

No. _____

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

WADE RYAN REEVES,
Petitioner,

v.

ALISHA MAY GREGORIO
Respondent.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to
The Court of Oklahoma Supreme Court

APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR CERTIORARI

Appendices A

(Pet. App. 1a through Pet. App. 19a)

Wade R. Reeves
P.O. Box 1533
Glenpool, OK 74033
(918) 691-0581
waderyanreeves@gmail.com

DECEMBER 8, 2025

Petitioner

**APPENDIX TO
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
WADE RYAN REEVES v. ALISHA MAY GREGORIO**

**APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Pet. App. 1a–19a)**

The Supreme Court of Oklahoma, Case No. 122,332 (consolidated with No. 122,373), entered an order dismissing Petitioner’s appeal on September 22, 2025. (Pet. App. 1a.)

The Supreme Court of Oklahoma, Case No. 122,332 (cons. w/ No. 122,373), entered an order denying rehearing on November 3, 2025.....(Pet. App. 2a.)

The Supreme Court of Oklahoma, Case No. 122,332 (consolidated with No. 122,373), issued an order on June 10, 2025, declining to compel correction of the appellate record..... (Pet. App. 3a.)

The District Court of Tulsa County, Case No. FD-2022-1789, entered an order on June 7, 2024, denying Petitioner’s jurisdictional challenge.....(Pet. App. 4a–5a.)

The Oklahoma Court of Civil Appeals, Case No. 120,954, issued an interlocutory opinion affirming registration of the California judgment on October 26, 2023. *The opinion is not reported....*(Pet. App. 6a–12a.)

The District Court of Tulsa County, Case FD-2022-1789, Order Confirming Registration of Foreign Judgment on October 31, 2022..... (Pet. App. 13a–16a.)

The District Court of Tulsa County, Case No. FD-2022-1789, entered an Order Confirming Registration of Foreign Judgment (MSA) IN PART on June 11, 2024..... (Pet. App. 17a–19a.)

APPENDIX A

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA
No. 122332 cons. w/ 122373
UNPUBLISHED ORDER
FILED: September 22, 2025

ALISHA M. REEVES, Respondent,
V.
WADE R. REEVES, Appellant;

The Court notes Appellant's "Judicial Notice of Enforcement of Supreme Court Order.. " "Appellant's Motion to Preserve Appellate Rights..," and "Appellant's Motion For Reconsideration, Clarification, and Enforcement of Prior Supreme Court Orders.... "filed June 26, 2025, as well as Appellant's Petition for Writ of Mandamus. All requested relief therein is denied. On the Court's own motion, this Cause is hereby dismissed for failure to file a Brief-in-chief in accordance with the Oklahoma Supreme Court Rules and the Court's June 11, 2025 order, and failure to comply with Supreme Court Rules and Court orders. See Rules 1.10(c)(3), 1.10(a)(7), 1.6(c), and 1.2, Oklahoma Supreme Court Rules, Tit. 12, ch. 15, App. 1. See also Rules 1.28, 1.32, and 1.34. *Smith v. Smith*, 1969 OK 150, 4, 463 P.2d 971.

ALL JUSTICES CONCUR.

Dustin Rowe
Chief Justice

APPENDIX A

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA
No. 122332 cons. w/ 122373
UNPUBLISHED ORDER
FILED: November 3, 2025

ALISHA M. REEVES, Respondent,
V.
WADE R. REEVES, Appellant;

Appellant Wade Ryan Reeves's "Petition to Vacate Void Dismissal and to Compel Constitutional Review" is treated as a petition for rehearing. Oklahoma Supreme Court Rule 1.13(a) requires a petition for rehearing be filed within 20 days from the date of the Court's order or opinion. Okla. Supreme Court Rule 1.13(a), 12 O.S.2021, ch. 15, app. 1. Appellant filed his petition for rehearing over 20 days from the date of the Court's order. Appellant's filing is therefore denied as untimely. No further filings in this appeal will be considered. DONE BY ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT IN CONFERENCE THE 3rd DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2025.

