ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT - 6 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Case 26-6033

The Supreme Court of the United States

"Roman Vladimirovich Serpik",-*Sui-Juris-Imago-Dei*

Petitioner

v.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

Respondent

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals Case No. MA-2026-673 (Refusing Jurisdiction Over Rule 8 Constitutional Challenge, from Beckham County Oklahoma Case cm-23-31, STATE OF OKLAHOMA v. Roman Serpik-LLC)

Petition For Writ Of Certiorari

Petitioner: "Roman Vladimirovich Serpik" Not to be construed as: ROMAN SERPIK, Roman Serpik; SERPIK, ROMAN; ROMAN VLADIMIROVICH SERPIK; or any entity/estate designation. Trade Name: Roman Serpik LLC (-2305 or Estate Account# -4437)

Address: **c/o** 105 Janets Way, Ste. C-228, Elk City, Oklahoma 00000-zip exempt.

Email: sampleexample@protonmail.com

Related Cases: u.s.a. No. 26-5597 (PC-26-414); No. 25-6625 (24-6071-Tenth Cir.)

Appearing: *Sui juris, in Imago-Dei, De-jure* at Common Law pursuant to the Supremacy Clause.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Article IV, Section 4 of the United States Constitution is implicated where a state court refuses review of a constitutional challenge to Rule 8 enforcement, while related state proceedings are terminated by orders directing that future filings be returned unfiled, effectively foreclosing further state-court review of objections concerning court identity records, caption designations, notice, and judicial process.

2. Whether due process under the Fourteenth Amendment is violated when a state court issues a court-fee bill, payment receipt, and Rule 8 enforcement order under the entity caption "ROMAN SERPIK"-LLC (DBA "ROMAN VLADIMIROVICH SERPIK"), despite the verdict identifying the defendant solely as "Roman Vladimirovich Serpik," a/k/a Roman Serpik, a/k/a Roman V. Serpik, and despite a binding appellate mandate (Okla. Sup. Ct. No. M-2023-910, Footnote 1) requiring inclusion of all versions of the name.

3. Whether a Rule 8 payment order is constitutionally valid when the underlying fee bill contains billing errors, charges assessed to the LLC entity "ROMAN SERPIK," and was never corrected to reflect the verdict identity "Roman Vladimirovich Serpik," thereby preventing Petitioner from receiving lawful notice, a correct receipt, or meaningful opportunity to comply before enforcement.

4. Whether due process is violated when the District Attorney charged the LLC entity "ROMAN SERPIK," mailed all notices to the business address of Roman Serpik LLC (105 Janets Way, Ste. C-228), and never corrected the caption to match the warrantless-arrest identity "SERPIK, ROMAN VLADIMIROVICH," resulting in mis-delivery, improper notice, structural identity variance, and a defective appellate caption ("Roman Serpik v. Oklahoma").

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Petitioner: Roman-Vladimirovich: Serpik (-7692), natural man, sui juris. Not to be construed as any entity or estate designation. Trade Name: Roman Serpik LLC (-2305). Address: c/o 105 Janets Way, Ste. C-228, Elk City, Oklahoma 00000-zip exempt. **Judicial Note:** Adding a zip or changing, converting from what is written voids filings and documents without challenge. Self Executing VOID if altered names, appearances to "pro se" after notice.

Respondent: STATE OF OKLAHOMA, Dist. of Columbia Corporation, by and through the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals.

[1]Oklahoma Attorney General Corporation

313 N.E. 21st

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

[2]STATE OF OKLAHOMA Second Judicial District Corporation

Angela Marsee & Gina Webb, Beckham County Prosecutors

P.O. Box 507, Sayre OK 73662

[3]Beckham County Oklahoma Court Clerk

P.O. Box 520, Sayre, OK 736662

APPENDIX ("App.") INDEX/EXHIBITS

App. 0 App. - Beckham County Oklahoma RULE 8 Hearing APPEALED as PC-26-414 in quasi-criminal case cm-23-31

App. 1-4 of 67 - ORDER DECLINING JURISDICTION PC-2026-414 APPEALED to u.s.a. Supreme Court as Writ of Certiorari.

App. 5-7 of 67 - ORDER DENYING REHEARING AND BARRING FUTURE FILINGS in MA-2026-476. APPEALING;

App. 8-10 of 67 - ORDER DENYING REHEARING AND BARRING FUTURE FILINGS in PC-26-414. APPEALING;

App. 11-12 of 67 -JUDICIAL NOTICE in cm-23-31 of uncontested Ponzi Scheme from the Beckham County Dist. Attorneys Office, unopposed, uncontested;

App. 13-34 of 67 - OSCN/OCCA records relating to Beckham County Case No. CM-2023-31.

