

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status not specified in the source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)