

ORIGINAL



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

DAVID DEVAL MARTIN,)
)
 Appellant,)
 vs.)
)
 THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,)
)
 Appellee.)

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
No. F-2016-1030

FILED
IN COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

APR 29 2021

JOHN D. HADDEN
CLERK

OPINION

LUMPKIN, JUDGE:¹

Appellant David Deval Martin was tried by jury and convicted of First Degree Murder (21 O.S.Supp.2012, § 701.7), After Former Conviction of Two or More Felonies, in the District Court of McIntosh County, Case No. CF-2014-14. In accordance with the jury’s recommendation the Honorable James D. Bland, District Judge,

¹As stated in my separate writing in *Bosse v. State*, 2021 OK CR 3, __ P.3d __, (Lumpkin, J., concurring in result), I am bound by my oath and adherence to the Federal-State relationship under the U.S. Constitution to apply the edict of the majority opinion in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020). However, I continue to share the position of Chief Justice Roberts’ dissent in *McGirt*, that at the time of Oklahoma Statehood in 1907, all parties accepted the fact that Indian reservations in the state had been disestablished and no longer existed.

sentenced Appellant to life in prison without the possibility of parole. Appellant appeals from this conviction and sentence.

In Proposition I, Appellant claims the District Court lacked jurisdiction to try him. Appellant argues that he is a citizen of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation and the crime occurred within the boundaries of the Creek Nation.

Pursuant to *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S.Ct. 2452 (2020) Appellant's claim raises two separate questions: (a) his Indian status and (b) whether the crime occurred in Indian Country. These issues require fact-finding. We therefore remanded this case to the District Court of McIntosh County for an evidentiary hearing.

Recognizing the historical and specialized nature of this remand for evidentiary hearing, we requested the Attorney General and District Attorney work in coordination to effect uniformity and completeness in the hearing process. Upon Appellant's presentation of *prima facie* evidence as to his legal status as an Indian and as to the location of the crime as Indian Country, the burden shifts to the State to prove it has subject matter jurisdiction. The District Court was ordered to determine whether Appellant has some Indian blood and is recognized as an Indian by a tribe or the federal government. The District Court

was also directed to determine whether the crime occurred in Indian Country. The District Court was directed to follow the analysis set out in *McGirt* to determine: (1) whether Congress established a reservation for the Creek Nation; and (2) if so, whether Congress specifically erased those boundaries and disestablished the reservation. In so doing, the District Court was directed to consider any evidence the parties provided, including but not limited to treaties, statutes, maps, and/or testimony.

We also directed the District Court that in the event the parties agreed as to what the evidence would show with regard to the questions presented, the parties may enter into a written stipulation setting forth those facts upon which they agree and which answer the questions presented and provide the stipulation to the District Court. The District Court was also ordered to file written findings of fact and conclusions of law with this Court.

An evidentiary hearing was timely held before the Honorable Michael Hogan, District Judge, and an order entitled *Journal Entry of Facts and Conclusions of Law in Accordance with Order Remanding for Evidentiary Hearing* was timely filed with this Court. The record indicates that appearing before the District Court were attorneys from

the office of the Attorney General of Oklahoma, the McIntosh County District Attorney's Office, and defense counsel.

In its Order, the District Court stated that Appellant and the State of Oklahoma stipulated: 1) the evidence would show that Appellant is "9/128 degree Indian blood of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation Tribe" and that he is an "enrolled member of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation of Oklahoma on the dates of the charged offenses"; and 2) "the Muscogee (Creek) Nation of Oklahoma is an Indian Tribal Entity recognized by the federal government." This was based on documentation from the Muscogee (Creek) Nation Citizenship Board and the Muscogee (Creek) Nation Realty Office. The District Court accepted the stipulations and concluded that Appellant "had some Indian blood" and is also "recognized as an Indian by a tribe and the federal government". For these reasons, the court found Appellant "is an Indian under federal law.'

Regarding whether the crime occurred in Indian country, the Order states that the parties stipulated that "[the] charged crimes occurred within the Creek Reservation". The court stated that it adopted the stipulation and found the crime occurred on the Creek Reservation.

Both Appellant and the State were given the opportunity to file response briefs addressing issues from the evidentiary hearing. Appellant did not file a response brief. The State filed a response brief acknowledging the District Court's acceptance of the stipulations regarding Appellant's status as an Indian and the location of the crime as occurring within the Muscogee (Creek) Reservation. The State argued that should this Court find Appellant is entitled to relief, this Court should stay any order reversing the conviction for thirty (30) days to allow the United States Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to secure custody of Appellant. *Cf.* 22 O.S. 2011, § 846.

