

No. 21-373

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
Petitioner,

v.

JOSES RIC-E BECK,
Respondent.

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

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

CHAD JOHNSON
OKLAHOMA INDIGENT
DEFENSE SYSTEM
P.O. Box 926
Norman, OK 73070
(405) 801-2727

ZACHARY C. SCHAUF
Counsel of Record
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 3

CONCLUSION 9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Bankers Life & Casualty Co. v. Crenshaw</i> , 486 U.S. 71 (1988).....	4
<i>Bosse v. Oklahoma</i> , 484 P.3d 286 (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. 2021), <i>withdrawn on other grounds by 2021 OK CR 23</i>	2-3
<i>Halliburton Co. v. Erica P. John Fund, Inc.</i> , 573 U.S. 258 (2014).....	6
<i>Illinois v. Gates</i> , 462 U.S. 213 (1983)	4
<i>Marris v. Sockeye</i> , 170 F.2d 599 (10th Cir. 1948).....	4
<i>McGirt v. Oklahoma</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020)	1, 3, 4
<i>Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Community</i> , 572 U.S. 782 (2014).....	6
<i>Murphy v. Royal</i> , 875 F.3d 896 (10th Cir. 2017).....	1
<i>Muscogee (Creek) Nation v. Hodel</i> , 851 F.2d 1439 (D.C. Cir. 1988).....	3-4
<i>Solem v. Bartlett</i> , 465 U.S. 463 (1984).....	1
<i>State ex rel. Matloff v. Wallace</i> , 2021 OK CR 21, <i>petition for cert. filed</i> , No. 21-467 (U.S. Sept. 29, 2021)	7
<i>United States v. Jones</i> , 565 U.S. 400 (2012)	4

OTHER AUTHORITIES

- Brief for Amicus Curiae Muscogee (Creek) Nation, *Oklahoma v. Mize*, No. 21-274 (U.S. Oct. 5, 2021) 7, 8, 9
- Brief in Opposition, *Oklahoma v. Mize*, No. 21-274 (U.S. Oct. 5, 2021) 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
- Order Approving Litigants’ Agreed Stipulations, *Ball v. State*, No. CF-2018-157 (Okla. Dist. Ct., McClain Cnty. Mar. 26, 2021), <https://bit.ly/2X4eSoA> 5
- Reese Gorman, *Cole Encourages State-Tribal Relations Over State Challenges to McGirt*, Norman Transcript (July 23, 2021), <https://yhoo.it/3lYMjD8> 6
- Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, *Oklahoma v. Bosse*, No. 21-186 (U.S. Aug. 6, 2021) 7
- Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429 (U.S. Sept. 17, 2021) 1, 4, 6, 7, 8

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. Mize*, No. 21-274 (as well as 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 *Mize* (“*Mize* Opp. __”), and for additional reasons detailed below.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Respondent Joses Ric-E Beck, a member of the Chickasaw Nation, was charged by information in March 2017 for alleged crimes committed within the Chickasaw reservation. Information at 1 (Okla. Dist. Ct., Johnston Cnty. Mar. 29, 2017).¹ 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). Oklahoma maintained its prosecution of Respondent, who was convicted in December 2018. Verdict (Okla. Dist. Ct., Johnston Cnty. Dec. 13, 2018).

On appeal, Respondent argued that Oklahoma lacked jurisdiction to prosecute him because he is Indian and the alleged crimes took place within the Chickasaw reservation. Pet. App. 3a. The Oklahoma Court of

¹ References to district-court filings are to Case No. CF-2017-00023, available at <https://bit.ly/3iXX7PD>.

Criminal Appeals (“OCCA”) stayed the appeal pending *McGirt*. Pet. App. 20a n.1.

After *McGirt*, the OCCA remanded 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 Chickasaw Nation and, if so, whether Congress disestablished that reservation. Pet. App. 21a-22a. The parties stipulated that Respondent is a member of the Chickasaw Nation. Pet. App. 5a. As to the Indian country issue, Oklahoma “took no position on whether Congress established a reservation for the Chickasaw Nation or whether Congress ever erased those boundaries and disestablished the reservation.” Pet. App. 6a. However, Oklahoma admitted, as a joint exhibit with Respondent, “the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law from *Bosse v. State* filed in McClain County District Court, concluding Congress established a reservation for the Chickasaws and never erased its boundaries.” *Id.* Based on that exhibit—as well as other other evidence presented by Respondent and the Chickasaw Nation—the trial court concluded that “Congress never disestablished the Chickasaw Nation Reservation.” Pet. App. 18a.

On appeal, Oklahoma did not argue that the OCCA should deny relief. *See* Supplemental Brief of Appellee after Remand at 4 (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. Dec. 22, 2020).² Relying on *Bosse v. Oklahoma*, 484 P.3d 286 (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. 2021), *withdrawn on other grounds by 2021*

² This OCCA filing refers to Case No. F-2019-115, available at <https://bit.ly/3FMXerc>.

