

No. 21-485

---

---

IN THE  
*Supreme Court of the United States*

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,  
*Petitioner,*

v.

SHAWN LEE MCDANIEL,  
*Respondent.*

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

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

JAMES H. LOCKARD  
OKLAHOMA INDIGENT  
DEFENSE SYSTEM  
P.O. Box 926  
Norman, OK 73070  
(405) 801-2601

DAVID A. STRAUSS  
SARAH M. KONSKY  
JENNER & BLOCK  
SUPREME COURT AND  
APPELLATE CLINIC AT  
THE UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL  
1111 E. 60th St.  
Chicago, IL 60637

ZACHARY C. SCHAUF  
*Counsel of Record*  
MATTHEW S. HELLMAN  
LEONARD R. POWELL  
ALLISON M. TJEMSLAND  
VICTORIA HALL-PALERM  
KELSEY L. STIMPLE  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
1099 New York Ave., NW  
Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 639-6000  
zschauf@jenner.com

**QUESTION PRESENTED**

1. Did the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals correctly hold that States lack jurisdiction to prosecute crimes by non-Indians against Indians in Indian country, as this Court has repeatedly affirmed and as lower courts uniformly agree?

2. Should this Court consider overruling its statutory decision in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020)?

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

QUESTION PRESENTED ..... i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... iii

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE ..... 1

REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION ..... 4

CONCLUSION ..... 12

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

## CASES

<i>A.J.B. v. State</i> , 1999 OK CR 50.....	6
<i>Bankers Life &amp; Casualty Co. v. Crenshaw</i> , 486 U.S. 71 (1988).....	7
<i>Bosse v. State</i> , 2021 OK CR 3.....	4
<i>Halliburton Co. v. Erica P. John Fund, Inc.</i> , 573 U.S. 258 (2014).....	9
<i>Illinois v. Gates</i> , 462 U.S. 213 (1983) .....	7
<i>McGirt v. Oklahoma</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020) .....	1, 6
<i>Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Community</i> , 572 U.S. 782 (2014).....	9
<i>Murphy v. Royal</i> , 875 F.3d 896, 966 (10th Cir. 2017) .....	2
<i>State ex rel. Matloff v. Wallace</i> , 2021 OK CR 21, petition for cert. filed, No. 21-467 (U.S. Sept. 29, 2021) .....	5
<i>Roth v. State</i> , 2021 OK CR 27 .....	4
<i>Sharp v. Murphy</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2412 (2020) .....	1
<i>Solem v. Bartlett</i> , 465 U.S. 463 (1984) .....	2
<i>Spears v. Oklahoma</i> , 485 P.3d 873 (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. 2021) .....	3
<i>United States v. Jones</i> , 565 U.S. 400 (2012) .....	7
<i>Williams v. United States</i> , 327 U.S. 711 (1946) .....	5

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

Brief for Amicus Curiae Cherokee Nation, <i>Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 21-429 (U.S. Oct. 29, 2021) .....	6, 8, 10, 11
Brief for Amicus Curiae Cherokee Nation, <i>Oklahoma v. Spears</i> , No. 21-323 (U.S. Oct. 28, 2021) .....	11, 12
Brief for Amicus Curiae Chickasaw Nation, <i>Oklahoma v. Beck</i> , No. 21-373 (U.S. Oct. 15, 2021).....	8, 11
Brief for Amicus Curiae Chickasaw Nation & Choctaw Nation, <i>Oklahoma v. Castro- Huerta</i> , No. 21-429 (U.S. Nov. 18, 2021).....	10, 12
Brief for Amicus Curiae Choctaw Nation, <i>Oklahoma v. Sizemore</i> , No. 21-326 (U.S. Oct. 28, 2021).....	8, 11
Brief for Amicus Curiae Muscogee (Creek) Nation, <i>Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 21-429 (U.S. Nov. 16, 2021).....	10, 11, 12
Brief in Opposition, <i>Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta</i> , No. 21-429 (U.S. Nov. 15, 2021).....	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
Reese Gorman, <i>Cole Encourages State- Tribal Relations Over State Challenges to McGirt</i> , Norman Transcript (July 23, 2021), <a href="https://yhoo.it/3lYMjD8">https://yhoo.it/3lYMjD8</a> .....	9
Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, <i>Oklahoma v. Bosse</i> , No. 21-186 (U.S. Aug. 6, 2021) .....	5

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429 (U.S. Sept. 17, 2021).....5, 7, 9, 10

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, *Royal v. Murphy*, No. 17-1107 (U.S. Feb. 6, 2018) ..... 1

Transcript of Oral Argument, *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, No. 18-9526 (U.S. May 11, 2020)..... 1

## INTRODUCTION

This is one of several near-identical petitions asking this Court to overrule its statutory decision in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 140 S. Ct. 2452 (2020). Its two questions presented are identical to the questions presented in *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429. This petition should be denied for the same reasons explained in the Brief in Opposition in *Castro-Huerta* (“*Castro-Huerta* Opp. \_\_”).

