

No. 24-7030

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff – Appellee,

v.

DENNIS HEBERT,
Defendant – Appellant.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA
THE HONORABLE RONALD A. WHITE, CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE,
PRESIDING
CASE No. 6:22-CR-00106-RAW

RESPONSE TO UNITED STATES' PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC

JULIA L. O'CONNELL
Federal Public Defender

WHITNEY R. MAULDIN
Asst. Federal Public Defender

JARED T. GUEMMER
Asst. Federal Public Defender

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA
One West 3rd Street, Suite 1225
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103-3532
(918) 581-7656

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT/APPELLANT
Attachments Electronically Filed in Native PDF Format

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ATTACHMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iv
ARGUMENT.....	1
I. Neither this case (nor <i>Ruiz</i>) are appropriate vehicles for resolving this issue because both cases are moot in that the relief sought cannot change the positions of the parties to these cases.....	1
II. Convictions have not been overturned because the <i>Prentiss II</i> burden is too difficult to meet. Instead, the United States has fundamentally failed to conduct even basic investigations or to understand the foundational legal principles underlying the burden that <i>Prentiss II</i> imposes.	2
III. In <i>Smith v. United States</i> , the Supreme Court has already held that the non-Indian status of the victim is an element because it is necessary to the court’s jurisdiction. If the victim’s non-Indian status must be proven, then so must a defendant’s non-Indian status. Moreover, the original <i>Prentiss</i> panel correctly identified the flaws of applying <i>McKelvey</i> ’s approach to statutory interpretation to 18 U.S.C. § 1152.....	7
IV. If this Court believes <i>en banc</i> rehearing is appropriate, it should reconsider the test for Indian status as a whole, not merely which party bears the burden of presenting evidence of status.	11
a. The current test is irredeemably tainted by Chief Justice Taney’s racial animus.....	13

- b. The current test does not respect the sovereignty of Native American tribes to decide which persons are “Indians,” and are therefore considered, by law, to be part of their political and social institutions..... 15
- c. The current test relies upon an analysis that more closely resembles a probability test than a “beyond a reasonable doubt” test..... 17

CONCLUSION 20

CERTIFICATE OF SUBMISSION AND PRIVACY REDACTIONS..... 21

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMIT ... 21

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE..... 22

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Spreadsheet of Section 1152 Convictions in Oklahoma Following *McGirt*

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Federal Cases	
<i>BP America Prod. Co. v. Haaland</i> , 87 F.4th 1226 (10th Cir. 2023)	8
<i>Burks v. United States</i> , 437 U.S. 1 (1978)	1
<i>District of Columbia v. Wesby</i> , 583 U.S. 48 (2018)	17
<i>Dred Scott v. Sandford</i> , 60 U.S. 393 (1857)	12, 14
<i>McGirt v. Oklahoma</i> , 591 U.S. 894 (2020)	6
<i>McKelvey v. United States</i> , 260 U.S. 353 (1922)	8, 9
<i>Morton v. Mancari</i> , 417 U.S. 535 (1974)	11, 16
<i>Smith v. United States</i> , 151 U.S. 50, 53 (1894)	7, 9, 10
<i>United States v. Ahidley</i> , 486 F.3d 1184 (10th Cir. 2007)	3
<i>United States v. Antelope</i> , 430 U.S. 641 (1977)	4, 11, 14, 15, 16
<i>United States v. Diaz</i> , 679 F.3d 1183 (10th Cir. 2012)	18
<i>United States v. Hebert</i> , 159 F.4th 777 (10th Cir. 2025)	1, 4

<i>United States v. Kasie Keys</i> , Case No. 21-CR-332-RAW, CM/ECF No. 235 (E.D. Okla. 2022)	2, 3, 4, 5
<i>United States v. McBratney</i> , 104 U.S. 621 (1881)	9, 10
<i>United States v. Prentiss</i> , 206 F.3d 960 (10th Cir. 2000).....	2, 5, 7, 8, 9
<i>United States v. Prentiss</i> , 256 F.3d 971 (10th Cir. 2001).....	2,
<i>United States v. Prentiss</i> , 273 F.3d 1277 (10th Cir. 2001).....	12, 13
<i>United States v. Rogers</i> , 45 U.S. 567 (1946).....	13, 14
<i>United States v. Ruiz</i> , 164 F.4th 1223 (10th Cir. 2026)	1, 4
<i>United States v. Simpkins</i> , 90 F.4th 1312 (10th Cir. 2024)	2, 3
Federal Statutes	
18 U.S.C. § 7	8
18 U.S.C. § 1152.....	6, 7, 8, 9, 12
18 U.S.C. § 1153.....	12
18 U.S.C. § 1154.....	7

ARGUMENT

- I. Neither this case (nor *Ruiz*) are appropriate vehicles for resolving this issue because both cases are moot in that the relief sought cannot change the positions of the parties to these cases.**

The United States has not claimed that the panel applied the law incorrectly or reached the incorrect outcome under the law; it does not seek reconsideration of the panel's merits decision. Instead, its claim is the law should change moving forward. Even if this Court were to grant the relief sought by the United States, the results of *United States v. Hebert*, 159 F.4th 777 (10th Cir. 2025), and *United States v. Ruiz*, 164 F.4th 1223 (10th Cir. 2026), will not change: The evidence was insufficient as a matter of law (as that law existed at the time of their trials) to support a guilty verdict. A retrial is unavailable to the United States because the Supreme Court has barred retrials following an appellate determination that the evidence was insufficient as to an element of the offense. *See Burks v. United States*, 437 U.S. 1, at 15–18 (1978). Moreover, any change in the law cannot be retroactively applied to the trial record and, therefore, cannot be used to reverse the panel's finding of insufficient evidence. Any ruling otherwise would violate Mr. Hebert's fundamental right to due process, as it would punish him

for conducting his trial on the law as it has existed for more than twenty years. Therefore, the United States' claim for relief is moot, making both this case and *Ruiz* inappropriate vehicles for considering the relief sought.

II. Convictions have not been overturned because the *Prentiss II* burden is too difficult to meet. Instead, the United States has fundamentally failed to conduct even basic investigations or to understand the foundational legal principles underlying the burden that *Prentiss II* imposes.

The United States cites three cases as examples of it losing convictions because of the burden placed upon it by *United States v. Prentiss*, 256 F.3d 971 (10th Cir. 2001) (*Prentiss II*); *United States v. Simpkins*, 90 F.4th 1312 (10th Cir. 2024), *Hebert*, and *Ruiz*. The United States paints a picture that would imply it put forward its best efforts to prove non-Indian status as to these defendants and its convictions were thrown out due to the technicalities of a test it portrays as excessively burdensome. (Pet. For Reh'g, at 2 & 12). But that picture is not the whole story. And Mr. Hebert adds one additional case to the list of those guilty verdicts lost by the United States: *United States v. Kasie Keys*, Case No.

21-CR-332-RAW, CM/ECF No 235 (E.D. Okla. 2022).¹ All four of these cases have something in common.

In *Simpkins*, the prosecutors were wholly oblivious to their obligation to prove the defendant's non-Indian status. 90 F.4th at 1318 (“Indeed, the government completely overlooked this element and introduced *no* evidence of *Simpkins*'s non-Indian status at trial.”). They did not “merely present[] inadequate evidence of the defendant's non-Indian status,” (Pet. For Reh'g, at 2); they failed to present *any* evidence.

