

• Case number

---

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

---

BRIAN D. DUBUC,

VS

FIRST NATIONAL BANK & TRUST et al

APPENDIX TO

PETITION FOR CERTORARI

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF OKLAHOMA,  
DISTRICT COURT OF OKMULGEE COUNTY OKLAHOMA WITHIN THE  
CREEK-CHEROKEE NATION RESERVATION IN CAUSE NUMBERS

---

CV-19-34 SC-14-597

---

OKLAHOMA SUPREME COURT NUMBER 121331

---

Brian D. DuBuc Pro se  
541 Citylake Rd  
Waldron Ark. 72958  
(918) 319-8392

antiquesandcollectablesitis@outlook.com  
PETITIONER

Courtney L. Eagan, OBA# 22553  
South County Law Firm  
311 West 7th Street  
Okmulgee, OK 74447  
(918) 528-6655  
Attorney for the Respondent

Luke Gaither Attorney  
Gaither Law  
P.O. BOX 1090  
Henryetta Oklahoma 74437  
luke@gatherlawoffice.com  
Attorney For FNB & Trust Prichards et al

NOTICE THAT UNITED STATES INTREST MAY APPLY

(i)  
**APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**APPENDIX -A -C OF ORDERS #121,331**

<b>1) April 4th, 2025 Order Okla. S. Ct Clarifying Denial of Stay of Trial Court Proceedings in CV-19-34 /SC-14-597 Pending Certiorari to U.S. Supreme Court .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2) April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2025 Order Okla. S. Ct. Granting Stay of Mandate 2A&amp;B with motion granted context</b>	
<b>3) .March 20<sup>th</sup>, 2025 Mandate Issued.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4) February 24<sup>th</sup>, 2025 Order of Okla. S. Ct Denying Certiorari....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5) September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2024 Order Of Okla. Ct. Civ. App. Okla. City Div. II &amp; III Denying Rehearing -Rehearing En Banc and Request to Stay and Direct determination of Venue and jurisdiction of Member Cherokee Nation Venue Jurisdiction and Land Rights .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6) August 16<sup>th</sup>, 2024 Order Affirming Trial Court reversal of prior panel II #118,772 and Affirming Decision without jury trial.</b>	<b>6-13</b>
<b>7) June 27<sup>th</sup> , 2024 Order of Okla. S. Ct. Assigning Pane III Okla. City Division Court of Civil Appeals .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>8) June 27<sup>th</sup> ,2024 Order Directing Appeal Record to proceed without Seized banking Records excluded in violation of Okla. S. Ct Rule as offer of proof Impeachment under court protective order of defendant Counsel.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>9) Applicants Affidavit in Opposition to Order of Explanation how evidence got out of attorney guardianship the court reporters custody and the courts observations contrary to the record and video if it exists of trial .....</b>	<b>16-18</b>
<b>10) June 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024 Order of Explanation of the Honorable Douglas A. Kirkley to show cause how banking records seized under protective order used during testimony offered into evidence to custody of Reporter got excluded from Appellant record transcript.....</b>	<b>19-20</b>

(ii)

APPENDIX - A - OF ORDERS #121,331 (continued)

11) June 6<sup>th</sup> 2024 Oklahoma Supreme Court Show Cause Directive to Supplement the record on appeal with the banking records used in evidence at trial under seizure order and protective custody of defendant counsel or Explanation for why it cant be done.....21-22

12) November 6<sup>th</sup> 2023 Notice of Non -Completion of Record by Court clerk Reporting her Original records of the Court were missing and could not be used without authorization to use copies .....23-24

13) December 11<sup>th</sup>, 2023 Notice of Completion of record with Index and amended certificate.....25-34

14) May 10<sup>th</sup> ,2023 Order findings of fact Appealed #121,331 Ok. S. Ct. From Okmulgee Oklahoma District court Un- Consolidated SC-14-597 /CV-19-34 .....35-37

15. Original Scheduling Order January 15<sup>th</sup>,2020 Setting Trial as September 15<sup>th</sup>.2020 defendants failed to appear and court was reserved for the trial Applicant Appeared with certified Docket showing the matter was not continued .....38