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In *Sharp v. Murphy*, 140 S. Ct. 2412 (2020), and *McGirt*, it was common ground that the Court’s holding would apply to all crimes involving Indians, whether as defendants or victims. That was because, as Oklahoma explained, “States lack criminal ... jurisdiction ... if either the defendant or victim is an Indian.” *Murphy* Pet. 18, No. 17-1107. Hence, Oklahoma emphasized that an adverse ruling would invalidate convictions for “crimes committed against Indians” by Indians or non-Indians, “which the state would not have jurisdiction over.” *McGirt* Arg. Tr. 54, No. 18-9526.

Respondent invoked that law below. Respondent Shawn Lee McDaniel was charged by information in March 2015 for an alleged crime committed within the Cherokee reservation against a member of the Cherokee Nation. Information (Okla. Dist. Ct., Muskogee Cnty. Mar. 27, 2015).<sup>1</sup> Respondent was convicted in March 2017. Verdict at 1 (Okla. Dist. Ct., Muskogee Cnty. Mar.

---

<sup>1</sup> References to district-court filings are to Case No. CF-2015-249, available at <https://bit.ly/3n4cerY>.

23, 2017). While Respondent’s appeal was pending, the Tenth Circuit applied *Solem v. Bartlett*, 465 U.S. 463 (1984), to hold that the Muscogee reservation endured. *Murphy v. Royal*, 875 F.3d 896, 966 (10th Cir. 2017).

On appeal, Respondent argued that Oklahoma lacked jurisdiction to try him because his victim was an Indian and the alleged crimes took place within the Cherokee reservation. Brief of Appellant at 5, 8 (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. Feb. 1, 2018).<sup>2</sup> The Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals (“OCCA”) stayed the appeal pending this Court’s review of *Murphy*. Order at 2 (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. Mar. 25, 2019).

After *McGirt*, the OCCA remanded to the district court for an evidentiary hearing on the victim’s Indian status and the location of the alleged crime—in particular, whether Congress established a reservation for the Cherokee Nation and, if so, whether Congress disestablished that reservation. Pet. App. 31a-33a. The parties stipulated that the victim was an enrolled member of the Cherokee Nation and that the alleged crime took place within the historical geographic area of the Cherokee reservation. Pet. App. 16a. The State “t[ook] no position as to the facts underlying the existence, now or historically, of the alleged Cherokee Nation Reservation. No evidence or argument was presented by the State specifically regarding disestablishment or boundary erasure of the Cherokee Reservation.” Pet. App. 23a.

---

<sup>2</sup> References to filings in the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals are to Case No. F-2017-357, available at <https://bit.ly/3aUoeGM>.



Based on the parties' stipulations and the court's review of the treaty evidence (and noting the State's failure to take a position as to facts underlying the existence or disestablishment of the Cherokee reservation), the district court concluded that Congress had established a reservation for the Cherokee, which it had never disestablished. Pet. App. 16a-23a. Thus, the district court concluded that the Cherokee reservation continues to exist. *Id.*

At that evidentiary hearing, Oklahoma for the first time sought to "preserve[] its position that the State of Oklahoma has concurrent jurisdiction over crimes committed by non-Indian defendants against Indian victims in Indian Country." Supplemental Brief of Appellee After Remand at 3 (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. Mar. 29, 2021). The State also pressed this argument in its post-remand supplemental briefing—contrary to its representations in *Murphy* and *McGirt*. *Id.* at 3-4. Respondent argued that this claim was waived and meritless. Appellant's Supplemental Brief at 8-12 (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. Jan. 4, 2021). Before the OCCA, Oklahoma again took no position on reservation status, and indeed went so far as to "accept[] ... that the crimes occurred within the boundaries of the Cherokee Nation Reservation." Supplemental Brief of Appellee After Remand at 3 (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. Mar. 29, 2021). Nor did Oklahoma argue that the OCCA should nonetheless deny relief and decline to follow *McGirt*.