In *Keys*, the prosecutors failed to allege Ms. Keys was a non-Indian person, failed to include the element in proposed jury instructions, and failed to recognize the element in trial briefs. See *Keys*, 21-CR-332, CM/ECF No. 235 pgs. 2–3. The prosecutors failed to put forth even a shred of evidence that Ms. Keys was a non-Indian person. *Id.* at CM/ECF Nos. 219, 235, 248. In *Keys*, the United States had the defendant's ex-husband on the stand to speak to his own, and his child's, tribal affiliation, but it never asked him about Ms. Keys's affiliation, nor did it

¹ This Court may take judicial notice of District Court records. *United States v. Ahidley*, 486 F.3d 1184, 1192 n.5 (10th Cir. 2007) (“[W]e may exercise our discretion to take judicial notice of publicly filed records in our court and certain other courts concerning matters that bear directly upon the disposition of the case at hand.”).

ever elicit testimony from investigators about Ms. Keys's tribal affiliations. *Id.*, at CM/ECF No. 235 pgs. 2–3. Instead, the only evidence touching upon Ms. Keys' status demonstrated that she did, in fact, have Native American blood *Id.*

In *Hebert*, the United States relied upon a flawed understanding of the law; it believed that statements regarding racial/ethnic identity were sufficient to prove non-Indian status, *see* 159 F.4th at 781–82, even though the Supreme Court made it clear in *United States v. Antelope* that racial identity is not relevant to a person's Indian status, 430 U.S. 641, 645 (1977). Furthermore, in attempting to prove Mr. Hebert was not a member of a Native American tribe, investigators contacted a mere five tribes out of nearly 600 such tribes, and they had no rational connection to Mr. Hebert, nor were the responses of those tribes disclosed. *Id.* at 789 & n.10.

In *Ruiz*, the prosecution's evidence was even weaker. Two investigators testified; one contacted an Oklahoma tribe regarding the status of the minor victims, but he never asked about Mr. Ruiz's enrollment status. *Ruiz*, 164 F.4th at 1227. Neither offered testimony indicating that their personal interactions with Mr. Ruiz informed them

that he was a non-Indian person. *Id.* at 1227–28. Both investigators apparently relied upon Mr. Ruiz’s birthplace as being Mexico to assume he was a non-Indian. *Id.* at 1228.

The common thread running through these cases is not that the United States made a valiant effort to prove a defendant’s status but fell short because the *Prentiss* test is too demanding. Instead, it is the categorical failures of those tasked with investigating and prosecuting the offenses. The prosecutors in *Simpkins* and *Keys* were oblivious to the non-Indian status element in its entirety, and the prosecutors and investigators in *Hebert* and *Ruiz* bungled the investigation and presentation of evidence to the point that it barely reflects an effort on their part to prove the element. Notably, three of the four cases discussed above were prosecuted by the Eastern District of Oklahoma U.S. Attorney’s Office.

The spreadsheet included as Attachment A to this Response lists those cases filed in Oklahoma district courts, after the decision in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 591 U.S. 894 (2020), that involved charges filed under 18 U.S.C. § 1152, and which resulted in a conviction, either by plea or guilty verdict, on a Section 1152 charge. This spreadsheet shows:

- 397 cases meet the criteria set forth above; NDOK had 263 cases; WDOK had 29 cases; and EDOK had 105 cases
- There were 35 trials that resulted in guilty verdicts; four verdicts were reversed on appeal or by a Rule 29 motion; all four of those cases were prosecuted in the Eastern District of Oklahoma
- Of the EDOK's 105 cases, it failed to allege the defendant's status in its indictment in 65 cases; in contrast, the NDOK cases reveal only five such failures out of 263 cases

One office, in particular, has consistently failed to understand and apply the *Prentiss II* burden. This office's consistent failure to understand the law and to learn from its mistakes should not lead to a sea change in the law of this Circuit that shifts the burden of proof from the United States to the defendants it prosecutes.

III. In *Smith v. United States*, the Supreme Court has already held that the non-Indian status of the victim is an element because it is necessary to the court’s jurisdiction. If the victim’s non-Indian status must be proven, then so must a defendant’s non-Indian status. Moreover, the original *Prentiss* panel correctly identified the flaws of applying *McKelvey*’s approach to statutory interpretation to 18 U.S.C. § 1152.

The Supreme Court has already held that the United States is required to prove, as a matter of jurisdiction, that the victim and defendant had opposing statuses under the predecessor statutes to Section 1152 (today codified at 25 U.S.C. §§ 217–218). In *Smith v. United States*, the Supreme Court stated that the question before it was “whether, Smith being admitted to be a Cherokee Indian . . . the undisputed testimony did not also show Gentry to have been an Indian.” 151 U.S. 50, 53 (1894). It noted, “That Gentry was a white man, and not an Indian, was a fact which the government was bound to establish,” it further stated that this “went to the jurisdiction of the court,” and that the defendant was “entitled, as matter of law, to an acquittal” if the evidence did not prove Gentry’s non-Indian status. *Id.* at 55. If the United States must prove the victim is a non-Indian in Section 1152 cases involving Indian defendants, then the inverse is also necessarily true; the United States must prove the defendant is a non-Indian when it premises

Section 1152 jurisdiction on the victim's status as an Indian. Furthermore, this Court, even in its *en banc* capacity, is without the power to overrule the Supreme Court.

Further, the purpose of statutory interpretation is to divine the intent of Congress in creating the statute. *BP America Prod. Co. v. Haaland*, 87 F.4th 1226, 1234 (10th Cir. 2023). The approach to statutory interpretation discussed in *McKelvey v. United States*, 260 U.S. 353 (1922), is just one more tool available to courts to determine congressional intent. It is not necessarily a hard-and-fast rule.

The *Prentiss I* panel correctly observed, “[w]hen the statutory definition [of the crime] is such that the crime may not be properly described without reference to the exception, then the exception constitutes an essential element of the offense.” *Prentiss I*, 206 F.3d at 973 (citing *United States v. Cook*, 84 U.S. 168, 173–74). *McKelvey* concerns statutes establishing a prohibition and then a separate exception from that prohibition. *See id.* *McKelvey* was not concerned with the interpretation of statutes establishing the existence (and also limiting the reach) of federal jurisdiction. “Because the Indian status of the defendant and victim are indispensable to establishing federal

jurisdiction in this statutory scheme, they must be alleged in the indictment and proven at trial.” *Id.* at 974.

And as a final matter, there is another unique flaw to applying *McKelvey*. If the exception is an affirmative defense, then the *whole exception* is an affirmative defense. Assuming a scenario in which the United States prosecutes a case involving a non-Indian victim under Section 1152, applying the *McKelvey* rule to a defendant’s status means it would not have to prove the defendant is an Indian. In cases such as these, the United States would be under no obligation to prove that any Indian was involved at all. This would run afoul of the Supreme Court’s decision in *United States v. McBratney*, which held federal courts lacked jurisdiction over an offense committed by one non-Indian against another non-Indian in Indian country. 104 U.S. 621, 624 (1881).

On the other hand, if the United States is instead simply required to prove that an Indian is involved, and it alleges the defendant’s status as an Indian, then the defendant is forced to prove the victim’s status, even though that fact “is not uniquely within the defendant’s knowledge,” *Prentiss I*, 206 F.3d at 974, as it would require delving into the historical background of the victim. But this scenario would also undeniably violate

the Supreme Court's ruling in *Smith*, which requires the United States to prove the victim's non-Indian status.

To twist the rule by holding that it only applies to the defendant's status, and then only when the victim is alleged to be an Indian, would not merely bend the rule, it would strain it beyond its breaking point. Instead, the interpretation more in line with congressional intent would be that both statuses are necessary jurisdictional elements to be pleaded and proven beyond a reasonable doubt. Since there must be an Indian involved in the case (under *McBratney*), and Congress has explicitly premised Section 1152 federal jurisdiction on the perpetrator and victim having different statuses, Congress has made it clear that it believes *both* are elements that must be pleaded and proven. The Supreme Court's holding in *Smith* reinforces this conclusion. Therefore, the original *Prentiss I* panel and this *en banc* Court in *Prentiss II* correctly held that the defendant's status is an element to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt in cases brought under 18 U.S.C. § 1152.

IV. If this Court believes *en banc* rehearing is appropriate, it should reconsider the test for Indian status as a whole, not merely which party bears the burden of presenting evidence of status.

