



In The Supreme Court Of The United States

Roman Vladimirovich Serpik,)
 Petitioner,)
 v.) No. 25-6625
 JILL WEEDON, et al.,)
 Respondents.)
 _____)


SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
(Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 15.8)

COMES NOW Petitioner Roman Vladimirovich Serpik, appearing Sui Juris, In Pro per, De Jure at Common Law, and respectfully enters this Supplemental Brief to call the Court's attention to newly obtained evidence and intervening state-court authority that were not available at the time of his petition, filed April 7, 2025.

I. NEWLY OBTAINED EVIDENCE — JANUARY 26, 2023 TRANSCRIPT (EXHIBIT A)

Attached as Exhibit A is a true and correct transcript of the initial appearance proceedings in Beckham County District Court Case No. cm-2023-00031, held January 26, 2023, before the Honorable Michele K. Roper.

This transcript was not previously available to Petitioner due to restrictions on his access to the courts





while incarcerated, and was first obtained on February 13, 2026.

The transcript conclusively establishes:

1. Petitioner objected to the misidentification of the alleged defendant at his initial appearance. (Tr. 23:54, 29:56, 32:31).
2. The state court acknowledged the error and directed the court clerk to "add that other name in." (Tr. 33:56).
3. The court clerk confirmed the correction was made on the computer system. (Tr. 34:41).
4. The court clerk stated that the court receives charging documents from the District Attorney's office and files them as provided. (Tr. 33:25-31).

This evidence directly refutes Respondents' characterization of Petitioner's identity-based claims as "frivolous sovereign citizen theories." The state court itself acknowledged the defect and attempted to remedy it.

II. SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY — OKLAHOMA SUPREME COURT ORDERS (NOVEMBER 17, 2025 AND FEBRUARY 2, 2026)

- A. Oklahoma Supreme Court Order, Case No. 123,537 (Nov. 17, 2025) (EXHIBIT B-1)

On November 17, 2025, the Oklahoma Supreme Court issued a final order in *Roman v. Dirickson*, Case No.



123,537. The order held:

"Petitioner is not a licensed attorney and cannot represent any legal entity. *Massongill v. McDevitt*, 1989 OK CIV APP 82, ¶15, 828 P.2d 438. Petitioner may only represent himself as an individual. *Id.* ('An individual may . . . represent himself pro se in any proceedings wherein he is a party. But a person appearing pro se represents only himself.')." "

This binding precedent establishes that "ROMAN SERPIK" is a legal entity distinct from Petitioner, the natural person Roman Vladimirovich Serpik. Respondents' continued characterization of Petitioner's identity-based claims as "frivolous" directly contradicts this ruling from the state's highest court.

**B. Oklahoma Supreme Court Mandate, PR-123,397
(Feb. 2, 2026) (EXHIBIT B-2)**

On February 2, 2026, the Oklahoma Supreme Court issued a Mandate in *Roman v. Honorable Judge Dirickson et al.*, No. PR-123,397, attached as Exhibit B-2. The Mandate vacated all orders entered in Beckham County District Court Case No. cv-2025-00063 after July 30, 2025.

This authority is directly relevant to Questions 1 and 3 presented in the petition:

1. It confirms that Petitioner's state court claims are not frivolous, as the Oklahoma Supreme Court has now repeatedly ruled in Petitioner's favor on



procedural grounds.

2. It undermines the factual predicate for the district court's findings of vexatiousness and bad faith, which were based in part on those now-vacated orders.
3. It demonstrates that the state judiciary has acknowledged, at the highest level, the serious and non-frivolous nature of Petitioner's identity-based claims.

III. RELEVANCE TO QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Question 1 (Jurisdiction): The transcript proves Petitioner preserved his jurisdictional objection at the earliest possible stage. The state court's failure to remedy the defect, despite acknowledging it, is a structural due process violation. The November 17, 2025 (**Exhibit B-1**, p.14) order confirms the legal distinction between Petitioner and the entity "ROMAN SERPIK," demonstrating that the state's highest court recognizes the validity of Petitioner's identity claims. The February 2, 2026 Mandate further confirms that orders dismissing Petitioner's related civil claims have been vacated, removing any procedural bar to this Court's review.

Question 3 (Bias/Labeling): Respondents' claim that Petitioner's identity argument is "frivolous" is now demonstrably false. The November 17, 2025 order from the Oklahoma Supreme Court explicitly holds that "ROMAN SERPIK"



is a legal entity and that Petitioner may only represent himself as an individual. The state court itself acknowledged the error in Petitioner's name at arraignment (Exhibit A), and the Oklahoma Supreme Court has now twice ruled in Petitioner's favor — first in the November 17, 2025 order establishing the entity/individual distinction, and again in the February 2, 2026 Mandate vacating orders that relied on the false characterization of Petitioner's claims as frivolous.

These intervening authorities directly contradict the narrative of frivolousness perpetuated by Respondents and the lower courts.

IV. REQUEST

Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court consider this supplemental authority and evidence in its deliberation of the petition for a writ of certiorari.

Respectfully entered this 17th day of February, 2026.

Roman Vladimirovich Serpik

Petitioner, Sui Juris,

In Pro per, De Jure at Common Law

105 Janets Way, Ste. C-228

Elk City, Oklahoma 73644

(888) 699-0272

sampleexample@protonmail.com