

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON

Adam Witkin,  
Plaintiff-Respondent,  
Respondent on Review,

v.

Mary McGreevy and occupants of the premises,  
Defendant-Appellant,  
Petitioner on Review.

Oregon Court of Appeals  
A185594

S072692

**ORDER STRIKING RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE TO PETITION  
FOR REVIEW, IMPOSING SANCTION, AND  
GRANTING PETITIONER'S MOTION TO TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE**

Upon consideration of the court.

This matter came before the court on February 10, 2026, on petitioner on review Mary McGreevy's petition for review. On March 2, 2026, respondent on review Adam Witkin filed a response to the petition for review. Petitioner on review filed a reply to the response that argued, among other things, that respondent on review's "response relies on authorities that cannot be located in the Oregon Reports." On March 26, 2026, respondent on review filed a response to the reply that addressed petitioner's other arguments but did not address the assertion about fabricated authorities.

On April 10, 2026, this court issued a show cause order directing respondent on review to confirm, under penalty of perjury, each of the citations in his response, to explain how any erroneous citations came to be included in the pleading, and to show cause why the court should not strike his response or impose other sanctions. On April 24, 2026, respondent on review complied with this court's order. The response addressed each of the fabricated authorities filed, explained that respondent had used generative artificial intelligence ("AI") to create the pleading, and asserted that respondent on review was unaware that generative AI could generate fictitious authorities and inaccurate legal arguments.

**ORDER STRIKING RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR REVIEW,  
IMPOSING SANCTION, AND GRANTING PETITIONER'S MOTION TO TAKE  
JUDICIAL NOTICE**

Respondent on review stipulates that a financial sanction of \$500 is appropriate. We agree. Although self-represented at the time of the filing, respondent on review was nonetheless obliged to make a reasonable effort to ensure that the filing included no affirmative misrepresentations. Reliance on legal citations and arguments produced by generative AI without any effort to verify those citations is unreasonable. Respondent on review's response to the show cause order -- which details the inaccurate and wholly fictitious citations included in respondent on review's response to the petition -- illustrates why that is so. Under these circumstances, a financial sanction is appropriate and we accept respondent's stipulation.

Respondent on review asks the court not to strike his response. We deny that request. The injection of false precedent into a case undermines the integrity of the proceedings and cannot be ignored.

However, considering the totality of the circumstances, including affirmative steps taken by respondent on review to accept responsibility for his errors in response to the court's show cause order, we grant respondent on review leave to refile his response to petitioner's petition on review at his own expense. Respondent on review is not allowed to raise new arguments or otherwise redraft the response except to correct the inaccurate description of the propositions for which the cited cases or other authority stand. In addition, any response filed must contain a certification that respondent on review or his counsel has verified that every source of law cited, quoted, or paraphrased in the revised response exists.

In addition, on April 6, 2026, petitioner on review filed a motion requesting the court take judicial notice of Klamath County Circuit Court Case No. 25CV29142.

Considering the foregoing, the court takes the following actions.

The court, on its own motion, strikes respondent on review's Response to Petition for Review (Docket Entry No. 7). Respondent on review may, but is not required to, file an amended response to the petition for review following the requirements included in this order. ORAP 9.10(1). Any such amended response is due 14 days from the date of this order.

Respondent or his counsel is directed to pay \$500 to the Appellate Court Services Division of the Oregon Judicial Department. Such payment must be made within 21 days of the date of this order.

**ORDER STRIKING RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR REVIEW,  
IMPOSING SANCTION, AND GRANTING PETITIONER'S MOTION TO TAKE  
JUDICIAL NOTICE**

The court grants petitioner on review's motion to take judicial notice.



Meagan A Flynn  
Chief Justice, Supreme Court  
06-04-2026

c: Mary McGreevy  
John Roberts

**ORDER STRIKING RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR REVIEW,  
IMPOSING SANCTION, AND GRANTING PETITIONER'S MOTION TO TAKE  
JUDICIAL NOTICE**