After thorough consideration of this proposition and the entire record before us on appeal including the original record, transcripts, and briefs of the parties, we find that under the law and the evidence relief is warranted. Under the record before us, we find the District Court did not abuse its discretion and its findings are supported by the evidence presented at the evidentiary hearing. *See State v. Delso*, 2013 OK CR 5, ¶ 5, 298 P.3d 1192, 1194. We find Appellant has met his burden of establishing his status as an Indian, having 9/128 degree Indian blood of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation Tribe and is an

enrolled member of the Muscogee Creek Nation of Oklahoma on the dates of the charged offense and that the charged crime occurred within the Muscogee (Creek) Reservation. Pursuant to *McGirt*, we find Congress established a reservation for the Muscogee (Creek) Nation and has not taken steps to disestablish that reservation.

We therefore find that under *McGirt*, the State of Oklahoma did not have jurisdiction to prosecute Appellant in this matter.² The Judgments and Sentences in this case are hereby reversed and the case remanded to the District Court of McIntosh County with instructions to dismiss the case.³

DECISION

The **JUDGMENTS and SENTENCES are REVERSED AND REMANDED with instructions to Dismiss.** The **MANDATE** is not to be issued until **twenty (20) days** from the delivery and filing of this decision.⁴

AN APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF McINTOSH COUNTY
THE HONORABLE MICHAEL HOGAN, DISTRICT JUDGE

² While Art. 7 of the Oklahoma Constitution vests the district courts of Oklahoma with “unlimited original jurisdiction of all justiciable matters,” the federal government has pre-empted the field as it relates to major crimes committed by or against Indians in Indian country.

³ This resolution renders the other seven (7) propositions of error raised in Appellant’s brief moot.

⁴ By withholding the issuance of the mandate for 20 days, the State’s request for time to determine further prosecution is rendered moot.

APPEARANCES IN DISTRICT COURT

KATRINA CONRAD-LEGLER
OKLA. INDIGENT DEFENSE
P.O. BOX 926
NORMAN, OK 73070
COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT

CAROL ISKI
DISTRICT ATTORNEY
GREG STIDHAM
ASST. DISTRICT ATTORNEY
110 1ST. STREET
EUFAULA, OK 74432

MIKE HUNTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF
OKLAHOMA
JOSHUA R. FANELLI
HANNAH WHITE
ASST. ATTORNEYS GENERAL
313 N.E. 21ST ST.
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73105
COUNSEL FOR THE STATE

OPINION BY: LUMPKIN, J.

KUEHN, P.J.: Concur in Results
ROWLAND, V.P.J.: Concur
LEWIS, J.: Concur in Results
HUDSON, J.: Specially Concur

APPEARANCES ON APPEAL

KATRINA CONRAD-LEGLER
OKLA. INDIGENT DEFENSE
P.O. BOX 926
NORMAN, OK 73070
COUNSEL FOR APPELLANT

MIKE HUNTER
ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF OKLAHOMA
JOSHUA R. FANELLI
ASST. ATTORNEY GENERAL
313 N.E. 21ST ST.
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73105
COUNSEL FOR THE STATE

LEWIS, JUDGE, CONCURRING IN RESULTS:

Based on my special writings in *Bosse v. State*, 2021 OK CR 3, ___ P.3d ___ and *Hogner v. State*, 2021 OK CR 4, ___ P.3d ___, I concur in results in the decision to dismiss this case for the lack of state jurisdiction.

HUDSON, J., SPECIALLY CONCURS:

Today's decision dismisses a conviction for first degree murder from the District Court of McIntosh County based on the Supreme Court's decision in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020). This decision is unquestionably correct as a matter of *stare decisis* based on the Indian status of Appellant and the occurrence of the crimes on the Creek Reservation. Under *McGirt*, the State has no jurisdiction to prosecute Appellant for the murder in this case. Instead, Appellant must be prosecuted in federal court. I therefore as a matter of *stare decisis* fully concur in today's decision. Further, I maintain my 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. See *Bosse v. State*, 2021 OK CR 3, __P.3d__ (Hudson, J., Concur in Results); *Hogner v. State*, 2021 OK CR 4, __P.3d__ (Hudson, J., Specially Concur); and *Krafft v. State*, No. F-2018-340 (Okl.Cr., Feb. 25, 2021) (Hudson, J., Specially Concur) (unpublished).