

No. 21-486

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,

Petitioner,

v.

DAKOTA JAMES ALLEYN SHRIVER,

Respondent.

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

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE*
THE CHEROKEE NATION
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT**

FRANK S. HOLLEMAN, IV

DOUGLAS B. L. ENDRESON

SONOSKY, CHAMBERS, SACHSE,

ENDRESON & PERRY, LLP

1425 K Street, NW,

Suite 600

Washington, DC 20005

PATTI PALMER GHEZZI

Attorney at Law

P.O. Box 812

Pawhuska, OK 74056

SARA HILL

Attorney General

CHRISSI NIMMO

Counsel of Record

Deputy Attorney General

CHEROKEE NATION

P.O. Box 948

Tahlequah, OK 74465

(918) 458-6998

chrissi-nimmo@cherokee.org

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

Cherokee Nation

October 28, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
INTEREST OF AMICUS	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	2
REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION ...	3
I. The State’s Supposed Practical Impacts are Non-Issues	3
II. The State Cannot Use this Moot Case to Challenge the Cherokee Reservation.....	15
III. The State Proffers No Just Basis For Abandoning <i>Stare Decisis</i> to Revisit <i>McGirt</i>	20
CONCLUSION	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	Page(s)
<i>Awuku-Asare v. Garland</i> , 991 F.3d 1123 (10th Cir. 2021).....	22
<i>B & B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.</i> , 575 U.S. 138 (2015).....	15
<i>Benjamin v. Coughlin</i> , 905 F.2d 571 (2d Cir. 1990)	15
<i>Chafin v. Chafin</i> , 568 U.S. 165 (2013).....	19
<i>Chandler v. Florida</i> , 449 U.S. 560 (1981).....	15
<i>Cherokee Nation v. Perales</i> , No. CRM-21-261 (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. filed Mar. 9, 2021).....	11
<i>Cherokee Nation v. Shriver</i> , No. CRM-21-55 (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. filed Feb. 19, 2021)	11
<i>Cherokee Nation v. Shriver</i> , No. CRM-21-56 (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. filed Feb. 19, 2021)	10, 11
<i>Citizens United v. FEC</i> , 558 U.S. 310 (2010).....	22
<i>City of Tulsa v. Hooper</i> , No. 7470397, slip op. (Tulsa Mun. Crim. Ct. Apr. 5, 2021)	12
<i>Flowers v. Mississippi</i> , 139 S. Ct. 2228 (2019).....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>Franchise Tax Bd. v. Hyatt</i> , 139 S. Ct. 1485 (2019).....	20, 21, 22
<i>Gamble v. United States</i> , 139 S. Ct. 1960 (2019).....	21
<i>Hogner v. State</i> , 2021 OK CR 4	<i>passim</i>
<i>Hooper v. City of Tulsa</i> , No. 4:21-cv-00165-JED-JFJ (N.D. Okla. filed Apr. 9, 2021).....	12
<i>Janus v. AFSCME, Council 31</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2448 (2018).....	20, 21, 22
<i>Kingdomware Techs., Inc. v. United States</i> , 136 S. Ct. 1969 (2016).....	19
<i>McGirt v. Oklahoma</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Cmty.</i> , 572 U.S. 782 (2014).....	21
<i>New Hampshire v. Maine</i> , 532 U.S. 742 (2001).....	16
<i>Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 21-429	2
<i>Okla. Tax Comm’n v. Chickasaw Nation</i> , 515 U.S. 450 (1995).....	14
<i>Okla. Tax Comm’n v. Citizen Band Potawatomi Indian Tribe of Okla.</i> , 498 U.S. 505 (1991).....	14
<i>Penobscot Nation v. Frey</i> , 3 F.4th 484 (1st Cir. 2021).....	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>Ramos v. Louisiana</i> , 140 S. Ct. 1390 (2020).....	20, 21
<i>Rojas v. FAA</i> , 989 F.3d. 666 (9th Cir. 2021).....	22
<i>Sharp v. Murphy</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2412 (2020).....	16
<i>Shriver v. State</i> , No. F-2017-1279 (Okla. Crim. App. Apr. 29, 2021).....	10
<i>Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.</i> , 564 U.S. 552 (2011).....	20
<i>Spears v. State</i> . 2021 OK CR 7, 485 P.3d 873	2
<i>Sprietsma v. Mercury Marine</i> , 537 U.S. 51 (2002).....	16
<i>State v. Shriver</i> , No. CF-2015-395 (Okla. Dist. Ct. Aug. 5, 2021)	19
<i>State v. United Cook Inlet Drift Ass’n</i> , 895 P.2d 947 (Alaska 1995).....	15
<i>Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env’t.</i> , 523 U.S. 83 (1998).....	19
<i>United States v. Bragg</i> , No. 4:21-cr-00088-JFH (N.D. Okla. filed Mar. 22, 2021)	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>United States v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 4:20-cr-00255-CVE (N.D. Okla. guilty plea filed Nov. 2, 2020).....	11
<i>United States v. Cottingham</i> , No. 4:20-cr-00209-GKF-1 (N.D. Okla. filed June 10, 2021).....	11
<i>United States v. Foster</i> , No. 4:21-cr-00118-CVE (N.D. Okla. filed March 16, 2021)	11-12
<i>United States v. Jones</i> , 565 U.S. 400 (2012).....	16
<i>United States v. Lara</i> , 541 U.S. 193 (2004).....	1
<i>United States v. Leathers</i> , No. 4:21-cr-00163-CVE-1 (N.D. Okla. filed Mar. 19, 2021).....	12
<i>United States v. McCombs</i> , No. 4:20-cr-00262-GKF-1 (N.D. Okla. filed Nov. 3, 2020)	12
<i>United States v. McDaniel</i> , No. 6:21-mj-00372-SPS-1 (E.D. Okla. filed Sept. 22, 2021).....	12, 16
<i>United States v. Sanchez-Gomez</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1532 (2018).....	19
<i>United States v. Spears</i> , No. 4:20-cr-00296-GKF (N.D. Okla. Nov. 18, 2020)	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>United States v. Vaught</i> , No. 4:21-cr-00202-JFH-1 (N.D. Okla. filed Apr. 2, 2021)	12
<i>United States v. Wheeler</i> , 435 U.S. 313 (1978).....	1
<i>Wood v. Milyard</i> , 566 U.S. 463 (2012).....	16
<i>Worcester v. Georgia</i> , 31 U.S. 515 (1832).....	2
 CONSTITUTIONS	
U.S. Const. amend. I	22
Okla. Const. art. 18, § 3(a)	13
 STATUTES AND TREATIES	
1866 Treaty of Washington with the Cherokee, July 19, 1866, 14 Stat. 799	1
art. 16	1
art. 17	1
art. 21	1
art. 31	1
Act of Mar. 3, 1893, ch. 209, § 10, 27 Stat. 612, 640-43.....	1
Curtis Act, ch. 504, § 14, 30 Stat. 499-500 (1898)	12
Treaty of New Echota, Dec. 29, 1835, 7 Stat. 478.....	1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
art. 1	1
art. 2	1
art. 5	1
Treaty with the Western Cherokee, Feb. 14, 1833, 7 Stat. 414	1
Okla. Stat. tit. 68 § 346	14
Okla. Stat. tit. 68 § 500.63	14
Tulsa, Okla. Code App. C	12-13