App. 35 of 67 - CJ-2023-20 filed following arraignment showing caption: *Roman Serpik LLC v. Angela Marsee*, et al.

App. 36-37 of 67 - February 2, 2023 arraignment records showing caption usage and handwritten references to: Roman Serpik a/k/a Roman Serpik LLC.

App. 38-39 of 67 - District Attorney correspondence and discovery mailings addressed to: Roman Serpik LLC.

App. 40 of 67 - OCCA and federal filings identifying CM-2023-31 as proceeding against: Roman Serpik LLC.

App. 41 of 67 - February 27, 2023, bench warrant (cm-23-31 for "ROMAN SERPIK LLC") reflecting caption designation.

Apps. 42-46 of 67 - Probable Cause Affidavit and arrest records identifying: SERPIK, ROMAN VLADIMIROVICH, including Carter, Oklahoma address information and Oklahoma Real ID identification.

App. 47 of 67 - Records relating to the Carter address.

App. 48 of 67 - January 25, 2023, INFORMATION filed by the District Attorney identifying:

"ROMAN SERPIK" (a Business, Corporation) and reflecting address and designation changes.

App. 49 of 67 - IRS and related records concerning use of the name classified as a "corporation": ROMAN SERPIK.

App. 50 of 67 - SC-2023-240 records reflecting recognition of representative-capacity issues.

App. 51 of 67 - October 25, 2023 Jury Verdict in CM-2023-31 identifying: Roman Serpik, a/k/a Roman-V. Serpik, a/k/a Roman Vladimirovich Serpik, a/k/a Roman V. Serpik

Apps. 52-53 of 67 - Records regarding the 105 Janets Way, Suite C-228 address is Business Address.

App. 54 of 67 - M-2023-910 (April 3, 2025), Footnote 1, directing that all versions of the name be included in subsequent proceedings.

Apps. 55-58 of 67 - SC-2023-240 records reflecting amendment of caption from: ROMAN SERPIK to Roman Vladimirovich Serpik.

App. 59 of 67 - Mandamus No. 123,537, Nov. 17th 2025 - Oklahoma Supreme Court - records identifying: Roman Vladimirovich Serpik and stating: "A person appearing pro se represents only himself."

Apps. 61-65 of 67 - Additional Oklahoma Supreme Court and related filings demonstrating subsequent usage of: Roman Vladimirovich Serpik and related caption forms.

App. 66 of 67 - Beckham County Oklahoma Newspaper: specifically identified "Roman Vladimirovich Serpik" as the CRIMINAL defendant AND no other ALL CAPS OR SHORTER VERSION WAS OFFERED.

App. 67 of 67 - Affidavit of Truth (unopposed) of Ponzi Scheme involving Beckham County Judges, Court Clerks, Risk Management Attorneys (CZW-LAW), Dist. Attorneys, Oklahoma Supreme Court Judges and Court Clerk.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals in MA-2026-673, entered September 23, 2026, is unpublished; AND . The Court declined jurisdiction over Petitioner's Rule 8 (*See Exhibit A - App. 0-67*) challenge. A copy is included in the Appendix.

JURISDICTION

The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals entered its final order on September 23, 2026(*See Exhibit A - App. 0-67, with Exhibit B - App. 1-4 0f 67*). This petition is timely under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) and Supreme Court Rule 13.1. Jurisdiction is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

Petitioner further invokes Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution of the United States, guaranteeing every State a Republican Form of Government, together with the constitutional guarantees of due process, meaningful access to courts, and the right to petition for redress of grievances. Petitioner submits that the refusal of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals to exercise jurisdiction over the Rule 8 challenge, coupled with subsequent orders directing that future filings in PC-2026-414 and MA-2026-476 be returned unfiled, presents substantial federal questions concerning access to judicial review, judicial process, notice, record integrity, and constitutional protections secured by Article IV, Section 4, the First Amendment, the Fifth Amendment, the Ninth Amendment, and the Fourteenth Amendment.

Petitioner respectfully-states that federal review is warranted because the challenged actions extinguished available state-court remedies while leaving unresolved constitutional questions concerning review of the Rule 8 enforcement proceedings.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

This petition involves the following provisions of the Constitution and laws of the United States:

U.S. Const. art. IV, § 4 (Guarantee Clause). U.S. Const. amend. I (Right to Petition for Redress of Grievances). U.S. Const. amend. V (Due Process of Law). U.S. Const. amend. IX (Rights

Retained by the People). U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1 (Due Process and Equal Protection). 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) (Review of Final Judgments of State Courts).

Relevant constitutional and statutory provisions are reproduced in the Appendix.

