

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE

Maurice Blocker v. Brandon Watwood, Warden

Blocker · No. 2:22-cv-01270-JTF-atc · Decided December 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee denied Maurice Blocker’s motion to proceed with his habeas case because a pending notice of appeal divested the district court of jurisdiction over the issues raised in the petition. The court granted his request for status, noted that relevant filings had already been served, and directed the Clerk to mail him a copy of the docket sheet.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John T. Fowlkes, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee
DECIDED	December 17, 2025
DOCKET	2:22-cv-01270-JTF-atc
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	In a pending federal habeas corpus action, Petitioner moved for status and to proceed with the case by requiring the State to answer the original petition and file a complete copy of the state-court proceedings. Petitioner had previously filed a notice of appeal.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- appellate jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Federal habeas corpus
- Federal appellate jurisdiction
- Civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the district court retained jurisdiction to proceed on the issues raised in the original habeas petition after Petitioner filed a notice of appeal.

2. Whether Petitioner was entitled to a copy of the docket sheet and an order directing the Clerk to mail one.

HOLDINGS

1. The filing of the notice of appeal divested the district court of jurisdiction to proceed on the issues raised in the original habeas petition while the appeal was pending.
2. Petitioner's request for a copy of the docket sheet was granted, and the Clerk was directed to mail him a copy with the Order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“As a general rule the filing of a notice of appeal divests the district court of jurisdiction and transfers jurisdiction to the court of appeals.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioner filed a federal habeas action and then filed a notice of appeal. He subsequently sought to advance the habeas case by obtaining an answer to the original petition and a complete copy of the state proceedings, while also requesting a copy of the docket sheet. The court noted that the requested petition materials had already been filed and served and that the docket had not changed since the Clerk previously mailed him a copy.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Maurice Blocker filed a federal habeas petition and later filed a notice of appeal on November 5, 2025. While the appeal was pending, he moved for status and sought an order requiring the State to answer the original petition and provide state-court materials. The district court denied the request to proceed because the notice of appeal divested it of jurisdiction over the petition's issues, granted the request for a docket sheet, and directed the Clerk to mail Blocker another copy.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- City of Cookeville, Tenn. v. Upper Cumberland Elec. Membership Corp., 484 F.3d 380, 394 (6th Cir. 2007)
- Williamson v. Recovery Ltd. P'ship, 731 F.3d 608, 626 (6th Cir. 2013)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION
MAURICE BLOCKER,)) Petitioner,))
No. 2:22-cv-01270-JTF-atc v.))
BRANDON WATWOOD, Warden,)) Respondent.)
ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION TO PROCEED, GRANTING PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR STATUS, AND DIRECTING CLERK TO MAIL PETITIONER A COPY OF THE DOCKET

SHEET Before the Court is Motion for Status and Motion to Proceed filed on November 10, 2025, by Petitioner Maurice Blocker.

(ECF No. 41.) Petitioner seeks a copy of the docket sheet and to proceed his habeas case by ordering the State to file an answer to the Original Petition with a complete copy of the state proceeding. (Id. at PageID 2189.) With regard to Petitioner's request to proceed the case, Petitioner filed a notice of appeal on November 5, 2025. (ECF No. 39.) "As a general rule the filing of a notice of appeal divests the district court of jurisdiction and transfers jurisdiction to the court of appeals." *City of Cookeville, Tenn. v. Upper Cumberland Elec.*

Membership Corp., 484 F.3d 380, 394 (6th Cir. 2007). The district court retains jurisdiction to enforce a judgment, to proceed with matters that will aid the appellate process, and to adjudicate matters unrelated to the issues on appeal. See *Williamson v. Recovery Ltd. P'ship*, 731 F.3d 608, 626 (6th Cir. 2013).

Therefore, the district court is without jurisdiction to proceed on the issues raised in the original petition while the appeal is pending. To the extent Petitioner seeks an answer to the original petition and a copy of the state court proceedings, that information has been filed in the case and served on Petitioner. (See ECF Nos. 12, 17 & 32.)

For these reasons, the motion to proceed is DENIED. To the extent Petitioner seeks a copy of the docket sheet, Petitioner's motion for status is GRANTED. The Clerk mailed Petitioner a copy of the docket sheet on November 12, 2025.

The status of the case is unchanged as there have been no filings since that time. The Clerk is DIRECTED to mail Petitioner a copy of the docket sheet with this Order. IT IS SO ORDERED, this the 17th day of December, 2025. s/John T. Fowlkes, Jr. JOHN T. FOWLKES, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE