

Supreme Court Appeals  
Pending Cases  
01-19-18

---

1.	Style	State of Tennessee v. Westley A. Albright
2.	Docket Number	M2016-01217-CCA-R3-CD
3.	Lower Court Decision Link	<a href="https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/westley_albright.pdf">https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/westley_albright.pdf</a>
4.	Lower Court Summary	<p>The defendant, Westley A. Albright, pled nolo contendere to one count of soliciting a minor in violation of Tennessee Code Annotated section 39-13-528, a Class E felony, for which he received a one-year suspended sentence and deferred judicial diversion. As a condition of probation, the defendant agreed to participate in therapeutic treatment for the duration of probation or until favorably discharged. Prior to the conclusion of the one year suspended sentence, the defendant's treatment provider discharged him for failure to comply with the goals of his treatment program. Following service of a probation warrant and a hearing, the trial court revoked the defendant's deferred diversion and extended his probation for six months to allow for the completion of treatment. On appeal, the defendant argues: (1) the trial court violated his due process rights by failing to advise him at the time he entered his nolo contendere plea that, as a condition of probation, he would be required to confess to the solicitation of a minor; (2) the trial court violated his due process rights by relying on a probation rule not referenced in the revocation warrant; and (3) the trial court erred when revoking his deferred diversion despite his completion of the objective requirements of the sex offender treatment program. Upon review, we affirm the findings of the trial court.</p>
5.	Status	Application granted 9/20/17; Appellant brief filed 10/24/17; Appellee brief filed 12/14/17; Appellant reply brief filed 1/9/18; TBH 02/07/18.

---

1.	Style	Athlon Sports Communications, Inc. v. Stephen C. Duggan, et al.
2.	Docket Number	M2015-02222-SC-R11-CV
3.	Lower Court Decision Link	<a href="http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/athlonsportscommunications.opn_.pdf">http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/athlonsportscommunications.opn_.pdf</a>
4.	Lower Court Summary	<p>This appeal arises from a dispute over the fair value of stock in a dissenting shareholders case. Athlon Sports Communications, Inc. ("Athlon") completed a merger ("the Merger") which converted the minority dissenting shareholders' ("Defendants") shares into cash consideration and terminated their rights as shareholders. Athlon offered cash consideration for the shares at \$0.10 per share. Defendants contend that their shares are worth at least \$6.48 per share. Athlon sued Defendants to determine judicially the fair value of these shares. This case was tried before the Chancery Court for Davidson County ("the Trial Court"). After a trial, the Trial Court, applying the Delaware Block Method<sup>1</sup> for determination of share value, found that the share value was \$0.10 per share as of the date of the Merger. Defendants appeal to this Court, arguing that (1) the Delaware Block Method is ill-suited for a business like Athlon attempting a new venture, and is antiquated, generally; and, (2) that the Trial Court erred in its application of the Delaware Block Method. We find and hold that, under Tennessee law, the Trial Court properly utilized the Delaware Block Method. We find and hold further that the Trial Court considered the competing expert testimony, accredited Athlon's expert, and the evidence does not preponderate against the Trial Court's factual findings. We affirm the judgment of the Trial Court.</p>
5.	Status	Heard 10/11/17 in Nashville.

---

1.	Style	Board of Professional Responsibility v. Robin K. Barry
2.	Docket Number	M2016-02003-SC-R3-BP
3.	Lower Court Decision Link	N/A
4.	Lower Court Summary	N/A
5.	Status	Heard 6/1/17 in Nashville.

---

1.	Style	Nathan E. Brooks v. Board of Professional Responsibility
2.	Docket Number	E2018-00125-SC-R3-BP
3.	Lower Court Decision Link	N/A
4.	Lower Court Summary	N/A
5.	Status	Notice of Appeal filed 01/18/2018.

