SUPREME COURT FILED

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE MUSCOGEE (CREEK) NATIO

			DEC 1 / 2014
MUSCOGEE (CREEK) NATION,)	Jm .
	Plaintiff-Appellant,)	COURT CLERK MUSCOGEE (CREEK) NATION
)	Case No. SC 14-04
v.)	(District Court Case No. CF 2012-39)
)	
STITH, Shawn,)	
)	
	Defendant-Respondent.)	

Appeal from District Court, Okmulgee District, Muscogee Nation.

Chad C. Harsha, Assistant Attorney General, Muscogee Nation, for Plaintiff-Appellant.

Michael E. Yeksavich, Attorney at Law, Tulsa, Oklahoma, for Defendant-Respondent.

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

MVSKOKVLKE FVTCECKV CUKO HVLWAT VKERRICKV HVYAKAT OKETV YVNKE VHAKV HAKATEN ACAKKAYEN MOMEN ENTENFVTCETV, HVTVM MVSKOKE ETVLWVKE ETEHVLVTKE VHAKV EMPVTAKV.¹

Before: ADAMS, C.J.; THOMPSON, V.C.J.; HARJO-WARE, SUPERNAW, DEER, and LERBLANCE, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Order of the District Court affirmed.

¹ "The Muscogee (Creek) Nation Supreme Court, after due deliberation, makes known the following decision based on traditional and modern Myskoke law."

PER CURIAM.

Respondent timely raised non-Indian status as a defect to personal jurisdiction during the

underlying disposition hearing held on March 24, 2014. Appellant was subsequently allowed time

to prepare a response and provide evidence of Respondent's Indian status. We have previously held

[a] defendant's failure to timely raise non-Indian status as a defect to

personal jurisdiction prior to trial or entry of a 'guilty' or 'nolo contendere' plea may be deemed to constitute waiver of the defect. If

raised prior to trial or entry of a trial-precluding plea, however, the

issue of whether a defendant is Indian presents a question of fact that

must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt by the prosecution in order

for the case to proceed. If the prosecution is unable to prove defendant's Indian status beyond a reasonable doubt, the District

Court is obligated to dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction.²

Here, the District Court properly granted Respondent's motion to dismiss because Appellant failed

to prove Respondent's Indian status beyond a reasonable doubt at the subsequent motion hearing

held on March 31, 2014.

Under Muscogee law, M(C)NCA Title 14, § 2-113(W) controls any determination of

personal jurisdiction as a component of Muscogee Nation criminal jurisdiction.³ It is unnecessary

for this Court to reach Respondent's challenges to the validity of § 2-113(W), because Appellant

has yet to meet its evidentiary burden to sustain jurisdiction in this case.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Order of the District Court entered April 22, 2014,

granting Respondent's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction is unanimously

AFFIRMED.

FILED AND ENTERED: December 17, 2014

² SC 11-12, Muscogee (Creek) Nation v. Lee 10 (August 15, 2013).

³ M(C)NCA Title 14, § 2-113(W) ("'Person' means a human being who is a member of a federally [-] recognized Indian Tribe or a human being who is eligible to be a member of a federally [-] recognized Indian Tribe.").

Andrew Adams III
Chief Justice

George Thompson Jr.
Vice-Chief Justice

Kathleen R. Supernaw
Kathleen R. Supernaw
Associate Justice

Montie R. Deer
Associate Justice

Richard C. Lerblance
Associate Justice

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that on December 17, 2014, I mailed a true and correct copy of the foregoing Order of Affirmance with proper postage prepaid to each of the following: Michael E. Yeksavich, 7122 S. Sheridan, Ste. #2-353, Tulsa, OK, 74133; and Chad C. Harsha, Assistant Attorney General, Muscogee (Creek) Nation, Office of the Attorney General, P.O. Box 580, Okmulgee, OK 74447. A true and correct copy was also hand-delivered to: Donna Beaver, Clerk of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation District Court.