

No. 21-486

---

---

IN THE  
*Supreme Court of the United States*

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

DAKOTA JAMES ALLEYN SHRIVER,  
*Respondent.*

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

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

KRISTI CHRISTOPHER  
OKLAHOMA INDIGENT  
DEFENSE SYSTEM  
P.O. Box 926  
Norman, OK 73070  
(405) 801-2601

DAVID A. STRAUSS  
SARAH M. KONSKY  
JENNER & BLOCK  
SUPREME COURT AND  
APPELLATE CLINIC AT  
THE UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL  
1111 E. 60th St.  
Chicago, IL 60637

ZACHARY C. SCHAUF  
*Counsel of Record*  
MATTHEW S. HELLMAN  
LEONARD R. POWELL  
ALLISON M. TJEMSLAND  
VICTORIA HALL-PALERM  
KELSEY L. STIMPLE  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
1099 New York Ave., NW  
Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 639-6000  
zschauf@jenner.com

**QUESTION PRESENTED**

Should this Court consider overruling its statutory decision in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020)?

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

QUESTION PRESENTED ..... i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... iii

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE ..... 1

REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION ..... 4

CONCLUSION ..... 10

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>Bankers Life &amp; Casualty Co. v. Crenshaw</i> , 486 U.S. 71 (1988).....	5
<i>Halliburton Co. v. Erica P. John Fund, Inc.</i> , 573 U.S. 258 (2014).....	7
<i>Hogner v. State</i> , 2021 OK CR 4.....	6
<i>Illinois v. Gates</i> , 462 U.S. 213 (1983) .....	5
<i>McGirt v. Oklahoma</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020) .....	1, 4
<i>Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Community</i> , 572 U.S. 782 (2014).....	7
<i>Murphy v. Royal</i> , 875 F.3d 896 (10th Cir. 2017).....	1
<i>Solem v. Bartlett</i> , 465 U.S. 463 (1984).....	1
<i>State ex rel. Matloff v. Wallace</i> , 2021 OK CR 21, petition for cert. filed, No. 21-467 (U.S. Sept. 29, 2021) .....	8
<i>United States v. Jones</i> , 565 U.S. 400 (2012) .....	5

### OTHER AUTHORITIES

Brief for Amicus Curiae Chickasaw Nation, <i>Oklahoma v. Beck</i> , No. 21-373 (U.S. Oct. 15, 2021).....	9
Brief for Amicus Curiae Chickasaw Nation & Choctaw Nation, <i>Oklahoma v. Castro- Huerta</i> , No. 21-429 (U.S. Nov. 18, 2021).....	7, 9, 10

Brief for Amicus Curiae Muscogee (Creek) Nation, <i>Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 21-429 (U.S. Nov. 16, 2021).....	7, 9, 10
Brief for Amicus Curiae Choctaw Nation, <i>Oklahoma v. Sizemore</i> , No. 21-326 (U.S. Oct. 28, 2021).....	9
Brief In Opposition, <i>Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 21-429 (U.S. Nov. 15, 2021).....	1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
Reese Gorman, <i>Cole Encourages State-Tribal Relations Over State Challenges to McGirt</i> , Norman Transcript (July 23, 2021), <a href="https://yhoo.it/3lYMjD8">https://yhoo.it/3lYMjD8</a> .....	7
Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, <i>Oklahoma v. Bosse</i> , No. 21-186 (U.S. Aug. 6, 2021) .....	5, 8
Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, <i>Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 21-429 (U.S. Sept. 17, 2021).....	5, 7, 8, 9

## INTRODUCTION

This is one of several near-identical petitions asking this Court to overrule its statutory decision in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020). Its single question presented is identical to the second question presented in *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429. This petition should be denied for the same reasons explained in the Brief in Opposition in *Castro-Huerta* (“*Castro-Huerta* Opp. \_\_\_”).