TRIBAL INSTRUMENTS

Cherokee Nation Code:

tit. 10A.....	8
tit. 21	8
tit. 22, §§ 154-155.....	8
tit. 47	8

Inter-tribal Council of Five Civilized Tribes, Res. No. 21-34 (Oct. 8, 2021), https:// bit.ly/3AOnb5Q	8-9
---	-----

STATE AND TRIBAL AGREEMENTS

Addendum to Law Enforcement Agreement Between U.S., Cherokee Nation, and City of Tulsa (Apr. 9, 2014), https://bit.ly/ 3DsYnSv	13
---	----

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
Addendum to Law Enforcement Agreement Between U.S., Muscogee (Creek) Nation, and City of Tulsa (May 2, 2006), https:// bit.ly/3uY6Lq6	13
Intergov'l Agreement Between Okla. & Cherokee Nation Regarding Jurisdiction over Indian Children Within the Nation's Reservation (Sept. 1, 2020), https://bit. ly/2Z2KWdA	8
RULES	
Sup. Ct. R. 14.1(i)(i)-(ii).....	19
COURT FILINGS	
Arrest Warrant, <i>Cherokee Nation v. Shriver</i> , No. CRM-21-56 (Cherokee Dist. Ct. Mar. 30, 2021).....	10
Br. in Supp. of Mot. to Stay & Abate Proceedings, <i>Russell v. State</i> , No. F-2019- 892 (Okla. Crim. App. June 24, 2021), https://bit.ly/3jbOhOh	19
Cherokee Nation Amicus Br. & App., <i>State v. Shriver</i> , No. CF-2015-395 (Okla. Dist. Ct. filed Sept. 16, 2020), https://bit.ly/ 3FYr0ZV	17
Cherokee Nation Unopposed Application for Authorization to File Amicus Brief, <i>Hogner v. State</i> , 2021 OK CR 4 (filed Aug. 3, 2020) (No. F-2018-138), https://bit.ly/ 3DZkOiK	10-11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
Def.'s Remanded Hr'g Br., <i>State v. Shriver</i> , No. CF-2015-395 (Okla. Dist. Ct. filed Sept. 21, 2020), https://bit.ly/3lNZbeS	17
Ex. 1 to Complaint, <i>Hooper v. City of Tulsa</i> , No. 4:21-cv-00165-JED-JFJ (N.D. Okla. filed Apr. 9, 2021), ECF No. 1-1	12
Pet. for a Writ of Cert., <i>Oklahoma v. Castro- Huerta</i> , No. 21-429..... <i>passim</i>	
ODAA Amicus Br., <i>Oklahoma v. Castro- Huerta</i> , No. 21-429.....	6
Stips., <i>State v. Shriver</i> , No. CF-2015-395 (Okla. Dist. Ct. filed Sept. 21, 2020), https://bit.ly/3lNZbeS	17
Suppl. Br. of Appellee after Remand, <i>Foster v. State</i> , No. F-2020-149 (Okla. Crim. App. filed Apr. 19, 2021), https:// bit.ly/3jjP67S	15
Suppl. Br. of Appellee after Remand, <i>McDaniel v. State</i> , No. F-2017-357 (Okla. Crim. App. filed Mar. 29, 2021), https:// bit.ly/3lM1Wgz	15
Suppl. Br. of Appellee After Remand, <i>Shriver v. State</i> , No. F-2017-1279 (Okla. Crim. App. filed Dec. 7, 2020), https:// bit.ly/3pf1Z70	18
Texas Amicus Br. at 13-20, <i>Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 21-429	21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
Tr. of Proceedings, <i>State v. Shriver</i> , No. CF-2015-395 (Oct. 19, 2020), https://bit.ly/3lNZbeS	17-18
 OTHER AUTHORITIES	
@CherokeeNation, Twitter (Oct. 9, 2021, 9:08 AM), https://bit.ly/3AsaehJ	9
Allison Herrera, “ <i>My Office Will Work Until We Drop</i> ”: Agencies Vow to Work Together on McGirt Cases, KOSU (Aug. 12, 2020, 10:02 AM), https://bit.ly/3DKOhg0	13
Allison Herrera, <i>Trent Shores Reflects on his Time as U.S. Attorney, Remains Committed to Justice for Indian Country</i> , KOSU (Feb. 24, 2021, 4:40 AM), https://bit.ly/3E3gD5x	9
Chad Hunter, <i>Cherokee Nation Marshals, Attorneys Dealing with McGirt Fallout</i> , Cherokee Phoenix (July 19, 2021), https://bit.ly/3mJZM0a	6
Cherokee Nation and Chickasaw Nation Criminal Jurisdiction Compacting Act of 2021, H.R. 3091, 117th Cong. (2021)	7
Curtis Killman, <i>Here’s How Cherokee Tribal Courts Are Handling the Surge in Cases Due to the McGirt Ruling</i> , Tulsa World (updated July 22, 2021), https://bit.ly/3FscfOK	4-5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
Drake Johnson, <i>Tulsa County Jail to be Used for City Jail Overflow</i> , Newson6 (Oct. 4, 2021 5:32 PM), https://bit.ly/3vz2DNy	5
Grant D. Crawford, <i>CN Marshal Service Rises to Challenge of McGirt</i> , Tahlequah Daily Press (May 7, 2021), https://bit.ly/3mFbx8g	5, 9
Hicham Raache, <i>Gov. Stitt Says Supreme Court’s McGirt Ruling Created ‘Public Safety Threat’, asks Oklahomans to Share Stories; Cherokee Nation Reacts</i> , KFOR (updated Apr. 16, 2021, 11:52 AM), https://bit.ly/2YV7mwS	14
Janelle Stecklein, <i>Tribes Talk About Intergovernmental Agreements with State Following McGirt Ruling</i> , Tahlequah Daily Press (Oct. 11, 2021), https://bit.ly/3pgZ7qh	6
Joe Tomlinson, <i>Promised Land Recap: AG O’Connor Focused on Challenging SCOTUS Reservation Ruling</i> , NonDoc (Sept. 17, 2021), https://bit.ly/3FOnJMG	7
<i>Legal Status of the Cherokee Nation Reservation</i> , Cherokee Nation Att’y Gen.’s Office (last accessed Oct. 20, 2021)	6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
Michael Overall, <i>The Cherokee Nation’s Budget Will Hit a Record \$3 Billion as the Tribe Responds to COVID and McGirt</i> , Tulsa World (Sept. 15, 2021), https://bit.ly/3apJHaj	4
Mike Hunter, Att’y Gen. of Okla., <i>Frequently Asked Questions Related to McGirt v. Oklahoma and the Proposed Legislative Framework Document</i> (n.d.), https://bit.ly/3vuPc1l	7
Press Release, Cherokee Nation, Cherokee Nation Files 1000th Case in Tribal Court Following McGirt Ruling (June 7, 2021), https://bit.ly/3v1g6NX	4
Press Release, Office of Okla. Att’y Gen., Attorney General Hunter Prepares Brief with Court of Criminal Appeals Seeking Guidance on Cases Affected by the McGirt Decision (last visited Oct. 20, 2021), https://bit.ly/3n4S9Si	7
Ray Carter, <i>McGirt Called Threat to State’s Economic Future</i> , Okla. Council of Pub. Affairs (Aug. 16, 2021), https://bit.ly/3vzCs9M	14
Reese Gorman, <i>Cole Continues to Advocate for Tribal Sovereignty on Indigenous Peoples’ Day</i> , Norman Transcript (Oct 11, 2021), https://bit.ly/3AK839C	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
Reese Gorman, <i>Cole Encourages State-Tribal Relations Over State Challenges to McGirt</i> , Norman Transcript (July 23, 2021), https://bit.ly/3ANKfBx	7
Restatement (Second) of Judgments (1980)...	15
Samantha Vicent, <i>Cherokee Nation Highlights Expansion of Legal System on Anniversary of McGirt Ruling</i> , Tulsa World (updated Aug. 30, 2021), https://bit.ly/3uXpJxf	4
<i>Tribal Code</i> , Cherokee Nation Office of Att’y Gen., https://bit.ly/3APtTsl (last visited Oct. 20, 2021).....	8
<i>Tribal Compacts and Agreements</i> , Okla. Sec’y of State, https://bit.ly/3FRTqoq (last visited Oct. 20, 2021).....	6