The OCCA, relying on *Spears v. Oklahoma*, 485 P.3d 873 (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. 2021), upheld the trial court's determination that the crime "occurred within the boundaries of [the Cherokee] reservation, and that

Congress never disestablished the Cherokee Nation Reservation.” Pet. App. 4a. The OCCA also rejected Oklahoma’s concurrent jurisdiction arguments, noting that it had rejected identical arguments in *Bosse v. Oklahoma*, 484 P.3d 286 (Okla. Ct. Crim. App. 2021), *withdrawn on other grounds by* 2021 OK CR 23. Although the OCCA subsequently vacated *Bosse* on other grounds, the OCCA again “reject[ed] the State’s concurrent jurisdiction argument” in *Roth v. State*. 2021 OK CR 27 ¶ 12. *Roth* observed that the rule of “exclusive” federal jurisdiction “is well-established.” *Id.* ¶ 13. And it explained that “Congress has authorized States to assume criminal jurisdiction over Indian Country in limited circumstances” but that Oklahoma never received such jurisdiction. *Id.* ¶ 14.

Therefore, on March 18, 2021, the OCCA duly vacated Respondent’s conviction for lack of jurisdiction. Pet. App. 5a. The mandate issued on October 4, 2021. Order (Okla. Dist. Ct., Muskogee Cnty. Oct. 4, 2021).

By then, the federal government had already indicted Respondent and taken him into federal custody. Complaint at 1 (E.D. Okla. Sept. 22, 2021), ECF No. 1;<sup>3</sup> Warrant at 1 (E.D. Okla. Sept. 27, 2021), ECF No. 5. Respondent’s trial is set for December 2021. Minute Order (E.D. Okla. Oct. 18, 2021), ECF No. 22.

### **REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION**

The OCCA’s application of settled law in the decision below does not warrant review, for the reasons

---

<sup>3</sup> References to filings in Respondent’s federal criminal case are to Case No. 21-cr-321 (E.D. Okla.).

explained in the *Castro-Huerta* Brief in Opposition. See *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 9-37. Oklahoma first told this Court that it must limit or overrule *McGirt* because “[t]housands” of prisoners were poised to successfully “challeng[e] decades’ worth of convictions.” Pet. 2, *Oklahoma v. Bosse*, No. 21-186. Events, however, removed that premise. After Oklahoma filed for certiorari in *Bosse*, the OCCA issued *State ex rel. Matloff v. Wallace*, 2021 OK CR 21. *Matloff* stated that the OCCA was “interpret[ing] ... state post-conviction statutes [to] hold that *McGirt* ... shall not apply retroactively to void a conviction that was final when *McGirt* was decided.” *Id.* ¶15. So Oklahoma shifted course. Seeking to salvage review, Oklahoma filed a new petition, focusing on *McGirt*’s consequences for present and future criminal prosecutions and for civil jurisdiction. *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429. But try as Oklahoma might, the simple facts remain: *McGirt*’s backwards-looking effects are now limited—and its going-forward effects are for Congress to weigh. Today, neither of Oklahoma’s questions presented warrants review.

Oklahoma’s first question presented asks “[w]hether a State has authority to prosecute non-Indians who commit crimes against Indians in Indian country.” Pet. i. The OCCA correctly answered no, in a decision implicating no conflict or disagreement. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 9-17. This Court has long affirmed that “the United States, rather than ... [the State], ha[s] jurisdiction over offenses committed” in Indian country “by one who is not an Indian against one who is.” *Williams v. United States*, 327 U.S. 711, 714 & n.10 (1946); see *Castro-*

*Huerta* Opp. 9-10. Lower courts uniformly concur. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 9 & n.5; Cherokee Nation Amicus Br. 15-22, *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429. Meanwhile, Congress has repeatedly embedded this understanding in statute. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 11-12, 14-15. Oklahoma previously asked this Court to upend that consensus based on *McGirt*'s effects on existing Oklahoma convictions. But again, those effects are now limited—and *Matloff* has reshaped the backdrop against which this Court stayed *Bosse*. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 10-11.<sup>4</sup>

Oklahoma's request to overrule *McGirt* is no more certworthy. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 2-4, 18-37. The Court must deny this petition, however, for even more mundane reasons. First, this case does not present Oklahoma's second question presented: It concerns not the Muscogee reservation (at issue in *McGirt*) but the Cherokee reservation, which has its own treaties, statutes, and history. While the Five Tribes share commonalities, "[e]ach tribe's treaties must be considered on their own terms." *McGirt*, 140 S. Ct. at 2479. For example, "[u]nlike the Creek Agreement, the Cherokee Agreement did not describe tribal courts as 'abolished' by the Curtis Act or prohibit revival of tribal courts." Pet. App. 36a, *Oklahoma v. Spears*, No. 21-323; cf. *McGirt*, 140 S. Ct. at 2484, 2490 (Roberts, C.J.,

---

<sup>4</sup> Oklahoma also waived its concurrent-jurisdiction argument by not raising it until after the OCCA's post-*McGirt* remand. Under Oklahoma law, "the State, like defendants, must ... preserve errors ..., otherwise they are waived." *A.J.B. v. State*, 1999 OK CR 50, ¶ 9. So whatever the answer to Oklahoma's question presented *in general*, the decision below reached the correct result.

dissenting) (emphasizing Congress’s abolition of Muscogee courts). This court cannot overrule *McGirt* in a case about the Cherokee reservation. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 18-19.

