## SUPREME COURT OF TENNESSEE SUPREME COURT DISCRETIONARY APPEALS February 12, 2001

STYLE/APPEAL NUMBER	COUNTY TRIAL JUDGE TRIAL COURT NO.	APPELLATE JUDGE JUDGMENT	NATURE OF APPEAL	ACTION
Marcia C. Bryant vs. Jeffery Steven Salter M2000-02372-SC-S09-JV	Rutherford Juvenile Ben Hall McFarlin 1273-C	Cantrell, Koch, Cottrell Rule 9 Application denied	Rule 9	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Jeffery Steven Salter
Helen Chase vs. Roger Springer M1999-01038-SC-R11-CV	Davidson Circuit Walter C. Kurtz 95C-2190	Cain, J. Affirmed and remanded	Rule 11	Denied - Application of Helen Chase
City of Clarksville vs. Raymond Davis M1999-00084-SC-R11-CV	Montgomery Circuit James E. Walton CII-409	Lillard, J. Reversed	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of City of Clarksville
Eddie Cooley vs. Joe May M2000-02630-SC-R11-CV	Sequatchie Circuit 7367	Cain, Koch, Cottrell Denied Rule 10 Application	Rule 10	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Eddie Cooley
Scott Graham Hartman, et al vs. The University of TN, et al M1999-02730-SC-R11-CV	TN Claims Comm. W.R. Baker 85,209	Cain, J. Reversed and remanded	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Applications of University of Tennessee and State of Tennessee
Metropolitan Government of Nashville & Davidson County vs. Castleman Trust M2000-00887-SC-R11-CV	Davidson Chancery Carol McCoy 99-705-II	Cantrell, Cain, Cottrell Appeal dismissed	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Castleman Trust

Benny Skinner vs. Nannie Bell M1999-02078-SC-R11-CV	Montgomery Circuit James E. Walton C9-295	Cantrell, J. Affirmed and remanded	Rule 11	Denied - Application of Nannie Bell
Hayes Washington vs. The 822 Corporation M1999-01318-SC-R11-CV	Davidson Circuit Carol Soloman 95C-4371	Crawford, J. Affirmed and remanded	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of The 822 Corporation
State of Tennessee vs. Douglas Bowers M1999-00778-SC-R11-CD	Lincoln Criminal William C. Lee S9900047	Smith, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Douglas Bowers
State of Tennessee vs. John H. Childress M1999-00843-SC-R11-CD	Davidson Criminal Frank Clement, Jr. 99-T-30	Welles, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of John H. Childress
State of Tennessee vs. James Henry Davis M1999-02467-SC-R11-CD	White Criminal Leon Burns, Jr. CR247	Welles, J. Modified	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of James Henry Davis
State of Tennessee vs. Charles Hamlin M1999-01970-SC-R11-CD	Marion J. Curtis Smith 3197	Wedemeyer, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	Denied - Application of Charles Hamlin
State of Tennessee vs. Gerald McCullough M1999-01525-SC-R11-CD	Bedford William C. Lee 14393	Wade, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Gerald McCullough

State of Tennessee vs. Sean Price M1999-02530-SC-R11-CD	Cheatham Circuit Robert Burch 13295	Hayes, J. Reversed and remanded	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Sean Price; recommended that the opinion of the Criminal Court of Appeals be published
Tommy Ray Warren vs. State of Tennessee M1999-01319-SC-R11-PC`	Wayne Criminal Jim T. Hamilton 10816-7-101	Ogle, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	Denied - Application of Tommy Ray Warren
Coldwell Banker-Hoffman Burke, et al vs. KRA Holdings, etc. W1999-02721-SC-R11-CV	Shelby Chancery D.J. Alissandratos 107899-3	Crawford, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	Denied - Application of Donna Sliney
Willie Toles and Ida Toles vs. City of Dyersburg, et al W1999-01238-SC-R11-CV	Dyer Circuit R. Lee Moore, Jr. 98-243	Highers, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Willie Toles and Ida Mae Toles
Hulon O. Warlick, III, et al vs. Jamie Hamilton, et ux W1999-00440-SC-R11-CV	Obion Chancery W. Michael Maloan 18,378 and 18,434	Farmer, J. Affirmed and remanded	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Jamie Hamilton and Bonnie Hamilton; recommended that the Court of Appeals opinion be published.
State of Tennessee vs. Arthur Clark W1999-01747-SC-R11-CD	Shelby Criminal Chris Craft 96-10672	Glenn, J. Affirmed as modified and remanded	Rule 11	Denied - Application of Arthur Clark

State of Tennessee vs. Deshawn McClenton W1999-00879-SC-R11-CD	Shelby Criminal Joseph B. Dailey 98-02226-7	Welles, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Deshawn McClenton
State of Tennessee vs. Carlos McDonald W1999-01459-SC-R11-CD	Shelby Criminal Chris Craft 97-02521	Wade, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	Denied - Application of Carlos McDonald
State of Tennessee vs. James Raymond Snider W1999-01849-SC-R11-CD	Madison Circuit Roy B. Morgan 98-630	Glenn, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of James Snider
Terrance Pulliam vs. State of Tennessee W1999-00277-SC-R11-PC	Shelby Criminal Carolyn W. Blackett P-19903	Welles, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Terrance Pulliam
American Materials Technologies vs. Adams Lithographing Company E1999-00806-SC-R11-CV	Hamilton Chancery W. Frank Brown, III 98-0991	Franks, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Adams Lithographing Co., et al.
Outdoor West of Tennessee, Inc. (Lamar Advertising of Tri-Cities) vs. City of Johnson City, Tennessee E1999-00412-SC-R11-CV	Washington Circuit G. Richard Johnson 17512	Swiney, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of City of Johnson City, TN
Perry H. Young vs. State of Tennessee E1999-01968-SC-R11-CV	Hamilton Samuel H. Payne 98C0354	Goddard, J. Affirmed	Petition to rehear	Denied - Application of Perry H. Young

State of Tennessee vs. Lorenzo Edward Ervin E1998-00564-SC-R11-CD	Hamilton Criminal Stephen M. Bevil 198207	Glenn, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Lorenzo Edward Ervin
State of Tennessee vs. John R. Farner, Jr. E1999-00491-SC-R11-CD	Sullivan Criminal R. Jerry Beck S40,003	Tipton, J. Affirmed in part, modified in part	Rule 11	<b>Granted</b> - Application of John R. Farner, Jr. <sup>1</sup>
State of Tennessee vs. Mark Steven Marlow E1998-00873-SC-R11-CD	Union W. Lee Asbury 1410	Wade, J. Affirmed	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Mark Steven Marlow
Jackie Ray Coffman vs. State of Tennessee E1999-00111-SC-R11-PC	Grainger Criminal Rex H. Ogle 6032	Woodall, J. Affirmed pursuant to Rule 20	Rule 11	<b>Denied</b> - Application of Jackie Ray Coffman

The following Rule 11 Dismissals were filed the weeks of February 5<sup>th</sup> - February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2001

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>For oral argument, the Court is particularly interested in the following issue: Can the defendant be held criminally responsible for the death of co-perpetrators? This statement of the issue for oral argument does not prevent the parties from raising additional issues pursuant to Rule 13(a), TRAP.

STYLE/APPEAL NUMBER	COUNTY TRIAL JUDGE TRIAL COURT NO.	APPELLATE JUDGE JUDGMENT	NATURE OF APPEAL	ACTION