



In The Supreme Court Of The United States

| Roman V. Serpik, |  
| Petitioner, |  
v. | No. 25-6625  
| JILL WEEDON, et al., |  
| Respondents. |

---

**PETITION FOR REHEARING**

---

Date: April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2026

Appearing: Sui juris, De jure at Common law pursuant u.s.a. const. Art.4 §4

By:

*Roman Vladimirovich Serpik*

[in that proper noun style]

Petitioner Sui juris, De jure, at common law

c/o 105 Janets Way, Ste. C-228  
Elk City, Oklahoma [73644 or zip-exempt]

**P#** 1.888.699.0272

**Email:** sampleexampleprotonmail.com

**Fax#** 1.877.633.5377

**RECEIVED**

APR 28 2026

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page(s)

PETITION FOR REHEARING .....	1
I. THE COURT OVERLOOKED COORDINATED STATE RETALIATION .....	1
Evidence of sanctions and filing restrictions post-denial of certiorari.	
II. SUMMARY OF THE NOVEMBER 25, 2025, FATAL VARIANCE RECORD ....	1
The charging instrument names a different legal person .....	2
The arrest and booking records identify Petitioner correctly .....	2
The State previously corrected this exact error .....	3
Criminal process was issued to an LLC .....	3
IRS and jail records confirm entity status .....	3
The Oklahoma Supreme Court confirmed the distinction .....	3
The OCCA further degraded the record .....	4
III. THE STATE'S SILENCE CONSTITUTES WAIVER .....	4
IV. CONCLUSION .....	4
VERIFICATION (28 U.S.C. § 1746(1)) .....	5
RULE 44.1 CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL .....	6
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE (RULE 40) .....	6
INDEX TO APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS .....	6
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE .....	7



In The Supreme Court Of The United States

Roman V. Serpik,	
Petitioner,	
v.	<u>No. 25-6625</u>
JILL WEEDON, et al.,	
Respondents.	

---

**PETITION FOR REHEARING**

---

COMES NOW Petitioner, Roman Vladimirovich Serpik (“Roman V. Serpik”), appearing sui juris, De jure at common law, and respectfully petitions this Court for rehearing of its order entered March 23, 2026, denying writ of certiorari.

**I. THE COURT OVERLOOKED COORDINATED STATE RETALIATION**

Since the denial of certiorari, Petitioner has obtained documented evidence that the state courts misapprehended the full extent of ongoing retaliation. On March 23, 2026, the same day this Court denied certiorari, the Oklahoma Supreme Court issued a monetary sanctions order (**Exhibit C**; Appnx. 8, PR-123397).

The very next day, March 24, 2026, the Beckham County District Court issued an Order to Show Cause Imposing Interim Filing Restrictions (**Exhibit A**; Appnx. 1–6; **Exhibit C**; Appnx. 8 - 9). This sequence demonstrates that the state courts waited until this Court closed the federal avenue before moving to strip Petitioner of his access to the courts.

**II. SUMMARY OF THE NOVEMBER 25, 2025, FATAL VARIANCE RECORD**



(Beckham County Case cm-2023-31)

On November 25, 2025 (separately attached **Exhibit F**; Appnx. 30 - 128), Petitioner filed a Move to Vacate for Fatal Variance (Doc #1086766465), supported by Exhibits A–R. This filing established the following material facts (*See also Exhibit D*; Appnx. 10 - 25):

1. The charging instrument names a different legal person

- The 01/25/2023 Information was filed against “ROMAN SERPIK”, a corporate-style name. (**Exhibit F**, Appnx. pp. 34–35), “INFORMATION” (cm-23-31), signed/filed by legal stranger (Gina Webb). (**Exhibit D**; Appnx. 10–25).
- The 01/25/2023 INFORMATION was signed and filed by an individual who was not authorized under Oklahoma law to initiate a criminal prosecution, rendering the charging instrument void and depriving the trial court of jurisdiction, from 01/25/2023. (**Exhibit D**, Appnx. pp. 10 – 25).
- Counsel (Attorney and Defendant in Beckham County Oklahoma Case cv-25-63, *Roman v. Lexie Norwood et al.*.) for Respondents mischaracterized Gina Webb’s (Gina Renee Farris) status as an Oklahoma ‘Assistant District Attorney.’ Evidence establishes she is not a de jure, bonded official with a valid oath of office, further invalidating the charging instrument. (**Exhibit D**).

2. The arrest and booking records identify Petitioner correctly



- Petitioner was arrested and booked as “Roman Vladimirovich Serpik”, with matching REAL ID documentation. (Exhibit F, Appnx. pp. 36–40, 41, 49–50, 68 – Jan. 19<sup>th</sup>, 2023, Booking #23-0055 as “Roman V. Serpik”).

3. The State previously corrected this exact error

- In TR-2020-1163, the District Attorney amended (12/08/2020 – 12/09/2020) the charging document to correct the name from “ROMAN SERPIK” to “Roman Vladimirovich Serpik,” and the court accepted the correction. (Exhibit F, Appnx. pp. 42–43, 44–45)

4. Criminal process was issued to an LLC

- A bench warrant was issued to “ROMAN SERPIK LLC.” (Exhibit F, Appnx. p. 58, see w/54). Mail in (cm-23-31) criminal case sent to business address. (Exhibit F; Appnx. 52, 53-54). Case proceeded as “ROMAN SERPIK LLC” After 01/26/2023 Arraignment (“ROMAN SERPIK”). (Exhibit F; Appnx. 51, 52-53, 54, 56, AND further evidenced in US. West Dist. Okla. Court Case: 5:23-cv-00135-JD Doc. 1-1 Filed 02/09/2023).

