

FILED

04/24/2026

Clerk of the
Appellate Courts

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF TENNESSEE
AT KNOXVILLE
April 10, 2026 Session

ETHAN BLACKBURN v. ALEXIS COOPER-HILL

Appeal from the Circuit Court for Roane County
No. 2023-JC-26, 2024-CV-89 Michael S. Pemberton, Judge

No. E2025-00855-COA-R3-JV

Because the order from which the appellant has filed an appeal does not constitute a final appealable judgment, this Court lacks jurisdiction to consider this appeal.

Tenn. R. App. P. 3 Appeal as of Right; Appeal Dismissed

JOHN W. MCCLARTY, P.J., E.S.; THOMAS R. FRIERSON, II, J.; AND WILLIAM E. PHILLIPS, II, J.

Rochelle Ann Oldfield, Knoxville, Tennessee, for the appellant, Ethan Blackburn.

Alexis Cooper-Hill, Harriman, Tennessee, Pro Se Appellee.

MEMORANDUM OPINION¹

The appellant, Ethan Blackburn (“Appellant”), filed a notice of appeal with the Roane County Circuit Court (“the Circuit Court”) that was subsequently transferred to this Court in March 2025, after the Circuit Court determined it did not have jurisdiction over the appeal and vacated all orders entered in this matter by the Circuit Court. The notice of appeal states that Appellant is appealing the August 14, 2024 order of the Roane County Juvenile Court (“the Juvenile Court”). Upon receiving the appellate record in this appeal,

¹ Rule 10 of the Rules of the Court of Appeals provides:

This Court, with the concurrence of all judges participating in the case, may affirm, reverse or modify the actions of the trial court by memorandum opinion when a formal opinion would have no precedential value. When a case is decided by memorandum opinion it shall be designated “MEMORANDUM OPINION,” shall not be published, and shall not be cited or relied on for any reason in any unrelated case.

this Court reviewed the record on appeal to determine if the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to Tennessee Rule of Appellate Procedure 13(b).

Based on that review, we determined that the order appealed is not a final judgment subject to an appeal as of right under Tennessee Rule of Appellate Procedure 3. The August 14, 2024 judgment adopted a permanent parenting plan that specifically states that determination of the parents' respective incomes is "Reserved for Child Support Magistrate" and that "[t]he Father shall pay to the Mother as regular child support the sum of RESERVED monthly." No amount of child support was included in the permanent parenting plan. The permanent parenting plan order states that a child support worksheet would be attached as an exhibit, but no such worksheet was attached. Furthermore, based on the record before us, it appears that the Juvenile Court never made a disposition regarding the pending request for attorney's fees.

Thereafter, this Court entered an order directing Appellant to supplement the record with a final judgment resolving all issues before the juvenile court in the underlying proceedings or to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. A supplemental record was subsequently transmitted to this Court; however, the supplemental record does not appear to resolve the issues that remain pending, including child support and a request for attorney's fees. There is no court order contained in the record or supplemental record dated after August 14, 2024 that resolves the issue of child support. Additionally, the supplemental record does not appear to resolve the father's initial request for attorney's fees that he requested in his "Complaint to Establish Paternity." Although the supplemental record contains an order of the Juvenile Court denying Appellant's motion to reconsider that states that the Juvenile Court's order is final, outstanding issues regarding attorney's fees and child support remain pending.

Based on the foregoing, Appellant did not appear to have complied with this Court's August 2025 order to supplement the record with a final judgment. As such, this Court entered a second show cause order in December 2025 directing Appellant to show cause why this appeal should not be dismissed due to lack of subject matter jurisdiction of this Court. To date, Appellant has not responded to this Court's show cause order.

This Court has previously held that without a determination regarding child support, the trial court's order is not final. *Reese v. Reese*, No. E2022-01116-COA-R3-CV, 2023 WL 6157248, at *2 (Tenn. Ct. App. Sept. 21, 2023), *perm. app. denied* (Mar. 6, 2024) ("A parenting plan that does not contain a determination of child support does not define or adjudicate the parties' rights with regard to all of the issues."). Furthermore, this Court has held that a pending request for attorney's fees prevents the trial court's order from becoming final. *See* Tenn. R. App. P. 3(a); *see e.g., E. Solutions for Buildings, LLC v. Knestricks Contractor, Inc.* No. M2017-00732-COA-R3-CV, 2018 WL 1831116, at *4 (Tenn. Ct. App. April 17, 2018) (finding that order directing parties to re-submit requests for attorney's fees after appeal was "improvidently certified as final," and holding that

because trial court did not dispose fully and finally of claim for attorney's fees, this Court lacked jurisdiction); *Grand Valley Lakes Property Owners' Assoc., Inc. v. Gunn*, No. W2008-01116-COA-R3-CV, 2009 WL 981697, at *3 (Tenn. Ct. App. April 13, 2009).

“A final judgment is one that resolves all the issues in the case, ‘leaving nothing else for the trial court to do.’” *In re Estate of Henderson*, 121 S.W.3d 643, 645 (Tenn. 2003) (quoting *State ex rel. McAllister v. Goode*, 968 S.W.2d 834, 840 (Tenn. Ct. App. 1997)). This Court does not have subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate an appeal as of right if there is no final judgment. *See Bayberry Assocs. v. Jones*, 783 S.W.2d 553, 559 (Tenn. 1990) (“Unless an appeal from an interlocutory order is provided by the rules or by statute, appellate courts have jurisdiction over final judgments only.”).

The court order from which Appellant seeks to appeal does not constitute a final appealable judgment. Therefore, this Court lacks jurisdiction to consider this appeal. The appeal is hereby dismissed. Costs on appeal are taxed to the appellant, Ethan Blackburn, for which execution may issue.

PER CURIAM