**EXHIBIT B**

16. November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2021 Copy of Original transcript of Second Pre-trial Setting before Honorable Kirkley following self Assignment .....25 pgs

**EXHIBIT C**

17. March 19<sup>th</sup> 2021 Pre-trial Transcript hearing on Motion to Quash Bank Subpoenas and engage in discovery withholding of actual Joint Pretrial Order .....23 pgs

**EXHIBIT D**

18. ORDER DENYING MOTION TO QUASH BANKING RECORDDS  
SECOND HEARING AFTER BRIEFING .....23 pgs

**EXHIBIT E**

19. Title Opinion Containing Attached Order and Promissory.13 pgs

(iii)

**EXHIBIT F**

20. ORDER PORPORTING TO DISMISS AFTER TRANSFERED some  
Five Years or longer After Decision.....2 pgs

**EXHIBIT G**

21. August 25<sup>th</sup> , 2014 ORIGIANAL PROCEEDING GIVING RISE TO  
Cause of Action .....50 pgs

Respectfully Submitted

~~Brian D. Dubuc Pro se  
541 Citylake rd  
Waldron , Arkansas 72958  
(918) 319-8392~~

[antiquesandcollectablesitis@outlook.com](mailto:antiquesandcollectablesitis@outlook.com)

**VERIFICATION AND MAILING**

I Brian D Dubuc Applicant herein for Certiorari and do declare certify, verify, and state ,under penalty of perjury that the foregoing Documents are true Exact Copies as those found in there respective courts and is true and correct. First Executed on ~~May 19<sup>th</sup> ,2025~~ . Further that service by first class postage prepaid to each party or attorney who has appeared for said party pro bono officially or unofficially with regard to all matter before the courts Below as now This ~~27<sup>th</sup>~~ day of August 2025 submitted in each said court in ~~CV-19-347 SC-14-597~~ who have been advised not to add to there

~~Brian D. Dubuc Pro se  
541 Citylake rd  
Waldron , Arkansas 72958  
(918) 319-8392~~

[antiquesandcollectablesitis@outlook.com](mailto:antiquesandcollectablesitis@outlook.com)

Courtney L. Eagan, OBA# 22553  
South County Law Firm  
311 West 7th Street  
Okmulgee, OK 74447  
(918) 528-6655  
(918) 917-8485  
Attorney for the Respondent

Luke Gaither Attorney  
Gaither Law  
P.O. BOX 1090  
Henryetta Oklahoma 74437  
[luke@gatherlawoffice.com](mailto:luke@gatherlawoffice.com)

Attorney For FNB &Trust Prichards et al

**Governor State of Oklahoma**  
Oklahoma Attorney general 313 NE 21st Street Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
[contact@oag.ok.gov](mailto:contact@oag.ok.gov)  
Respondents



\* 1 0 6 1 2 0 8 1 1 4 \*

**ORIGINAL**

FILED  
SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

FEB 24 2025

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

JOHN D. HADDEN  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2025

THE CLERK IS DIRECTED TO ENTER THE FOLLOWING ORDERS OF THE COURT:

121,331 Brian Dale Dubuc v. First National Bank of Okmulgee, Nevyle R. Cable, Kyle Powell, William C. Mabrey, Linda Prichard and Joseph Gallagher  
**Petition for certiorari is denied.**  
CONCUR: Rowe, C.J., Kuehn, V.C.J., Winchester, Edmondson, Combs, Gurich, Darby and Kane, JJ.

121,488 Afefa Wilcots v. Tracy Calamaio, D.C., P.C. d/b/a TL Chiropractic  
**Petition for certiorari is denied.**  
CONCUR: Rowe, C.J., Kuehn, V.C.J., Winchester, Edmondson, Combs, Gurich, Darby and Kane, JJ.

122,791 Werner Enterprises, Inc. v. The Hon. Kory Kirkland; and Jodi Cross, as Personal Rep. Of the Estate of Rae Anne Darrow, deceased.  
**Application to assume original jurisdiction is denied.**  
CONCUR: Rowe, C.J., Kuehn, V.C.J., Winchester, Edmondson, Combs, Gurich, Darby and Kane, JJ.