ALL JUSTICES CONCUR.

Dustin Rowe
Chief Justice

APPENDIX A

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

122332: Alisha May-Gregorio Reeves v. Wade Reeves

ORDER FILED: June 11, 2025

The Court notes appellant's notice of clerk default and motion to compel correction of the record and to reset briefing deadlines. Appellant previously filed a motion to compel the court reporter to complete the record and this Court entered an order on March 6, 2025 advising appellant that the trial court retains jurisdiction to resolve issues concerning the appellate record. This Court's order stated that "appellant may proceed in the trial court, and request appropriate orders in the district court, to seek the relief sought in the motion." The Court extended the time for filing the notice of completion of record until March 26, 2025. The appealing party bears the burden of timely designating the record and monitoring the timely completion of the appellate record. Okla. Sup. Ct. R. 1.33(c) and 1.34(g). Issues involving the correctness of the transcript or of other materials to be included in the record shall be resolved by the trial court if the dispute should arise before the record has been transmitted to his court. The appellant must take appropriate steps in the district court to ensure the timely preparation of designated items. The Notice of Completion of Record with an attached Index of the Designation and Counter Designation of Record on Appeal was filed in this Court on March 27, 2025. Appellant's May 5, 2025 motion to compel correction of the record is denied. This appeal will proceed on the Notice of Completion as filed on March 27, 2025. Unless appellant's brief in chief is filed by June 26, 2025, this appeal will be subject to dismissal without further notice. Okla. Sup. Ct. Rule 1.2. - **C.J. Dustin Rowe**

APPENDIX A

DISTRICT COURT OF TULSA COUNTY
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

ALISHA M. REEVES, Respondent,
V.
WADE R. REEVES, Appelant;

Case No. **FD-2022-1789**

ORDER FILED: June 07, 2024

NOW on this 7th day of June 2024, the above styled matter comes on before me, the undersigned Judge, on Respondent's Judicial Notice of Petitioner's Active Divorce in Stanislaus County filed on March 27, 2024, and **Challenge Jurisdiction also filed March 27, 2024**. Petitioner filed a response to Respondent's Challenge Jurisdiction on April 4 , 2024. Pursuant to Okla.Dist.Ct.R. 4(h) motions may be decided by the Court without a hearing.

The Court, having reviewed the file, together with review of the pleadings and docket sheets, and after examining the Judicial Notice of Petitioner's Active

APPENDIX A

Divorce in Stanislaus County, the Challenge
Jurisdiction, and Petitioner's response hereby denies
said motions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Todd Chesbro
Special Judge

APPENDIX A

IN THE COURT OF CIVIL APPEALS OF THE
STATE OF OKLAHOMA - DIVISION III

UNPUBLISHED OPINION

October 16, 2023

Interlocutory Appeal

(Foreign Judgement Registration)

AFFIRMED

Opinion by Bay Mitchell, Chief Judge:

1. Petitioner/Appellee Alisha Mae Reeves (Mother) and Respondent/Appellant Wade Ryan Reeves (Father) were divorced in California. Mother still lives in California with the parties' three minor children, while Father now resides in Tulsa. In May 2022, the parties reached an agreement to modify Father's child support. The Superior Court of California, County of Stanislaus entered a stipulation and order reflecting the modification on May 19, 2022. Mother then filed an application to register the California support order in the Tulsa County, Oklahoma District Court. She was ultimately successful in that regard. On appeal, Father challenges the orders confirming registration

APPENDIX A

of the support order and denying his motion for new trial. We affirm.

2. This proceeding is governed by the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act, 43 O.S. 2021 §§601-100 through 601-903. The Act provides that "[a] support order or an income-withholding order issued in another state... may be registered in this state for enforcement." See 43 O.S. 2021 §601-601. The nonregistering party may contest the validity or enforcement of the registered order by requesting a hearing within twenty days of notice of the registered order. See 43 O.S. 2021 §§601-605(B)(2) & 601-606(A). If the nonregistering party fails to contest the validity or enforcement of the registered support order in a timely manner, the order is confirmed by operation of law. *Id.*, §601-606(B).

