


NO. 26-5720



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF UNITED STATES

TONY LAMAR VANN
PLAINTIFF- PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA
VIEANA EBBS
JUDGE CARL GIBSON
DEFENDANTS- RESPONDENTS

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES COURT
OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT
CASE NO. 4:26-CV-00189-JDR-JFJ

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED
TONY LAMAR VANN
2717 CUSTER DRIVE DALLAS
TEXAS 75216 # 214-270-5753
APPELLANT

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

DID THE TRIAL COURTS ABUSE ITS DISCRETION BY NOT ADDRESSING THE ISSUE OF TRANSFERRING JURISDICTION FROM NOWATA DISTRICT COURT TO CHEROKEE DISTRICT COURT IN COURT ORDERS?

DID THE LOWER COURTS "EFFECTIVELY OVERRULE" THIS COURTS DECISION IN MCGIRT V. OKLAHOMA 591 U.S. 894(2020) RENDERING IT VOID? BY REFUSING TO RESPOND TO ISSUES RAISED IN SAID CASE. DISTRICT COURT OF NOWATA REFUSE TO RESPOND TO SAID ISSUE (MOTION STILL PENDING). THE SUPREME COURT OF OKLAHOMA ALSO REFUSED TO RESPOND TO SAID ISSUE. THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA, ALSO REFUSED TO RESPOND TO SAID ISSUE. NOW THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT ALSO REFUSED TO RESPOND TO SAID ISSUE. AVOIDING ISSUE AT ALL COST.

LIST OF PARTIES

APPELLANT CERTIFIES THAT THE FOLLOWING LISTED PERSONS AND ENTITIES AS DESCRIBED IN FOURTH SENTENCE OF RULE 28.2.1 HAVE AN INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME OF THIS CASE. THESE REPRESENTATIONS ARE MADE IN ORDER THAT THE JUDGES OF THIS COURT MAY EVALUATE POSSIBLE DISQUALIFICATION OR RECUSAL;

PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT

**TONY LAMAR VANN
2717 CUSTER DRIVE
DALLAS TEXAS 75216
PHONE; 214-270-5753
E-MAIL; tell_the@yahoo.com**

**ATTORNEY GENERALS OFFICE
GENTNER DRUMMOND
313 NE 21ST STREET OKLAHOMA
CITY, OK 73105**

DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES

**JUDGE GIBSON
229 N. MAPLE ST.#9
NOWATA OKLA
74048**

**VIEANA ROSE EBB
P.O. BOX 151731
ARLINGTON TEXAS
76015**

**ATTORNEY RICK D. TUCKER, OBA #
15864 P.O. BOX 1066 BARTLESVILLE, OK 74005.**

**D.A. OFFICE WILL DRAKE 229 N. MAPLE ST.
NOWATA OKLAHOMA 74048**

RELATED CASES

MCGIRT V. OKLAHOMA 591 U.S. 894(2020)

PAGE 1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED.....	1
LIST OF PARTIES.....	1
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	2
RELATED CASES.....	1
OPINIONS BELOW.....	4
JURISDICTION.....	5
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	6
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	6
REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	7
INDEX TO APPENDICES.....	2
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED.....	2
STATUTES AND RULES.....	2
OTHER.....	3
CONCLUSION.....	7
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	7
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	8

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A; COURT OF APPEALS TENTH CIRCUIT (ORDER AND JUDGMENT)	
APPENDIX B; PETITION FOR REHEARING (TENTH CIRCUIT)	
APPENDIX C; ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR REHEARING (TENTH CIRCUIT)	
AND RECUSAL.	
APPENDIX D; UNITED STATES NORTHERN DISTRICT COURT (ORDER)	
APPENDIX E; THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA (COURT ORDER)	
APPENDIX F; MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT (SUPREME COURT OKLAHOMA)	
APPENDIX G; THE SUPREME COURT OF OKLAHOMA (FINAL COURT ORDER)	
APPENDIX H; MOTION TO TRANSFER JURISDICTION (NOWATA DISTRICT COURT)	
MOTION IS STILL PENDING JUDGE REFUSES TO MAKE A RULING.	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

MCGIRT V. OKLAHOMA 591 U.S. 894(2020)	6
---	---

STATUTES AND RULES

RECUSAL 28 U.S.C. 455 AND 28 U.S.C. 144.....	6
CONSTITUTION OF CHEROKEE NATION 1999 ART II TERRITORIAL	
JURISDICTION.....	6
DUE PROCESS OF THE 5TH, AND 14TH AMENDMENTS.....	6
18 U.S.C. 1503 AND 18 U.S.C. 1505.....	6
OKLAHOMA CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT.....	6
PROHIBITED UNDER 28 US. CODE 454.....	6

OTHER

A EFFORT TO DISREGARD CHEROKEE TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY, AND
MAINTAIN JURISDICTION REGARDLESS OF WHAT THE LAW SAYS.
OVERRULING THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURTS RULING IN
MCGIRT V. OKLAMOMA BY REFUSING TO RESPOND TO ISSUES
RAISED IN SAID SUPREME COURT RULING. (BY DEFLECTING)
SHIFTING THE FOCUS.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

[] reported at SEE COURT RECORDS; or,
☒ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix D to the petition and is

[] reported at SEE COURT RECORDS; or,
☒ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix E to the petition and is

[] reported at OKLAHOMA SUPREME COURT SEE RECORDS; or,
☒ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

The opinion of the OKLAHOMA SUPREME COURT SEE RECORDS court appears at Appendix G to the petition and is

[] reported at SEE COURT RECORDS; or,
☒ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was JULY 6, 2026.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: JULY 28, 2026, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix C.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☒ For cases from state courts:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was FEB 2, 2026.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix G.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

PLAINTIFF TIMELY FILED A **MOTION TO TRANSFER JURISDICTION FROM NOWATA DISTRICT COURT TO CHEROKEE DISTRICT COURT.**

THAT THE TRUSTEE, AND THE VIEANA ROSE EBBS HEREINAFTER "EXECUTOR" ARE BOTH CHEROKEES. OUR PROPERTY; 7540 NS RD SOUTH COFFEYVILLE 74072 IS LOCATED INSIDE OF CHEROKEE TERRITORY. THIS IS THE SUBJECT MATTER PROPERTY.

UNDER **MCGIRT V. OKLAHOMA 591 U.S. 894(2020)** ARGUED MAY 11, 2020 DECIDED JULY 9, 2020. AND **CONSTITUTION OF CHEROKEE NATION 1999 ART II TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION.** CHEROKEE COUNTY IS PROPER JURISDICTION FOR THE ABOVE STYLED MATTER.

BY THE LOWER COURTS REFUSING TO RESPOND TO THE ABOVE SAID INFORMATION IS IN VIOLATION OF THE **DUE PROCESS OF THE 5TH, AND 14TH AMENDMENTS.** AND IN DOING SO IS A CONFLICT BETWEEN THE DECISION OF THIS HONORABLE COURT OF WHICH REVIEW IS SOUGHT. AND A DECISION OF ANOTHER APPELLATE COURT ON THE SAME ISSUE.

ALSO BY THE NOWATA JUDGE CARL G. GIBSON REFUSAL TO MAKE A RULING ON HIS PENDING SAID MOTION IS IN VIOLATION OF **18 U.S.C. 1503 AND 18 U.S.C. 1505 OBSTRUCT PENDING FEDERAL JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS AND COURT RECORDS.** ALSO HIS REFUSAL TO RESPOND TO THE SUPREME COURT ORDER TO RESPOND TO WHY HE IS HOLDING SAID MOTION WITHOUT A RULING IS IN VIOLATION OF **OKLAHOMA CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT. AND. PROHIBITED UNDER 28 US. CODE 454.**

