

In the Supreme Court of the United States



STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

Petitioner,

v.

RYAN CORTLAN JOHNSON,

Respondent.

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals**

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JOHN M. O'CONNOR

ATTORNEY GENERAL

MITHUN MANSINGHANI

SOLICITOR GENERAL

COUNSEL OF RECORD

CAROLINE HUNT

JENNIFER CRABB

ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL

BRYAN CLEVELAND

RANDALL YATES

ASSISTANT SOLICITORS GENERAL

OFFICE OF THE OKLAHOMA

ATTORNEY GENERAL

313 N.E. TWENTY-FIRST STREET

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73105

(405) 522-4392

MITHUN.MANSINGHANI@OAG.OK.GOV

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020), should be overruled.

LIST OF PROCEEDINGS

Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals

No. F-2020-208

Ryan Cortlan Johnson, Appellant v.

State of Oklahoma, Appellee

Date of Final Opinion: April 1, 2021

Oklahoma District Court (Okmulgee County)

No. CF-2017-316

State of Oklahoma, Plaintiff v.

Ryan Cortlan Johnson, Defendant

Date of Judgment and Sentence: February 20, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED	i
LIST OF PROCEEDINGS.....	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	v
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	3
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.....	6
CONCLUSION.....	8

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opinion of the Court of Criminal Appeals,
State of Oklahoma (April 1, 2021) 1a

District Court of Okmulgee County, State of
Oklahoma, Findings of Fact and Conclusions
of Law (Signed December 8, 2020, Filed
December 9, 2020)..... 12a

Court of Criminal Appeals, State of Oklahoma,
Order Remanding for Evidentiary Hearing
(November 24, 2020)..... 15a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

<i>Bosse v. State</i> , 484 P.3d 286 (Okla. Crim. App. 2021)	5
<i>Hogner v. State</i> , 2021 OK CR 4, ___ P.3d ____	4
<i>McGirt v. Oklahoma</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020)	passim
<i>Oklahoma v. Bosse</i> , Petition for Writ of Certiorari, No. 21-186 (U.S.)	passim

STATUTES

18 U.S.C. § 1151	2
18 U.S.C. § 1153(a)	2
28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)	2

JUDICIAL RULES

Sup. Ct. R. 12.7	3
------------------------	---

In the Supreme Court of the United States

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

Petitioner,

v.

RYAN CORTLAN JOHNSON,

Respondent.

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals**

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals, dated April 1, 2021, is included in the Appendix at App.1a-11a. The order of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals, dated November 24, 2020, remanding the case for an evidentiary hearing is included below at App.15a-20a. The Order with Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law of the District Court in and for Okmulgee County, State of Oklahoma, dated December 9, 2020, is included below at App.12a-14a. These opinions and orders were not designated for publication.



JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals was entered on April 1, 2021. App.1a. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).



STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

18 U.S.C. § 1151 (in relevant part) **Indian country defined**

[T]he term ‘Indian country’, as used in this chapter, means (a) all land within the limits of any Indian reservation under the jurisdiction of the United States Government, notwithstanding the issuance of any patent, and, including rights-of-way running through the reservation.

18 U.S.C. § 1153(a) **Offenses committed within Indian country**

Any Indian who commits against the person or property of another Indian or other person any of the following offenses, namely, murder, manslaughter, kidnapping, maiming, a felony under chapter 109A, incest, a felony assault under section 113, an assault against an individual who has not attained the age of 16 years, felony child abuse or neglect, arson, burglary, robbery, and a felony under section 661 of this title within the Indian country, shall be subject to the same law

and penalties as all other persons committing any of the above offenses, within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.



STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Thousands of state criminal prosecutions have been called into question by this Court's decision in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020). Like the pending petition in *Oklahoma v. Bosse*, No. 21-186, this case presents the question whether *McGirt* should be overruled. As the *Bosse* petition explains, review is warranted here to examine that question. The petition for a writ of certiorari in this case should either be granted or, if the petition in *Bosse* is granted, held pending a decision in *Bosse* and then disposed of as is appropriate.

1. On September 26, 2017, respondent shot twenty-one-year-old Destiny Arnold once in the left hip and once in the left eye, killing her. Tr. 408, 470, 474.* Leading up to the deadly shot to Destiny's eye, respondent also inflicted numerous bruises and abrasions to her face, arms, and legs. Tr. 475-76. Respondent pressed the muzzle of the gun against Destiny's hip and fired. Tr. 494-97. Destiny was alive and conscious for some period of time after this wound, as she left a trail of blood drips and bloody footprints around the house. Tr. 564-68, 581-83, 587. Finally, respondent pointed the gun at Destiny's eye from a foot or less

* All fact citations are to respondent's trial transcript (Tr.), which is available below. See Sup. Ct. R. 12.7.

away, and fired the fatal shot. Tr. 485-87, 491-92. Respondent was convicted of first degree murder and sentenced to life imprisonment

2. After this Court issued its decision in *McGirt*, the Court of Criminal Appeals remanded the case to the trial court for an evidentiary hearing. On remand, the court found that respondent is an Indian based on the parties' stipulation that he has 1/32 Indian blood and is enrolled in the Chickasaw Nation. App.13a-14a. The court further concluded that the crime occurred on the Creek reservation recognized by *McGirt*. App.14a.

