on the language of the treaties and congressional enactments at issue, rather than the State’s interpretation of subsequent events that are urged to overcome statutory text.⁴⁸ The Court’s conclusion was

⁴⁷ This, and the reliance costs imposed by work to implement *McGirt*, see *infra* at 22-23, rebut the State’s assertion that “the recent nature of the decision entitles it to less stare decisis weight.” *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 28 (citing constitutional cases where reliance interests, if they existed, were weakened by lower courts’ confused applications of precedent).

⁴⁸ The State’s and its supporting *amici*’s position that *McGirt* should be reversed because the disestablishment analysis involves evaluation of “inherently ambiguous” statutes is self-defeating. See Tex. Amicus Br. at 13-20, *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429. The judicial interpretation of ambiguous statutes fosters certainty and predictability in their application and enforcement, which is an argument for sparingly revisiting such interpretations. See *Gamble v. United States*, 139 S. Ct. 1960, 1986 (2019) (Thomas, J., concurring). And even if the State were right that *McGirt* involved inherent ambiguities, *McGirt* resolved them through a thorough review of the circumstances surrounding the enactment and implementation of statutes affecting the Muscogee (Creek) Nation. 140 S. Ct. at 2470-74.

no outlier, as it is consistent with the federal court decisions that have applied the disestablishment factors, including the panel in *Murphy*. Unlike *Janus* and *Hyatt*, no intervening decision affects the law on which *McGirt* is based or calls *McGirt*'s reasoning into question. In fact, subsequently, multiple circuits have repeatedly relied on *McGirt*'s approach to statutory interpretation as a touchstone in their own analyses, both in and outside of the Indian law context.⁴⁹ Nor have there been any later factual developments that call the *McGirt* decision's reasoning into question. *Cf. Janus*, 138 S. Ct. at 2465-66, 2482-83; *Citizens United v. FEC*, 558 U.S. 310, 364 (2010) (massive changes in political media landscape undermined poorly-reasoned First Amendment precedent). Indeed, the relevant facts showing the Creek Reservation's existence could not have changed in the past year. Perhaps most significantly, the Oklahoma courts have applied *McGirt* with precision and without difficulty. And the Nations and the federal governments have successfully implemented *McGirt* and the OCCA's decisions to bring criminals to justice, which proves *McGirt* is not "unworkable."

Reliance interests are present here too. *McGirt* palliates injustice, honors the treaty promises of the United States, restores to Congress its constitutional prerogative to decide whether and how to change those promises, and demonstrates that this Court will not permit "the rule of the strong" to triumph over the rule of law, 140 S. Ct. at 2474. While the State relies heavily on the "century of reliance interests that

⁴⁹ See, e.g., *Rojas v. FAA*, 989 F.3d. 666, 689 (9th Cir. 2021) (Wardlaw, J. concurring in part and dissenting in part); *Awuku-Asare v. Garland*, 991 F.3d 1123, 1128 (10th Cir. 2021); *Penobscot Nation v. Frey*, 3 F.4th 484, 493-94 (1st Cir. 2021).

McGirt upset,” *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 28, the correction of a century of injustice cannot entirely avoid doing so. And the Nations, federal government, state courts, local governments, and other public servants have invested great time and resources to make the recognition of the Nations’ treaty rights in *McGirt* and its follow-on cases meaningful by protecting public safety and punishing wrongdoers. Reversing course now would leave all those efforts without purpose or meaning—affecting the public’s confidence in the justice system, wasting tens of millions of dollars and substantial administrative investments, and imposing costs of re-arresting, re-transferring, and re-prosecuting thousands of offenders. These are the interests that are now on the line, and they are threatened by efforts to overthrow *McGirt*, not efforts to adhere to it.

CONCLUSION

The petition should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANK S. HOLLEMAN, IV	SARA HILL
DOUGLAS B. L. ENDRESON	<i>Attorney General</i>
SONOSKY, CHAMBERS, SACHSE, ENDRESON & PERRY, LLP	CHRISSI NIMMO <i>Counsel of Record</i>
1425 K Street, NW, Suite 600 Washington, DC 20005	<i>Deputy Attorney General</i> CHEROKEE NATION P.O. Box 948 Tahlequah, OK 74465 (918) 458-6998 chrissi-nimmo@cherokee.org
PATTI PALMER GHEZZI <i>Attorney at Law</i> P.O. Box 812 Pawhuska, OK 74056	

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae
Cherokee Nation*

October 28, 2021