CHIEF JUSTICE

Rec'd (date)	2-24-25
Posted	JM
Mailed	JM
Distrub	JM
Publis	yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/>



ORIGINAL

IN THE COURT OF CIVIL APPEALS OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

DIVISION III

FILED  
COURT OF CIVIL APPEALS  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

SEP 10 2024

JOHN D. HADDEN  
CLERK

Case No. 121,331

BRIAN DALE DUBUC,

Plaintiff/Appellant,

vs.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF OKMULGEE,  
NEVYLE R. CABLE, KYLE POWELL,  
WILLIAM C. MABREY, LINDA PRICHARD,  
JOSEPH GALLAGHER,

Respondents/Appellees,

and

BRIAN DALE DUBUC, KAREN TOWNSEND  
and DONNA SHATTO,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

LINDA PRICHARD, APRIL WHITAKER,  
GENE WHITAKER, CHARLIE ARNOLD  
and ALL OTHER PETS,

Respondents/Appellees.

Rec'd (date)	9-10-24
Posted	RE
Mailed	RE
Distrib	RE
Publish	yes NO

5

ORDER

Appellant, Brian Dale Dubuc's Petition for Rehearing and Request to Stay  
both filed September 5<sup>th</sup>, 2024, are DENIED.

DONE BY ORDER OF THE COURT OF CIVIL APPEALS this 9<sup>th</sup> day of  
September, 2024.

  
E. BAY MITCHELL, III

Presiding Judge

5

**ORIGINAL**



FILED  
COURT OF CIVIL APPEALS  
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

AUG 18 2024

JOHN D. HADDEN  
CLERK

NOT FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATION  
See Okla. Sup. Ct. R. 1.200 before citing.

IN THE COURT OF CIVIL APPEALS OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

DIVISION III

BRIAN DALE DUBUC,

)

Plaintiff/Appellant,

)

vs.

)

Case No. 121,331

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF  
OKMULGEE, NEVYLE R. CABLE,  
KYLE POWELL, WILLIAM C.  
MABREY, LINDA PRICHARD,  
JOSEPH GALLAGHER,

)

Respondents/Appellees,

)

and

)

BRIAN DALE DUBUC, KAREN  
TOWNSEND and DONNA SHATTO,

)

Plaintiffs,

)

vs.

)

LINDA PRICHARD, APRIL  
WHITAKER, GENE WHITAKER,  
CHARLIE ARNOLD and ALL OTHER  
PETS,

)

Respondents/Appellees.

Rec'd (date)	8-16-79
Posted	<i>PF</i>
Mailed	<i>PF</i>
Distrib	<i>PF</i>
Publish	yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/>

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF  
OKMULGEE COUNTY, OKLAHOMA

A6f

HONORABLE DOUGLAS KIRKLEY, TRIAL JUDGE

AFFIRMED

Brian D. DuBuc,  
Waldron, Arkansas,

*Pro Se,*

Courtney L. Eagan,  
EAGAN LAW OFFICE, PLLC,  
Eufaula, Oklahoma,

For Respondent/Appellee,  
Joseph Gallagher.

OPINION BY TIMOTHY J. DOWNING, JUDGE:

¶1 Appellant, Brian Dubuc (Dubuc) appeals from an Order entered on May 8, 2023 in Okmulgee County District Court Case Nos. SC-2014-597 and CV-2019-34. In SC-2014-597, the trial court granted judgment in favor of Dubuc in the amount of \$4,650. In CV-2019-34, the trial court ruled in favor of Joseph Gallagher (Gallagher) and ordered Dubuc to deliver marketable title pursuant to the rent-to-own contract (contract) between the parties. Pursuant to the contract, the trial court ordered Gallagher to reimburse Dubuc for the property taxes paid on the property during the pendency of the litigation. Based on our review of the record and applicable law, we affirm.