In *United States v. Antelope*, the Supreme Court made it clear that it views the regulation of “Indians” as being “rooted in [their] unique status . . . as ‘a separate people’ with their own political institutions.” 430 U.S. at 646. Indian persons are treated differently under federal law, “not as a discrete racial group, but, rather, as members of quasi-sovereign tribal entities.” *Id.* at 645 (quoting *Morton v. Mancari*, 417 U.S. 535, 554 (1974)). As the Supreme Court explained in *Antelope*, “respondents were not subjected to federal criminal jurisdiction because they are of the Indian race, but because they are enrolled members of the Coeur d’Alene Tribe.” *Id.* at 646. While the Supreme Court explicitly declined to explore whether tribal membership is, or should be, the sole standard for Indian status, it declined to reach that matter because the defendants’ status was not in question. *Id.* at 646 n.7. Mr. Hebert asks this Court to engage in precisely that analysis if it chooses to grant rehearing *en banc* in this case. Specifically, the test should be reduced to one factual inquiry: Was the individual an enrolled member of a federally-recognized Native American tribe at the time of the charged offense conduct?

Currently, this Court’s test to determine if a person is an “Indian” for purposes of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1152 and 1153 consists of two parts: Blood Quantum and Recognition. *United States v. Prentiss*, 273 F.3d 1277, 1280 (10th Cir. 2001) (*Prentiss III*). The recognition prong is typically resolved by looking to non-exclusive factors that include: “(1) enrollment in a tribe, (2) provision of government assistance reserved only for Indians, (3) enjoying the benefits of tribal affiliation, and (4) social recognition as an Indian through living on a reservation and participating in Indian social life.” This test is flawed for multiple reasons.

First, the test traces its origins to an opinion written by the same man who authored the decision in *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 60 U.S. 393 (1857). The racial animus that drove the decision in *Dred Scott* is apparent in the rationale of the opinion that gives rise to our modern test for Indian status.

Second, this test infringes upon the sovereignty of tribes to determine who among them are members of their political institutions and therefore subject to the treatment reserved for those who are members of quasi-sovereign tribal entities.

And third, the test is highly subjective and capable of conflicting and inconsistent outcomes depending on the jury and the nature of the evidence presented. The wishy-washy nature of the test creates the possibility of strange outcomes divorced from the fundamental legal objectives that lead to Indians being regulated separately from non-Indians.

a. The current test is irredeemably tainted by Chief Justice Taney’s racial animus.

The modern test for Indian status traces its origins to an opinion, *see Prentiss III*, 273 F.3d at 1280, written by the same man who authored the judicial opinion representing one of the greatest failures in this Nation’s judicial history: Chief Justice Roger Taney. In *United States v. Rogers*, Chief Justice Taney said:

And we think it very clear, that a white man who at mature age is adopted in an Indian tribe does not thereby become an Indian, and was not intended to be embraced in the exception above mentioned. He may by such adoption become entitled to certain privileges in the tribe, and make himself amenable to their laws and usages. Yet he is not an Indian; and the exception is confined to those who by the usages and customs of the Indians are regarded as belonging to their race. It does not speak of members of a tribe, but of the race generally,—of the family of Indians. . . .

45 U.S. 567, 572–73 (1946). Chief Justice Taney concluded by stating: “Whatever obligations the prisoner may have taken upon himself by becoming a Cherokee by adoption, his responsibility to the laws of the United States remained unchanged and undiminished. He was still a white man, of the white race, and therefore not within the exception in the act of Congress.” *Id.* at 573.

It would not at all be appropriate to say that every opinion authored by Chief Justice Taney is suspect simply because he authored the *Dred Scott* decision. But it would be fair to say that any opinion authored by him that was supported, in whole or in part, by his racial views is inherently flawed precisely because of his role in the *Dred Scott* decision. Continuing to adopt the *Rogers* analysis as the foundation of our modern Indian country jurisprudence gives credence to the racist views of Chief Justice Taney, and it allows his hand to influence this Nation’s continued relationships with the people it drove from their ancestral lands and placed on reservations.

Moreover, Chief Justice Taney’s rationales have been effectively overridden by the Supreme Court through its decision in *Antelope*; it is not race that decides whether a person is an Indian, it is their

membership with the tribal entity that sets Indian persons apart from everyone else. 430 U.S. at 645–46.

b. The current test does not respect the sovereignty of Native American tribes to decide which persons are “Indians,” and are therefore considered, by law, to be part of their political and social institutions.

If the different treatment of Indians is “rooted in [their] unique status . . . as ‘a separate people’ with their own political institutions,” *Antelope*, 430 U.S. at 646, then any a rule defining who is an Indian should respect the right of those sovereign tribal entities to decide who is among their “separate people.” The current test fails to do that.

Where a person is enrolled in a federally-recognized tribe, that fact is determinative of recognition, but not of Indian status because of the blood quantum requirement. So even those individuals that tribes have actively declared members of their sovereign political institutions, under the current test, may be declared by courts to not be Indians for purposes of federal prosecution. This is particularly pronounced with respect to the Freedmen of various tribes.

And where a person is not enrolled, and a tribe has perhaps rejected their application for enrollment, that person may still be declared an Indian by the courts (and therefore treated differently than non-Indians),

if a jury decides that a person has been recognized as an Indian through other mechanisms, some as vague as attending powwows and living on a reservation.² Many forms of recognition, as set forth in the current test, do not rely on the intentional decision of a tribe and person to affiliate with one another in a formal sense; instead, they often derive from nothing more than the fact that a parent or grandparent is a tribal member. Where recognition is rooted in mere genealogical relation to a tribal member, recognition begins to look a lot like a racial classification rather than treating individuals differently “as members of quasi-sovereign tribal entities.” *Id.* at 645 (quoting *Morton*, 417 U.S. at 554). By making the test focused solely on enrollment, the test will respect the rights of sovereign Native American tribes to decide for themselves whom they have formally affiliated with and welcomed into their political institutions.

Moreover, the current test also rejects the right of individuals to choose whether to affiliate with the sovereign in a formal manner, and it essentially forces Indian status, at the discretion of the jury, upon

² It should be noted that many tribal events are open to the public, and those not affiliated with the tribe may nonetheless be welcome to participate in the ceremonies or festivities.

someone who has previously benefitted from their tribal ancestry even if they have consciously rejected membership with a tribe. Similarly, parents who have made the decision to not enroll their child with the tribe may have the status of Indian forced upon their child just because they chose to utilize services available to them as parents.

c. The current test relies upon an analysis that more closely resembles a probability test than a “beyond a reasonable doubt” test.

The Supreme Court has explained that “probable cause deals with probabilities and depends on the totality of the circumstances,” and that “it is a fluid concept that is not readily or even usefully, reduced to a neat set of legal rules.” *District of Columbia v. Wesby*, 583 U.S. 48, 57 (2018) (internal quotation marks omitted).

In this Circuit, the test for recognition as an Indian relies upon a multi-factor, “totality-of-the-evidence” approach that typically considers enrollment, receipt of federal benefits, receipt of tribal benefits, and social recognition. *See United States v. Diaz*, 679 F.3d 1183, 1187 (10th Cir. 2012). At the outset, this sounds like a probability test instead of a beyond a reasonable doubt test.

The recognition test is inherently fluid. Problematically, it depends on the legal significance a jury attaches to any given factual finding. What significance should a jury attribute to its determination that an individual went to Indian hospitals as a child, but that person is now in their thirties, forties, or fifties? Should attendance at powwows and participation in tribal ceremonies count toward recognition just as strongly as receipt of federal benefits? What weight should a jury give to the benefits someone receives solely because their parent is an enrolled tribal member, and that same person has consciously declined to enroll because they do not want to join the tribe? What if parents have chosen to not enroll their child in a tribe, but they have sought tribal benefits available to them as parents? Does this force Indian status upon the child, seemingly against the wishes of the parents? Does a person's recognition, and therefore their Indian status, wax and wane over time?