I would also make it match your Jurisdiction section by adding one final sentence:

Petitioner respectfully-states that the questions presented concern access to judicial review, due process, notice, court-record integrity, exhaustion of available state remedies, and the ability to obtain meaningful review of constitutional claims following the refusal of jurisdiction by the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals and subsequent orders barring further filings in related proceedings.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I. The Rule 8 Order (September 3, 2026) - In CM-2023-31, the District Court issued a Rule 8 (*See Exhibit A - App. 0-67*) payment order under the defective entity caption "ROMAN VLADIMIROVICH SERPIK" (*See App. 52-53 of 67*) This caption contradicts: the verdict (*See App. 51; 54 of 67*)identity ("Roman Vladimirovich Serpik"), the Clerk's October 15, 2025 certified record, the Oklahoma Supreme Court's identity-estoppel ruling in Case No. 123537(*See App. 59 of 67*), the judicial finding in SC-2023-240(*See App. 61-64 of 67; 55-58 of 67*), and the OCCA mandate in M-2023-910, Footnote 1(See App. 54 of 67).

II. Petitioner's Appeal (September 8, 2026) - Petitioner filed a Petition in Error seeking review of: identity variance, caption defects, mandate violations, clerk concealment of signed orders, (*See Exhibit B - App. 1-4 of 67*) judicial refusal to rule, structural defects in Rule 8 enforcement, and real-time fraud by CZW Law and county risk-management counsel(*See App. 67 of 67; App. 12-13 of 67*).

III. OCCA Declines Jurisdiction (MA-2026-673) - On September 23, 2026, the OCCA held: (*See Exhibit B - App. 1-4 of 67*)

"Petitioner cites no relevant authority permitting an appeal… The Court DECLINES jurisdiction."

The Court refused to review: constitutional due process, access to the courts under correct identity not variance, mandate violation, Clerk's certified record, verdict identity, caption defects, structural irregularities, clerk concealment, judicial refusal to rule, and fraud by county-contracted counsel.

This left Petitioner with no state remedy.

IV. Evidence of Identity Variance in Related Proceedings (SC-2023-240) - In related proceedings (SC-2023-240), the State of Oklahoma repeatedly treated "Roman Serpik" as a **separate legal identity**(*See App. 50 of 67; App. 55-58 of 67; App. 59 of 67; App. 64 of 67*) from Petitioner. The Return of Service and sworn process-server narrative show that Petitioner appeared **as the living man** and accepted service **only "on behalf of Roman Serpik,"** (*See App. 64 of 67*) demonstrating that "Roman Serpik" is an entity/trade name, not the natural-man identity used in the verdict of CM-23-31(*See App. 51 of 67, with App. 54 of 67 @ Page1, Footnote 1 - underlined*).

The process server documented that Petitioner did not identify himself as "Roman Serpik," but accepted service **on behalf of** that name(*See App. 64 of 67*). The server further distinguished between Petitioner's Carter residence and the Elk City business address of **Roman Serpik LLC/Estate,** confirming that the State itself treated "Roman Serpik" as a business identity(*See App. 11-12 of 67; App.15 of 67 @ "1/31/2023 Affidavit of non-corporate status and initial of Appearance Falsified…"; See w/ App. 15 of 67 @ "2/6/2023 - Affidavit of False Record Being Recorded…" All Affidavits/Declaration never rebutted, unopposed in all of case cm-23-31*).

The judgment in SC-2023-240 further demonstrates identity confusion, listing Petitioner under multiple inconsistent names ("Roman Serpik," "ROMAN SERPIK," "Living man on behalf of Roman Super"), none of which match the verdict identity "Roman Vladimirovich Serpik" (*See Oklahoma Court "adopts" "Roman Vladimirovich Serpik" as real party of Interest, See App. 58 of 67 - underlined*). These records confirm structural identity variance and support Petitioner's argument that the Rule 8 order in CM-23-31 was issued to the wrong legal identity "ROMAN VLADIMIROVICH SERPIK at Address 105 Janets Way, Ste. C-228 Elk

City, Oklahoma [73644]" which is the LLC (*See Exhibit - App. 0 of 67; App. 36-37 of 67; App. 38 of 67; App. 40 of 67; App. 41 of 67; App. 49 of 67*).

V. Subsequent State-Court Proceedings Demonstrating Exhaustion of Available Remedies - Following the filing of related proceedings arising from Beckham County Case No. CM-2023-31, the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals entered orders in Case Nos. PC-2026-414 and MA-2026-476 (*See Exhibit B - App. 1-4 of 67; Exhibit C - App. 5-7 of 67; Exhibit D - App. 8-10 of 67*) denying further relief and directing that future filings in those proceedings be returned unfiled.

In PC-2026-414, the court construed Petitioner's filings as requests for rehearing, denied relief, and ordered:

"Any future attempts by Petitioner to file pleadings in this case are to be returned by the Clerk of this Court to Petitioner unfiled."

