

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE, EASTERN DIVISION

Karla Harrell v. Harry Nunnely Bushart Jr., et al.

Harrell · No. No. 26-1022-STA-jay · Decided June 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee adopts the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation and dismisses Karla Harrell’s complaint sua sponte. The court certifies that an appeal would not be taken in good faith and denies leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal, directing any appeal-related pauper application to the Sixth Circuit.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	S. Thomas Anderson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, Eastern Division
DECIDED	June 23, 2026
DOCKET	No. 26-1022-STA-jay
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's report and recommendation for sua sponte dismissal after the plaintiff failed to file objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the magistrate judge's report and recommendation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status not specified in the source
PARTIES	Karla Harrell v. Harry Nunnely Bushart Jr., et al.

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- motions to dismiss
- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal jurisdiction
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's report and recommendation for sua sponte dismissal should be adopted.
2. Whether the plaintiff's prospective appeal should be certified as not taken in good faith and whether leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal should be denied.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's report and recommendation and dismissed the matter sua sponte.
2. The court certified that any appeal by the plaintiff would not be taken in good faith and denied leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"It is CERTIFIED, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 24(a), that any appeal in this matter by Plaintiff is not taken in good faith."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The plaintiff filed a complaint in the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee. The magistrate judge recommended sua sponte dismissal, apparently for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff filed no objections to the report and recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge issued a report and recommendation on June 2, 2026, recommending sua sponte dismissal of the complaint. Plaintiff did not object within the fourteen-day period. The district court reviewed the report de novo, adopted it, dismissed the matter, certified that any appeal would not be taken in good faith, and denied leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Callihan v. Schneider, 178 F.3d 800, 803-04 (6th Cir. 1999)
- Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962)
- Williams v. Kullman, 722 F.2d 1048, 1050 n.1 (2d Cir. 1983)

OPINION

Harrell

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

EASTERN DIVISION

KARLA HARRELL,

Plaintiff, v. No. 26-1022-STA-jay

HARRY NUNNELY BUSHART

JR.,

et

al.,

Defendants.

ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
FOR SUA SPONTE DISMISSAL

Before the Court is the United States Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation that the complaint in this matter be dismissed sua sponte. (ECF No. 8.) The Magistrate Judge submitted his report and Recommendation on June 2, 2026. Objections to the Report and Recommendation were due within fourteen (14) days of the entry of the Report. To date Plaintiff has filed no objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report. Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation de novo and the entire record of the proceedings, the Court hereby ADOPTS the Report, and this matter is DISMISSED. The court must also consider whether Plaintiff should be allowed to appeal this decision in forma pauperis, should she seek to do so. Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, a non-prisoner desiring to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis must obtain pauper status under Fed. R. App. P. 24(a). See *Callihan v. Schneider*, 178 F.3d 800, 803-04 (6th Cir. 1999). Rule 24(a) provides that if a party seeks pauper status on appeal, she must first file a motion in the district court, along with a supporting affidavit. However, Rule 24(a) also provides that if the district court certifies that an appeal would not be taken in good faith, or otherwise denies leave to appeal in forma pauperis, the party must file her motion to proceed in forma pauperis in the Court of Appeals. The good faith standard is an objective one. *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). The test for whether an appeal is taken in good faith is whether the litigant seeks appellate review of any issue that is not frivolous. *Id.* It would be inconsistent for a district court to determine that a complaint should be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction but has sufficient merit to support an appeal in forma pauperis. See *Williams v. Kullman*, 722 F.2d 1048, 1050 n.1 (2d Cir. 1983). The same considerations that lead the court to dismiss this case sua sponte also compel the conclusion that an appeal would not be taken in good faith. It is CERTIFIED, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 24(a), that any appeal in this matter by Plaintiff is not taken in good faith. Leave to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis is, therefore, DENIED. Accordingly, if Plaintiff files a notice of appeal, she must also pay the full appellate filing fee or file a motion to proceed in forma pauperis and supporting affidavit in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals within thirty (30) days.¹ IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ S. Thomas Anderson

S. THOMAS ANDERSON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Date: June 23, 2026 1 Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 3(a), any notice of appeal should be filed in this court. A motion to appeal in forma pauperis then should be filed directly in the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. Unless she is specifically instructed to do so, Plaintiff should not send to this Court copies of documents intended for filing in the Sixth Circuit.