---

1.	Style	Chuck's Package Store, et al. v. City of Morristown
2.	Docket Number	E2015-01524-SC-R11-CV
3.	Lower Court Decision Link	<a href="http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/chucks_package_store_et_al._v._city_of_morristown_2.pdf">http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/chucks_package_store_et_al._v._city_of_morristown_2.pdf</a>
4.	Lower Court Summary	This case originated when six retail wine and liquor stores filed suit against the City of Morristown seeking a refund of a portion of inspection fees that had been erroneously calculated by the City. The fees were assessed by the City on the purchases at wholesale of alcoholic beverages. The City failed to use the correct percentage mandated by Tenn. Code Ann. § 57-3-501 (2013). It is undisputed that the plaintiffs overpaid the City; since the plaintiffs were understandably unaware of the error, they failed to state that they were paying the fees under protest. The City moved to dismiss the case, citing the plaintiffs' failure to pay "under protest." The trial court held that Tenn. Code Ann. § 67-1-1807 (2013) relieved the plaintiffs of the requirement to pay the inspection fees under protest. Accordingly, the trial court denied the City's motion. The case proceeded to a bench trial where the court resolved all of the issues in the plaintiffs' favor. The City appeals, arguing that Tenn. Code Ann. § 67-1-1801, et seq. (2013) does not apply to challenges involving fees paid to municipalities. The State Attorney General filed an amicus curiae brief supporting the City's position. We affirm the trial court.
5.	Status	Heard 5/9/17 in Knoxville.

---

1.	Style	Rose Coleman v. Bryan Olson
2.	Docket Number	M2015-00823-SC-R11-CV

3. Lower Court Decision Links [http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/colemanr.opn\\_.pdf](http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/colemanr.opn_.pdf)
4. Lower Court Summary
 

This appeal concerns two disputes between the widowed husband and mother of a deceased woman: (1) the proper party to whom the woman's life insurance proceeds are owed; and (2) a request for grandparent visitation. We conclude that the trial court erred in failing to return the life insurance beneficiary to the status quo that existed prior to wife's violation of the automatic injunction pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated Section 36-4-106(d)(2). The proceeds from the life insurance policy are therefore awarded to husband. We vacate, however, the trial court's seizure of the grandmother's Bank of America account and remand for further proceedings to determine if the funds contained therein represent the remainder of the life insurance proceeds improperly paid to the grandmother. We further conclude that the trial court erred in awarding grandparent visitation, where there was no evidence of opposition to visitation prior to the filing of the grandparent visitation petition. Reversed in part, vacated in part, and remanded.
5. Status Heard 10/11/17 in Nashville.

1. Style In re: James Carl Cope, BPR #3340
2. Docket Number M2016-02144-SC-BAR-BP
3. Lower Court Decision Link N/A
4. Lower Court Summary N/A
5. Status Order proposing to increase punishment filed 8/17/17; Attorney brief filed 9/11/17; BPR brief filed 10/2/17; TBH 02/07/18.

1. Style Frederick Copeland v. HealthSouth/Methodist Rehabilitation Hospital LP Et Al.
2. Docket Number W2016-02499-SC-R11-CV
3. Lower Court Decision Link <http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/copelandopn.pdf>
4. Lower Court Summary
 

This is an appeal from the grant of summary judgment in favor of Appellee. Following Appellant's knee surgery, Appellee provided Appellant transportation, by wheelchair van, from the rehabilitation hospital to a follow-up appointment with his surgeon. Prior to transport, Appellant signed an exculpatory agreement, releasing Appellee from all claims of ordinary negligence. Appellant was injured when he fell while trying to enter the van and filed suit against Appellee for negligence. The trial court granted summary judgment in favor of Appellee, finding that the exculpatory agreement was enforceable. Discerning no error, we affirm.
5. Status Application granted 12/8/17; Appellant brief due 2/7/18, after extension.

1. Style Benjamin Shea Cotten, as Personal Representative for the Estate of Christina Marie Cotten, Deceased, et al. v. Jerry Scott Wilson
2. Docket Number M2016-02402-SC-R11-CV
3. Lower Court Decision Links [http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/cotten.christina.opn\\_.pdf](http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/cotten.christina.opn_.pdf)

4. Lower Court Summary  
The personal representative, on behalf of the decedent's estate, brought this negligence action against the defendant based, *inter alia*, on the defendant's alleged acts of displaying and failing to properly store and prevent accessibility to the firearm with which the decedent ultimately committed suicide. The trial court granted summary judgment in favor of the defendant, determining that he owed no duty of care to the decedent and that her suicide was an independent, intervening cause that broke the chain of causation. The estate has appealed. Based upon the applicable balancing test, we conclude that the defendant owed a legal duty of care to the decedent and that summary judgment was improperly granted in the defendant's favor on the basis of lack of duty. We further determine that the estate's evidence at the summary judgment stage was sufficient to establish the existence of a genuine issue of material fact for trial regarding causation. We therefore vacate the trial court's grant of summary judgment and remand for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. We affirm, however, the trial court's determination that no special relationship existed such as to impose liability for nonfeasance.