In MA-2026-476, the court likewise construed subsequent pleadings as requests for rehearing, denied relief, and ordered:

"Any future attempts by Petitioner to file pleadings in this case are to be returned by the Clerk of this Court to Petitioner unfiled."

These orders were entered after Petitioner sought review of issues arising from CM-2023-31 (See OCCA Record App. 13-34 of 67) and demonstrate that no further filings will be accepted in those proceedings. Petitioner therefore submits that state-court remedies concerning those issues have been exhausted and that federal review is now necessary.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The OCCA's refusal to exercise jurisdiction over Petitioner's Rule 8 challenge constitutes a Fourteenth Amendment violation. The Rule 8 order was issued under a defective entity caption (*aka Billing Error*), contrary to: the verdict identity, the Clerk's certified record, the Oklahoma Supreme Court's identity-estoppel ruling, and the OCCA's own mandate.

The refusal to review proceedings tainted by: false captioning, clerk concealment, judicial refusal to rule, and real-time fraud

by county-contracted counsel, denied Petitioner meaningful access to the courts.

Federal review is warranted.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I. State Court Refusal of Jurisdiction Creates a Federal Question - When a state court refuses jurisdiction over constitutional claims, federal review is appropriate.

II. Mandate Violation (M-2023-910, Footnote 1) - The OCCA ignored its own mandate requiring inclusion of all versions of the name.

III. Identity Variance and Caption Defects - The Rule 8 order contradicts: verdict identity, Clerk certification, Supreme Court identity-estoppel, judicial findings, and mandate law.

IV. Structural Defects and Clerk Concealment - Clerk concealment of signed orders and judicial refusal to rule violate due process.

V. Fraud by County-Contracted Counsel - Real-time fraud by CZW Law and risk-management clients tainted the proceedings.

VI. No State Remedy Exists - The OCCA's refusal to exercise jurisdiction leaves Petitioner without any state remedy.

VII. Evidence from SC-2023-240 Confirms Structural Identity Variance Affecting Rule 8 Enforcement - The Return of Service, affidavit, and judgment in SC-2023-240 demonstrate that the State of Oklahoma treated "Roman Serpik" as a business/entity identity, not the natural-man identity "Roman Vladimirovich Serpik." Petitioner accepted service **on behalf of** the entity name, confirming that "Roman Serpik" is not Petitioner's personal identity.

The affidavit in SC-2023-240 lists the defendant's mailing address as **105 Janets Way, Ste. C-228,** the business address of **Roman Serpik LLC/Estate,** further proving that the State mailed notices to an entity address rather than Petitioner's domicile. The judgment in that case used multiple inconsistent identities, none of which match the verdict identity in CM-23-31.

This evidence (*See w/ Oklahoma OCCA Public Record @ App. 13-34 of 67*) confirms that the Rule 8 order was issued to the wrong legal identity ("ROMAN SERPIK" LLC), depriving Petitioner of lawful notice and meaningful opportunity to comply. The OCCA's refusal to exercise jurisdiction over this structural defect presents a substantial federal question under the Fourteenth Amendment and Article IV, Section 4.

Following denial of relief, the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals directed that future filings in PC-2026-414 and MA-2026-476 be returned unfiled. Petitioner submits that these orders demonstrate that no further review is available in those proceedings, thereby reinforcing the necessity of federal review.

CONCLUSION


For the foregoing reasons, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully entered,

Roman Vladimirovich Serpik Petitioner, Sui Juris

c/o 105 Janets Way, Ste. C-228 Elk City, Oklahoma 00000-zip exempt

12A O.S. § 1-308



Word Count Certificate

I, "Roman Vladimirovich Serpik" [in-that-proper-noun-style-all capping, converting formats-voids-name], hereby certify that the foregoing Writ filed in No. MA 2026 673 (*Financial Rule 8 Appeal from Beckham County District Court, Oklahoma Quasi-criminal case #cm-23-31, STATE OF OKLAHOMA v. ROMAN SERPIK LLC*) contains 2711 words, as calculated by the word-count function in the software used to prepare this document, and therefore complies with the applicable word-limit requirement.

Roman Vladimirovich Serpik Petitioner, Sui Juris

c/o 105 Janets Way, Ste. C-228 Elk City, Oklahoma 00000-zip exempt

12A O.S. § 1-308



Verification 28 u.s.c. 1746(1)

I, "*Roman Vladimirovich Serpik*" [in-that-proper-noun-style-all capping, converting formats-voids-name], declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States of America (Art. 4 Sec.4) that the foregoing document is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Roman Vladimirovich Serpik Petitioner, Sui Juris

c/o 105 Janets Way, Ste. C-228 [illegible] City, Oklahoma 00000-zip
exempt

12A O.S. § 1-308