5. IRS and jail records confirm entity status

- Records show “ROMAN SERPIK” is treated as a corporation or LLC.

(Exhibit F, Appnx. pp. 53–54, 61)

6. The Oklahoma Supreme Court confirmed the distinction



In Case No. 123,537 (Nov. 17, 2025), the Oklahoma Supreme Court held that Petitioner “cannot represent any legal entity,” **confirming** that “ROMAN SERPIK” (legal entity) and “Roman Vladimirovich Serpik” are distinct man from persons. (**Exhibit B; Exhibit F**, Appnx. p. 63).

7. The OCCA further degraded the record

The April 3, 2026, OCCA order (**Exhibit E**; Appnx. 25, 26 - 29) introduced new misidentifications (“Serpil,” “Serpick”), demonstrating that the Okla. Supreme Court did not review the November 25, 2025, record and materially misapprehended the identity issue. **Judicial Notice**: 04-07-2026 OSCN.net Doc#1064719216, Okla. Sup. Court Mandamus Case No. MA-2026-193.

These facts constitute a jurisdictional fatal variance that was overlooked by this Court.

### III. THE STATE'S SILENCE CONSTITUTES WAIVER

All Respondents failed to file a brief in opposition by the February 19, 2026, deadline. This silence constitutes a procedural admission that the jurisdictional and identity discrepancies raised, including the lack of a lawful prosecutor, cannot be rebutted.

### IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Petitioner respectfully enters that rehearing is warranted under **Rule 44.1**. The record now before this Court demonstrates (1)



newly discovered evidence of coordinated state retaliation occurring immediately after the denial of certiorari, (2) material facts overlooked concerning the identity variance and the prosecution of an entity rather than the natural person, and (3) a jurisdictional fatality arising from the 01/25/2023 Information being signed and filed by an individual not authorized under Oklahoma law to initiate a criminal prosecution. A charging instrument subscribed by an unqualified officer is *void ab initio*, and a void case cannot be cured by subsequent proceedings, appellate history, or procedural default, resulting in a total lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.

The Oklahoma Supreme Court has already recognized that Petitioner cannot represent the legal entity “ROMAN SERPIK,” confirming that the entity person and the natural-man are distinct. The continued prosecution of the entity name, combined with the absence of a lawful signatory on the Information, deprived the trial court of subject-matter jurisdiction from the outset. Jurisdictional defects of this nature are structural, not procedural, and courts have long held that a void judgment is a legal nullity that may be challenged at any time.

Because the defects identified here go to the very power of the State to hale a person into court, and because the State declined to file a brief in opposition, thereby waiving any contest to these jurisdictional issues, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court grant rehearing, vacate its prior order denying certiorari, and grant the petition for a writ of certiorari.

VERIFICATION - 28 U.S.C. § 1746(1)



I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on this 13th day of April, 2026.

Roman Vladimirovich Serpik, Petitioner Sui juris

**RULE 44.1 CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL**

I hereby certify that this petition is presented in good faith and not for delay, and that it is restricted to the grounds specified in **Rule 44.1**, specifically the intervening circumstances of coordinated state retaliation and newly discovered evidence of record degradation.

Roman Vladimirovich Serpik

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

As required by Supreme Court **Rule 33.1(h)** and **Rule 40**, I certify that the foregoing Petition for Rehearing contains 1,363 words, excluding the parts of the document that are exempted by Supreme Court **Rule 33.1(d)**.

In making this certification, I have relied on the word count of the word-processing system used to prepare the document.

Respectfully entered this 13th day of April, 2026.

Roman Vladimirovich Serpik

**Schedule of Separately Attached Exhibits (“Appnx”):**

**Exhibit A:** Order to Show Cause and Interim Filing Restrictions (March 24, 2026). [p.1 – 6].

**Exhibit B:** Oklahoma Supreme Court Order No. 123,537 (Nov. 17, 2025). [p.7].

**Exhibit C:** Oklahoma Supreme Court Sanctions Order PR-123397 (March 23, 2026). [p.8 – 9].

**Exhibit D:** Judicial Notice of Jurisdictional Fatality regarding the 01/25/2023 Information (filed March 26, 2026). [p.10 – 25].

**Exhibit E:** Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals Order MA-2026-193 (April 3, 2026) documenting name misidentifications. [p.26 – 29].

**Exhibit F:** Move to Vacate for Fatal Variance (Beckham Co. CM-2023-31, Doc #1086766465, filed Nov. 25, 2025 OSCN.net Doc#1086766465, from Case cm-23-31, State v. Serpik llc). [p.30 – 128].



In The Supreme Court Of The United States

Roman V. Serpik,	
Petitioner,	
v.	No. <u>25-6625</u>
JILL WEEDON, et al.,	
Respondents.	

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

**For Petition of Rehearing**

I hereby certify that on this 13<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2026, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Petition for Rehearing was served via First-Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the following counsel for Respondents:

1] Lexie P. Norwood

2] Stephanie Lawson

Oklahoma Attorney General's Office

Litigation Section

313 NE 21st Street

Oklahoma City, OK 73105. *cv# 9405 5508 9956 2035 5727 80*

Respectfully entered,

*Roman Vladimirovich Serpik*  
 Petitioner Sui juris  
 c/o 105 Janets Way, Ste. C-228  
 Elk City, OK 73644

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