

TENNESSEE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

Jonathan Hamilton v. State of Tennessee

No. W2026-00147-CCA-R10-PC · No. W2026-00147-CCA-R10-PC · Decided March 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The Tennessee Court of Criminal Appeals denied Jonathan Hamilton’s application for an extraordinary appeal under Tennessee Rule of Appellate Procedure 10 and his request for mandamus relief. The court concluded that Hamilton failed to satisfy Rule 10’s procedural requirements, that mandamus was unnecessary because his post-conviction proceedings were proceeding appropriately, and that his request for recusal was not proper under Rule 10.

OPINION

JUDGE J. ROSS DYER, JUDGE JOHN W. CAMPBELL, JUDGE MATTHEW J. WILSON, J.

03/03/2026 IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TENNESSEE AT JACKSON
JONATHAN HAMILTON v. STATE OF TENNESSEE Criminal Court for Shelby County No.
C1800426 _____ No. W2026-00147-CCA-R10-PC

_____ ORDER On February 4, 2026, the pro se Appellant filed an application for an extraordinary appeal pursuant to Tennessee Rule of Appellate Procedure 10.

On February 6, 2026, this Court issued an order noting that the Appellant failed to comply with the procedural requirements of Rule 10 by failing to attach to his application any order issued by the trial court for which review may be available. See Tenn. R. App. P. 10(a), (c).

However, the Appellant also requested relief pursuant to the writ of mandamus, asserting that the trial court had failed to comply with the procedural requirements of the Post-Conviction Procedure Act. This Court requested a response from the State regarding the current status of the trial court proceedings and the appropriateness of the writ of mandamus.

On February 12, 2026, the State filed a response arguing that the Appellant’s application should be dismissed. In addition to the Appellant’s failure to comply with Rule 10, the State asserted that a writ of mandamus was not appropriate because the Appellant’s post-conviction petition was proceeding in accordance with the statutory requirements.

The State attached a copy of the trial court’s preliminary order, issued less than 30 days after the Appellant filed his petition, which found that the Appellant had asserted a colorable claim and stated that counsel would be appointed. See T.C.A. § 40- 30-106(a). This Court has been informed that attorney Earnest Beasley was recently appointed by the trial court to represent the Appellant

in his post-conviction proceedings.¹ Neither the Appellant's request for an extraordinary appeal nor mandamus relief is well-taken.

The Appellant's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of Rule 10 is fatal to his request for extraordinary review. See generally *State v. Fiveash*, 626 S.W.2d 477 (Tenn. Crim. App. 1981). Moreover, this Court will only entertain a request ¹ It has long been the rule that an appellant may not be represented by counsel and simultaneously proceed pro se in this Court.

See *State v. Davis*, 141 S.W.3d 600, 615 n.12 (Tenn. 2004); *State v. Burkhardt*, 541 S.W.2d 365, 371 (Tenn. 1976). for the writ of mandamus when the writ is necessary to aid the exercise of our appellate functions, and such circumstances are not present in this case. See *State v. Irick*, 906 S.W.2d 440, 442 (Tenn. 1995).

Although it appears that the Appellant's case has been reset multiple times, this Court does not control the trial court's handling of its docket. Finally, the Appellant's request for the trial court judge to be recused is not appropriate under Rule 10. See Tenn. Sup. Ct. R. 10B, § 2, Adv. Comm. Cmt. It is hereby ORDERED that the Appellant's application for an extraordinary appeal is DENIED.

Because it appears that the Appellant is indigent, costs associated with this proceeding shall be taxed to the State. The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this order to the Appellant, the State, attorney Earnest Beasley, and the trial court clerk. s/ J. Ross Dyer, Judge s/ John W. Campbell, Judge s/ Matthew J. Wilson, Judge