Additionally, two different juries could hear the exact same evidence, and reach the exact same conclusions as to the facts that the evidence proves and still reach different conclusions about the legal status of an individual because they have prescribed different degrees of significance to the factors. The current test does not ask the jury to decide

if a person did receive benefits or attend tribal ceremonies; it asks the jury to weigh the significance of the benefits received or of attendance at tribal ceremonies. The ultimate question to be resolved is one of legal status. The best way to achieve this is to reduce the analysis to one simple question: Is the individual an enrolled member of a federally-recognized Native American tribe?

CONCLUSION

This Court should deny the United States' Petition for Rehearing *En Banc*. However, if it chooses to grant rehearing, Mr. Hebert respectfully requests this Court include, as an issue for *en banc* review, whether the test for Indian status should consider only enrollment in a federally-recognized Native American tribe.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia L. O'Connell, Federal Public Defender

s/ Jared T. Guemmer

Jared T. Guemmer

Assistant Federal Public Defender

Mo. Bar. No. 69109

Office of the Federal Public Defender

Northern District of Oklahoma

1 West Third Street, Ste. 1225

Tulsa, OK 74104

(918) 571-7656 / Fax (918) 581-7630

Counsel for Defendant/Appellee

**CERTIFICATE OF DIGITAL SUBMISSION AND PRIVACY
REDACTION**

I hereby certify that the digital version of this brief and attachment is an exact copy of any paper copy required to be submitted to the court. It has been scanned by the most recent version of Apex One Security Agent and according to the program is free of viruses. All required privacy redactions have been made.

s/ Jared T. Guemmer

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMIT

1. This document complies with the type-volume limitations of Fed. R. App. P. 40 because, excluding the parts of the document exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f), it contains 3885 words.

2. This document complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because it has been prepared in proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in 14 point Century Schoolbook.

Date: March 16, 2026

s/ Jared T. Guemmer

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 16th day of March, 2026, I electronically filed this Response, with attachments, in the Tenth Circuit using the ECF System, which transmitted a Notice of Docket Activity to the following ECF registrant: Linda Epperley, Assistant United States Attorney, counsel for Plaintiff/Appellant.

s/ Jared T. Guemmer

Attachment A

Spreadsheet of Section 1152 Convictions in Oklahoma Following *McGirt*

District	Case No.	Name	Charge	Defendant Status	Plea or Trial
1 oknd	4:20-cr-00103	Landry	18 U.S.C. 1112	Non-Indian	Plea
2 oknd	4:20-cr-00123	Kemp	18 U.S.C. 1111(a)	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
3 oknd	4:20-cr-00128	Chotinikorn	18 U.S.C. 13 (47 O.S. 4-103)	Unalleged (Indian Victim)	Plea
4 oknd	4:20-cr-00137	Barton	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 644(C))	Non-Indian	Plea
5 oknd	4:20-cr-00141	Dennis	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5(C)) (2 counts)	Non-Indian	Plea
6 oknd	4:20-cr-00149	Woodruff, Jr	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1438(B))	Indian	Plea
7 oknd	4:20-cr-00153	Attocknie	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 540A(A) and (B))	Indian	Plea
8 oknd	4:20-cr-00166	Markwardt	18 U.S.C. 113(a)(4) (2 counts)	Indian	Plea
9 oknd	4:20-cr-00168	Kratz	18 U.S.C. 113(a)(6)	Non-Indian	Plea
10 oknd	4:20-cr-00175	Irons	18 U.S.C. 1112	Non-Indian	Plea
11 oknd	4:20-cr-00181	Goodin	18 U.S.C. 2244(a)(5)	Non-Indian	Plea
12 oknd	4:20-cr-00196	Morrison	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5(A)) (2 counts)	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
13 oknd	4:20-cr-00198	Presley	18 U.S.C. 113(a)(5)	Non-Indian	Plea
14 oknd	4:20-cr-00199	Prouty	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1021(A)(1))	Indian	Plea
15 oknd	4:20-cr-00202	Thurairajah	18 U.S.C. 13(a)(5)	Non-Indian	Plea
16 oknd	4:20-cr-00203	Hardiman	18 U.S.C. 1112	Non-Indian	Plea
17 oknd	4:20-cr-00215	McClain	18 U.S.C. 113(a)(7)	Non-Indian	Plea
18 oknd	4:20-cr-00217	Patterson	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1438(B) and 1760(A)(1))	Indian	Plea
19 oknd	4:20-cr-00219	Price	18 U.S.C. 2261A	Non-Indian	Plea
20 oknd	4:20-cr-00222	Sanders	18 U.S.C. 1201(a)(2)	Non-Indian	Plea
21 oknd	4:20-cr-00237	Ortner, Jr	18 U.S.C. 2243(a) and 2244(b)(3)	Unalleged (Indian Victim)	Trial - Guilty
22 oknd	4:20-cr-00246	Peterson	18 U.S.C. 2244(a)(5)	Non-Indian	Plea
23 oknd	4:20-cr-00252	Proctor	18 U.S.C. 113(a)	Non-Indian	Plea
24 oknd	4:20-cr-00253	Timmons	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1435 and 1436)	Indian	Plea
25 oknd	4:20-cr-00259	McGhee	18 U.S.C. 113(a)(8) and 13 (21 O.S. 1431 and 1436)	Non-Indian	Plea
26 oknd	4:20-cr-00261	Wilde	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1289.11 and 1289.15)	Indian	Plea
27 oknd	4:20-cr-00262	McCombs et al	18 U.S.C. 2, 13, and 2111	Indian	Plea
28 oknd	4:20-cr-00264	Keahbone	18 U.S.C. 13 and 113(a)(3) (21 O.S. 843.5(A))	Non-Indian	Plea
29 oknd	4:20-cr-00265	Marcantel	18 U.S.C. 113(a)(6)	Non-Indian	Plea
30 oknd	4:20-cr-00286	Cabrera-Westerheidy	18 U.S.C. 2244	Non-Indian	Plea
31 oknd	4:20-cr-00295	Youtsey	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
32 oknd	4:20-cr-00306	Deshawn Patrick, et al	18 U.S.C. 2111 and 2	Unalleged (Indian Victim)	Plea
33 oknd	4:20-cr-00311	Khan	18 U.S.C. 2244(b)	Non-Indian	Plea
34 oknd	4:20-cr-00314	Wright	18 U.S.C. 661	Non-Indian	Plea
35 oknd	4:20-cr-00323	Lara	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1438(B))	Non-Indian	Plea
36 oknd	4:20-cr-00324	Hernandez	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Plea
37 oknd	4:20-cr-00328	Gardner, et al	18 U.S.C. 2111 and 2	Non-Indian	Plea
38 oknd	4:20-cr-00332	Gingras et al	18 U.S.C. 113 and 2	Non-Indian	Plea
39 oknd	4:21-cr-00001	Nichols	18 U.S.C. 13 and 2 (21 O.S. 1431 and 1436)	Non-Indian	Plea
40 oknd	4:21-cr-00021	Stith et al (Ackerson)	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Plea
41 oknd	4:21-cr-00033	McCarthy	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 652)	Indian	Plea
42 oknd	4:21-cr-00039	Mason	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1787)	Non-Indian	Plea
43 oknd	4:21-cr-00047	Moore	18 U.S.C. 13 and 21 O.S. 1123	Indian	Plea
44 oknd	4:21-cr-00054	Searle	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
45 oknd	4:21-cr-00060	Wiggins	18 U.S.C. 661	Unalleged (Indian Victim)	Plea