5. Status Application granted 01/18/18; Appellant brief due 2/19/18.

---

1. Style State of Tennessee v. Angela Faye Daniel

2. Docket Number M2015-01073-SC-R11-CD

3. Lower Court Decision Links <http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/danielangelafayeopn.pdf>

4. Lower Court Summary  
In this interlocutory appeal, the appellant, State of Tennessee, appeals the Williamson County Circuit Court's order granting a motion to suppress evidence filed by the appellee, Angela Faye Daniel. The appellant claims that the trial court erroneously concluded that a police officer's failure to deliver a copy of a search warrant to the appellee was not a "clerical error" under Tennessee Code Annotated section 40-6-108, the Exclusionary Rule Reform Act. Based upon the oral arguments, the record, and the parties' briefs, we affirm the order of the trial court.

5. Status Heard 9/6/17 in Knoxville.

---

1. Style Board of Professional Responsibility v. Charles Edward Daniel

2. Docket Number E2017-01170-SC-R3-BP

3. Lower Court Decision Link N/A

4. Lower Court Summary N/A

5. Status Heard 01/10/18 in Knoxville.

---

1. Style Dialysis Clinic, Inc. v. Kevin Medley, et al

2. Docket Number M2017-01352-SC-R11-CV

3. Lower Court Decision Link N/A

4. Lower Court Summary N/A

5. Status Application granted 12/07/17; Appellant brief due 2/22/18, after extension.

---

1. Style Gerald Stanley Green v. Board of Professional Responsibility

2. Docket Number W2017-02358-SC-R3-BP

3. Lower Court Decision Link N/A

4. Lower Court Summary N/A

5. Status Notice of Appeal filed 12/01/17.

---

1. Style State of Tennessee v. David Scott Hall

2. Docket Number M2015-02402-SC-R11-CD

3. Lower Court Decision Link [http://tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/hall\\_david\\_scott\\_opn.pdf](http://tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/hall_david_scott_opn.pdf)

4. Lower Court Summary  
The Appellant, David Scott Hall, was convicted in the Davidson County Criminal Court of attempted especially aggravated sexual exploitation of a minor, a Class C felony, and sentenced to four years to be served as one year in confinement and the remainder on supervised probation. On appeal, the Appellant contends that the evidence is insufficient to support the conviction, that the trial court erred by allowing an expert witness to give irrelevant and highly prejudicial testimony, that he is entitled to coram nobis relief, that his right to a speedy trial was violated, that the trial court erred by allowing the State to introduce evidence without showing a proper chain of custody, that the trial court erred by allowing the State to play only a portion of a controlled telephone call to the Appellant, that the trial court erred by allowing the victim to testify about habit, that the trial court erred by allowing the State to introduce into evidence a letter supposedly written by the Appellant, and that the trial court erred by allowing the State to make improper closing arguments. Based upon the oral arguments, the record, and the parties' briefs, we conclude that the evidence is sufficient to support the conviction, that the trial court erred by allowing a witnesses to give irrelevant testimony but that the error was harmless, that the Appellant is not entitled to coram nobis relief, and that his right to a speedy trial was not violated. Finding no plain error as to the remaining issues, we affirm the judgment of the trial court.

5. Status Heard 1/10/18 in Knoxville.

---

1. Style State of Tennessee v. Lajuan Harbison

2. Docket Number E2015-00700-SC-R11-CD

3. Lower Court Decision Link [http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/harbisonlajuanopn\\_0.pdf](http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/harbisonlajuanopn_0.pdf)

4. Lower Court Summary  
The Defendant, Lajuan Harbison, stands convicted by a Knox County jury of four counts of attempted voluntary manslaughter and four counts of employing a firearm during the commission of a dangerous felony, for which the trial court sentenced him to an effective term of twenty-two years' incarceration. On appeal, the Defendant argues (1) that the trial court erred by refusing to grant his motion for a severance; (2) that the evidence was insufficient to support his convictions, including therein a double jeopardy challenge to his employing a firearm during the commission of a dangerous felony convictions, and (3) that

consecutive sentencing was improper. Following our review, we first conclude that a severance of defendants should have been granted and that the failure to do so constitutes reversible error. We also conclude that the evidence was insufficient to support one of the Defendant's convictions for attempted voluntary manslaughter because the doctrine of transferred intent is inapplicable to such a conviction, and therefore, the corresponding count of employing a firearm during the commission of said dangerous felony likewise cannot stand. Additionally, multiple convictions for employing a firearm during the commission of a dangerous felony violate double jeopardy principles because the statute does not authorize separate firearms convictions for each felony committed in a single transaction. Accordingly, we reverse the judgments of the trial court and remand the case for a new trial.

