



APPENDIX

The following exhibits are attached in support of this Petition for Writ of Certiorari. Page numbers correspond to the consecutively-paginated Appendix (1–19).

Exhibit A — Order Affirming Denial (PC-2026-414)

Appendix Pages 1–4 August 14, 2026, Order affirming denial of post-conviction relief in PC-2026-414. (See PC-26-414 order)

Exhibit B — Mandate (PC-2026-414)

Appendix Page 5 Mandate issued in PC-2026-414 under the defective entity caption “ROMAN SERPIK.” (See PC-26-414 mandate)

Exhibit C — TR-2020-1163 Record (Identity Correction)

Appendix Pages 6–9 Record pages from TR-2020-1163 showing the District Attorney’s prior correction of the defendant’s identity, establishing res judicata on “Roman Vladimirovich Serpik.” (See TR-2020-1163 identity record)

Exhibit D — M-2023-910 (Criminal Appeal) — First Page

Appendix Page 10 (& 10.1) First page of the direct-appeal order containing Footnote 1 requiring all versions of the defendant’s name to be included in subsequent proceedings. (See M-2023-910 footnote)

Exhibit E — Oklahoma Supreme Court Case No. 123537 (Nov. 17, 2025, Order)

Appendix Page 11 Order establishing judicial estoppel on identity and recognizing “Roman Vladimirovich Serpik” as the certified identity. (See 123537 order)

Exhibit F — CM-2023-31 Bench Warrant (ROMAN SERPIK LLC)

Appendix Page 12 Bench warrant naming “ROMAN SERPIK LLC” as defendant, demonstrating entity-caption usage and identity variance. (See CM-23-31 bench warrant)

Exhibit G — Caption-Change Page Filed in Five Cases Simultaneously

Appendix Page 13 First caption page showing simultaneous caption changes across five cases, evidencing systemic caption conversion. (See caption conversion)

Exhibit H — SC-2023-240 (Custer County) — Appearance Recognition

Appendix Page 14 Order recognizing appearance “on behalf of ROMAN SERPIK,” confirming dual-capacity identity structure. (See SC-23-240 appearance)

Exhibit I — Court Adoption of “Roman Vladimirovich Serpik”

Appendix Pages 15–16 Record pages where the court explicitly adopts the certified identity “Roman Vladimirovich Serpik.” (See identity adoption)

Exhibit J — Affidavit of Commercial Address (ROMAN SERPIK LLC)

Appendix Page 19 Affidavit establishing the commercial address of ROMAN SERPIK LLC and its trade-name relationship to “Roman Vladimirovich Serpik.” (See commercial address affidavit)

ORIGINAL



**IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

ROMAN SERPIK,

Petitioner,

v.

THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

Respondent.

No. PC-2026-414

**FILED
IN COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

AUG 14 2026

**SELDEN JONES
CLERK**

ORDER AFFIRMING DENIAL OF POST-CONVICTION RELIEF

Petitioner, pro se, appeals the denial of post-conviction relief by the District Court of Beckham County in Case No. CM-2023-31. A jury convicted Petitioner of obstructing an officer and failure to stop at a red light. He was sentenced to confinement for one year and ten days, respectively. He was also ordered to pay \$500.00 fines for each offense.

The convictions and sentences were affirmed on direct appeal. *Serpik v. State*, No. M-2023-910 (Okla. Cr. April 3, 2025) (not for publication). A previous post-conviction application was denied by the district court. We affirmed that denial in *Serpik v. State*, No. PC-2025-464 (Okla. Cr. November 17, 2025) (not for publication).

The district court denied the present application in orders filed on June 3, 2026. We review the district court's decision for an abuse

Appendix 1-19

EXHIBIT

A

of discretion. *State ex rel. Smith v. Neuwirth*, 2014 OK CR 16, ¶ 12, 337 P.3d 763, 766. An abuse of discretion is any unreasonable or arbitrary action taken without proper consideration of the facts and law pertaining to the matter at issue or a clearly erroneous conclusion and judgment, one that is clearly against the logic and effect of the facts presented. *Neloms v. State*, 2012 OK CR 7, ¶ 35, 274 P.3d 161, 170.

The district court denied claims that the information was void and that the assistant district attorney who signed the information was unqualified to do so because the claims were, or could have been, presented earlier. This was not an abuse of discretion. See *Fox v. State*, 1994 OK CR 52, ¶ 2, 880 P.2d 383, 384 (issues that could have been previously raised, but were not, are waived); *Battenfield v. State*, 1998 OK CR 8, ¶ 4, 953 P.2d 1123, 1125 (issues that have been previously raised are barred by *res judicata*).

Petitioner's remaining complaints, such as the spelling of his name, are not proper in a post-conviction application because they do not seek to challenge the convictions or sentences. See 22 O.S.2021, § 1080 (Excluding a timely appeal, the Post-Conviction Procedure Act

Appendix 2-19

“encompasses and replaces all common law and statutory methods of challenging a conviction or sentence.”).¹


Petitioner has failed to establish an entitlement to post-conviction relief. Accordingly, the District Court’s order denying post-conviction relief in Beckham County District Court Case No. CM-2023-31 is **AFFIRMED**. Pursuant to Rule 3.15, *Rules of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals*, Title 22, Ch.18, App. (2026), the **MANDATE** is **ORDERED** issued upon the delivery and filing of this decision. Petitioner is placed on notice that his state remedies are deemed exhausted on all issues raised in his petition in error, brief, and any prior appeals. See Rule 5.5, *supra*.

¹ Petitioner’s motions to correct the record filed June 10, 2026, June 29, 2026, and July 2, 2026, are **DENIED**.


IT IS SO ORDERED.

WITNESS OUR HANDS AND THE SEAL OF THIS COURT this


14th day of August, 2026.




GARY L. LUMPKIN, Presiding Judge




WILLIAM J. MUSSEMAN, Vice Presiding Judge



DAVID B. LEWIS, Judge



ROBERT L. HUDSON, Judge



SCOTT ROWLAND, Judge

ATTEST:



Clerk

Appendix 4-19

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