ALSO THE FACT THE TENTH CIRCUIT JUDGES CONTINUED MAKING RULINGS IN ABOVE STYLED CASE WHILE A **MOTION FOR RECUSAL** IS PENDING IS IN VIOLATION OF **28 U.S.C. 455 AND 28 U.S.C. 144.** SHOWING A NEED FOR THIS HONORABLE COURTS JURISDICTION AND SUPERVISION.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

NOWATA COUNTY DISTRICT COURT REFUSED TO ADDRESS TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION FROM NOWATA TO CHEROKEE DISTRICT COURT(MOTION STILL PENDING). THE OKLAHOMA SUPREME COURT REFUSED TO ADDRESS THE SAME ISSUE. THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA ALSO REFUSED TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF TRANSFERRING JURISDICTION FROM NOWATA DISTRICT TO CHEROKEE DISTRICT COURT. NOW THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT HAS ALSO REFUSED TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE, AND SAME JUDGES MADE RULING WHILE A MOTION FOR RECUSAL WAS PENDING AGAINST THEM.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THE REASON TO GRANT THE PETITION IS TO SHOW THE LOWER COURTS THAT THE SUPREME COURT RULINGS IS NOT SOMETHING FOR THE LOWER COURTS TO IGNORE BY SIMPLY REFUSING TO RESPOND TO ISSUES RAISED UNDER THIS COURTS RULINGS. ALSO THIS COURTS RULING ON THE MATTER NOW BEFORE THE BAR OF THIS COURT. WILL EFFECT MILLIONS OF OF CHEROKEE INDIANS THAT LIVE IN THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA. THAT WILL NEVER BE ABLE TO MAKE IT TO THIS HONORABLE COURT DUE TO LACK OF LEGAL KNOWLEDGE, OR UNABLE TO AFFORD AN ATTORNEY TO FILE IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

YOUR PETITIONER HAVE MADE IT TO THIS HONORABLE COURT ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS ONLY TO BE DENIED WITH LESS THAN TWO PARAGRAPHS. HOPEFULLY THIS PETITION WILL BE OF SOME SIGNIFICANT VALUE TO THIS COURT. AND TO THE CHEROKEE NATION.

CONCLUSION

APPELLANT ASK THIS HONORABLE COURT TO TRANSFER JURISDICTION FROM NOWATA DISTRICT COURT TO CHEROKEE DISTRICT COURT. REVERSING BACK TO NOWATA COUNTY WILL SERVE NO PURPOSE. THE JUDGE WILL IGNORE THE RULING AND CONTINUE TO OBSTRUCT THE MOTIONS. AND ORDER THE FEDERAL MARSHALS TO OVER SEE THE TRANSFER AND COMPLIANCE WITH COURT ORDER. ALSO PRAY FOR SUCH OTHER AND FURTHER RELIEF AS IS JUST "IT IS SO PRAYED"

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ON THE 23RD DAY OF SEP 2026. I MAILED A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF APPEAL BRIEF ON THE FOLLOWING PERSONS;

JUDGE GIBSON
229 N. MAPLE ST.#9
NOWATA OKLA
74048

VIEANA ROSE EBB
P.O. BOX 151731
ARLINGTON TEXAS
76015

COURT CLERK, SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES,
WASHINGTON D.C. 20543

ATTORNEY RICK D. TUCKER, OBA #
15864 P.O. BOX 1066 BARTLESVILLE, OK 74005.

SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE U.S.
ROOM 5614 DEPARTMENT OF
JUSTICE. 950 PENNSYLVANIA AVE.
N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20530-0001

ATTORNEY GENERALS OFFICE
GENTNER DRUMMOND
313 NE 21ST STREET OKLAHOMA
CITY, OK 73105

D.A. OFFICE WILL DRAKE 229 N. MAPLE ST.
NOWATA OKLAHOMA 74048