5.	Status	Heard 5/24/17 at Boys State SCALES Project in Cookeville; Opinion filed 01/09/18.
<hr/>		
1.	Style	Individual Healthcare Specialists, Inc. v. BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee, Inc.
2.	Docket Number	M2015-02524-SC-R11-CV
3.	Lower Court Decision Link	<a href="http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/indiv.healthv.bluecro.blushi.opn_.pdf">http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/indiv.healthv.bluecro.blushi.opn_.pdf</a>
4.	Lower Court Summary	<p>This is a breach of contract action in which the issues hinge on the meaning of several provisions in the agreement. In 1999 and again in 2009, BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee, Inc. ("BlueCross") and Individual Healthcare Specialists, Inc. ("IHS") entered into a general agency agreement that authorized IHS to solicit applications for individual insurance policies through IHS's in-house agents and outside "subagents." The commission rates to be paid were stated in a schedule, which was subject to modification by BlueCross. During the first eleven years, BlueCross modified the commission schedule several times and each modification was prospective only. In 2011, BlueCross modified the commission schedule and, for the first time, applied the commission schedule retrospectively. At the same time, IHS determined that BlueCross had been underpaying commissions since 1999. As a consequence, it commenced this action asserting claims for, inter alia, breach of contract and damages, while also claiming it was entitled to recover its attorney's fees based on the contract's indemnification provision. BlueCross denied any breach of contract. It also asserted the statute of limitations defense as a bar to recovering any commissions that accrued more than six years earlier, and asserted that IHS was not entitled to recover its attorney's fees because the indemnification provision did not apply to disputes between the contracting parties. Shortly thereafter, BlueCross terminated the general agency agreement and began paying renewal commissions directly to IHS's subagents instead of paying them to IHS as it had done since 1999. IHS then amended its complaint to assert a claim that BlueCross also breached the agreement by failing to pay commissions directly to IHS. Following a bench trial, the court denied BlueCross's statute of limitations defense on the ground that IHS's claims were "inherently undiscoverable." The court also determined that BlueCross breached the contract by underpaying commissions, by applying the 2011 commission rates for renewals to existing policies, and by failing to pay all renewal commissions to IHS after termination of the general agency agreement. As for damages, the court awarded IHS some of the damages it claimed but denied others on the ground the evidence was speculative. As for IHS's attorney's fees, the trial court considered parol 05/15/2017 evidence to ascertain the intent of the parties and held that the indemnification provision authorized the recovery of attorney's fees in a dispute between the contracting parties.</p>
5.	Status	Application granted 10/3/17; Amicus brief filed 9/26/17; Appellant brief filed 11/03/17; Appellee brief filed 12/4/17; Appellant reply brief filed 12/18/17; TBH 02/7/18.
<hr/>		
1.	Style	State of Tennessee v. Jerome Antonio McElrath
2.	Docket Number	W2015-01794-SC-R11-CD