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Respondent Dakota James Alleyn Shriver, a member of the Cherokee Nation, was charged by information in June 2015 for an alleged crime committed within the Cherokee reservation. Information Count 1 (Okla. Dist. Ct., Rogers Cnty. June 30, 2015)<sup>1</sup>; Information Count 2 (Okla. Dist. Ct., Rogers Cnty. June 30, 2015). In August 2017, the Tenth Circuit applied *Solem v. Bartlett*, 465 U.S. 463 (1984), to hold that the Muscogee reservation endured. *Murphy v. Royal*, 875 F.3d 896, 966 (10th Cir. 2017). Respondent promptly moved to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, citing the Tenth Circuit’s decision in *Murphy* and Respondent’s Indian status. Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction at 2 (Okla. Dist. Ct., Rogers Cnty. Sept. 8, 2017). Oklahoma nonetheless maintained its prosecution of Respondent, who was convicted later that month after a jury trial. Verdict (Okla. Dist. Ct., Rogers Cnty. Sept. 29, 2017).

---

<sup>1</sup> References to district-court filings are to Case No. CF-2015-395, available at <https://bit.ly/3CwWynw>.

On appeal, Respondent renewed his argument that Oklahoma lacked jurisdiction to prosecute him because he is an Indian and the alleged crimes took place within the Cherokee reservation. Br. of Appellant at 6-18 (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. July 18, 2018).<sup>2</sup> The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals (“OCCA”) stayed the appeal pending *Murphy*. Order at 2 (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. Mar. 22, 2019).

After *McGirt* and the resolution of *Murphy* in *Sharp v. Murphy*, 140 S. Ct. 2412 (2020), the OCCA remanded to the district court for an evidentiary hearing on Respondent’s Indian status and the location of the alleged crimes—in particular, whether Congress established a reservation for the Cherokee Nation and, if so, whether Congress disestablished that reservation. Pet. App. 42a. The parties stipulated that Respondent was an enrolled member of the Cherokee Nation. Pet. App. 4a.

As to the Indian country issue, Oklahoma, took “no position as to the facts underlying the existence, now or historically, of the alleged Cherokee Nation Reservation.” Pet. App. 38a. And “[n]o evidence or argument was presented by the State specifically regarding disestablishment or boundary erasure.” *Id.* Based on evidence presented by Respondent and the Cherokee Nation, the trial court concluded that Congress established a reservation for the Cherokee Nation via the 1833 Treaty with the Western Cherokee, the 1835 Treaty with the Cherokee, the 1846 Treaty with

---

<sup>2</sup> References to filings in the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals are to Case No. F-2017-1279, available at <https://bit.ly/2ZCfbbK>.

the Cherokee, and the 1866 Treaty with the Cherokee. Pet. App. 21a-24a; *see* Pet. App. 5a.

Then, the trial court canvassed the statutes around Oklahoma’s statehood that might have disestablished the Cherokee reservation—including provisions concerning the Cherokee Nation in the 1898 Curtis Act, the 1902 Cherokee allotment agreement, and the Five Tribes Act. Pet. App. 26a-34a. It concluded that none of these statutes disestablished the Cherokee reservation. *Id.* The trial court also analyzed the “[e]vents [s]urrounding [e]nactment of Cherokee [a]llotment [l]egislation and [l]ater [d]emographic [e]vidence” and found no evidence of disestablishment. Pet. App. 34a-38a. Thus, the district court concluded that the Cherokee reservation continues to exist.

On appeal, Oklahoma did not argue that the OCCA should deny relief. *See* Supplemental Brief of Appellee after Remand (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. Dec. 8, 2020). The OCCA upheld the trial court’s determination that the Cherokee reservation has not been disestablished and found that Oklahoma did not have jurisdiction to prosecute Respondent. Pet. App. 7a. The trial court then dismissed the case. Order (Okla. Dist. Ct., Rogers Cnty. Aug. 5, 2021).

