

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**



STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

*Petitioner,*

v.

DAVID DEVAL MARTIN,

*Respondent.*

---

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

---

---

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

---

JOHN M. O'CONNOR

*ATTORNEY GENERAL*

MITHUN MANSINGHANI

*SOLICITOR GENERAL*

*COUNSEL OF RECORD*

CAROLINE HUNT

JENNIFER CRABB

*ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL*

BRYAN CLEVELAND

RANDALL YATES

*ASSISTANT SOLICITORS GENERAL*

OFFICE OF THE OKLAHOMA

ATTORNEY GENERAL

313 N.E. TWENTY-FIRST STREET

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73105

(405) 522-4392

MITHUN.MANSINGHANI@OAG.OK.GOV

**QUESTION PRESENTED**

Whether *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S.Ct. 2452 (2020), should be overruled.

## LIST OF PROCEEDINGS

Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals

No. F-16-1030

*David Deval Martin*, Appellant v.

*The State of Oklahoma*, Appellee

Date of Final Opinion: April 29, 2021

---

Oklahoma District Court (McIntosh County)

No. CF-2014-14

*State of Oklahoma*, Plaintiff v.

*David Deval Martin*, Defendant

Date of Judgment and Sentence: November 3, 2016

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED .....	i
LIST OF PROCEEDINGS.....	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	v
OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	3
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.....	6
CONCLUSION.....	8

**TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued**

Page

**APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Opinion of the Court of Criminal Appeals, State of Oklahoma (April 29, 2021) .....	1a
District Court of McIntosh County, State of Oklahoma, Journal Entry of Facts and Conclusions of Law (October 1, 2020)...	10a
Court of Criminal Appeals, State of Oklahoma, Order Remanding for Evidentiary Hearing (August 14, 2020) .....	13a

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

### CASES

<i>Bosse v. State</i> , 484 P.3d 286 (Okla. Crim. App. 2021) .....	5
<i>Hogner v. State</i> , ___ P.3d ___ (2021 OK CR 4).....	5
<i>McGirt v. Oklahoma</i> , 140 S.Ct. 2452 (2020) .....	passim
<i>Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta</i> , Petition for Writ of Certiorari, No. 21-186 (U.S.) .....	3, 6, 7

### STATUTES

18 U.S.C. § 1151 .....	2
18 U.S.C. § 1153(a) .....	2
28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) .....	2

### JUDICIAL RULES

Sup. Ct. R. 12.7 .....	3
------------------------	---

---

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

*Petitioner,*

v.

DAVID DEVAL MARTIN,

*Respondent.*

---

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

---

---

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

---

**OPINIONS BELOW**

The opinion of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals, dated April 29, 2021, is included in the Appendix at App.1a-9a. The order of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals, dated August 14, 2020, remanding the case for an evidentiary hearing is included below at App.13a-16a. The Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law of the District Court in and for McIntosh County, State of Oklahoma, dated October 1, 2020, is included below at App.10a-12a. These opinions and orders were not designated for publication.



## JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals was entered on April 29, 2021. App.1a. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).



## STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

### **18 U.S.C. § 1151 (in relevant part)** **Indian country defined**

[T]he term ‘Indian country’, as used in this chapter, means (a) all land within the limits of any Indian reservation under the jurisdiction of the United States Government, notwithstanding the issuance of any patent, and, including rights-of-way running through the reservation.

### **18 U.S.C. § 1153(a)** **Offenses committed within Indian country**

Any Indian who commits against the person or property of another Indian or other person any of the following offenses, namely, murder, manslaughter, kidnapping, maiming, a felony under chapter 109A, incest, a felony assault under section 113, an assault against an individual who has not attained the age of 16 years, felony child abuse or neglect, arson, burglary, robbery, and a felony under section 661 of this title within the Indian country, shall be subject to the same law



and penalties as all other persons committing any of the above offenses, within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.



## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Thousands of state criminal prosecutions have been called into question by this Court’s decision in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S.Ct. 2452 (2020). Like the pending petition in *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429, this case presents the question whether *McGirt* should be overruled. For the same reasons given in the *Castro-Huerta* petition, review is warranted to examine that question. The petition for a writ of certiorari in this case should either be granted or, in the alternative, held if the petition in *Castro-Huerta* is granted.

1. In 2013, Jennifer Kitchens was dating respondent. Tr. 857, 1183, 1186.\* In November, she told several family members and friends that if something happened to her, it was respondent who did it. Tr. 857, 861, 1188, 1306.

Tragically, Jennifer’s intuition was correct. On November 7, 2013, when Jennifer’s mother, Mary Kitchen, could not reach her daughter, she went to Jennifer’s home. Tr. 862, 878-79, 1188-89. Mary, who had a spare set of keys, noticed the deadbolt was not locked, as it always was. Tr. 863. Inside, the house was “a wreck” with large amounts of blood everywhere.

---

\* All fact citations are to the transcript of respondent’s trial (Tr.), which is available below. *See* Sup. Ct. R. 12.7.

Tr. 864, 896-97, 957, 961, 1116. Mary found Jennifer naked and face down in the bathtub in the main bathroom. Tr. 864-66.