INTEREST OF AMICUS¹

Amicus Cherokee Nation (“Nation”) is a federally-recognized Indian tribe, residing on a reservation in Oklahoma, where it protects public safety and prosecutes Indian offenders in the exercise of its inherent sovereign authority. *United States v. Wheeler*, 435 U.S. 313 (1978); *United States v. Lara*, 541 U.S. 193 (2008). Under the Treaty of New Echota, Dec. 29, 1835, 7 Stat. 478, the Nation ceded its lands east of the Mississippi, *id.* art. 1, in exchange for a new homeland in present-day Oklahoma, *id.* art. 2 (incorporating Treaty with the Western Cherokee, Feb. 14, 1833, 7 Stat. 414), on which it was guaranteed the right to self-government under federal supervision, *id.* art. 5; see 1866 Treaty of Washington with the Cherokee, art. 31, July 19, 1866, 14 Stat. 799.² The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals (“OCCA”) upheld the existence of the Nation’s Reservation, *Hogner v. State*, 2021 OK CR 4, analyzing the Nation’s unique history and treaties in light of *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020). The State did not seek certiorari in *Hogner*—in fact, the State once accepted *Hogner* as settling the Reservation’s existence.

The Nation has fundamental interests in protecting the treaty promises under which the Nation, as the

¹ No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part. No one other than the Nation made a monetary contribution to fund preparation or submission of this brief. The parties’ counsels of record received notice of the Nation’s intent to file more than ten days before the date for filing and consented thereto.

² The boundaries of the Reservation established by the 1833 Treaty, the 1835 Treaty, and a December 31, 1838 fee patent to the Nation, were modified by the 1866 Treaty, arts. 16, 17, 21, and the Act of Mar. 3, 1893, ch. 209, § 10, 27 Stat. 612, 640-43. See Pet’r’s App. 13a-26a.

sole tribal signatory of those treaties, resides on and governs the Reservation. Accordingly, even before *Hogner* was decided the Nation began a comprehensive enhancement of its criminal justice system, growing its capacity and redoubling coordination with other governments to meet the expanded responsibilities that it anticipated. That effort continues today, under the ruling in *Hogner*.

Now, however, Oklahoma seeks reconsideration and reversal of *McGirt*, boldly declaring it is wrong and challenging the OCCA's decisions upholding the United States' treaty promises to the Nation. To protect those rights and to aid the Court in its disposition of this petition, the Nation turns to this Court—as it has before, *Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515 (1832)—and submits this brief to show that certiorari should be denied to protect the Nation's rights and the rule of law on its Reservation.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The petition should be denied for three reasons.³ First, *McGirt* has been implemented successfully on the Cherokee Reservation by the Nation and the federal government. A balanced and accurate description of how the Nation is addressing *McGirt* disproves the State's argument that *McGirt* is unworkable.

³ To state its argument against *McGirt* in this case, the State seeks to incorporate its attack on *McGirt* from its petition in *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429 (“*Castro-Huerta Pet.*”), see Pet. 6-7. The Nation responds here to that argument, mindful that the Court may not accept the State's practice, which hangs attacks on all Five Tribes' Reservations on a Cherokee Reservation case and diverts attention from the OCCA's analyses of the Cherokee Reservation's status in its published decisions, *Hogner*; *Spears v. State*, 2021 OK CR 7, 485 P.3d 873.

Second, the State waived its right to seek reversal of *McGirt* or the overthrow of the Cherokee Reservation by not challenging the Reservation's existence in the court below and expressly accepting it in other cases. And the District Court has since dismissed the charges against Respondent, mooted this case. Finally, the State provides no basis for discarding *McGirt*. The cases on which it relies are worlds apart from this situation, where *McGirt* has provided a workable standard that is being applied by the courts below, both in the Oklahoma Indian reservation context and elsewhere, the facts and law underlying the decision have not changed, and the opinion was a well-reasoned one that has established reliance interests by the governments that are implementing it.

REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION

I. The State's Supposed Practical Impacts are Non-Issues.

The State's claim that *McGirt* caused criminal justice issues that justify revisiting that decision does not support certiorari because those supposed issues are either non-existent or overblown. The tribal and federal judicial systems are capably managing the jurisdictional changes effected by *McGirt* and the OCCA's follow-on cases recognizing the Reservations of the other Five Tribes (collectively, "Nations"). Their success is evidenced by their need for more resources to prosecute those crimes and the State's reduced need. *McGirt* anticipated that shift, noting "it doesn't take a lot of imagination to see how things could work out in the end." 140 S. Ct. at 2480. Here, the Nation illustrates how the transition is being made in an orderly way that protects the public and that the Nation is confident will be successful for all stakeholders.