46 oknd	4:21-cr-00066	Goodbar	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
47 oknd	4:21-cr-00073	Byrd	18 U.S.C. 1801	Indian	Plea
48 oknd	4:21-cr-00078	Wilson	18 U.S.C. 113 and 13 (21 O.S. 843.5(A))	Non-Indian	Plea
49 oknd	4:21-cr-00079	Young	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5(A))	Non-Indian	Plea
50 oknd	4:21-cr-00091	Bowman et al	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Indian	Plea
51 oknd	4:21-cr-00096	Armijo, Jr	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
52 oknd	4:21-cr-00104	Williams	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Plea
53 oknd	4:21-cr-00107	Mize	18 U.S.C. 1112	Non-Indian	Plea
54 oknd	4:21-cr-00119	Starks	18 U.S.C. 1112	Non-Indian	Plea
55 oknd	4:21-cr-00127	Harris	18 U.S.C. 2111	Non-Indian	Plea
56 oknd	4:21-cr-00128	Hood	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1435)	Non-Indian	Plea
57 oknd	4:21-cr-00130	Miller	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
58 oknd	4:21-cr-00145	Myers	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
59 oknd	4:21-cr-00146	Pointer	18 U.S.C. 1201(a)(2)	Non-Indian	Plea
60 oknd	4:21-cr-00151	Murphy	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Plea
61 oknd	4:21-cr-00153	Hemphill	18 U.S.C. 1112(a)	Non-Indian	Plea
62 oknd	4:21-cr-00156	Summers et al	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
63 oknd	4:21-cr-00160	Haas	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
64 oknd	4:21-cr-00161	McBride	18 U.S.C. 1112	Non-Indian	Plea
65 oknd	4:21-cr-00174	Morrow et al	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
66 oknd	4:21-cr-00182	Williams	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
67 oknd	4:21-cr-00188	Weeks	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
68 oknd	4:21-cr-00195	Botonis	18 U.S.C. 2244	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
69 oknd	4:21-cr-00205	Ramsey, et al. (Ramsey)	18 U.S.C. 113 and 2	Non-Indian	Plea
70 oknd	4:21-cr-00205	Ramsey, et al. (Thomison)	18 U.S.C. 113 and 2	Non-Indian	Plea
71 oknd	4:21-cr-00205	Ramsey, et al. (Brayboy)	18 U.S.C. 113 and 2	Non-Indian	Plea
72 oknd	4:21-cr-00216	Martin	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
73 oknd	4:21-cr-00217	Pearson	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
74 oknd	4:21-cr-00218	Armentor	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
75 oknd	4:21-cr-00219	Estrada	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
76 oknd	4:21-cr-00225	Smith	18 U.S.C. 113 and 13 (21 O.S. 1431 and 1436)	Non-Indian	Plea
77 oknd	4:21-cr-00228	Dana	18 U.S.C. 2422(b)	Non-Indian	Plea
78 oknd	4:21-cr-00233	Blount et al (Hobbs)	18 U.S.C. 2111, 2 , and 1111	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
79 oknd	4:21-cr-00258	Arnold et al (Arnold)	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Plea
80 oknd	4:21-cr-00273	Witte	18 U.S.C. 2244, 2243, and 2246	Non-Indian	Plea
81 oknd	4:21-cr-00279	Garrison	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
82 oknd	4:21-cr-00286	Ciccone	21 O.S. 1438	Indian	Plea
83 oknd	4:21-cr-00294	Polk	18 U.S.C 13 (46 O.S. 11-904(B) and 10-103)	Indian	Plea
84 oknd	4:21-cr-00296	Brooks	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
85 oknd	4:21-cr-00297	Dufoe	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1438)	Non-Indian	Plea
86 oknd	4:21-cr-00298	Morris Pettie	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
87 oknd	4:21-cr-00305	Myall	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
88 oknd	4:21-cr-00306	White	18 U.S.C. 2243	Non-Indian	Plea
89 oknd	4:21-cr-00308	Chivers, Jr.	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
90 oknd	4:21-cr-00309	Russell	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea

91 oknd	4:21-cr-00327	Trammell	18 U.S.C. 661	Non-Indian	Plea
92 oknd	4:21-cr-00328	Guinn	18 U.S.C. 113 and 2241	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
93 oknd	4:21-cr-00336	Beauchamp	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
94 oknd	4:21-cr-00338	Deleon	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
95 oknd	4:21-cr-00372	Jackson	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
96 oknd	4:21-cr-00374	Walker	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
97 oknd	4:21-cr-00376	Pierce	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
98 oknd	4:21-cr-00382	Puffinbarger	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Plea
99 oknd	4:21-cr-00395	Cone	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
100 oknd	4:21-cr-00396	Dement et al (Dement)	18 U.S.C. 13 and 2 (21 O.S. 1431 and 1436)	Non-Indian	Plea
101 oknd	4:21-cr-00396	Dement et al	18 U.S.C. 13 and 2 (21 O.S. 1431 and 1436)	Non-Indian	Plea
102 oknd	4:21-cr-00397	Gonzalis	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
103 oknd	4:21-cr-00400	Johnson	18 U.S.C. 662	Indian	Plea
104 oknd	4:21-cr-00401	Simon	18 U.S.C. 1201(a)(2)	Non-Indian	Plea
105 oknd	4:21-cr-00403	Dacosta	18 U.S.C. 2243	Non-Indian	Plea
106 oknd	4:21-cr-00406	Dixon	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
107 oknd	4:21-cr-00410	Vanderburg et al (Vanderberg)	18 U.S.C. 2241	Non-Indian	Plea
108 oknd	4:21-cr-00410	Vanderburg et al (Krick)	18 U.S.C. 2244	Non-Indian	Plea
109 oknd	4:21-cr-00416	DiCristofaro	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
110 oknd	4:21-cr-00418	Ennis	18 U.S.C. 2243	Non-Indian	Plea
111 oknd	4:21-cr-00419	Koloff	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Trial - Guilty
112 oknd	4:21-cr-00431	Williams	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
113 oknd	4:21-cr-00433	Bell	18 U.S.C. 2242	Non-Indian	Plea
114 oknd	4:21-cr-00441	Vallejo-Rivera	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
115 oknd	4:21-cr-00445	Crites	18 U.S.C. 2243	Non-Indian	Plea
116 oknd	4:21-cr-00454	Conn	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
117 oknd	4:21-cr-00459	Wood	18 U.S.C. 2243	Non-Indian	Plea
118 oknd	4:21-cr-00461	Fisher	18 U.S.C. 13 and 662	Non-Indian	Plea
119 oknd	4:21-cr-00469	Simpson	18 U.S.C. 2242 and 2244	Non-Indian	Plea
120 oknd	4:21-cr-00472	Martinez	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
121 oknd	4:21-cr-00475	Gregory	18 U.S.C. 662	Indian	Plea
122 oknd	4:21-cr-00478	Perales-Sanchez	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
123 oknd	4:21-cr-00481	Hudson	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1435 and 1436)	Non-Indian	Plea
124 oknd	4:21-cr-00482	Jordan et al (Jordan)	18 U.S.C. 661	Non-Indian	Plea
125 oknd	4:21-cr-00482	Jordan et al (Parmley)	18 U.S.C. 661	Non-Indian	Plea
126 oknd	4:21-cr-00483	Smith	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1435 and 1436)	Indian	Plea
127 oknd	4:21-cr-00486	Johnson	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Plea
128 oknd	4:21-cr-00491	Stevens	18 U.S.C. 1112 and 13 (47 O.S. 10-102.1)	Indian	Plea
129 oknd	4:21-cr-00505	Pugh	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
130 oknd	4:21-cr-00508	Blizzard	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
131 oknd	4:21-cr-00510	Long	18 U.S.C. 2244(a)(3)	Non-Indian	Plea
132 oknd	4:21-cr-00519	Burton	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 540)	Indian	Plea
133 oknd	4:21-cr-00525	Limose	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Plea
134 oknd	4:21-cr-00526	Biglow	18 U.S.C. 113 and 1201	Non-Indian	Plea
135 oknd	4:21-cr-00535	Doyle	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea

136 oknd	4:21-cr-00539	Johnson	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
137 oknd	4:21-cr-00541	Zofi	18 U.S.C. 2241	Non-Indian	Plea
138 oknd	4:21-cr-00548	Murray	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
139 oknd	4:21-cr-00550	Rose	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
140 oknd	4:21-cr-00552	Singleton	18 U.S.C. 2111	Non-Indian	Plea
141 oknd	4:21-cr-00553	Smith et al (Amanda Smith)	18 U.S.C. 13 and 2 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
142 oknd	4:22-cr-00003	Crowels et al (Bowdler)	18 U.S.C. 2111 and 2	Non-Indian	Plea
143 oknd	4:22-cr-00006	Stotesbury	18 U.S.C. 1201	Non-Indian	Plea
144 oknd	4:22-cr-00007	Sutton	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
145 oknd	4:22-cr-00008	West	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
146 oknd	4:22-cr-00011	Snow	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
147 oknd	4:22-cr-00015	English	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
148 oknd	4:22-cr-00021	Cruz	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1435 and 1436)	Non-Indian	Plea
149 oknd	4:22-cr-00022	Ellis	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Plea
150 oknd	4:22-cr-00025	Johannesen	18 U.S.C. 2244	Non-Indian	Plea
151 oknd	4:22-cr-00028	Holt	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
152 oknd	4:22-cr-00039	Hudgins	18 U.S.C. 1111	unalleged (Indian Victim)	Plea
153 oknd	4:22-cr-00048	Cook	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
154 oknd	4:22-cr-00057	Banks	18 U.S.C. 661	Non-Indian	Plea
155 oknd	4:22-cr-00060	Davis	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
156 oknd	4:22-cr-00064	Campus	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
157 oknd	4:22-cr-00065	Nadolny	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1431 and 1436)	Non-Indian	Plea
158 oknd	4:22-cr-00069	Bates	18 U.S.C. 81	Non-Indian	Plea
159 oknd	4:22-cr-00070	Collins	18 U.S.C. 2111	Non-Indian	Plea
160 oknd	4:22-cr-00077	Bowlds III	18 U.S.C. 113 and 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
161 oknd	4:22-cr-00083	Matlock	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
162 oknd	4:22-cr-00086	Thompson	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1438)	Non-Indian	Plea
163 oknd	4:22-cr-00095	Roberts	18 U.S.C. 113 and 1363	Indian	Plea
164 oknd	4:22-cr-00098	Holt	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
165 oknd	4:22-cr-00103	Hopkins	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1431, 1435 and 1436)	Non-Indian	Plea
166 oknd	4:22-cr-00106	Parker	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
167 oknd	4:22-cr-00109	Withrow	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
168 oknd	4:22-cr-00118	Thompson	18 U.S.C. 2241	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
169 oknd	4:22-cr-00125	Bringinggood	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1438 and 42)	Indian	Plea
170 oknd	4:22-cr-00127	Sullivan	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
171 oknd	4:22-cr-00137	Williams et al (Williams)	18 U.S.C. 661	Non-Indian	Plea
172 oknd	4:22-cr-00137	Williams et al (Green)	18 U.S.C. 661	Non-Indian	Plea
173 oknd	4:22-cr-00141	Ragster	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
174 oknd	4:22-cr-00144	Clark	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
175 oknd	4:22-cr-00145	Brashers	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
176 oknd	4:22-cr-00148	Phillippe	18 U.S.C. 2244	Non-Indian	Plea
177 oknd	4:22-cr-00150	Crane	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1760)	Indian	Plea
178 oknd	4:22-cr-00157	Henshall	18 U.S.C. 2243, 2241, and 13 (21 O.S. 885)	Non-Indian	Plea
179 oknd	4:22-cr-00159	Berry	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
180 oknd	4:22-cr-00164	Chavez-Danillo	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea

181 oknd	4:22-cr-00172	Lazenby	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
182 oknd	4:22-cr-00177	Mosby	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
183 oknd	4:22-cr-00180	Gann	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1438)	Non-Indian	Plea
184 oknd	4:22-cr-00182	Morton	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
185 oknd	4:22-cr-00183	Gilliam	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
186 oknd	4:22-cr-00184	Hodges	18 U.S.C. 662	Indian	Plea
187 oknd	4:22-cr-00186	Laskey	18 U.S.C. 113 (x3)	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
188 oknd	4:22-cr-00192	Fairchild	18 U.S.C. 2242	Non-Indian	Plea
189 oknd	4:22-cr-00195	Ortiz-Hernandez	18 U.S.C. 2422(b)	Non-Indian	Plea
190 oknd	4:22-cr-00205	Wagener	18 U.S.C. 661	Non-Indian	Plea
191 oknd	4:22-cr-00206	Willis	18 U.S.C. 1201	Non-Indian	Plea
192 oknd	4:22-cr-00211	Harper	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
193 oknd	4:22-cr-00215	Paycer	18 U.S.C. 2241 and 2244	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
194 oknd	4:22-cr-00216	Solis	18 U.S.C. 14 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
195 oknd	4:22-cr-00236	Schulze et al (Schulze)	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
196 oknd	4:22-cr-00255	Jordan	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 540A)	Indian	Plea
197 oknd	4:22-cr-00271	Nickols	18 U.S.C. 2241	Non-Indian	Plea
198 oknd	4:22-cr-00283	Morales	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
199 oknd	4:22-cr-00285	Brandon	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
200 oknd	4:22-cr-00287	Horn	18 U.S.C. 2244	Non-Indian	Plea
201 oknd	4:22-cr-00288	Wells	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
202 oknd	4:22-cr-00289	Woolman	18 U.S.C. 113 and 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
203 oknd	4:22-cr-00312	Williams	18 U.S.C. 662	Indian	Plea
204 oknd	4:22-cr-00313	Ragsdale	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
205 oknd	4:22-cr-00322	Caraballo	18 U.S.C. 2243	Non-Indian	Plea
206 oknd	4:22-cr-00326	Standridge	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
207 oknd	4:22-cr-00327	Martinez	18 U.S.C. 2422 and 2244	Non-Indian	Plea
208 oknd	4:22-cr-00331	Rector	18 U.S.C. 113 and 2243	Non-Indian	Plea
209 oknd	4:22-cr-00332	Barnett	18 U.S.C. 13 (47 O.S. 10-102 and 11-902)	Indian	Plea
210 oknd	4:22-cr-00335	Atwell	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
211 oknd	4:22-cr-00341	McDonald	18 U.S.C. 2241	Non-Indian	Plea
212 oknd	4:22-cr-00378	Burns et al	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
213 oknd	4:22-cr-00390	Black	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
214 oknd	4:22-cr-00397	Gillis	18 U.S.C. 2244	Non-Indian	Plea
215 oknd	4:22-cr-00408	Patton	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
216 oknd	4:22-cr-00414	Koloff	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 21-504(A))	Indian	Plea
217 oknd	4:23-cr-00012	Coffee	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 540(A))	Indian	Plea
218 oknd	4:23-cr-00068	Smith	18 U.S.C. 1363	Indian	Plea
219 oknd	4:23-cr-00071	Gray	21 O.S. 540A	Indian	Plea
220 oknd	4:23-cr-00072	Williams	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
221 oknd	4:23-cr-00091	Bynum et al (Gossett)	18 U.S.C. 2244 and 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
222 oknd	4:23-cr-00115	Copeland	18 U.S.C. 13	Indian	Plea
223 oknd	4:23-cr-00134	Brown	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
224 oknd	4:23-cr-00142	Gregory	18 U.S.C. 113 and 1112	Non-Indian	Plea
225 oknd	4:23-cr-00161	Thompson	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea

226 oknd	4:23-cr-00162	Moore	18 U.S.C. 2422	Indian	Plea
227 oknd	4:23-cr-00164	Burk	21 O.S. 1438	Indian	Plea
228 oknd	4:23-cr-00177	Vang	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
229 oknd	4:23-cr-00182	Andrews	18 U.S.C. 2244	Non-Indian	Plea
230 oknd	4:23-cr-00227	Gonzales	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1438)	Indian	Plea
231 oknd	4:23-cr-00239	Jones	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
232 oknd	4:23-cr-00242	Stark	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
233 oknd	4:23-cr-00276	Burris et al	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
234 oknd	4:23-cr-00278	Hindman	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1289.17A)	Indian	Plea
235 oknd	4:23-cr-00286	Smallwood	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
236 oknd	4:23-cr-00303	Forrester	18 U.S.C. 1363	Indian	Plea
237 oknd	4:23-cr-00332	Bear	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
238 oknd	4:23-cr-00354	Sanders	18 U.S.C. 2243 and 2244	Non-Indian	Plea
239 oknd	4:23-cr-00367	Vallejo-Rivera	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
240 oknd	4:23-cr-00388	Perez et al (Bernal-Perez)	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
241 oknd	4:24-cr-00023	Arthur	18 U.S.C. 81	Non-Indian	Plea
242 oknd	4:24-cr-00044	Foreman	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1435 and 1436) (x7)	Indian	Plea
243 oknd	4:24-cr-00081	King	18 U.S.C. 2241 and 2244	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
244 oknd	4:24-cr-00087	Hellard	18 U.S.C. 1363	Indian	Plea
245 oknd	4:24-cr-00088	McCord	18 U.S.C. 12 (21 O.S. 540A)	Indian	Plea
246 oknd	4:24-cr-00129	Tate	18 U.S.C. 13 (47 O.S. 10-102)	Indian	Plea
247 oknd	4:24-cr-00167	Hogan	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
248 oknd	4:24-cr-00175	De La Cruz Rodriguez	18 U.S.C. 2243	Non-Indian	Plea
249 oknd	4:24-cr-00176	Gutierrez	18 U.S.C. 1363	Indian	Plea
250 oknd	4:24-cr-00180	Martin	18 U.S.C. 2244	Non-Indian	Plea
251 oknd	4:24-cr-00191	Warrior	18 U.S.C. 662	Indian	Plea
252 oknd	4:24-cr-00210	Campbell	18 U.S.C. 2243	Non-Indian	Plea
253 oknd	4:24-cr-00259	Creek	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
254 oknd	4:24-cr-00308	Bear	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
255 oknd	4:24-cr-00377	Carson	18 U.S.C. 2243	Non-Indian	Plea
256 oknd	4:24-cr-00394	Enyart et al (Barger-Enyart)	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
257 oknd	4:25-cr-00017	Locke, Jr	18 U.S.C. 2243 and 2244	Non-Indian	Plea
258 oknd	4:25-cr-00033	Torres	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
259 oknd	4:25-cr-00076	Foster	18 U.S.C. 1363	Indian	Plea
260 oknd	4:25-cr-00084	Harris	18 U.S.C. 2243	Non-Indian	Plea
261 oknd	4:25-cr-00100	Wagener	18 U.S.C. 661	Non-Indian	Plea
262 oknd	4:25-cr-00113	Frierson	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
263 oknd	4:25-cr-00167	Griffin	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
264 okwd	5:20-cr-00268	Gibson	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
265 okwd	5:21-cr-00115	Stowers	18 U.S.C. 2243	Non-Indian	Plea
266 okwd	5:21-cr-00131	Flores	18 U.S.C. 13 (47 O.S. 11-902)	Indian	Plea
267 okwd	5:21-cr-00143	Ross	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 852.1 and 11-902)	Indian	Plea
268 okwd	5:21-cr-00148	Anderson	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
269 okwd	5:21-cr-00167	Robinson	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
270 okwd	5:21-cr-00178	Leonhart	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 852.1 and 11-902)	Indian	Plea

271 okwd	5:21-cr-00263	Bookman	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
272 okwd	5:21-cr-00269	Bumpass	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
273 okwd	5:21-cr-00290	Kendall	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
274 okwd	5:21-cr-00292	Jordan	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
275 okwd	5:21-cr-00295	Earls	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
276 okwd	5:21-cr-00307	Patchell	18 U.S.C. 1112	Non-Indian	Plea
277 okwd	5:21-cr-00351	Mayes	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 540A)	Indian	Plea
278 okwd	5:22-cr-00183	Bunch et al (Bunch)	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
279 okwd	5:22-cr-00183	Bunch et al (Myers)	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
280 okwd	5:22-cr-00200	Wilkinson	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1435)	Non-Indian	Plea
281 okwd	5:22-cr-00207	Jones	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
282 okwd	5:22-cr-00229	Daniel	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1123)	Non-Indian	Plea
283 okwd	5:22-cr-00231	Martin	18 U.S.C. 13 (47 O.S. 4-102)	Non-Indian	Plea
284 okwd	5:22-cr-00250	Griffitts	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1787)	Indian	Plea
285 okwd	5:22-cr-00295	Bailey, II	18 U.S.C. 13 (47 O.S. 11-902)	Indian	Plea
286 okwd	5:22-cr-00433	Ruiz	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 540A)	Indian	Plea
287 okwd	5:22-cr-00452	Joe	18 U.S.C. 13 (47 O.S. 4-102)	Indian	Plea
288 okwd	5:23-cr-00118	Knight	18 U.S.C. 661	Indian	Plea
289 okwd	5:23-cr-00134	Fullbright	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
290 okwd	5:23-cr-00438	Semien et al	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Plea
291 okwd	5:24-cr-00153	Story	18 U.S.C. 662	Indian	Plea
292 okwd	5:24-cr-00328	Phillips	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 540A)	Indian	Plea
293 oked	6:20-cr-00059	Clark	18 U.S.C. 13 (47 O.S. 11-904)	Indian	Plea
294 oked	6:20-cr-00076	Edwards et al (Edwards)	18 U.S.C. 2111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
295 oked	6:20-cr-00076	Edwards et al (Jones)	18 U.S.C. 2111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
296 oked	6:20-cr-00076	Edwards et al (Key)	18 U.S.C. 2111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
297 oked	6:20-cr-00076	Edwards et al (Williams)	18 U.S.C. 2111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
298 oked	6:20-cr-00101	Stone	18 U.S.C. 2243 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
299 oked	6:20-cr-00104	Fields	18 U.S.C. 113	Indian	Plea
300 oked	6:20-cr-00105	Townsley et al	18 U.S.C. 2242 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
301 oked	6:20-cr-00107	Gittens	18 U.S.C. 113	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
302 oked	6:20-cr-00111	Hall	18 U.S.C. 1111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
303 oked	6:20-cr-00118	Elliott	18 U.S.C. 1112	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
304 oked	6:20-cr-00122	Meyer	18 U.S.C. 113	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
305 oked	6:20-cr-00125	Gonzales, et al.	18 U.S.C. 13 and 2 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
306 oked	6:20-cr-00134	Jackson	18 U.S.C. 1111 and 2111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Trial - Guilty
307 oked	6:20-cr-00144	Jordan	18 U.S.C. 113	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
308 oked	6:20-cr-00146	Purdom	18 U.S.C. 2241 and 2244	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
309 oked	6:21-cr-00020	Prestel	18 U.S.C. 2242 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
310 oked	6:21-cr-00023	Pearson	18 U.S.C. 1112	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
311 oked	6:21-cr-00029	Coleman	18 U.S.C. 2241 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
312 oked	6:21-cr-00032	Garcia-Limon	18 U.S.C. 2241, 2246, 2244	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Trial - Guilty
313 oked	6:21-cr-00034	Morris	18 U.S.C. 2241, 2246, 2244	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Trial - Guilty
314 oked	6:21-cr-00044	McAlister et al	18 U.S.C. 1111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
315 oked	6:21-cr-00051	Tiger et al	18 U.S.C. 2 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea

