

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF TENNESSEE
AT JACKSON

FILED

10/01/2026

Clerk of the
Appellate Courts

ANTWAIN TAPAIGE SALES v. S. SGT. GROSS ET AL.

**Appeal from the Chancery Court for Hardeman County
No. 20278 Kasey Culbreath, Chancellor**

No. W2026-00084-COA-R3-CV

Pro se Appellant, Antwain Tapaige Sales, has appealed an order of the Hardeman County Chancery Court that was entered on December 17, 2025. We determine that the trial court's order does not constitute a final appealable judgment. As a result, this Court lacks jurisdiction to consider this appeal. The appeal is, therefore, dismissed.

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

J. Steven Stafford, P.J., W.S.; Carma Dennis McGee, J.; Valerie L. Smith, J.

Antwain Tapaige Sales; Whiteville, Tennessee, *Pro se*.

Nathan D. Tilly and Haynes T. Russell, Jackson, Tennessee, for the appellees, Trangela Gross, Sanquesha Anderson, and Frankie Pugh.

John William Ayers, Nashville, Tennessee, for the appellee, Commissioner, TN. Dept. of Correction.

MEMORANDUM OPINION¹

Pursuant to Tenn. R. App. P. 13(b), the Court has reviewed the record on appeal in this case to determine whether the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the appeal. The order to which the Notice of Appeal is directed does not appear to be “a final judgment adjudicating all the claims, rights, and liabilities of the parties” from which an appeal as of

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 When a case is decided by memorandum opinion it shall be designated “MEMORANDUM OPINION,” shall not be published, and shall not be cited or relied on for any reason in any unrelated case.

right would lie. *See* Tenn. R. App. P. 3(a). A party is entitled to an appeal as of right only after the trial court has entered a final judgment. Tenn. R. App. P. 3(a). A final judgment is a judgment that resolves all the claims between all the parties, “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)). An order that adjudicates fewer than all the claims between all the parties is subject to revision at any time before the entry of a final judgment and is not appealable as of right. Tenn. R. App. P. 3(a); *In re Estate of Henderson*, 121 S.W.3d at 645.

Appellant’s Notice of Appeal denotes his intent to appeal an order of the trial court entered on December 17, 2025. It appears, however, that there is still a pending motion left unresolved in the trial court. According to the record, on December 29, 2025, the trial court clerk received a “Rule 12.06 Motion to Strike” filed by Appellant, who is an inmate. The still unresolved motion includes a certificate of service, which is dated December 15, 2025.

On June 22, 2026, this Court entered an order directing Appellant to, within thirty (30) days, either supplement the appellate record with a final judgment, or otherwise show cause in this Court why the appeal should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. The order further warned that the failure to comply with the order may result in dismissal. On July 9, 2026, Appellant filed a “Motion to Show Cause or in the Alternative Motion to Remand to Comply with this Court’s Order.” Therein, Appellant requested that this Court remand the case to the trial court. Ultimately, we determined that a remand order was unnecessary and that the pleading was not responsive to the Court’s June 22, 2026 show cause order.

On July 17, 2025, this Court entered a second show cause order. Therein, we stated that “Appellant is permitted a **final opportunity** to comply with this Court’s previous show cause order.” We further stated: “If Appellant fails to comply with this Order within the time allowed herein, **this appeal shall be dismissed without further notification of the Court, with costs taxed to Appellant.**” Appellant failed to timely supplement the record. Instead, on September 16, 2026, he filed a letter to this court asserting that “the trial court is not answering” his motion. Again, we determine that Appellant’s filing is not responsive to this Court’s orders.

As the order appealed does not constitute a final appealable judgment, this Court lacks jurisdiction to consider this appeal. Thus, the appeal is hereby DISMISSED. Costs on appeal are taxed to Appellant, Antwain Tapaige Sales, for which execution may issue.

PER CURIUM