Even before *McGirt* was decided, the Nation began preparations to exercise criminal jurisdiction throughout its Reservation. Those preparations accelerated after *McGirt* and came to fruition after *Hogner*. In response to those rulings, Principal Chief Chuck Hoskin Jr. committed the Nation to “building up the largest criminal justice system in our tribe’s history in record speed . . . to provide a blanket of protection within the Cherokee Nation Reservation for all citizens.” Michael Overall, *The Cherokee Nation’s Budget Will Hit a Record \$3 Billion as the Tribe Responds to COVID and McGirt*, *Tulsa World* (Sept. 15, 2021) (“Overall”)⁴.

The Nation is meeting that commitment. Last fiscal year, the Nation spent \$10 million to expand its justice system, including seating two new district court judges, appointing six new prosecutors, and hiring additional victim advocates. *See* Press Release, Cherokee Nation, Cherokee Nation Files 1000th Case in Tribal Court Following McGirt Ruling (June 7, 2021).⁵ This fiscal year, the budgets for the Nation’s court system, Attorney General’s office, and Marshal Service more than doubled. *See* Overall. The Nation is also opening two new courts, *see* Samantha Vicent, *Cherokee Nation Highlights Expansion of Legal System on Anniversary of McGirt Ruling*, *Tulsa World* (updated Aug. 30, 2021),⁶ which will add to the well-established Cherokee Nation courts at the W.W. Keeler Tribal Complex, *see* Curtis Killman, *Here’s How Cherokee Tribal Courts Are Handling the Surge*

⁴ <https://bit.ly/3apJHaj>

⁵ <https://bit.ly/3v1g6NX>

⁶ <https://bit.ly/3uXpJxf>

in Cases Due to the McGirt Ruling, Tulsa World (updated July 22, 2021).⁷

This effort also significantly relies on local cooperation. The Nation has entered into agreements with counties under which defendants are housed in adult or juvenile detention facilities while they await trial or serve their sentences. *Id.* Those agreements benefit both signatories. As the director of the Cherokee Nation Marshall Service (“CNMS”) explains:

The jails have the same people still in them. The only difference is that the tribe pays for the Native Americans in the jail. The jails aren’t being overcrowded because of this. Quite frankly, the jails are getting more benefit now, because before McGirt, they had these people in the jails, but the tribe wasn’t paying \$42 [per inmate] a day to the jail.

Grant D. Crawford, *CN Marshal Service Rises to Challenge of McGirt*, Tahlequah Daily Press (May 7, 2021) (alteration in original) (“Crawford”).⁸ Such agreements are not uncommon—the City of Tulsa has one with the County of Tulsa, for instance. See Drake Johnson, *Tulsa County Jail to be Used for City Jail Overflow*, Newson6 (Oct. 4, 2021 5:32 PM).⁹

The Nation has also continued its long-standing policy of entering into cross-deputization agreements with other governments on the Reservation, under which local and state law enforcement may enforce tribal law and tribal law enforcement may enforce local and state law. Before *McGirt*, the Nation had

⁷ <https://bit.ly/3FscfOK>

⁸ <https://bit.ly/3mFbx8g>

⁹ <https://bit.ly/3vz2DNy>

entered twenty-one agreements with over fifty municipalities, counties, and local and state agencies in the Reservation. Since then, the Nation has entered into fifty-eight more such agreements.¹⁰

The Nation has also entered into agreements with municipalities on the Reservation, whereby the Nation donates revenue from the fines and fees paid under tribal law for traffic and misdemeanor citations and retains a modest processing fee equal to the assessment that would be paid to the State if the citation were issued off-Reservation.¹¹ See Chad Hunter, *Cherokee Nation Marshals, Attorneys Dealing with McGirt Fallout*, Cherokee Phoenix (July 19, 2021);¹² Janelle Stecklein, *Tribes Talk About Intergovernmental Agreements with State Following McGirt Ruling*, Tahlequah Daily Press (Oct. 11, 2021).¹³

The Nation hopes for similar tribal-state agreements and supports Congressman Tom Cole's proposed legislation that would allow the State and Nation to negotiate tribal-state compacts to define

¹⁰ All agreements are on file in the Oklahoma Secretary of State's office. See *Tribal Compacts and Agreements*, Okla. Sec'y of State, <https://bit.ly/3FRTqoq> (last visited Oct. 20, 2021) (enter "Cherokee" into "Doc Type" searchbar and press "Submit"). The State's *amici* call these agreements into question, see ODAA Amicus Br. at 16-17, *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429, but only offer speculation against their effectiveness, which is defeated by our quarter-century of experience with them, and the dozens of agreements we have entered.

¹¹ Municipal agreements are available on Cherokee Nation's website. See *Legal Status of the Cherokee Nation Reservation*, Cherokee Nation Att'y Gen.'s Office (last accessed Oct. 20, 2021) (follow hyperlinks under "Municipal Agreements").

¹² <https://bit.ly/3mJZM0a>

¹³ <https://bit.ly/3pgZ7qh>

state and tribal criminal jurisdiction within the Reservation to their mutual benefit. *See* Cherokee Nation and Chickasaw Nation Criminal Jurisdiction Compacting Act of 2021, H.R. 3091, 117th Cong. (2021). However, Oklahoma’s Governor opposes it because it would acknowledge the existence of Indian Reservations. Reese Gorman, *Cole Encourages State-Tribal Relations Over State Challenges to McGirt*, Norman Transcript (July 23, 2021).¹⁴ In contrast, Oklahoma’s former elected Attorney General accepted *McGirt*, *see* Press Release, Office of Okla. Att’y Gen., Attorney General Hunter Prepares Brief with Court of Criminal Appeals Seeking Guidance on Cases Affected by the McGirt Decision (last visited Oct. 20, 2021),¹⁵ and sought to implement it by “working with federal and tribal partners to make sure criminals are still being arrested and prosecuted,” Mike Hunter, Okla. Att’y Gen., *Frequently Asked Questions Related to McGirt v. Oklahoma and the Proposed Legislative Framework Document 1* (n.d.).¹⁶ The new Attorney General, recently appointed by the Governor, is staunchly opposed to acknowledging or implementing *McGirt*, Joe Tomlinson, *Promised Land Recap: AG O’Connor Focused on Challenging SCOTUS Reservation Ruling*, NonDoc (Sept. 17, 2021).¹⁷ Nevertheless, the Nation still engages with willing state partners. Shortly after *McGirt* was decided, the Nation entered into an agreement with the State Department of Human Services which recognizes the Nation’s Reservation and permits the State and Nation to exercise

¹⁴ <https://bit.ly/3ANKfBx>

¹⁵ <https://bit.ly/3n4S9Si>

¹⁶ <https://bit.ly/3vuPc1l>

¹⁷ <https://bit.ly/3FOnJMG>

concurrent jurisdiction over Indian child custody on the Reservation. *See Intergovernmental Agreement Between Okla. & Cherokee Nation Regarding Jurisdiction over Indian Children Within the Nation's Reservation* (Sept. 1, 2020).¹⁸ The Nation is also negotiating with the Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse to reach a mutually beneficial agreement to provide additional resources for mental health treatment on the Reservation.