316 oked	6:21-cr-00052	Caldwell	18 U.S.C. 113	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
317 oked	6:21-cr-00059	Root	18 U.S.C. 2242 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
318 oked	6:21-cr-00084	Roberts	18 U.S.C. 1112 and 13 (47 O.S. 11-904)	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
319 oked	6:21-cr-00105	Parker	18 U.S.C. 1112	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
320 oked	6:21-cr-00108	Bitar	18 U.S.C. 1113	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
321 oked	6:21-cr-00120	Hurst	18 U.S.C. 2243 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
322 oked	6:21-cr-00128	Polina	18 U.S.C. 2244 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
323 oked	6:21-cr-00137	Hendricks	18 U.S.C. 2244 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
324 oked	6:21-cr-00149	Duncan	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1123)	Indian	Plea
325 oked	6:21-cr-00151	Menees et al (Menees)	18 U.S.C. 2 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Trial - Guilty
326 oked	6:21-cr-00151	Menees et al (Schardein)	18 U.S.C. 2 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Trial - Guilty
327 oked	6:21-cr-00167	Washington	18 U.S.C. 1111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
328 oked	6:21-cr-00170	Pierce	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
329 oked	6:21-cr-00184	Walker	18 U.S.C. 113	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
330 oked	6:21-cr-00185	Sambrano	18 U.S.C. 2242 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
331 oked	6:21-cr-00190	Voyles	18 U.S.C. 1111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
332 oked	6:21-cr-00192	Morris	18 U.S.C. 113	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
333 oked	6:21-cr-00195	Bullard	18 U.S.C. 2 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
334 oked	6:21-cr-00198	Nace et al (Nace)	18 U.S.C. 1111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
335 oked	6:21-cr-00198	Nace et al	18 U.S.C. 3, 2 and 1111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
336 oked	6:21-cr-00201	Chapa	18 U.S.C. 2244 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
337 oked	6:21-cr-00214	Stephens	18 U.S.C. 1801	Indian	Plea
338 oked	6:21-cr-00217	Swarer	18 U.S.C. 1112	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
339 oked	6:21-cr-00218	Kelley	18 U.S.C. 2111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
340 oked	6:21-cr-00220	Simpkins	18 U.S.C. 2243, 2244, 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Trial - Guilty (Rev'd on Appeal)
341 oked	6:21-cr-00224	Poulin	18 U.S.C. 1111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
342 oked	6:21-cr-00232	Rogers	18 U.S.C. 2241, 2244, and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Trial - Guilty
343 oked	6:21-cr-00240	Bulla	18 U.S.C. 1112 and 13 (47 O.S. 11-904)	Indian	Plea
344 oked	6:21-cr-00254	Horner	18 U.S.C. 113	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
345 oked	6:21-cr-00263	Altom	18 U.S.C. 2243 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
346 oked	6:21-cr-00270	Turner	18 U.S.C. 1112	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
347 oked	6:21-cr-00271	Hatley	18 U.S.C. 13 (47 O.S. 11-904)	Indian	Trial - Guilty (Rev'd on Appeal)
348 oked	6:21-cr-00281	Spence	18 U.S.C. 1112	Non-Indian	Plea
349 oked	6:21-cr-00294	Rose, et al. (Rose)	18 U.S.C. 2 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
350 oked	6:21-cr-00294	Rose, et al. (Brown)	18 U.S.C. 2 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
351 oked	6:21-cr-00300	Goldman	18 U.S.C. 113	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
352 oked	6:21-cr-00301	Castillo	18 U.S.C. 113	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
353 oked	6:21-cr-00302	Delozier	18 U.S.C. 113, 2261 and 2 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
354 oked	6:21-cr-00304	Scrivener	18 U.S.C. 2244 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
355 oked	6:21-cr-00312	Good	18 U.S.C. 113	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
356 oked	6:21-cr-00313	Adams	18 U.S.C. 2244 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
357 oked	6:21-cr-00324	Coffman	18 U.S.C. 113 and 1111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Trial - Guilty
358 oked	6:21-cr-00326	Clark et al	18 U.S.C. 1201 and 2111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Trial - Guilty
359 oked	6:21-cr-00332	Keys	21 O.S. 843.5	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Trial - Guilty (Rule 29 granted)
360 oked	6:21-cr-00345	Carter	21 O.S. 843.5	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea

361 oked	6:21-cr-00353	Bray	18 U.S.C. 113	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
362 oked	6:21-cr-00359	Fincher	18 U.S.C. 1111	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
363 oked	6:21-cr-00365	Boomer	18 U.S.C. 2243 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
364 oked	6:21-cr-00371	Hayes	18 U.S.C. 2244 and 2246	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
365 oked	6:21-cr-00375	Ivie et al.	18 U.S.C. 2 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Unalleged (victim Indian)	Plea
366 oked	6:21-cr-00383	Primeaux	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 540A)	Indian	Plea
367 oked	6:22-cr-00003	Rainford	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
368 oked	6:22-cr-00025	Robertson	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
369 oked	6:22-cr-00031	Nolen	18 U.S.C. 1112	Non-Indian	Plea
370 oked	6:22-cr-00042	Weedon	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
371 oked	6:22-cr-00055	Laverty	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
372 oked	6:22-cr-00098	Cole	18 U.S.C. 2241 and 2246	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
373 oked	6:22-cr-00099	Andrews	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
374 oked	6:22-cr-00103	Kelley	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 540A)	Indian	Plea
375 oked	6:22-cr-00106	Hebert	18 U.S.C. 2241 and 2246	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty (Rev'd on Appeal)
376 oked	6:22-cr-00145	Phillips	18 U.S.C. 48 and 113	Indian	Plea
377 oked	6:23-cr-00003	Strawn	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Plea
378 oked	6:23-cr-00022	Luman	18 U.S.C. 13 (47 O.S. 11-904)	Non-Indian	Plea
379 oked	6:23-cr-00047	Jackson	18 U.S.C. 2 (21 O.S. 1161.1)	Indian	Plea
380 oked	6:23-cr-00075	Kelley	18 U.S.C. 2244 and 2246	Non-Indian	Plea
381 oked	6:23-cr-00101	Hollars	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
382 oked	6:23-cr-00114	Collins et al.	18 U.S.C. 1111, 2 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
383 oked	6:23-cr-00156	Graves	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 540A)	Indian	Plea
384 oked	6:24-cr-00024	Toyne	18 U.S.C. 2243 and 2246	Non-Indian	Trial - Guilty
385 oked	6:24-cr-00050	Rains et al (Valdez)	18 U.S.C. 113 and 2	Non-Indian	Plea
386 oked	6:24-cr-00058	Magness et al (Higgins)	18 U.S.C. 2, 13 (21 O.S. 843.5)	Non-Indian	Plea
387 oked	6:24-cr-00069	Palma et al (Wilson)	18 U.S.C. 2241 and 2246	Non-Indian	Plea
388 oked	6:24-cr-00087	Fraser	18 U.S.C. 13 (47 O.S. 10-102.1)	Indian	Plea
389 oked	6:24-cr-00097	Evans	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 540A)	Indian	Plea
390 oked	6:24-cr-00101	McGuire	18 U.S.C. 81	Non-Indian	Plea
391 oked	6:24-cr-00139	Mickle	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
392 oked	6:24-cr-00162	Miller	18 U.S.C. 1111	Non-Indian	Plea
393 oked	6:24-cr-00180	Walkos	18 U.S.C. 2241 and 2246	Non-Indian	Plea
394 oked	6:24-cr-00190	Coggins	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
395 oked	6:24-cr-00205	Sangines	18 U.S.C. 113	Non-Indian	Plea
396 oked	6:25-cr-00037	Pettit	18 U.S.C. 13 (21 O.S. 1289.17A)	Indian	Plea
397 oked	6:25-cr-00104	Phillips	18 U.S.C. 13 (47 O.S. 10-102)	Indian	Plea