By then, the Cherokee Nation had long since filed criminal charges against Respondent. Information (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. Feb. 19, 2021).<sup>3</sup> The Cherokee Nation issued an arrest warrant against Respondent even before the OCCA reversed his

---

<sup>3</sup> References to filings in Respondent’s tribal criminal case are to Case No. CRM-21-56 (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct.).



criminal conviction. Arrest Warrant (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. Mar. 30, 2021); *see* Cherokee Nation Amicus Br. 10. After the OCCA’s opinion issued on April 29, the Cherokee Nation promptly accepted custody of Respondent from Oklahoma. Arrest Warrant (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. Mar. 30, 2021); *see* Cherokee Nation Amicus Br. 10. Respondent remains in the custody of the Cherokee Nation awaiting trial. Court Minute/Order (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. Sept. 14, 2021).

### **REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION**

As explained in the *Castro-Huerta* Brief in Opposition, Oklahoma’s request to overrule this Court’s statutory decision in *McGirt* does not warrant review. The Court must deny this petition, however, for even more mundane reasons.

First, this case does not present Oklahoma’s question presented: It concerns not the Muscogee reservation (at issue in *McGirt*) but the Cherokee reservation, which has its own treaties, statutes, and history. While the Five Tribes share commonalities, “[e]ach tribe’s treaties must be considered on their own terms.” *McGirt*, 140 S. Ct. at 2479. For example, “[u]nlike the Creek Agreement, the Cherokee Agreement did not describe tribal courts as ‘abolished’ by the Curtis Act or prohibit revival of tribal courts.” Pet. App. 31a; *cf.* *McGirt*, 140 S. Ct. at 2484, 2490-91 (Roberts, C.J., dissenting) (emphasizing Congress’s abolition of Muscogee courts). This court cannot overrule *McGirt* in a case about the Cherokee reservation. *See Castro-Huerta* Opp. 18-19.

Second, Oklahoma below did not raise its request to overrule *McGirt* and declined to even present evidence

on the Cherokee reservation’s disestablishment. In cases from state courts, this Court considers only claims “pressed or passed on below”—even when litigants claim that a “well-settled federal” rule “should be modified.” *Illinois v. Gates*, 462 U.S. 213, 219-20, 222 (1983). “[C]hief among” the considerations supporting that rule “is [the Court’s] own need for a properly developed record.” *Bankers Life & Cas. Co. v. Crenshaw*, 486 U.S. 71, 79 (1988). Likewise, this Court treats as waived arguments “not raise[d] ... below.” *United States v. Jones*, 565 U.S. 400, 413 (2012).

This case illustrates why this Court does so. Oklahoma says *McGirt* should have placed more weight on “contemporaneous understanding” and “histor[y].” *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 17.<sup>4</sup> And it seeks *McGirt*’s overruling based on claims of “disruption.” *Id.* 3-4. But below, even though the OCCA remanded *expressly* to hold a hearing on the Cherokee reservation, Oklahoma presented no evidence on either point and declined even to take a position on the disestablishment of the Cherokee reservation. Meanwhile, in other cases, Oklahoma affirmatively accepted that the Cherokee reservation exists. Cherokee Nation Amicus Br. 15-16 (discussing *McDaniel* and *Foster*). Only with the arrival

---

<sup>4</sup> Because *Castro-Huerta* is Oklahoma’s most recent version of its certiorari arguments—which it originally made in *Oklahoma v. Bosse*, No. 21-186—Respondent addresses that petition. Again, it is bizarre for Oklahoma to ask the Court to weigh overruling *McGirt* in cases (like *Castro-Huerta* and this one) concerning the Cherokee reservation, a different reservation subject to different treaties and statutes. But that oddity should be of no moment. Oklahoma’s question presented does not warrant review in any case.

of a new Attorney General, in June 2021, did Oklahoma reverse course. *Id.* at 19 n.49.