The Nation has also revised its laws to aid an orderly criminal justice transition by amending or enacting provisions that track state law. *See Tribal Code*, Cherokee Nation Office of Att'y Gen. (last visited Oct. 20, 2021).¹⁹ That includes new traffic, criminal, and juvenile codes that define offenses and crimes similarly to state law. Cherokee Nation Code tits. 10A,²⁰ 21,²¹ 47.²² The Nation also amended its statute of limitations, so that the limitation period tolls when the State initiated prosecution but then dismissed a prosecution or conviction for lack of jurisdiction. Cherokee Nation Code tit. 22, §§ 154-155.²³

These investments are delivering justice daily. As of September 30, 2021, the Nation had prosecuted 2,031 felony and misdemeanor cases since the *Hogner* ruling and had issued 1,263 traffic citations. *See Inter-Tribal Council of Five Civilized Tribes*, Res. No.

¹⁸ <https://bit.ly/2Z2KWdA>

¹⁹ <https://bit.ly/3APtTsl>

²⁰ <https://bit.ly/3jko3jk>

²¹ <https://bit.ly/3DTe6dQ>

²² <https://bit.ly/3G5nKfw>

²³ <https://bit.ly/2Xj23XA>

21-34 (Oct. 8, 2021)²⁴; @CherokeeNation, Twitter (Oct. 9, 2021, 9:08 AM).²⁵ These arrests and prosecutions are being undertaken with a respect for the rule of law and the needs of the entire community: “We protect the tribe, we protect the community,’ [CNMS Director] said ‘You’ll hear a lot in the media about the world coming to an end,’ ‘It really isn’t.” Crawford. The role that tribal justice systems play in punishing criminals rebuts the notion, repeated by Oklahoma, *see Castro-Huerta* Pet. 20, that the federal government’s declination of cases results in criminals going free. As the outgoing United States Attorney for the Northern District of Oklahoma explained:

[S]ome of those cases that people were describing as declinations were actually cases that were being referred to tribal attorneys general to be prosecuted. And I think that when a tribal attorney general decides to prosecute a case that’s actually a great exercise of tribal sovereignty and [the] tribal justice system. So, I don’t consider that case a declination where justice wasn’t pursued. . . . And, I think the tribal court should get our full faith and credit for being the great justice systems that they are.

Allison Herrera, *Trent Shores Reflects on his Time as U.S. Attorney, Remains Committed to Justice for Indian Country*, KOSU (Feb. 24, 2021, 4:40 AM).²⁶

These efforts also include the handling of cases where offenders have already been prosecuted by the

²⁴ <https://bit.ly/3AOnb5Q>

²⁵ <https://bit.ly/3AsaehJ>

²⁶ <https://bit.ly/3E3gD5x>

state and jurisdiction has shifted to the United States or the Nation. In those cases, the Nation and federal government are acting swiftly to keep offenders off the street and make sure they are brought to justice in the proper forum. For instance, Respondent is a Cherokee citizen who was convicted in state court of killing one woman and injuring another with his car while driving intoxicated on the Cherokee Reservation. After the OCCA acknowledged the existence of the Cherokee Reservation in *Hogner*, the Nation prepared to indict and try Shriver. On March 30, 2021, the Nation issued an arrest warrant against him for second degree murder and accessory to leaving the scene of an accident. Arrest Warrant, *Cherokee Nation v. Shriver*, No. CRM-21-56 (Cherokee Dist. Ct. Mar. 30, 2021). Shriver's state criminal conviction was reversed on direct appeal by the OCCA on April 29, 2021. *Shriver v. State*, No. F-2017-1279 (Okla. Crim. App. Apr. 29, 2021).²⁷ The Oklahoma Department of Corrections then transferred custody to the Cherokee Nation, which has since detained him awaiting trial.

That response was no one-off and resulted from an extensive effort by the Nation to ensure that *McGirt* was brought to bear on cases arising on the Reservation in a responsible, orderly manner. In the month after the *McGirt* decision, the Nation assisted the OCCA's consideration of appeals raising *McGirt*-based jurisdictional arguments. It did so by tendering an amicus briefs and appendix in *Hogner* less than a month after *McGirt* was decided and identifying nine then-pending appeals raising the claim that the Cherokee Reservation is intact. Cherokee Nation

²⁷ <https://bit.ly/3oEwT8A>

Unopposed Application for Authorization to File Amicus Br., *Hogner v. State*, 2021 OK CR 4 (filed Aug. 3, 2020) (No. F-2018-138).²⁸ In each case, the Nation confirmed the location of the offenses and the Indian status of the defendants and victims. Less than two weeks later, the OCCA remanded those cases for evidentiary hearings. As in this case, the State presented no evidence or argument at those hearings that the Reservation was disestablished or that *McGirt* should be overruled. The Nation appeared and participated at the hearings, filing amicus briefs, exhibits, historical documents, and proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. Each trial court determined the Reservation is intact.

Based on the evidentiary records and trial courts' findings, the Nation anticipated the OCCA would vacate convictions and began to coordinate, sometimes in advance of the OCCA opinions, to ensure defendants would be lawfully prosecuted in federal or tribal courts. That effort was successful. Today, the OCCA has vacated twelve state convictions in Cherokee Reservation cases on direct appeal. In every case, federal or tribal prosecution is proceeding. See *Cherokee Nation v. Perales*, No. CRM-21-261 (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. filed Mar. 9, 2021); *Cherokee Nation v. Shriver*, No. CRM-21-55 (Cherokee Nation Dist. Ct. filed Feb. 19, 2021); *Shriver*, No. CRM-21-56; *United States v. Bragg*, No. 4:21-cr-00088-JFH (N.D. Okla. filed Mar. 22, 2021); *United States v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 4:20-cr-00255-CVE (N.D. Okla. guilty plea Nov. 2, 2020); *United States v. Cottingham*, No. 4:20-cr-00209-GKF-1 (N.D. Okla. guilty plea June 10, 2021); *United States v. Foster*, No.

²⁸ <https://bit.ly/3DZkOiK>

4:21-cr-00118-CVE (N.D. Okla. filed Mar. 16, 2021); *United States v. Leathers*, No. 4:21-cr-00163-CVE-1 (N.D. Okla. filed Mar. 19, 2021); *United States v. McCombs*, No. 4:20-cr-00262-GKF-1 (N.D. Okla. filed Nov. 3, 2021); *United States v. McDaniel*, No. 6:21-mj-00372-SPS-1 (E.D. Okla. filed Sept. 22, 2021); *United States v. Spears*, No. 4:20-cr-00296-GKF (N.D. Okla. filed Nov. 18, 2020); *United States v. Vaught*, No. 4:21-cr-00202-JFH-1 (N.D. Okla. filed Apr. 2, 2021).