**BACKGROUND**

¶2 In 2014, Dubuc filed a forcible entry and detainer action against Linda Prichard, April Whitaker, Gene Whitaker, Charlie Arnold, and all other pets from

Dubuc's property in Henryetta, Oklahoma. At the conclusion of a hearing, the small claims court determined the case could not proceed as a forcible entry and detainer action and ordered the case to be transferred to district court. Another division of this Court affirmed the small claims court decision in *Townsend, et al. v. Linda Prichard, et al.*, No. 118,772, slip op. at 6 (COCA Div. II Dec. 2, 2021) (unpublished) cert. denied (Okla. Sup. Ct. June 27, 2022).<sup>1</sup>

¶3 Subsequent to the small claims order in the above-mentioned case, Dubuc entered into a rent-to-own contract with Gallagher on July 12, 2016 for the purchase of the home located at 103 South Seventh Street in Henryetta, Oklahoma. The purchase price of the home was \$17,127.16. Gallagher was required to make a \$5,000.00 down payment and then pay \$550.00 per month for twenty-three months. At the end of the twenty-three months, Gallagher was to pay the balance of \$127.16 and the property taxes for 2019. Upon Gallagher's fulfillment of his duties under the contract, Dubuc was to obtain and deliver clear title to Gallagher.

¶4 Gallagher made all the required payments and paid the 2019 property taxes. However, Dubuc refused to provide clear title to the property and filed this quiet title action alleging Gallagher did not comply with the requirements of the contract, was

---

<sup>1</sup> The facts related to the allegations in the small claims case are fully set out in the 2021 opinion and will not be recited here.

required to pay property taxes for 2016-2018, and was required to carry homeowner's insurance on the property.

¶5 At the conclusion of the nonjury trial, the trial court issued an Order finding, *inter alia*, that Gallagher fulfilled his duties under the contract and granted Gallagher specific performance. The trial court ordered Gallagher to reimburse Dubuc for the property taxes paid in 2020-2023 during the pendency of the case. From this Order, Dubuc appeals.

#### STANDARD OF REVIEW

¶6 Actions to quiet title are matters of equitable cognizance. *Tres C, LLC v. Raker Resources, LLC*, 2023 OK 13, ¶ 22, 532 P.3d 1, 14. In equitable cases, “issues of fact are reviewable under the clearly-against-the-weight-of-the-evidence standard, but issues of law are reviewable under the *de novo* standard.” *Id.* Where the evidence is in conflict, the findings of the trial court will not be set aside unless a review of the record shows such findings are clearly against the weight of the evidence. *Hall v. Galmor*, 2018 OK 59, ¶ 12, 427 P.3d 1052, 1061. “It is for the trial court in a case of equitable cognizance to determine the credibility of the witnesses and the weight and value to be given to the testimony.” *Id.* This Court possesses “plenary, independent, and non-deferential authority to reexamine a trial court’s legal rulings.” *Tres C, LLC*, 2023 OK 13, at ¶ 22 (quoting *Hall*, 2018 OK 59, at ¶ 13).

## ANALYSIS

¶7 Dubuc raises five propositions of error, many of which are difficult to decipher, including multiple claims within a single proposition of error, and, in many instances, do not include citations to the record in support of the claims. Thus, Dubuc's Brief in Chief is not compliant with Oklahoma Supreme Court Rules. *See* Okla. Sup. Ct. R. 1.11, 12 O.S.2021, Ch. 15, App. 1.<sup>2</sup> However, to the extent this Court can discern Dubuc's arguments, those are without merit.<sup>3</sup>

¶8 In the second part of proposition one and the second part of proposition two, Dubuc appears to challenge the impartiality of the trial judge. Dubuc filed two recusal requests in the instant case. Contrary to Gallagher's claim, Rule 15 was followed in each instance. *See* R. for Dist. Cts. of Okla. 15, 12 O.S.2021, Ch. 2, App. In both instances, Judge Kirkley denied Dubuc's request to recuse, which was affirmed by the Chief Judge of the district.

¶9 "Absent a showing of bias, prejudice, conflict of interest, lack of objectivity, an appearance of impropriety, a manifest disregard for the law, or some other evidence the assigned judge is not a fair and objective jurist, any request for

---

<sup>2</sup> To the extent Dubuc raises new claims in his Reply Brief, these claims will not be considered by this Court. *See Fansler v. Fansler*, 2012 OK CIV APP 95, ¶ 12, 287 P.3d 1028, 1033 ("[N]ew arguments presented by an appellant for the first time in a reply brief will not be considered on appeal.")

