

SUPREME COURT



Media Release

COPIES:

Copies of the orders may be obtained from the Appellate Records Section,
appeals.docrequests@ojd.state.or.us

Contact:

Coty Hollister, Court Manager
Coty.M.Hollister@ojd.state.or.us

On June 2, 2026, the Supreme Court:

1. Denied the petition for reconsideration in:

State of Oregon v. Lohr (S072882) (DeHoog and James, JJ., did not participate in this decision)

2. Denied the petition for a writ of mandamus in:

State of Oregon v. Hatton (S072889) (CC 23CR28340) (DeHoog and James, JJ., did not participate in this decision)

3. Denied the petition for a writ for habeas corpus in:

Bray v. Sundquist (S072905) (CC 11FE1078) (DeHoog and James, JJ., did not participate in this decision)

On June 4, 2026, the Supreme Court:

1. Allowed petitions for review in¹:

Michael Lewis Laseur v. Jamie Miller, 345 Or App 33, 582 P3d 241 (2025) (precedential opinion) (A182827) (S072509) (from the Malheur County Circuit Court)

Plaintiff has been granted review of a Court of Appeals decision affirming in part and reversing in part the general judgment and order granting relief to plaintiff on his habeas corpus claims.

¹ These summaries of cases are prepared for the benefit of members of the media to assist them in reporting the court's activities to the public. Parties and practitioners should not rely on the summaries, or the statement of issues to be decided in the summaries, as indicating the questions that the Supreme Court will consider. Regarding the questions that the Supreme Court may consider, see Oregon Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.20.

On review, the issues are:

- (1) Whether the unnecessary rigor provision of Article I, section 13, of the Oregon Constitution applies to the medical treatment of adults in custody and, if so, what is the standard to prove that medical treatments amount to unnecessary rigor.
- (2) Whether a defendant violates the prohibition on unnecessary rigor by refusing to provide a plaintiff suffering from chronic pain medications recommended by the defendant's providers if current medications are ineffective and the defendant provides no justification for the refusal.
- (3) Whether a defendant violate the prohibition on unnecessary rigor if they fail to provide more frequent mental health counseling sessions for a plaintiff suffering from PTSD, where the defendant's own policies indicate that plaintiff should receive more frequent counseling given the severity of his symptoms.
- (4) If a habeas court determines that there has been a constitutional violation, what remedies can the court impose.

Tara Ellyssia Zyst v. Jamie Miller, 346 Or App 801, 585 P3d 16 (2026) (precedential opinion) (A183152) (S072759) (from the Malheur County Circuit Court)

Plaintiff has been granted review of a Court of Appeals decision affirming in part and reversing in part the general judgment and orders granting in part and denying in part relief to plaintiff on her habeas corpus claims.

On review, the issues are:

- (1) What is the standard for construing pleadings to determine whether an issue is properly before the court in a habeas corpus proceeding.
- (2) Whether the Court of Appeals construed plaintiff's pleadings too narrowly when it concluded that plaintiff's psychiatric diagnoses were not directly at issue in the habeas corpus proceedings.

- (3) If a habeas corpus trial court determines there has been a constitutional violation, what remedies can the court impose.
- (4) Whether the Court of Appeals erred in concluding that the trial court did not have authority to order DOC to provide a psychiatric evaluation of plaintiff.
- (5) Whether the Court of Appeals erred in concluding that the trial court did not have authority to order DOC to identify an appropriate cellmate for plaintiff.

Adam Khosroabadi et al. v. North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District, 347 Or App 465, 587 P3d 1 (2026) (precedential opinion) (A181673) (S072822) (from the Clackamas County Circuit Court)

Respondent, the North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District, has been granted review of a Court of Appeals decision reversing the circuit court's judgment in favor of respondent.

On review, the issues are:

- (1) Whether ORS chapter 190 allows units of Oregon government to contract for a method of territorial withdrawal.
- (2) Whether petitioner may withdraw territory from respondent under the facts of this case pursuant to ORS 222.520 and ORS 222.524.

2. Denied petitions for reconsideration in:

Hornbuckle v. State of Oregon (S072313) (A186886) (Bushong, J., not participating)
Wilson v. Wilson (S072426) (A187377)
DeHart v. Rayfield (S072708)
Ernest-Lee A. Wordsmouth Trust v. Russ Auto, Inc. (S072779)
Chavez-Martinez v. State of Oregon (S072862)

3. Denied petitions for review in:

State of Oregon v. Propp (S072570) (A180539)
Copeland v. City of Redmond (S072578) (A181006) (Masih, J., concurred in denying review but observed that the petition raised an important legal issue that the Court should consider in an appropriate case)
Webster v. Redwood Holdings, LLC (S072610) (A184351)

Macias-Trujillo v. David Pedro (S072660) (A183012)
State of Oregon v. Luna-Benitez (S072667) (A183974)
Dumanovskiy v. Oregon Youth Authority (S072672) (A181340) (Flynn, C.J., and Masih, J., concurred in denying review but observed that the petition raised an important legal issue that the Court should consider in an appropriate case)
State of Oregon v. McAdoo (S072685) (A180365)
State of Oregon v. Avalos-Lezama (S072712) (A182933)
State of Oregon v. Eaton (S072714) (A179652) (Bushong, J., not participating)
State of Oregon v. Jimenez-Cervantes (S072730) (A183440)
Department of Human Services v. S. L. B. (S072742) (A187882) (Masih, J., concurred in denying review but observed that the petition raised an important legal issue that the Court should consider in an appropriate case)
Engweiler v. Highberger (S072745) (A186274)
State of Oregon v. Tenorio (S072761) (A181761)
State of Oregon v. Johnson (S072806) (A185291)
State of Oregon v. Anner (S072826) (A183837)
Department of Human Services v. T. G. (S072829) (A187564)
Criado v. Reyes (S072833) (A184595)
State of Oregon v. Meyer (S072849) (A184737)
Williams v. Hendricks (S072896) (A185791)
Middlekauff v. Reyes (S072913) (A186571)
State of Oregon v. Espinoza-Lopez (S072915) (A182083)
Department of Human Services v. J. A. W. (S072917) (A188534)

4. Denied petitions for writs of mandamus in:

Preusse v. Lee Enterprises, Inc. (S072738) (CC 25CV68072)
State of Oregon v. Parkerson (S072830)
State of Oregon v. Nees (S072831) (CC 17CR79888)
State of Oregon v. Maharaj-Ali (S072911) (CC 22CR43948)
State of Oregon v. Sprague (S072920) (CC 23CR15835)
State of Oregon v. Mackin (S072922) (CC 22CR04548)

5. Denied the petition for a writ for habeas corpus in:

Watts v. Massey (S072894) (CC 26CR04874)

6. Dismissed the petition for a writ of mandamus in:

Aldridge v. Tussing (S072780) (CC 24CV53848) (court struck petition for mandamus and supporting documents that included fabricated authorities, struck response to show cause order that included fabricated authorities, and dismissed the proceeding)

Between May 29, 2026, and June 4, 2026, an order was issued by a Presiding Justice taking the following action:

1. Dismissed the petition for a writ of mandamus in:

State of Oregon v. Campbell (S072846) (CC 24CR01188)