The State worries about “civil jurisdiction of non-Indian municipal courts in eastern Oklahoma under the Curtis Act, ch. 504, § 14, 30 Stat. 499-500 (1898),” citing one pending case, *Hooper v. City of Tulsa*, No. 4:21-cv-00165-JED-JFJ (N.D. Okla. filed Apr. 9, 2021). *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 25. *Hooper*—which deals with *criminal* jurisdiction—arose from a decision of the Municipal Criminal Court of the City of Tulsa, which is mostly located on the Creek and Cherokee Reservations. The municipal court concluded that under the Curtis Act,²⁹ municipalities on the Creek Reservation which incorporated under that Act before Oklahoma statehood can enforce municipal criminal ordinances against both Indians and non-Indians. *City of Tulsa v. Hooper*, No. 7470397, slip op. at 5-10 (Tulsa Mun. Crim. Ct. Apr. 5, 2021).³⁰

The Nation disagrees with that decision. Tulsa is organized under Oklahoma state law pursuant to a charter adopted *after* statehood. See Tulsa, Okla. Code

²⁹ The Curtis Act was one of the statutes passed by Congress to coerce the Five Tribes into agreeing to allotment of their lands. See *McGirt*, 140 S. Ct. at 2465.

³⁰ Exhibit 1 to Complaint, *Hooper v. City of Tulsa*, No. 4:21-cv-00165-JED-JFJ (N.D. Okla. filed Apr. 9, 2021), ECF No. 1-1.

App. C;³¹ Okla. Const. art. 18, § 3(a). In any event, under existing cross-deputization agreements with Tulsa, tribal and municipal law enforcement officers can enforce applicable tribal, local, and federal laws and refer those cases to the appropriate prosecutors. *See* Addendum to Law Enforcement Agreement Between U.S., Cherokee Nation, and City of Tulsa (Apr. 9, 2014);³² Addendum to Law Enforcement Agreement Between U.S., Muscogee (Creek) Nation, and City of Tulsa (May 2, 2006).³³ Such agreements are available to any other municipality on a reservation. And since *McGirt*, inter-governmental cooperation with Tulsa police has been intensive. *See* Allison Herrera, “*My Office Will Work Until We Drop*”: *Agencies Vow to Work Together on McGirt Cases*, KOSU (Aug. 12, 2020, 10:02 AM).³⁴ The Nation is doing all it can to ensure Indians and non-Indians in Tulsa are held accountable to the law.

Finally, the State’s suggestion that lurking “[q]uestions” about tribal civil authority are of concern has no basis in fact within the Nation’s knowledge. *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 25. The Nation has made no effort to exercise civil jurisdiction over anyone on terms that were not already available before *McGirt*, and no such cases are pending in the Nation’s courts. The State provides no evidence that any of the challenges to the State’s civil jurisdiction elsewhere are even remotely serious. *See id.* at 24-26. If serious disputes were to arise over civil jurisdiction, they should be resolved in those cases, not this criminal case.

³¹ <https://bit.ly/3nejTDZ>

³² <https://bit.ly/3DsYnSv>

³³ <https://bit.ly/3uY6Lq6>

³⁴ <https://bit.ly/3DKOhg0>

Resolution of such issues is also available through tribal-state agreement, as the tribes and State have done time and time again, even when the Supreme Court has found the State has overstepped its authority in Indian country. *See, e.g.*, Okla. Stat. tit. 68 § 500.63 (authorizing the State and tribes to enter agreements to share motor fuel tax revenues after *Oklahoma Tax Commission v. Chickasaw Nation*, 515 U.S. 450 (1995)); *id.* § 346 (authorizing State and tribes to enter agreements to share tobacco tax revenues after *Oklahoma Tax Commission v. Citizen Band Potawatomi Indian Tribe of Oklahoma*, 498 U.S. 505 (1991)). That this model works is shown by the Nation’s recent child custody agreement with the State. *See supra* at 7-8.

The State’s reliance on exaggeration is of a piece with the Oklahoma Governor’s attempts to stoke hysteria and sensationalism in the media. *See* Hicham Raache, *Gov. Stitt Says Supreme Court’s McGirt Ruling Created ‘Public Safety Threat’, asks Oklahomans to Share Stories; Cherokee Nation Reacts*, KFOR (Apr. 16, 2021, 11:52 AM)³⁵; Ray Carter, *McGirt Called Threat to State’s Economic Future*, Okla. Council of Pub. Affairs (Aug. 16, 2021)³⁶; Reese Gorman, *Cole Continues to Advocate for Tribal Sovereignty on Indigenous Peoples’ Day*, Norman Transcript (Oct 11, 2021) (“Stitt spokesperson Carly Atchinson said, ‘McGirt is the biggest issue that’s ever hit any state since the Civil War’”).³⁷ That provides no ground for certiorari. Furthermore, rewarding this strategy could threaten the fair adjudication of criminal cases

³⁵ <https://bit.ly/2YV7mwS>

³⁶ <https://bit.ly/3vzCs9M>

³⁷ <https://bit.ly/3AK839C>

arising on Indian country in Oklahoma in the future. See *Flowers v. Mississippi*, 139 S. Ct. 2228, 2254 (2019) (Thomas, J., dissenting); *Chandler v. Florida*, 449 U.S. 560, 580 (1981).

II. The State Cannot Use this Moot Case to Challenge the Cherokee Reservation.

The State’s effort to undo the Cherokee Reservation is a starkly new position. The State earlier *affirmatively accepted* the Cherokee Reservation, Suppl. Br. of Appellee after Remand at 3, *McDaniel v. State*, No. F-2017-357 (Okla. Crim. App. filed Mar. 29, 2021) (“The State further accepts, in light of this Court’s ruling in *Hogner v. State*, . . . that the crimes occurred within the boundaries of the Cherokee Nation Reservation.”)³⁸; Suppl. Br. of Appellee after Remand at 6, *Foster v. State*, No. F-2020-149 (Okla. Crim. App. filed Apr. 19, 2021) (noting the State stipulated that, under *Hogner*, the Cherokee Reservation exists).³⁹ In line with its avowed acceptance of *Hogner*, the State did not challenge the Reservation below.⁴⁰

Now, under the direction of a newly appointed Attorney General, the State contends that “[u]nder the correct framework . . . Congress disestablished the

³⁸ <https://bit.ly/3lM1Wgz>

³⁹ <https://bit.ly/3jjP67S>

⁴⁰ The State’s decision to accept *Hogner* and not seek certiorari there also suggests its effort to challenge the Reservation is barred by non-mutual collateral estoppel. See Restatement (Second) of Judgments § 29 (1980); *B & B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.*, 575 U.S. 138, 148 (2015) (quoting Restatement (Second) of Judgments for collateral estoppel principles); see also *State v. United Cook Inlet Drift Ass’n*, 895 P.2d 947, 951-52 (Alaska 1995); *Benjamin v. Coughlin*, 905 F.2d 571, 576 (2d Cir. 1990).

