## IN THE CHANCERY COURT FOR HAMILTON COUNTY, TENNESSEE

Barbara Sims Arthur,	)	
Petitioner,	)	
·	)	
v.	)	No. 10-0908
Board of Professional Responsibility	)	Part II
of the Supreme Court of Tennessee,	.)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

## MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

There are two motions before the Court:

- 1. The Board of Professional Responsibility's ("BPR") motion to dismiss the appeal; and
- 2. Petitioner's motion to amend.

In deciding these motions, the Court has well considered the supporting arguments of both sides contained in the replies to the motions, as well as the supporting briefs and pleadings.

This is an attorney discipline case. Ms. Arthur was the subject of an adverse finding by a Hearing Panel rendered July 20, 2010, with an amended judgment rendered August 26, 2010. Ms. Arthur filed a petition for writ of certiorari on October 25, 2010, seeking review pursuant to SCR 9, § 1.3. She did not file the petition under oath, nor did the petition state that it was the first application for the writ as required by Tenn. Code Ann. §27-8-106. Failure to contain the oath and the applicable language deprives this Court of jurisdiction. BPR v. Cawood, \_\_\_\_\_\_ S.W.3d \_\_\_\_, 2010 WL 5141785 (Tenn. Dec. 20, 2010). See also Nebel v. BPR, \_\_\_\_\_ S.W.3d \_\_\_\_, 2011 WI 197868 (Tenn. Jan. 21, 2011).

11 FEB 22 PM 12: 49

The petitioner attempted to cure this defect by filing a motion to amend on February 2, 2011. The proposed amended petition was filed under oath and did contain the language that "it was the first application for the writ." The problem with the motion to amend and the amended petition is that they were filed well beyond the 60-day window allowed by Tenn. Code Ann. § 27-9-102. This Court has no jurisdiction over the appeal, and, therefore, no jurisdiction to grant a motion to amend.

Based upon the holdings in Cawood, supra, and Nebel, supra, this Court GRANTS the BPR's motion to dismiss the appeal. The motion to amend and to file an amended petition is DENIED.

The appeal is DISMISSED. Any remaining court costs are taxed to Ms. Arthur.

This the 17th day of February, 2011,

The undersigned hereby centhes here a copy of this order has been mailed to all parties or

their counsel in this case.

cc:

Martin J. Levitt 312 Vine Street

Chattanooga, Tennessee 37403

Via facsimile: 423-266-8342

Kurtz

Krisann Hodges, Disciplinary Counsel - Litigation Section

Board of Professional Responsibility of the Supreme Court of Tennessee

1101 Kermit Drive, Suite 730

Nashville, Tennessee 37217

Via facsimile: 367-2480