OK CR 23, the OCCA concluded that “the land upon which the parties agree [Respondent] committed these [alleged] crimes is within the Chickasaw Nation Reservation and is Indian country.” Pet. App. 7a. The OCCA therefore, on April 8, 2021, duly vacated Respondent’s conviction. *Id.*

Shortly after the OCCA’s ruling, on April 23, 2021, the federal government charged Respondent. Complaint at 1 (E.D. Okla. Apr. 23, 2021), ECF No. 1.³ Federal authorities promptly took Respondent into custody. Warrant at 1 (E.D. Okla. Apr. 29, 2021), ECF No. 7. On October 14, 2021, Respondent pled guilty. Minutes of Proceedings at 1 (E.D. Okla. October 14, 2021), ECF No. 64.

REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION

As explained in the *Mize* 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 Chickasaw 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. The Chickasaw, for example, signed a separate agreement—different from the Muscogee—that preserved its tribal courts. *Muscogee (Creek) Nation v.*

³ References to filings in Respondents’s federal criminal case are to Case No. 21-cr-142 (E.D. Okla.).

Hodel, 851 F.2d 1439, 1442 (D.C. Cir. 1988); *Marris v. Sockeye*, 170 F.2d 599, 602 (10th Cir. 1948); *cf. McGirt*, 140 S. Ct. at 2484, 2490 (Roberts, C.J., dissenting) (emphasizing Congress’s abolition of Muscogee courts). This court cannot overrule *McGirt* in a case about the Chickasaw reservation.

Second, Oklahoma below did not raise its request to overrule *McGirt*, declined to even present evidence on the Chickasaw reservation’s disestablishment, and indeed, jointly submitted findings of fact and conclusions of law that the Chickasaw reservation *had not* been disestablished. 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. And it seeks *McGirt*’s overruling based on claims of “disruption.” *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 3-4. But below, Oklahoma presented no evidence on either point and declined even to take a position on the disestablishment of the Chickasaw reservation. Indeed, in another case involving the Chickasaw reservation, Oklahoma *stipulated* that the crimes occurred “within the boundaries of the Chickasaw Reservation, *and thus*

in Indian Country.” Order Approving Litigants’ Agreed Stipulations at 2, *Ball v. State*, No. CF-2018-157 (Okla. Dist. Ct., McClain Cnty. Mar. 26, 2021), <https://bit.ly/2X4eSoA> (emphasis added); *accord* Chickasaw Nation Amicus Br. 15-16.

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* Pet. App. 14a (OCCA decision) (Hudson, J., concurring in results) (explaining that this case should not be used to “conclude definitively” 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” the issue); *accord* Chickasaw Nation Amicus Br. 15-20.⁴

Regardless, Oklahoma’s request to overrule *McGirt* does not warrant review even in a case, unlike this one, presenting that question—as the *Mize* Brief in Opposition explains. *Mize* Opp. 2-4, 19-38. 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

⁴ 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 evidence or argument on disestablishment, it would be inappropriate to allow Oklahoma to present such evidence or argument simply because it has sought *certiorari*.

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 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 *Mize* Opp. 20-21.

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 to obtain its pre-*McGirt* criminal jurisdiction. *Mize* Opp. 3, 12. In July 2021, the State opposed federal-law-enforcement funding because it did not desire “a permanent federal fix.”⁵ 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

⁵ Reese Gorman, *Cole Encourages State-Tribal Relations Over State Challenges to McGirt*, Norman Transcript (July 23, 2021), <https://yhoo.it/3IYMjD8>.

[its] problems,” *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 4, badly misunderstands this Court’s role.⁶ *Mize* Opp. 20-24; *see* Muscogee (Creek) Nation *Mize* Amicus Br. 25-28; Chickasaw Nation Amicus Br. 6-7, 13-15.

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

⁶ 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. *See Mize* Opp. 1-2, 3 n.2; Letter to the Court of Okla. at 1, *Beck* (Sept. 22, 2021). 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* and *Chickasaw* reservations, different reservations 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.

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, including Respondent's case. *Mize* Opp. 24-27; *see* Muscogee (Creek) Nation *Mize* Amicus Br. 8-11; Chickasaw Nation 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). *Mize* Opp. 27-32; *see* Muscogee (Creek) Nation *Mize* Amicus Br. 12-18; Chickasaw Nation Amicus Br. 5-7, 9.

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. *Mize* Opp. 32-37; *see* Muscogee (Creek) Nation *Mize* Amicus Br. 19-24; Chickasaw Nation Amicus Br. 9-12.

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. *Mize* Opp. 31-32; *see* Muscogee (Creek) Nation *Mize* Amicus Br. 25-28; Chickasaw Nation Amicus Br. 21-22.

CONCLUSION

The petition should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

CHAD JOHNSON
OKLAHOMA INDIGENT
DEFENSE SYSTEM
P.O. Box 926
Norman, OK 73070
(405) 801-2727

ZACHARY C. SCHAUF
Counsel of Record
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