All of that is why Oklahoma’s petition is so light on evidence and so heavy on citation-free assertions. This is no way to undertake the grave task of weighing whether to abandon *stare decisis*. Oklahoma’s waiver, and its failure to develop a record, militate powerfully against granting its petition. *See id.* at 15-20; *cf. Hogner v. State*, 2021 OK CR 4, ¶ 2 (Hudson, J., concurring in result) (explaining that the case should not be used to “definitively resolv[e]” whether the Chickasaw reservation was disestablished because “[Oklahoma’s] tactic of passivity has created a legal void in [the] ability to adjudicate properly the facts underlying” that issue).<sup>5</sup>

Regardless, Oklahoma’s request to overrule *McGirt* does not warrant review even in a case, unlike this one, presenting that question—as the *Castro-Huerta* Brief in Opposition explains. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 2-4, 18-38. Like many of this Court’s statutory decisions, *McGirt* was divided. Like many such decisions, *McGirt* had real effects (though Oklahoma vastly overstates them). And like all of this Court’s statutory decisions, the ball is now where the Constitution has placed it: With Congress.

Certiorari is not warranted to address Oklahoma’s invitation for this Court to elbow Congress aside. It

---

<sup>5</sup> To Respondent’s knowledge, in none of Oklahoma’s pending petitions did it develop evidence to support the claims it now presses. And given Oklahoma’s tactical choice below to decline to present such evidence or argument, it would be inappropriate to allow Oklahoma to do so simply because it has sought *certiorari*. *See Cherokee Nation Amicus Br.* 15-20 & n.40 (identifying additional procedural obstacles, including mootness and estoppel).

scarcely needs saying that this Court does not overrule statutory decisions based solely on changes in personnel. *Stare decisis* exists precisely to protect the “actual and perceived integrity of the judicial process” against such threats. *Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Cmty.*, 572 U.S. 782, 798 (2014) (quotation marks omitted). And *stare decisis* applies with “special force” in statutory cases, where “Congress remains free to alter what [this Court has] done.” *Halliburton Co. v. Erica P. John Fund, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 258, 274 (2014) (quotation marks omitted); see *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 20-22.

Here, those principles are no mere abstractions. Oklahoma seeks certiorari *in order to* preempt active negotiations. In May 2021, its governor opposed H.R. 3091, which would have allowed the State to compact with two of the Five Tribes over criminal jurisdiction. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 3, 10-11. In July 2021, the State opposed federal-law-enforcement funding because it did not desire “a permanent federal fix.”<sup>6</sup> And weeks later, it became clear why: It preferred to swing for the fences in this Court. This Court’s place, however, is not in the middle of legislative negotiations. And Oklahoma’s siren song that “[o]nly the Court can remedy [its] problems,” *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 4, badly misunderstands this Court’s role. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 20-24; see Cherokee Nation Amicus Br. 4-8; Muscogee (Creek) Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 25-28; Chickasaw Nation & Choctaw Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 6-7, 13-15.

---

<sup>6</sup> Reese Gorman, *Cole Encourages State-Tribal Relations Over State Challenges to McGirt*, Norman Transcript (July 23, 2021), <https://yhoo.it/3IYMjD8>.

Rarely, moreover, will this Court receive so inappropriate a request justified by so little. Despite claiming “unprecedented disruption,” *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 10, Oklahoma points to few real effects—and none that could justify this Court substituting itself for Congress.