3.	Lower Court Decision Link	<a href="http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/mcelrathj_opinion.pdf">http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/mcelrathj_opinion.pdf</a>
4.	Lower Court Summary	The State appeals the suppression of evidence by the Obion County Circuit Court. The defendant, Jerome Antonio McElrath, was arrested on two separate occasions for criminal trespass. The searches of the defendant's person incident to those arrests produced marijuana in the amounts of 10.1 grams and 4.0 grams, respectively. After an evidentiary hearing, the trial court granted the defendant's motion to suppress the evidence seized incident to his arrests and dismissed the charges. The State argues that the arresting officer had probable cause to arrest the defendant and, therefore, the search incident to each arrest was lawful. Furthermore, the State contends that the evidence was legally obtained because the officer acted in good-faith reliance on information provided by dispatch. After review, we affirm the decision of the trial court.
5.	Status	Application granted 10/3/17; Appellant brief filed 11/06/17; Appellee brief filed 12/6/17.
<hr/>		
1.	Style	Sean K. Hornbeck v. Board of Professional Responsibility
2.	Docket Number	M2016-01793-SC-R3-BP
3.	Lower Court Decision Link	N/A
4.	Lower Court Summary	N/A
5.	Status	Heard 6/1/17 in Nashville.
<hr/>		
1.	Style	State of Tennessee v. Henry Lee Jones
2.	Docket Number	W2015-02210-SC-DDT-DD
3.	Lower Court Decision Link	<a href="http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/jones_henry_lee_opn.pdf">http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/jones_henry_lee_opn.pdf</a>
4.	Lower Court Summary	Defendant, Henry Lee Jones, was convicted of two counts of premeditated first degree murder and two counts of felony murder for his role in the 2003 murders of two Shelby County citizens. The jury sentenced Defendant to death for each murder. Defendant now appeals from these convictions and sentences. Defendant argues that the trial court erred by allowing Defendant to represent himself and committed other errors with regard to the provision of elbow counsel; the trial court erred by declaring a witness unavailable and allowing testimony from that witness regarding a prior bad act; the trial court erred by admitting photographs of the victims' bodies and wounds; the State utilized improper closing argument; the evidence was insufficient to support the convictions; the trial court erred in denying Defendant a mitigation expert or investigator in preparation for sentencing; and the death sentence is arbitrary and disproportionate.
5.	Status	Notice of Appeal filed 10/3/17; Appellant brief filed 01/03/18; Appellee brief due 02/02/18.
<hr/>		
1.	Style	Loring Edwin Justice v. Board of Professional Responsibility
2.	Docket Number	E2017-01334-SC-R3-BP

3.	Lower Court Decision Link	N/A
4.	Lower Court Summary	N/A
5.	Status	Notice of Appeal received 6/30/17; Motion for extension to file record granted on 10/23/17; Record to be filed 02/05/18.

---

1.	Style	State of Tennessee v. Lindsey Brooke Lowe
2.	Docket Number	M2014-00472-SC-R11-CD
3.	Lower Court Decision Link	<a href="http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/lowelb.opn6_.pdf">http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/lowelb.opn6_.pdf</a>
4.	Lower Court Summary	The parents of the defendant, Lindsey Brooke Lowe, discovered the body of one of her newborn twins in a laundry basket in her bedroom. A second deceased newborn was also found in the basket, and the defendant gave an incriminating statement to police. A jury convicted the defendant of two counts of first degree (felony) murder, two counts of first degree (premeditated) murder, and two counts of aggravated child abuse, a Class A felony. The trial court merged the first degree murder convictions for each victim. The defendant received a life sentence for each first degree murder conviction and a twenty-five year sentence for each aggravated child abuse conviction, all to be served concurrently. On appeal she asserts that the evidence was insufficient to support the verdicts; that the trial court erred in not suppressing her statement; that the trial court was biased; that the trial court denied her the right to testify in her defense; that the burden of proof was shifted to the defense; that her motion for a change of venue should have been granted; that the physical evidence obtained through a search warrant should have been suppressed; that the trial court erred in excluding expert testimony regarding her ability to waive her right to remain silent; that the trial court erred in various other evidentiary decisions; and that she is entitled to relief under the theory of cumulative error. After a thorough review of the record and the applicable law, we affirm the judgments of the trial court.
5.	Status	Heard 9/6/17 in Knoxville.

---

1.	Style	State of Tennessee v. Anthony Jerome Miller
2.	Docket Number	E2016-01779-SC-R11-CD
3.	Lower Court Decision Link	<a href="https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/anthony_jerome_miller_opinion.pdf">https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/anthony_jerome_miller_opinion.pdf</a>
4.	Lower Court Summary	Anthony Jerome Miller, the Defendant, pled guilty to sexual exploitation of a minor and reserved a certified question for appeal regarding the trial court's denial of his motion to suppress evidence. He asserts that the trial court erred in denying his motion to suppress the evidence obtained by the State during a search of his residence because the District Attorney General's Office did not apply for the search warrant, as required by Tennessee Code Annotated section 39-17-1007. The State responds that: (1) a search warrant is not "process" as intended by the meaning of section 39-17-1007; (2) the search warrant is valid under section 39-17-1007 because Investigator O'Keefe's application falls under the "except as otherwise provided" clause because law enforcement are authorized to apply for search warrants under Tennessee Rule of Criminal Procedure 41(a); and (3) if a search warrant is considered process under section 39-17-1007, then Investigator O'Keefe fulfilled the requirements of the statute by seeking verbal consent from an Assistant District Attorney. After a thorough review of the record and applicable law, we affirm.