3. The defenses available to the contesting party are delineated in 43 O.S. 2021 §601-607. It provides: A. A party contesting the validity or enforcement of a registered support order or seeking to vacate the registration has the burden of proving one or more of the following defenses: 1. The issuing tribunal lacked personal jurisdiction over the contesting party; 2. The order was obtained by fraud; 3. The order has been vacated, suspended, or modified by a later

APPENDIX A

order; 4. The issuing tribunal has stayed the order pending appeal; 5 . There is a defense under the law of this state to the remedy sought; 6. Full or partial payment has been made; 7. The statute of limitation under Section 601-604 of this title precludes enforcement of some or all of the alleged arrearages; or 8. The alleged controlling order is not the controlling order.

Id., §601-607(A). If the contesting party presents evidence establishing a full or partial defense under subsection A, the court may stay enforcement of the registered support order, continue the proceeding to permit production of additional relevant evidence, and issue other appropriate orders. Id., §601-607(B). If the contesting party does not establish a defense under subsection A, "the registering tribunal shall issue an order confirming the order." Id., §601-607(C).

4. According to the California stipulation and order, the parties agreed Father would pay \$7,000 per month in child support. Mother and Father also agreed t o set Father's child support arrears at \$40,000. In his objection to Mother's application to register the order in Oklahoma, Father claimed the stipulated child support total was based on a

APPENDIX A

calculation that improperly included his new wife's monthly income. Father also alleged he only agreed to the stipulation because the California court threatened him with incarceration and that the court refused to follow the law. He subsequently claimed he did not sign the stipulation and was not allowed to read a copy prior to its entry.

5. The Tulsa County court entered an order confirming registration of the California support order on October 31, 2022. **The order notes that the court heard argument from counsel but that it denied Father's request to present evidence or testimony in support of his objection.** The court found, based on its review of the file, that the four corners of the California support order allowed its registration.

6. The court denied Father's motion for new trial on November 30, 2022. However, it utilized its authority under §601-607(B) and stayed enforcement of the registered support order, noting that the issuing court in California had set a hearing on a motion to vacate or modify the stipulation and order. Father appealed from the October 31 and November 30 orders. Father also filed, in response to this Court's show cause order, a supplemental petition in error

APPENDIX A

that includes the latest order from California showing the California court denied his post-trial motion. According to the Tulsa County docket, the court entered a final order on March 15, 2023 confirming registration of this most-recent order.¹

7. On appeal, Father claims the court erred by failing to allow him to present evidence or testimony in support of his objection. He argues the Act entitles him to an evidentiary hearing and the court erred by ruling without first conducting one. The record shows, however, that Father never requested an evidentiary hearing. The Act clearly places the burden upon the non-registering party to request a hearing within twenty days if he wishes to contest the order's registration. See 43 O.S. 2021 §§601-605 (requiring registering party to provide notice to non-registering party "[t]hat a hearing to contest the validity or enforcement of the registered order must be requested within twenty (20) days after notice" and "that failure to contest the validity or

¹ The docket also shows the court stayed Mother's subsequently-filed application for a contempt citation pending the outcome of this appeal. Our show cause order sought clarification of the first stay issued by Tulsa County due to the pending hearing in California, not the contempt-related stay. However, our jurisdictional inquiry is satisfied, and this appeal may proceed.

APPENDIX A

enforcement of the registered order in a timely manner will result in confirmation of the order and enforcement of the order and the alleged arrearages"); 601-606(A) (providing, "[a] nonregistering party seeking to contest the validity or enforcement of a registered support order in this state shall request a hearing within the time required by Section 601-605 of this title") and 601-606(C) (requiring tribunal to schedule matter for hearing "if a nonregistering party requests a hearing to contest the validity or enforcement of the registered support order") (emphases added). Here, the court set the matter for hearing upon Mother's response to Father's objection, not because Father requested it.