Creek territory in Oklahoma, as well as the territories of the rest of the Five Tribes,” and that *McGirt* is incorrect. *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 18.⁴¹ That framework, the State insists, requires “[c]onsideration of history . . . because the effect on reservation status of statutes targeting Indian land ownership is inherently ambiguous.” *Id.* But this case is moot, and so the State cannot seek to advance any “framework” here. And having taken the contrary position in *McDaniel* to avoid the burden of litigating the existence of the Reservation, and the OCCA having accepted that position, the State is barred from raising that argument for the first time here as part of an unfair appellate ambush. See *New Hampshire v. Maine*, 532 U.S. 742, 750-51, 755-56 (2001).

Moreover, the State’s attack is barred by its conduct in *this* case. When a party does not raise an argument below, and the lower court does not rule on it, it is waived. See *Sprietsma v. Mercury Marine*, 537 U.S. 51, 56 n.4 (2002). “Waiver is the intentional relinquishment or abandonment of a known right,” *Wood v. Milyard*, 566 U.S. 463, 474 (2012) (cleaned up), which is exactly what the State did here. And an argument waived below is forfeited before this Court. *United States v. Jones*, 565 U.S. 400, 413 (2012).

After *McGirt* and *Sharp v. Murphy*, 140 S. Ct. 2412 (2020) (per curiam), were decided, the OCCA remanded for an evidentiary hearing and directed the District Court to “follow the analysis set out in *McGirt*” to determine if the Cherokee Reservation had been disestablished. Pet’r’s App. at 42a. The OCCA made clear that the State should develop evidence

⁴¹ *McGirt* addressed only the Creek Reservation, not all of the Five Tribes’ Reservations. 140 S. Ct. at 2479.

below on the question of Reservation status: “Recognizing the historical and specialized nature of this remand for evidentiary hearing, we request the Attorney General and District Attorney to work in coordination to effect uniformity and completeness in the hearing process.” *Id.* at 41a.

Nevertheless, on remand the State did not present *any* evidence or briefing. The Nation submitted an amicus brief and supporting exhibits showing the establishment and continued existence of the Cherokee Reservation, Cherokee Nation Amicus Br. & App., *State v. Shriver*, No. CF-2015-395 (Okla. Dist. Ct. filed Sept. 16, 2020),⁴² and Respondent also briefed the issue, Def.’s Remanded Hr’g Br. (filed Sept. 21, 2020).⁴³ Instead of challenging these facts or presenting its own briefing, the State stipulated that the crime occurred within the “geographic area set out” in the Cherokee Treaties, Stips. at 1-2 (filed Sept. 21, 2020).⁴⁴

The District Court held a hearing, where the Nation presented extensive argument on the existence of the Reservation and submitted another set of exhibits to the court, which the State asked be admitted into the record. Tr. of Proceedings 6:13-16:15, 18:18-22 (Oct. 19, 2020).⁴⁵ Respondent also submitted evidence into the record, to which the State did not object. Tr. 22:4-24. In response, the State presented no evidence, took no position on the Reservation’s existence, Tr. 18:10-13, and “respectfully ask[ed] th[e] Court to

⁴² <https://bit.ly/3FYr0ZV>

⁴³ <https://bit.ly/3lNZbeS>

⁴⁴ <https://bit.ly/3DQDxg7>

⁴⁵ The Transcript is not available online but is available from the District Court as part of the record.

take note of all the relevant evidence and to make a conclusion based on the law that has been provided,” Tr. 18:14-17. The District Court then issued its decision, in which it made extensive findings of fact and conclusions of law, Pet’r’s App. at 13a-38a, noted that the State had taken no position on Reservation existence, *id.* at 38a, and concluded that “no evidence was presented to this Court to establish Congress explicitly erased or disestablished the boundaries of the Cherokee Nation or that the State of Oklahoma has jurisdiction in this matter,” *id.* at 39a.

Back before the OCCA, the State again made no argument on the existence of the Cherokee Reservation, *see* Suppl. Br. of Appellee After Remand, *Shriver v. State*, No. F-2017-1279 (Okla. Crim. App. filed Dec. 7, 2020),⁴⁶ but instead simply repeated the District Court’s findings, *id.* at 2, and asked that the OCCA “stay any order reversing the conviction” so that the federal government could take custody of Respondent, *id.* at 3. The OCCA then granted relief to Respondent, concluding that “[i]n its order, the District Court stated that based upon stipulations and evidence presented by the parties, briefs and argument of counsel, Appellant was shown to be a citizen of the Cherokee Nation, Congress had established a reservation for the Cherokee Nation, and Congress had not disestablished the reservation,” Pet’r’s App. at 4a, that “the District Court appropriately applied *McGirt* to determine that Congress did establish a reservation for the Cherokee Nation and that no evidence was presented showing that Congress explicitly erased or disestablished the boundaries of the Cherokee Reservation,” *id.* at 7a, which was

⁴⁶ <https://bit.ly/3pf1Z70>

consistent with its own ruling in *Hogner*, see Pet'r's App. at 7a. Consistent with that ruling, on August 5, 2021, the District Court dismissed the case. *State v. Shriver*, No. CF-2015-395 (Okla. Dist. Ct. Aug. 5, 2021).⁴⁷

Because the criminal charges giving rise to this case have been dismissed, it is moot. The dismissal ended the controversy between the State and Respondent, and so any decision this Court issues on the State's ability to bring the now-dismissed charges will not give the State any relief, *Chafin v. Chafin*, 568 U.S. 165, 172 (2013), and would only be advisory, see *Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env't*, 523 U.S. 83, 101 (1998).⁴⁸

The State also forfeited its anti-Reservation position under principles of waiver. The OCCA ordered a hearing on the Reservation's existence and requested that the State help develop a record on that question. The State chose not to do so, chose not to challenge *McGirt*,⁴⁹ and expressly took no position and presented

⁴⁷ <https://bit.ly/3BWZ9ai>. The State did not include this order in its appendix, despite its connection to the judgment and clear relevance to this Court's jurisdiction. See Sup. Ct. R. 14.1(i)(i)-(ii).

⁴⁸ The only exception to mootness that the Court has recognized—"capable of repetition, yet evading review"—is inapplicable in this case, which deals with the validity of a criminal conviction, not a transient injury too short to be litigated but likely to be repeated. See *United States v. Sanchez-Gomez*, 138 S. Ct. 1532, 1540 (2018); *Kingdomware Techs., Inc. v. United States*, 136 S. Ct. 1969, 1976 (2016).