The Court of Criminal Appeals vacated the conviction, adopting the trial court's conclusions and holding that the federal government had exclusive authority to prosecute respondent for the crime at issue. App.3a-4a.

Four judges wrote separate opinions. Judge Rowland concurred in the result, but wrote that he would find the State lacked territorial, rather than subject matter, jurisdiction. App.6a.

Judge Lumpkin also concurred in the result. App.7a-9a. He expressed his view that the Court's opinion in *McGirt* "contravened * * * the history leading to the disestablishment of the Indian reservations in Oklahoma," but concluded that he was bound to follow it. App.7a.

Judge Lewis specially concurred based on his previous concurrences in *Bosse* and *Hogner* in which he—in relevant part—explained that *McGirt* required reversal. App.10a; see *Hogner v. State*, 2021 OK CR 4, ¶¶ 1-5, ___ P.3d ___ (Lewis, J., concurring in results);

Bosse v. State, 484 P.3d 286, 299 (Okla. Crim. App. 2021) (Lewis, J., specially concurring).

Judge Hudson also specially concurred based on *stare decisis*, but maintained his “previously expressed views on the significance of *McGirt*, its far-reaching impact on the criminal justice system in Oklahoma and the need for a practical solution by Congress.” App.11a.



REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

In the decision below, the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals applied *McGirt* to free yet another criminal from state custody, exacerbating the crisis in the criminal-justice system in Oklahoma. As the State of Oklahoma explains in its petition in *Bosse*, reconsideration of *McGirt* is the only realistic avenue for ending the ongoing chaos affecting every corner of daily life in Oklahoma. This case presents yet another opportunity to end the damage caused by *McGirt*. This petition should either be granted or, if the petition in *Bosse* is granted, held pending a decision in *Bosse* and then disposed of as is appropriate.

As explained more fully in *Bosse*, *McGirt* was wrongly decided, and the Court's review is urgently needed because no recent decision has had a more immediate and disruptive effect on life in an American State. *McGirt* contravened longstanding precedent on the disestablishment of Indian reservations. 140 S. Ct. at 2485 (Roberts, C.J., dissenting). It did so by wrongly reasoning that historical materials showing the original public meaning of statutes may be considered in the disestablishment inquiry "only" to "clear up" statutory ambiguity. *See id.* at 2467-2468, 2469-2470 (majority opinion). But consideration of history is necessary precisely because it is unclear whether Congress's alienation of Indian lands at the turn of the century changed the Indian country status of the land. *See id.* at 2488 (Roberts, C.J., dissenting). Under the correct framework prescribed by this Court's precedent, it is clear that Congress disestablished the Creek territory in Oklahoma, as well as the territories

of the four other Oklahoma tribes. And with that conclusion, it is clear the decision below is incorrect and warrants reversal.

Overruling *McGirt* and restoring the state jurisdiction it stripped is important not only for this case and the victim of the terrible crime at issue. As the Chief Justice correctly predicted, the “burdens” of the *McGirt* decision on the State of Oklahoma have been “extraordinary.” 140 S. Ct. at 2500. The challenges from that seismic shift in jurisdiction have rippled through every aspect of life in Oklahoma. Most immediately, *McGirt* has jeopardized the state’s jurisdiction over thousands of criminal cases—this case being just one of them.

The question presented in this case is materially identical to the third question presented in *Bosse*. The Court should either grant review in this case or hold the petition pending the resolution of the third question presented in *Bosse*.



CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted. In the alternative, if the petition in *Oklahoma v. Bosse*, No. 21-186, is granted, the petition in this case should be held pending a decision there and then disposed of as is appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN M. O'CONNOR

ATTORNEY GENERAL

MITHUN MANSINGHANI

SOLICITOR GENERAL

COUNSEL OF RECORD

CAROLINE HUNT

JENNIFER CRABB

ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL

BRYAN CLEVELAND

RANDALL YATES

ASSISTANT SOLICITORS GENERAL

OFFICE OF THE OKLAHOMA

ATTORNEY GENERAL

313 N.E. TWENTY-FIRST STREET

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73105

(405) 522-4392

MITHUN.MANSINGHANI@OAG.OK.GOV

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER

AUGUST 27, 2021