Second, Oklahoma below did not raise its request to overrule *McGirt* and declined to even present evidence on the Cherokee reservation’s disestablishment. In cases from state courts, this Court considers only claims “pressed or passed on below”—even when litigants claim that a “well-settled federal” rule “should be modified.” *Illinois v. Gates*, 462 U.S. 213, 219-20, 222 (1983). “[C]hief among” the considerations supporting that rule “is [the Court’s] own need for a properly developed record.” *Bankers Life & Cas. Co. v. Crenshaw*, 486 U.S. 71, 79 (1988). Likewise, this Court treats as waived arguments “not raise[d] ... below.” *United States v. Jones*, 565 U.S. 400, 413 (2012).

This case illustrates why this Court does so. Oklahoma says *McGirt* should have placed more weight on “contemporaneous understanding” and “histor[y].” *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 17.<sup>5</sup> And it seeks *McGirt*’s overruling based on claims of “disruption.” *Id.* 3-4. But below, Oklahoma presented no evidence on either point, took no position on disestablishment, and “accept[ed]”

---

<sup>5</sup> Because Oklahoma has asked that this petition be held for *Castro-Huerta*, Respondent addresses that petition. Again, it is bizarre for Oklahoma to ask the Court to weigh overruling *McGirt* in cases (like *Castro-Huerta* and this one) concerning the *Cherokee* reservation, a different reservation subject to different treaties and statutes. But that oddity should be of no moment. Oklahoma’s question presented does not warrant review in any case.

that the crimes took place within the Cherokee reservation. *Supra* p. 3; *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 18-19.

All of that is why Oklahoma’s petition is so light on evidence and so heavy on citation-free assertions. This is no way to undertake the grave task of weighing whether to abandon *stare decisis*. Oklahoma’s waiver, and its failure to develop a record, militate powerfully against granting its petition. *See* Pet. App. 12a (OCCA decision) (Hudson, J., concurring in result) (explaining that this case should not be used to reach a “definitive conclusion” as to whether the reservation was disestablished because of the dearth of evidence Oklahoma put in the record); *accord* Chickasaw Nation Amicus Br. 18-20, *Oklahoma v. Beck*, No. 21-373; Choctaw Nation Amicus Br. 17-21, *Oklahoma v. Sizemore*, No. 21-326; Cherokee Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 13-14.<sup>6</sup>

Regardless, Oklahoma’s request to overrule *McGirt* does not warrant review even in a case, unlike this one, presenting that question—as the *Castro-Huerta* Brief in Opposition explains. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 2-4, 18-38. Like many of this Court’s statutory decisions, *McGirt* was divided. Like many such decisions, *McGirt* had real effects (though Oklahoma vastly overstates them). And

---

<sup>6</sup> To Respondent’s knowledge, in none of Oklahoma’s pending petitions did it develop evidence to support the claims it now presses. And given Oklahoma’s tactical choice below to decline to present such evidence or argument, it would be inappropriate to allow Oklahoma to do so simply because it has sought *certiorari*. *See* Chickasaw Nation *Beck* Amicus Br. 3-8 (identifying additional procedural obstacles).

like all of this Court’s statutory decisions, the ball is now where the Constitution has placed it: With Congress.

Certiorari is not warranted to address Oklahoma’s invitation for this Court to elbow Congress aside. It scarcely needs saying that this Court does not overrule statutory decisions based solely on changes in personnel. *Stare decisis* exists precisely to protect the “actual and perceived integrity of the judicial process” against such threats. *Michigan v. Bay Mills Indian Cmty.*, 572 U.S. 782, 798 (2014) (quotation marks omitted). And *stare decisis* applies with “special force” in statutory cases, where “Congress remains free to alter what [this Court has] done.” *Halliburton Co. v. Erica P. John Fund, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 258, 274 (2014) (quotation marks omitted); see *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 20-22.

