

No. \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Christopher J. Barnett — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

Judge Doug Drummond — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Supreme court of Oklahoma

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Christopher J. Barnett  
(Your Name)

216 N MURRAY ST  
(Address)

Helena, ok 73741  
(City, State, Zip Code)

Inmate  
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

MAY the TULSA County District Court Seal  
A Public Police Report of An Elected  
TULSA County District court Judge?

Did The Oklahoma Supreme court Err  
When they ordered that the Entire  
Filing Regarding this matter be Sealed,  
Despite it being A Public Record.

## **LIST OF PARTIES**

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

## **RELATED CASES**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	
CONCLUSION.....	

## **INDEX TO APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### CASES

### PAGE NUMBER

Electronic Frontier Foundation v. Superior Court  
83 CAL APP 5th 407

United States v. BACON 950 F3d 1286

U.S. v. McVeigh

Courthouse News Service v. New Mexico Administrative  
Office of Courts

Collier v. Reese 223 P3d 966 OKSCT

Nichols v. JACKSON OCCA 38 P3d 228

### STATUTES AND RULES

Oklahoma 51 O.S. § 24A .29

51 O.S. 2011 § 24A 25

12 O.S. 2011 § 3224

51 O.S. 2011 § 24A,17(B)

### OTHER

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

[ ] For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

[ ] For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished. *Scal'd by OK Supreme Court*

The opinion of the \_\_\_\_\_ court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was \_\_\_\_\_

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_ A \_\_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was 6-5-2023. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix N/A.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_ A \_\_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

*No Rehearing Allowed*

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

First Amendment Right to Redress

Free Speech, Free expression, Discussion Including  
Politics

Due Process Clause under the Fourteenth  
Amendment

Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment

The Oklahoma Open Records Act

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On February 15, 2023 Tulsa County District Court Judge Doug Drummond found your petitioner violated a statute that makes it illegal to publish "state employee home addresses, state employee home telephone numbers and state employee social security numbers shall not be open to public inspection or disclosure."

Judge Doug Drummond did not hold any hearing and give your petitioner any due process and instead, violated the Oklahoma Open Records Act by ordering that a document filed in a Tulsa County Court Case, be completely sealed.

Judge Doug Drummond went on further to threaten the petitioner that if he puts any further information in violation of this statute, he will not be allowed to file any further in the courts.

The document in question is a police report of Tulsa County elected District Court Judge Rebecca Nightingale. It came to the attention of your petitioner, that when he ran for Governor of Oklahoma, Judge Nightingale filed a police report against him because he was blogging about the Oklahoma Attorney General and the Judiciary. Judge Nightingale put in her police report that the petitioner called her young daughter a whore, which your petitioner denies. Judge Nightingale further said that someone needed to figure out a way to stop Barnett.

Judge Nightingale was presiding over litigation and did not recuse herself, despite her conflict of interest.

After your petitioner received a copy of the ruling from Judge Drummond, your petitioner filed a WRIT OF MANDAMUS because your petitioner was denied all due process and not allowed to be heard. The Mandamus was filed in the Oklahoma Supreme Court. The Oklahoma Supreme Court denied the mandamus and ordered that EVERYTHING be sealed. Again, your petitioner was not allowed to be heard. Your petitioner cannot even get a copy of the petition he filed from the Oklahoma Supreme Court.

The police report is a public record and was readily provided to your petitioner. It should not be sealed in the court file either. Judge Nightingales home addresses is available from the Tulsa County Tax Assessors record and is public record. Judge Doug Drummond and The Oklahoma Supreme Court ordered the record be sealed to protect Judge Nightingale and the fact that she violated the free speech rights of your petitioner.

Your petitioner seeks review by the US Supreme Court and that the filing in the Oklahoma Supreme Court be unsealed, as well as the Tulsa County District Court. Your petitioner also seeks that the US Supreme Court determine if the statute is illegal, sealing the police reports of a elected district court judge, to shield her from embarrassment.

**REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

Please review to determine if the Statute Sealing Public Police Reports of Elected District Court Judges in Oklahoma violates the EQUAL protection CLAUSE of the Fourteenth Amendment And for the Oklahoma open Records Act.

## **CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher J. Barnett

Date: 2/12/2024