⁴⁹ The State began attempting to reserve its right to challenge *McGirt* only after the former Attorney General left office, thereby implicitly acknowledging its earlier waivers. See, e.g., Br. in Supp. of Mot. to Stay & Abate Proceedings at 5 n.3, *Russell v. State*, No. F-2019-892 (Okla. Crim. App. June 24, 2021), <https://bit.ly/3jbOhOh>. Of course, an attempt to preserve an argument,

no evidence on the existence of the Cherokee Reservation. In its post-remand briefing to the OCCA, the State raised no challenge to the District Court’s Indian country ruling. By knowingly waiving every opportunity to challenge the Cherokee Reservation below, the State forfeited its right to do so here, by attacking *McGirt* or otherwise. In short, the State’s effort to reverse its earlier decisions not to challenge the existence of the Cherokee Reservation “comes too late in the day” to be considered. *See Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.*, 564 U.S. 552, 563 (2011).

III. The State Proffers No Just Basis For Abandoning *Stare Decisis* to Revisit *McGirt*.

The State claims this is a “paradigmatic” example of when *stare decisis* should yield but relies on cases that are worlds apart from this one. *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 28 (citing *Janus v. AFSCME, Council 31*, 138 S. Ct. 2448 (2018); *Franchise Tax Bd. v. Hyatt*, 139 S. Ct. 1485, 1499 (2019); *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 140 S. Ct. 1390 (2020)). When the “factors to consider” in deciding whether to overturn precedent are applied to this case, namely “the quality of the decision’s reasoning; its consistency with related decisions; legal developments since the decision; and reliance on the decision,” *Hyatt*, 139 S. Ct. at 1499, *McGirt* does not yield.

In the cases the State cites, the Court overturned prior constitutional precedents, acknowledging that *stare decisis* “is at its weakest when we interpret the Constitution.” *Janus*, 138 S. Ct. at 2478; *Hyatt*, 139 S. Ct. at 1492; *Ramos*, 140 S. Ct. at 1404-08. Here *stare decisis* is most potent, as Congress has plenary

regardless of whether it could prevent waiver, cannot succeed if the argument is estopped or *already* waived.

authority to revisit what the Court has done and, exercising its primary authority over Indian affairs, to reverse or modify the Court’s decisions. *Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Cmty.*, 572 U.S. 782, 799 (2014).⁵⁰ Yet, in this case the State asks the Court to do Congress’s business by accepting its view of funding and policy debates. The political nature of this attack is underscored by its timing, which follows the appointment of a new Attorney General. That is a call for prospective legislation, not grounds for certiorari.

McGirt is also well-reasoned, in contrast to the decisions overruled in *Hyatt*, 139 S. Ct. at 1499, *Janus*, 138 S. Ct. at 2463-65, 2483, and *Ramos*, 140 S. Ct. at 1404-08. *McGirt* rests on a comprehensive analysis of law and history—despite the State’s claim to the contrary, *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 18-19—and its ruling is based on the language of the treaties and congressional enactments at issue, rather than the State’s interpretation of subsequent events that are urged to overcome statutory text.⁵¹ The Court’s conclusion was

⁵⁰ This, and the reliance costs imposed by work to implement *McGirt*, see *infra* at 22-23, rebut the State’s assertion that “the recent nature of the decision entitles it to less stare decisis weight.” *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 28 (citing constitutional cases where reliance interests, if they existed, were weakened by lower courts’ confused applications of precedent).

⁵¹ The State’s and its supporting *amici*’s position that *McGirt* should be reversed because the disestablishment analysis involves “inherently ambiguous” statutes is self-defeating. See Tex. Amicus Br. at 13-20, *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429. The judicial interpretation of ambiguous statutes fosters certainty and predictability in their application and enforcement, which is an argument for sparingly revisiting such interpretations. See *Gamble v. United States*, 139 S. Ct. 1960, 1986 (2019) (Thomas, J., concurring). And even if the State were right that *McGirt* involved inherent ambiguities, *McGirt* resolved them through a thorough review of the circumstances surrounding the

no outlier, as it is consistent with the federal court decisions that have applied the disestablishment factors, including the panel in *Murphy*. Unlike *Janus* and *Hyatt*, no intervening decision affects the law on which *McGirt* is based or calls *McGirt*'s reasoning into question. In fact, subsequently, multiple circuits have repeatedly relied on *McGirt*'s approach to statutory interpretation as a touchstone in their own analyses, both in and outside of the Indian law context.⁵² Nor have there been any later factual developments that call the *McGirt* decision's reasoning into question. *Cf. Janus*, 138 S. Ct. at 2465-66, 2482-83; *Citizens United v. FEC*, 558 U.S. 310, 364 (2010) (massive changes in political media landscape undermined poorly-reasoned First Amendment precedent). Indeed, the relevant facts showing the Creek Reservation's existence could not have changed in the past year. Perhaps most significantly, the Oklahoma courts have applied *McGirt* with precision and without difficulty. And the Nations and the federal governments have successfully implemented *McGirt* and the OCCA's decisions to bring criminals to justice, which proves *McGirt* is not "unworkable."

Reliance interests are present here too. *McGirt* palliates injustice, honors the treaty promises of the United States, restores to Congress its constitutional prerogative to decide whether and how to change those promises, and demonstrates that this Court will not permit "the rule of the strong" to triumph over the

enactment and implementation of statutes affecting the Muscogee (Creek) Nation. 140 S. Ct. at 2470-74.

⁵² See, e.g., *Rojas v. FAA*, 989 F.3d. 666, 689 (9th Cir. 2021) (Wardlaw, J. concurring in part and dissenting in part); *Awuku-Asare v. Garland*, 991 F.3d 1123, 1128 (10th Cir. 2021); *Penobscot Nation v. Frey*, 3 F.4th 484, 493-94 (1st Cir. 2021).

rule of law, 140 S. Ct. at 2474. While the State relies heavily on the “century of reliance interests that *McGirt* upset,” *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 28, the correction of a century of injustice cannot entirely avoid doing so. And the Nations, federal government, state courts, local governments, and other public servants have invested great time and resources to make the recognition of the Nations’ treaty rights in *McGirt* and its follow-on cases meaningful by protecting public safety and punishing wrongdoers. Reversing course now would leave all those efforts without purpose or meaning—affecting the public’s confidence in the justice system, wasting tens of millions of dollars and substantial administrative investments, and imposing costs of re-arresting, re-transferring, and re-prosecuting thousands of offenders. These are the interests that are now on the line, and they are threatened by efforts to overthrow *McGirt*, not efforts to adhere to it.

CONCLUSION

The petition should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANK S. HOLLEMAN, IV

DOUGLAS B. L. ENDRESON

SONOSKY, CHAMBERS, SACHSE,

ENDRESON & PERRY, LLP

1425 K Street, NW,

Suite 600

Washington, DC 20005

PATTI PALMER GHEZZI

Attorney at Law

P.O. Box 812

Pawhuska, OK 74056

SARA HILL

Attorney General

CHRISSI NIMMO

Counsel of Record

Deputy Attorney General

CHEROKEE NATION

P.O. Box 948

Tahlequah, OK 74465

(918) 458-6998

chrissi-nimmo@cherokee.org

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

Cherokee Nation

October 28, 2021