<sup>3</sup> Many of these propositions contain repetitive arguments that are raised in various other propositions. This Court will only address the main claims in each proposition of error.

disqualification must be denied.” *Tigges v. Andrews*, 2017 OK 9, ¶ 10, 390 P.3d 251, 254. Dubuc’s allegations are insufficient to support disqualification of Judge Kirkley. These portions of propositions one and two are denied.

¶10 In proposition two part one, Dubuc appears to allege that Luke Gaither and First National Bank and Trust caused harm to Dubuc in this quiet title action. Luke Gaither was never a party to the action below and Dubuc filed a dismissal with prejudice against First National Bank and Trust prior to trial. Many of these claims appear to relate to actions taken during the small claims case and were not raised below during the nonjury trial. As this Court does not consider claims raised for the first time on appeal, this portion of proposition two is denied. *Matter of Estate of Foresee*, 2020 OK 88, ¶ 19, 475 P.3d 862, 868-869 (“Issues not presented by the parties below, may not be raised for the first time on appeal.”).

18

¶11 Dubuc raises multiple claims in proposition three which appear to relate to his contention that the evidence was insufficient to support the trial court’s ruling in the quiet title action. As noted above, where the evidence is in conflict, the findings of the trial court will not be set aside unless a review of the record shows such findings are clearly against the weight of the evidence. *Hall*, 2018 OK 59, at ¶ 12. The evidence demonstrated that Gallagher complied with the requirements in the contract by making all the required payments, including the 2019 property tax payment. After

a thorough review of the record, this Court finds the trial court's decision was not against the clear weight of the evidence. Proposition three is denied.<sup>4</sup>

¶12 In proposition four Dubuc argues he was entitled to a jury trial in the quiet title action.<sup>5</sup> It is well settled that "where the equitable issues are paramount or the legal issues incidental to or dependent upon the equitable issues, then the issues are treated as equitable for purposes of the trial, and the parties are not entitled to a jury trial." *I.C. Gas Amcana, Inc., v. J.R. Hood*, 1992 OK 119, ¶ 9, 855 P.2d 597, 599. To determine which issue is paramount, the trial court must look to the character of the issues in the pleadings, including the issues raised in a counter-claim. *Id.* at ¶ 10.

¶13 Dubuc filed the 2019 case as a quiet title, foreclosure, and ejectment action. The paramount issue was quiet title as the action for ejectment was incidental and dependent upon the quiet title cause of action. Accordingly, the trial court's denial of Dubuc's request for a jury trial was not error. *See Bader v. Bader*, 1953 OK 8, ¶ 20, 252 P.2d 427, 430. Proposition four is denied.

¶14 Dubuc's final proposition of error is indecipherable. Although it appears by the proposition heading that Dubuc is challenging the trial court's denial of the

---

<sup>4</sup> We also reject Dubuc's claim that the subpoena for banking records was improper pursuant to 6 O.S.2021, §§ 2201-2206. The law cited by Dubuc in support of his claim is not persuasive and the trial court's denial of the Motion to Quash was not error.

<sup>5</sup> In the first part of proposition one, Dubuc also claims he was entitled to a jury trial in the 2014 small claims ejectment action. However, as Dubuc prevailed in the 2014 ejectment action, any request for relief is moot.

admission of evidence, Dubuc spends the majority of his argument challenging the trial court's denial of his motion to quash. The trial court's denial of the motion to quash is affirmed herein. To the extent Dubuc claims the trial court should have admitted alleged negotiation documents, the trial court's refusal to admit these documents was not an abuse of discretion as the language of the contract was unambiguous. *See Lewis v. Sac & Fox Tribe of Oklahoma Housing Authority*, 1994 OK 20, ¶ 27, 896 P.2d 503, 514 ("Where . . . a contract is complete in itself and, when viewed as a totality, is unambiguous, its language is the only legitimate evidence of what the parties intended. That intention cannot be determined from the surrounding circumstances, but must be gathered from a four-corners examination of the instrument.") Proposition five is denied.

### **CONCLUSION**

¶15 After review of the record on appeal, we find the trial court's award of damages in SC-2014-597 and quiet title in favor of Gallagher in CV-2019-34 was not against the clear weight of the evidence. The trial court's Order is affirmed.

¶16 AFFIRMED.

MITCHELL, P.J., and GOREE, J., concur.

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**