Here, those principles are no mere abstractions. Oklahoma seeks certiorari *in order to* preempt active negotiations. In May 2021, its governor opposed H.R. 3091, which would have allowed the State to compact with two of the Five Tribes over criminal jurisdiction. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 3, 10-11. In July 2021, the State opposed federal-law-enforcement funding because it did not desire “a permanent federal fix.”<sup>7</sup> And weeks later, it became clear why: It preferred to swing for the fences in this Court. This Court’s place, however, is not in the middle of legislative negotiations. And Oklahoma’s siren song that “[o]nly the Court can remedy [its] problems,” *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 4, badly misunderstands this Court’s

---

<sup>7</sup> Reese Gorman, *Cole Encourages State-Tribal Relations Over State Challenges to McGirt*, Norman Transcript (July 23, 2021), <https://yhoo.it/3IYMjD8>.

role. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 20-24; see Muscogee (Creek) Nation Amicus Br. 25-28, *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429; Chickasaw Nation & Choctaw Nation Amicus Br. 6-7, 13-15, *Oklahoma v. Castro-Huerta*, No. 21-429; Cherokee Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 10-12.

Rarely, moreover, will this Court receive so inappropriate a request justified by so little. Despite claiming “unprecedented disruption,” *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 10, Oklahoma points to few real effects—and none that could justify this Court substituting itself for Congress. Again, *McGirt’s* impact on existing convictions is now limited and affects only the modest set of criminal cases still on direct review. Many of those cases proceeded when Oklahoma knew its prosecutions might be invalid—and in such cases, retrial is easiest and least likely to face obstacles from time bars or stale evidence. Indeed, Oklahoma’s many petitions fail to mention the federal and tribal prosecutions that are *comprehensively* occurring in those cases, or that the federal government has already obtained convictions in several such cases. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 24-27; see Muscogee (Creek) Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 8-11; Chickasaw Nation & Choctaw Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 4-5, 7-9; Cherokee Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 8-9, 11-12.

Going forward, the proper allocation of jurisdiction among the federal government, the State, and Tribes is a question for Congress, which can decide whether to modify jurisdictional lines. Meanwhile, Oklahoma’s claims of a “criminal-justice crisis” today, *Castro-Huerta* Pet. 4, are largely unburdened by evidence and badly



misstate the facts. In reality, the federal government and Five Tribes are working to fulfill the responsibilities *McGirt* gives them and seeking the resources they need to do so (often over Oklahoma's opposition). *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 27-32; see Muscogee (Creek) Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 12-19; Chickasaw Nation *Beck* Amicus Br. 5-7, 9; Choctaw Nation *Sizemore* Amicus Br. 9-16; Cherokee Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 4-12.

Oklahoma's claims about civil consequences are even more reality-free. In fact, its position, undisclosed to the Court in its petitions, is that *McGirt* applies *only* to criminal jurisdiction and has *no* civil effects. In all events, moreover, those effects will be vastly less than Oklahoma suggests. And the place to address such concerns is in civil cases—which will make concrete *McGirt's* (limited) actual consequences. Oklahoma's overwrought claims have no place in this criminal case. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 32-37; see Muscogee (Creek) Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 20-25; Chickasaw Nation *Beck* Amicus Br. 9-12; Choctaw Nation *Sizemore* Amicus Br. 10; Cherokee Nation Amicus Br. 12-14, *Oklahoma v. Spears*, No. 21-323.

Indeed, Oklahoma's petitions are a source of, not a solution to, uncertainty. Overruling *McGirt* would invalidate thousands of federal and tribal prosecutions and squander tens of millions of dollars spent in reliance on *McGirt*. Meanwhile, granting review would freeze negotiations indefinitely. Oklahoma apparently is happy to impose those costs. But that only underscores why its arguments should be directed to Congress, which the Constitution charges with making such decisions. *Castro-Huerta* Opp. 31-32; see Muscogee (Creek) Nation

*Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 25-28; Chickasaw Nation & Choctaw Nation *Castro-Huerta* Amicus Br. 2; Cherokee Nation *Spears* Amicus Br. 22-23.

**CONCLUSION**

The petition should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES H. LOCKARD  
OKLAHOMA INDIGENT  
DEFENSE SYSTEM  
P.O. Box 926  
Norman, OK 73070  
(405) 801-2601

DAVID A. STRAUSS  
SARAH M. KONSKY  
JENNER & BLOCK  
SUPREME COURT AND  
APPELLATE CLINIC AT  
THE UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL  
1111 E. 60th St.  
Chicago, IL 60637

ZACHARY C. SCHAUF  
*Counsel of Record*  
MATTHEW S. HELLMAN  
LEONARD R. POWELL  
ALLISON M. TJEMSLAND  
VICTORIA HALL-PALERM  
KELSEY L. STIMPLE  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
1099 New York Ave., NW  
Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 639-6000  
zschauf@jenner.com