

IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TENNESSEE
AT KNOXVILLE

FILED

11/07/2025

Clerk of the
Appellate Courts

STATE OF TENNESSEE v. JERELL ANTHONY WILLIAMS

**Criminal Court for Washington County
Nos. 990C1-2025-CR-50718 and 18999S**

No. E2025-01720-CCA-R9-CO

ORDER

The Defendant has filed an application for interlocutory appeal, *see* Tennessee Rules of Appellate Procedure 9, seeking review of the October 22, 2025 order permitting appointed counsel to withdraw from representation. Because the application is procedurally insufficient for this court's review, an answer from the State is not necessary and the application is respectfully DENIED.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The pleading before this court informs this court that the Defendant was arrested on January 26, 2025, for aggravated domestic assault. On May 6, 2025, the Defendant was charged with the same, presumably via indictment. The trial court determined the Defendant to be indigent and appointed counsel to represent the Defendant. Throughout counsel's representation, the Defendant insisted that counsel communicate with family members—rather than with the Defendant—concerning matters pertaining to his defense. Counsel declined to communicate through family members, citing counsel's ethical obligations relative to the attorney-client privilege. On October 13, 2025, the Defendant was arrested for violating an order of protection. On October 22, 2025, counsel filed a motion to withdraw from representation. The Defendant filed a response to counsel's motion to withdraw in which he demanded a hearing as to whether counsel had rendered ineffective assistance. On October 22, 2025, the general sessions court entered an order granting counsel's motion to withdraw and setting the new charge for further hearing on November 20, 2025, to permit the Defendant time to hire counsel.

In the pleading, the Defendant claims that the trial court granted counsel's motion to withdraw as well. That said, the attachments to the pleading include, in pertinent part, the Defendant's response to counsel's motion, a copy of an email exchange between appointed

counsel and the Defendant's brother, and the general sessions court's October 22, 2025 order. The attachments do not include counsel's motion to withdraw from representation or a trial court order granting counsel's motion to withdraw.

ANALYSIS

Rule 9 of the Tennessee Rules of Appellate Procedure outlines the procedure for obtaining interlocutory appellate review of a trial court order. Both the trial and appellate court must approve the appeal. To that end, a party must first file a motion in the trial court requesting the appeal within thirty days of the order being appealed. Tenn. R. App. P. 9(b). If the trial court determines the interlocutory appeal shall be allowed to proceed, the party must then file an application for permission to appeal in this court within ten days of the trial court's order granting the appeal. Tenn. R. App. P. 9(c). The application must be accompanied by copies of the trial court order from which appellate review is being sought, the trial court's statement of reasons for granting the appeal, and the other parts of the record necessary for consideration of the application. Tenn. R. App. P. 9(d). Thus, and because there is generally no record already on file, when a party seeks a Rule 9 appeal, it is that party's responsibility to provide this court with an *ad hoc* record of the proceeding below.

The Defendant failed to attach a copy of the trial court's order granting counsel's motion to withdraw and also failed to seek permission from the trial court to appeal that order. Indeed, it is not apparent from the included attachments whether the trial court has ruled upon a motion to withdraw. Therefore, we conclude that the application before this court is procedurally insufficient for this court's review.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the Defendant's application for permission to appeal pursuant to Rule 9 of the Tennessee Rules of Appellate Procedure is respectfully DENIED. Because the trial court previously determined the Defendant to be indigent, the costs associated with this proceeding are taxed to the State of Tennessee.

JUDGE TOM GREENHOLTZ
JUDGE KYLE A. HIXSON
JUDGE STEVEN W. SWORD