5. Status Application granted 11/16/17; Appellant brief filed 12/14/17; Appellee brief due 02/12/18 after extension.

---

1. Style State of Tennessee v. Christopher Minor

2. Docket Number W2016-00348-SC-R11-CD

3. Lower Court Decision Link [https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/minorc\\_opinion.pdf](https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/minorc_opinion.pdf)

4. Lower Court Summary  
In a bifurcated trial, a Madison County jury convicted the defendant, Christopher Minor, of two counts of first degree murder, two counts of aggravated burglary, one count of aggravated assault, one count of convicted felon in possession of a firearm, one count of employing a firearm during the commission of a dangerous felony, one count of employing a firearm during the commission of a dangerous felony having been previously been convicted of a felony, and six counts of violating Tennessee Code Annotated section 40-35-121, the criminal gang offenses enhancement statute. The trial court imposed an effective sentence of life plus twenty years. The defendant appeals his conviction, challenging the sufficiency of the evidence and the constitutionality of Tennessee Code Annotated section 40-35-121. The State argues the evidence was sufficient to support the defendant's convictions, and the defendant waived his constitutional challenge by raising his argument for the first time on appeal. We agree with the State and affirm the judgments of the trial court.

5. Status Heard 10/11/17 in Nashville; Appellant supplemental brief filed 11/07/17; Appellee supplemental brief filed 12/08/17.

---

1. Style Brittany Noel Nelson, et al. v. Charles W. Myres, et al.

2. Docket Number M2015-01857-SC-R11-CV

3. Lower Court Decision Link [https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/nelson.brittany.correction.opn\\_.pdf](https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/nelson.brittany.correction.opn_.pdf)

4. Lower Court Summary  
A woman died in a multi-vehicle accident. Two wrongful death actions were filed, one by the woman's daughter, the other by the woman's husband. The daughter's suit named the husband and others as defendants. The husband's suit named one of the other drivers as the only defendant. The trial court dismissed the daughter's complaint, holding that Tennessee's wrongful death statute creates only one cause of action and that the husband, as the surviving spouse, was granted priority to prosecute the action under the statute. The daughter appeals the dismissal of her complaint. Because the husband is unable to name himself as a defendant in the suit he has filed, he is not able to prosecute the wrongful death action in a manner consistent with the right of the decedent to sue all wrongdoers whose actions are alleged to have led to her death; accordingly, we reverse the judgment of the trial court dismissing the daughter's complaint, reinstate the complaint, and remand the case for further proceedings.

5. Status Heard 10/11/17 in Nashville.

---

1. Style Tommy Nunley v. State of Tennessee

2. Docket Number W2016-01487-SC-R11-ECN

3. Lower Court Decision Link [http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/nunley\\_tommyopn.pdf](http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/nunley_tommyopn.pdf)

4. Lower Court Summary The petitioner, Tommy Nunley, appeals the summary denial of his petition for writ of error coram nobis, which petition challenged his 1998 Shelby County Criminal Court jury conviction of aggravated rape, claiming that the trial court erred by treating his petition for writ of error coram nobis as a petition for DNA testing and by summarily dismissing the petition. Discerning no error, we affirm.

5. Status Heard 11/30/17 at SCALES docket at Lane College.

---

1. Style Board of Professional Responsibility v. Larry Edward Parrish

2. Docket Number W2017-00889-SC-R3-BP

3. Lower Court Decision Link N/A

4. Lower Court Summary N/A

5. Status Notice of Appeal filed 5/5/17; Appellate Record filed 8/28/17; Appellant Brief filed 10/18/17; Appellate amended brief filed 11/09/17; Appellee brief filed 12/15/17; Amended reply brief filed 01/09/18.