8. Father's second and final proposition of error - that the court's orders were contrary to the evidence and the law-also fails. Father argues that, because California is a community property state and Oklahoma is not, and because the support order includes Father's new spouse's income, the order was "manifestly incompatible with public policy" and "incompatible with a support order involving the same parties and having the same purpose in this state[.]" See 43 O.S. 2021 §§601-708(B)(1) and 601-

APPENDIX A

710(D)(3). As noted by Mother, however, the provisions Father cites are located in Article 7 of the Act, which applies only to convention support orders, i.e., those issued by a tribunal of a foreign country. See 43 O.S. 2021 §§ 601-701(3) and 601-702.

9. Father failed to request an evidentiary hearing under the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act in a timely manner. He also failed to show evidence of a proper defense to registration under §601-607. Accordingly, he cannot show the court erred by confirming registration of the California stipulation and order. See 43 O.S. §8602-606(B) ("If the nonregistering party fails to contest the validity or enforcement of the registered support order in a timely manner, the order is confirmed by operation of law") and 601-607(C) ("If the contesting party does not establish a defense under subsection A of this section ... the registering tribunal shall issue an order confirming the order.") (emphasis added).

10. AFFIRMED.

PRINCE, P.J., and BELL, J., concur.

APPENDIX A

DISTRICT COURT OF TULSA COUNTY
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

ALISHA M. REEVES, Respondent,
V.
WADE R. REEVES, Appellant;

Case No. **FD-2022-1789**

ORDER FILED: October 31, 2022

REGISTRATION OF FOREIGN JUDGMENT

Now ON this 28 day of October, 2022, this matter comes on before the undersigned Judge of the District Court upon Petitioner's Application to Register and Enforce Foreign Judgment filed on August 23, 2022, and Respondent's Objection to Application to Register and Enforce Foreign Judgment filed on September 1, 2022. Petitioner, Alisha May Reeves, is represented by her counsel of record Benjamin Aycock of HENRY + DoW + MAsTERS + AyCOCK. Respondent, Wade Ryan Reeves is represented by his counsel of record, James R. Hicks, of Barrow & Grimm, P.C.

APPENDIX A

The Court, having reviewed the file herein, listened to the arguments of counsel for each party, and being fully advised in the premises, hereby enters the following findings and orders:

1. That Petitioner filed an Application to Register and Enforce Foreign Judgment with this Court on August 23, 2022, seeking to register a Stipulation and Order filed in the Superior Court of California, County of Stanislaus (Case No. 8005328) on May 19, 2022.

2. That Respondent filed an Objection to Application to Register and Enforce Foreign Judgment filed on September 1, 2022.

3. That Respondent was properly served with Notice of the Applications to Register and Enforce Foreign Judgment.

4. Pursuant to § 601-607(A)(5) of the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act ("the Act"), a party, such as Respondent, contesting the validity or enforcement of a foreign support order has the burden of proving:

“ 5. There is a defense under the law of this state to the remedy sought;”

5. Pursuant to § 601-710(D)(3) of the Act, a tribunal of this state may refuse recognition and enforcement

APPENDIX A

of the agreement if it finds:

"3. The agreement is incompatible with a support order involving the same parties and having the same purpose in this state..."

6. Respondent argues that recognition and enforcement of the support order is manifestly incompatible with public policy pursuant to Section 601-708(B)(1) as the two (2) orders sought to be enforced include the monthly income of Respondent's current spouse and her two (2) separately owned LLCs. Further, Respondent asserts that he did not sign the Stipulation and Order and that he was not allowed to review or read a copy of the Stipulation and Order prior to its entry.

7. Respondent's request to present evidence or testimony in support of his Objection is denied. The Court finds that the four (4) corners of the Order allow its registration.

