

The Eleven Areas of Inquiry

Filed September 23, 2026 · Tulsa County District Court · Case No. GJ-26-2

Each item below is a question the petition asks a grand jury to investigate. None is a finding that wrongdoing occurred.

A**Tulsa County Juvenile Detention Center**

The petition asks what the DA's Office knew about reported assaults, sexual misconduct, staffing failures, and state inspection findings at the facility from 2022 to 2024, and whether it advised county commissioners that the county bore no responsibility. It asks whether that advice delayed intervention, permitted further harm, or increased the county's liability.

B**State v. Hankins and employee credibility**

The petition asks whether a prosecutor gave inaccurate sworn testimony in a case that ended in acquittal, and whether the Office reviewed or disclosed those credibility concerns in other cases. It also asks whether she was later promoted despite them, while noting the public record does not itself establish perjury.

C**April Wilkens proceedings**

The petition asks whether two prosecutors bought Ms. Wilkens' former home, and whether officials attended a social event there, while the Office was litigating her case, creating a conflict that required disclosure or recusal. It also asks about a reported text from the DA saying he was "busy keeping April Wilkens in prison" and about any judicial communications held without her counsel present.

D**Rosario Chico prosecution**

The petition asks whether the DA personally initiated a child-stealing prosecution of Ms. Chico after receiving a note from a guardian ad litem who may have been a political supporter, and whether that note was improperly withheld from the defense. It also asks how her domestic violence claims were evaluated and why charges against her alleged abuser were dropped.

E**Henry Jamerson post-conviction review**

The petition asks whether the Office told a court that biological evidence was unavailable without adequately searching for it. It also asks why the Office kept opposing relief after a witness recanted and DNA testing excluded Mr. Jamerson.

F**Open records and private communications**

The petition asks whether the Office delayed, narrowed, or inadequately searched for public records, including requests about the Glossip, Wilkens, and detention center matters. It also asks whether public business was conducted on personal phones, private email, or encrypted apps and not disclosed, an issue raised in a pending 2026 lawsuit.

G**Oklahoma Survivors' Act waivers**

The petition asks whether the Office used plea documents asking defendants to give up future relief under the Oklahoma Survivors' Act, a law meant for people whose crimes were linked to abuse. It asks who approved the language, how often it was used, and whether defendants, judges, and defense counsel were informed.

H**Public resources in the 2026 re-election campaign**

The petition asks whether employees did campaign work on county time or with county equipment, and whether they were pressured to participate or treated differently based on their support. It distinguishes this from voluntary political activity on employees' own time.

I**Office administration and supervision**

Citing former employees and a March 2026 campaign remark that the DA "will not lead from a desk," the petition asks how often he is present and performing his administrative duties. It also asks whether inadequate supervision contributed to the other problems described.

J**Tulsa Little League litigation**

The petition asks whether legal advice to county commissioners about the Tulsa Little League and LaFortune Park lawsuit was delayed or shaped by the DA's re-election campaign. It also asks whether related executive sessions complied with the Open Meeting Act.

K**Campaign relationships and case outcomes**

The petition asks whether contributions or endorsements from defense attorneys influenced plea deals and sentencing for their clients, focusing on the *Binney* and *Cole* cases, and whether victims were properly notified. It states these relationships do not, by themselves, prove improper influence.
