

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

**Mariah Lynn Whynot, Intellectually Challenged Individual; By and
Through Next Friend Carrie Shurtleff v. Terri Lee St. Hilaire;
Nicolas Stephen Robinson; Robert Charles Thompson Jr.; The Law
Firm of Thompson & Fernald, P.A.; Joseph Michael Murphy; The
Law Firm of Deloach, Hofstra & Cavis, P.A.; and Taylor Hatch**

Whynot v. St. Hilaire · No. 1:25-cv-01190 STA-jay · Decided March 4, 2026

OPINION

Whynot

PER CURIAM.

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

MARIAH LYNN WHYNOT Intellectually Challenged Individual; By and Through Next Friend
CARRIE SHURTLEFF, Petitioner; v. No. 1:25-cv-01190 STA-jay TERRI LEE ST. HILAIRE;
NICOLAS STEPHEN ROBINSON; ROBERT CHARLES THOMPSON JR.; THE LAW FIRM
OF THOMPSON & FERNALD, P.A.; JOSEPH MICHAEL MURPHY;
THE LAW FIRM OF DELOACH, HOFSTRA & CAVIS, P.A.; and
TAYLOR HATCH
Respondents.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On August 7, 2025, Carrie Shurtleff filed this pro se action against the above-named respondents. [D.E. 1] On the same day, Ms. Shurtleff filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis, which was granted on February 27, 2026. [D.E. 2] This case has been referred to the United States Magistrate Judge for management and for all pretrial matters for determination and/or report and recommendation as appropriate. Admin. Order 2013-05. The Court is required to screen in forma pauperis cases and to dismiss the case at any time if the Court determines that the action or appeal (i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Petitioner Shurtleff filed this action as a Writ of Habeas Corpus on behalf of her “biological

daughter” Mariah Lynn Whynot (D.E. 1, p. 2). The object of a writ of habeas corpus is to ascertain whether a prisoner can lawfully be detained in custody. See *Council v. Clemmer*, 177 F.2d 22, 23 (D.C. Cir. 1949). “An individual is held ‘in custody’ by the United States when the United States official charged with his detention has ‘the power to produce’ him.” *Munaf v. Geren*, 553 U.S. 674, 686, 128 S. Ct. 2207, 2217, 171 L. Ed. 2d 1 (2008) citing *Wales v. Whitney*, 114 U.S. 564, 574, 5 S.Ct. 1050, 29 L.Ed. 277 (1885). Neither Petitioner nor Ms. Whynot are alleged to be a federal prisoner, in federal or state custody, or illegally detained in immigration custody. Thus, there is no possible relief under a Writ of Habeas Corpus, and so Petitioner has failed to state a claim on which relief may be granted. Moreover, Petitioner admits that she is not the legal representative or guardian of Ms. Whynot, and thus lacks standing to bring claims on her behalf. Consequently, Petitioner’s case warrants dismissal under § 1915(e)(2)(B).

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court dismiss the Writ of Habeas Corpus in its entirety, and that all remaining motions be denied as moot. Respectfully submitted this 4th day of March, 2026. s/Jon A. York

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

ANY OBJECTIONS OR EXCEPTIONS TO THIS REPORT AND

RECOMMENDATION MUST BE FILED WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS AFTER

BEING SERVED WITH A COPY OF THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION. 28

U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). FAILURE TO FILE THEM WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS MAY

CONSTITUTE A WAIVER AND/OR FORFEITURE OF OBJECTIONS,

EXCEPTIONS, AND ANY FURTHER APPEAL.