---

1. Style Tiffinne Wendalyn Gail Runions, et al. v. Jackson-Madison County General Hospital District, et al.

2. Docket Number W2016-00901-SC-R11-CV

3. Lower Court Decision Link <https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/runionstopn.pdf>

4. Lower Court Summary This is an interlocutory appeal pursuant to Rule 9 of the Tennessee Rules of Appellate Procedure. In this health care liability action, we must determine whether the plaintiff properly complied with the pre-suit notice requirement found in Tennessee Code Annotated section 29-26-121(a)(1). The original defendants in this matter all filed a motion to dismiss and/or for summary judgment alleging that they did not provide medical treatment to the plaintiff/appellee. Subsequently, the plaintiff filed a response to the defendants' motion acknowledging that she had mistakenly identified a proper defendant in this suit. The plaintiff also filed a motion to amend her complaint attempting to remedy that mistake by substituting in the proper defendant. After both motions were heard, the trial court denied the original defendants' motion to dismiss and/or for summary judgment and granted the plaintiff/appellee's motion to amend her complaint. For the following reasons, we affirm the decision of the trial court and remand for further proceedings.

5. Status Heard 11/30/17 at SCALES docket at Lane College.

---

1. Style Board of Professional Responsibility v. Michael Gibbs Sheppard

2. Docket Number M2017-00804-SC-R3-BP

3. Lower Court Decision Link N/A

4. Lower Court Summary N/A

5.	Status	Heard 01/10/18 in Nashville.
<hr/>		
1.	Style	David R. Smith v. The Tennessee National Guard
2.	Docket Number	M2016-01109-SC-R11-CV
3.	Lower Court Decision Link	<a href="http://tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/smith.david_opn.pdf">http://tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/smith.david_opn.pdf</a> <a href="http://tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/smith.david_diss_opn.pdf">http://tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/smith.david_diss_opn.pdf</a>
4.	Lower Court Summary	This case involves a military service member's claim against the Tennessee National Guard pursuant to the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994, 38 U.S.C. § 4301 et seq., and Tennessee Code Annotated section 29-20-208. The trial court dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim. We reverse and remand for further proceedings.
5.	Status	Application granted 8/17/17; Appellant filed 9/15/17; Appellee brief filed 11/7/17 after extension; TBH 02/7/18.
<hr/>		
1.	Style	Drayton Beecher Smith II v. Board of Professional Responsibility
2.	Docket Number	W2017-00247-SC-R3-BP
3.	Lower Court Decision Link	N/A
4.	Lower Court Summary	N/A
5.	Status	Heard 11/8/17 in Jackson.
<hr/>		
1.	Style	State of Tennessee v. Janet Michelle Stanfield, Tony Alan Winsett and Justin Bradley Stanfield
2.	Docket Number	W2015-02503-SC-R11-CD
3.	Lower Court Decision Link	<a href="https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/stanfield-winssett-stanfieldopn.pdf">https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/stanfield-winssett-stanfieldopn.pdf</a>
4.	Lower Court Summary	The Defendants, Janet Michelle Stanfield, Tony Alan Winsett, and Justin Bradley Stanfield, were indicted by the Obion County Grand Jury for various drug and firearm offenses following a warrantless search of their house. The Defendants filed motions to suppress the evidence seized, and the trial court granted the motions and dismissed the case. The State appeals, asserting that the warrantless search was valid and the evidence was admissible. Upon review, we affirm the judgment of the trial court.
5.	Status	Heard 11/8/17 in Jackson.
<hr/>		
1.	Style	Rhonda Willeford, et al. v. Timothy P. Klepper, M.D., et al. v. State of Tennessee
2.	Docket Number	M2016-01491-SC-R11-CV

- 3. Lower Court Decision Link N/A
- 4. Lower Court Summary N/A
- 5. Status Heard 01/10/18 in Nashville.

- 1. Style State of Tennessee v. Jimmy Williams
- 2. Docket Number W2016-00946-SC-R11-CD
- 3. Lower Court Decision Link [http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/williams\\_jimmy\\_opn.pdf](http://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/williams_jimmy_opn.pdf)
- 4. Lower Court Summary A Shelby County jury convicted the Defendant, Jimmy Williams, of aggravated assault. The trial court sentenced the Defendant as a career offender to fifteen years in prison. On appeal, the Defendant contends that the evidence is insufficient to sustain his conviction and that the trial court erred in sentencing him as a career offender. After review, we affirm the trial court's judgment.
- 5. Status Application granted 01/22/18; Appellant brief due 2/21/18.