Oklahoma first told this Court that it must limit or overrule *McGirt* because “[t]housands” of prisoners were poised to successfully “challeng[e] decades’ worth of convictions.” Pet. 2, *Oklahoma v. Bosse*, No. 21-186. Subsequent events, however, removed that premise. After Oklahoma filed for certiorari in *Bosse*, the OCCA issued *State ex rel. Matloff v. Wallace*, 2021 OK CR 21, *petition for cert. filed*, No. 21-467 (U.S. Sept. 29, 2021). *Matloff* stated that the OCCA was “interpret[ing] ... state post-conviction statutes [to] hold that *McGirt* ... shall not apply retroactively to void a conviction that was final when *McGirt* was decided.” *Id.* ¶ 15. So Oklahoma shifted course. Seeking to salvage review, it filed a new petition, focusing on *McGirt*’s consequences for present and future criminal prosecutions and for civil jurisdiction. *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 18-22, 23-29. But try as Oklahoma might, the simple fact remains: *McGirt* today affects only the modest set of criminal cases still on direct review. Many of those cases (like this case) proceeded when Oklahoma knew its prosecutions might be invalid—and in such cases, retrial is easiest and least likely to face obstacles from time bars or stale evidence. Indeed, Oklahoma’s many petitions fail to mention the federal and tribal prosecutions that are *comprehensively* occurring in those cases, or that the federal government has already obtained convictions in several such cases. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 24-27; *see* Cherokee Nation Amicus

Br. 9-12; Muscogee (Creek) Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 8-11; Chickasaw Nation & Choctaw Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 4-5, 7-9.

Going forward, the proper allocation of jurisdiction among the federal government, the State, and Tribes is a question for Congress, which can decide whether to modify jurisdictional lines. Meanwhile, Oklahoma's claims of a "criminal-justice crisis" today, *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 4, are largely unburdened by evidence and badly misstate the facts. In reality, the federal government and Five Tribes are working to fulfill the responsibilities *McGirt* gives them and seeking the resources they need to do so (often over Oklahoma's opposition). *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 27-32; see Cherokee Nation Amicus Br. 3-12; Muscogee (Creek) Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 12-19; Chickasaw Nation Amicus Br. 5-7, 9, *Oklahoma v. Beck*, No. 21-373; Choctaw Nation Amicus Br. 9-16, *Oklahoma v. Sizemore*, No. 21-326.

Oklahoma's claims about civil consequences are even more reality-free. In fact, its position, undisclosed to the Court in its petitions, is that *McGirt* applies *only* to criminal jurisdiction and has *no* civil effects. In all events, moreover, those effects will be vastly less than Oklahoma suggests. And the place to address such concerns is in civil cases—which will make concrete *McGirt's* (limited) actual consequences. Oklahoma's overwrought claims have no place in this criminal case. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 32-37; see Cherokee Nation Amicus Br. 12-15; Muscogee (Creek) Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 20-25; Chickasaw Nation *Beck* Amicus Br. 9-12; Choctaw Nation *Sizemore* Amicus Br. 10.

Indeed, Oklahoma's petitions are a source of, not a solution to, uncertainty. Overruling *McGirt* would invalidate thousands of federal and tribal prosecutions and squander tens of millions of dollars spent in reliance on *McGirt*. Meanwhile, granting review would freeze negotiations indefinitely. Oklahoma apparently is happy to impose those costs. But that only underscores why its arguments should be directed to Congress, which the Constitution charges with making such decisions. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 31-32; see Cherokee Nation Amicus Br. 21-23; Muscogee (Creek) Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 25-28; Chickasaw Nation & Choctaw Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 2.

### CONCLUSION

The petition should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

KRISTI CHRISTOPHER  
OKLAHOMA INDIGENT  
DEFENSE SYSTEM  
P.O. Box 926  
Norman, OK 73070  
(405) 801-2601

DAVID A. STRAUSS  
SARAH M. KONSKY  
JENNER & BLOCK  
SUPREME COURT AND  
APPELLATE CLINIC AT  
THE UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL  
1111 E. 60th St.  
Chicago, IL 60637

ZACHARY C. SCHAUF  
*Counsel of Record*  
MATTHEW S. HELLMAN  
LEONARD R. POWELL  
ALLISON M. TJEMSLAND  
VICTORIA HALL-PALERM  
KELSEY L. STIMPLE  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
1099 New York Ave., NW  
Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 639-6000  
zschauf@jenner.com