Respondent had viciously beaten and stabbed Jennifer, causing at least eighty-nine blunt force injuries and twenty knife wounds. Tr. 1681, 1699, 1716, 1765. Respondent broke seventeen of Jennifer's twenty-four ribs. Tr. 1705. And he stomped on her cheek, causing a skull fracture and bruising to her brain. Tr. 1692-97.

Jennifer put up a tremendous fight, as evidenced by the disarray in the home, blood throughout the house, and drag marks and blood swipe patterns. Tr. 896-97, 957, 961-62, 993, 1016, 1116. It would have taken at least twenty-five minutes for Jennifer to succumb to her injuries. Tr. 1704, 1718.

Respondent was convicted of first-degree murder and sentenced to life imprisonment without the possibility of parole. He then appealed to the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals.

2. After this Court issued its decision in *McGirt*, the Court of Criminal Appeals remanded the case to the trial court for an evidentiary hearing. On remand, the court accepted the parties' stipulations and found that respondent is an Indian, as an enrolled member of the Creek Nation with 9/128 Indian blood. App.11a-12a. The court further concluded, based on *McGirt*, that the crime occurred on the reservation of the Creek Nation. App.12a.

The Court of Criminal Appeals reversed the conviction, finding "that under *McGirt*, the State of Oklahoma did not have jurisdiction to prosecute" respondent. App.5a. The opinion's author, Judge Lumpkin, wrote in

a footnote that he was bound to follow *McGirt* but believed it was wrongly decided. App.1a.

Two judges wrote separate opinions. Judge Lewis concurred in the result based on previous concurrences in which he—in relevant part—explained that *McGirt* required reversal. App.8a; see *Hogner v. State*, 2021 OK CR 4, ¶¶ 1-5, \_\_\_ P.3d \_\_\_ (Lewis, J., concurring in results); *Bosse v. State*, 484 P.3d 286, 299 (Okla. Crim. App. 2021) (Lewis, J., specially concurring), *withdrawn by Bosse v. State*, 2021 OK CR 23, \_\_\_ P.3d \_\_\_.

Judge Hudson specially concurred based on *stare decisis*, while reiterating his “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.” App.9a.



## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

In the decision below, the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals applied *McGirt* to free yet another criminal from state custody, exacerbating the crisis in the criminal-justice system in Oklahoma. As the State of Oklahoma explains in its petition in *Castro-Huerta*, reconsideration of *McGirt* is the only realistic avenue for ending the ongoing chaos affecting every corner of daily life in Oklahoma. *See* Pet. at 17-29, *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429. This case presents yet another opportunity to end the damage caused by *McGirt*. This petition should either be granted or, if the petition in *Castro-Huerta* is granted, held pending a decision in *Castro-Huerta* and then disposed of as is appropriate.

As explained more fully in *Castro-Huerta*, *McGirt* was wrongly decided, and the Court's review is urgently needed because no recent decision has had a more immediate and disruptive effect on life in an American State. *McGirt* contravened longstanding precedent on the disestablishment of Indian reservations. 140 S.Ct. at 2485 (Roberts, C.J., dissenting). It did so by wrongly reasoning that historical materials showing the original public meaning of statutes may be considered in the disestablishment inquiry "only" to "clear up" statutory ambiguity. *See id.* at 2467-2468, 2469-2470 (majority opinion). But consideration of history is necessary precisely because it is unclear whether Congress's alienation of Indian lands at the turn of the century changed the Indian country status of the land. *See id.* at 2488 (Roberts, C.J., dissenting). Under the correct framework prescribed by this Court's precedent, it is

clear that Congress disestablished the Creek territory in Oklahoma, as well as the territories of the four other Oklahoma tribes. And with that conclusion, it is clear the decision below is incorrect and warrants reversal.

Overruling *McGirt* and restoring the state jurisdiction it stripped is important not only for this case and the victim of the terrible crime at issue. As the Chief Justice correctly predicted, the “burdens” of the *McGirt* decision on the State of Oklahoma have been “extraordinary.” 140 S.Ct. at 2500. The challenges from that seismic shift in jurisdiction have rippled through every aspect of life in Oklahoma. Most immediately, *McGirt* has jeopardized the State’s jurisdiction over thousands of criminal cases—this case being just one of them.

The question presented in this case is materially identical to the second question presented in *Castro-Huerta*. For the compelling reasons explained in the petition in *Castro-Huerta*, review on this question is warranted. Accordingly, the Court should either grant review in this case or hold the petition pending the resolution of the second question presented in *Castro-Huerta*.



## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted. In the alternative, if the petition in *Castro-Huerta* is granted, the petition in this case should be held pending a decision there and then disposed of as is appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN M. O'CONNOR

*ATTORNEY GENERAL*

MITHUN MANSINGHANI

*SOLICITOR GENERAL*

*COUNSEL OF RECORD*

CAROLINE HUNT

JENNIFER CRABB

*ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL*

BRYAN CLEVELAND

RANDALL YATES

*ASSISTANT SOLICITORS GENERAL*

OFFICE OF THE OKLAHOMA

ATTORNEY GENERAL

313 N.E. TWENTY-FIRST STREET

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73105

(405) 522-4392

MITHUN.MANSINGHANI@OAG.OK.GOV

*COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER*

SEPTEMBER 24, 2021