8. That the Application to Register and Enforce Foreign Judgment filed by Petitioner on August 23, 2022, is granted, and the Stipulation and Order filed in the Superior Court of California, County of Stanislaus (Case No. 8005328) on May 19, 2022, is hereby confirmed as registered.

9. That the issue of attorney's fees is reserved for

APPENDIX A

proper application. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED by the Court that the above and foregoing findings numbered one (1) through nine (9), inclusive, are hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as if hereinafter set out at length. and judgment is rendered accordingly.

April Seibert
Special Judge

APPENDIX A

DISTRICT COURT OF TULSA COUNTY
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

ALISHA M. REEVES, Respondent,
V.
WADE R. REEVES, Appellant;

Case No. **FD-2022-1789**

ORDER FILED: June 11, 2024

REGISTRATION OF FOREIGN JUDGMENT IN
PART (Filed By Wade Reeves "Pro Se" Enforcement
of Marital Settlement Agreement)

NOW on this 10th day of June 2024, the above styled matter comes on before me, the undersigned Judge, on Respondent's Application to Register and Enforce Foreign Judgment filed on March 27, 2024, and Petitioner's Partial Objection to Respondent's Application to Register and Enforce Foreign Judgment filed April 4, 2024.

The Court, having reviewed the file, together with review of the pleadings and docket sheets, and being fully advised in the premises, hereby enters the following findings and orders:

1. The Respondent filed an Application to Register and Enforce Foreign Judgment with this Court on March 27, 2024, seeking to register a Marital Settlement Agreement (ExhibitA) filed in the Superior Court of California, County of Stanislaus

APPENDIX A

(Case No. 8005328) on August 14, 2018, and three different documents all attached as Exhibit B .

2. The Petitioner filed a Petitioner's Partial Objection to Respondent's Application to Register and Enforce Foreign Judgment on April 4, 2024.

3. Respondent is seeking to register the Marital Settlement Agreement pursuant to the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act, Title 43 O.S. Section 551-101 et seq., which governs registration of a child custody determination. All previous litigation in this case has concerned registration of support orders pursuant to the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act, Title 43 O.S. Section 601-100 et seq., to register and enforce foreign support orders.

4. Respondent's Application to Register and Enforce Foreign Judgment did include a Certificate of Mailing indicating service to Petitioner's attorney although no Notice of Filing Foreign Judgment was filed and there is not sufficient evidence that Petitioner was properly notified pursuant to either Act required by Title 43 O.S. Section 551-305 and Title 43 O.S. Section 601.605.

5. Petitioner did not request an evidentiary hearing in her filing but did include an Order Setting Hearing.

6. Respondent's attached Exhibit B does not contain a "Child Custody Determination" as defined by Title 43 O.S. Section 551-102 or a "Support Order" as defined by Title 43 O.S. 601-102. Accordingly, this Court denies the registration of those documents.

7. The child support provisions of the Marital Settlement Agreement were modified by a Stipulation and Order filed in the Superior Court of California,

APPENDIX A

County of Stanislaus (case No. 8005328) on May 19, 2022, which was previously registered by this Court by the Order Confirming Registration of Foreign Judgment filed October 31, 2022.

8 . However, recognizing that the Respondent is pro se, that it is unclear under which act he is seeking registration, that the Respondent did not follow proper procedure under either act, that the Petitioner only partially objected due to the said child support modifications, and that the Marital

Settlement Agreement contains additional orders concerning child custody and spousal support, the Application to Register and Enforce Foreign Judgment with this Court on March 27, 2024, is granted subject to the child support modifications, and the Marital Settlement Agreement (Exhibit A) filed in the Superior Court of California, County of Stanislaus (Case No. 8005328) on August 14, 2018, is hereby confirmed as registered. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED by this Court that the above and foregoing findings numbered one (1) through eight (8), inclusive, are hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as if hereinafter set out at length, and judgment is rendered accordingly.

Todd Chesbro
Special Judge