


**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF TENNESSEE
AT NASHVILLE**



IN RE: MICHAEL SNEED, BPR # 11141
An Attorney Licensed to Practice Law in Tennessee
(Davidson County)

NO. M2009-00361-SC-BPR-BP

BOPR NO. 2002-1339-5-CH

ORDER OF ENFORCEMENT

On February 24, 2009, an Order of Enforcement was entered in this case. This matter is now before the Court on Respondent Michael H. Sneed's Objection to Order of Enforcement with attachments, filed February 26, 2009; the Board of Professional Responsibility's ("BPR") Response filed March 10, 2009; Mr. Sneed's Motion to Stay Order of Enforcement with attachments, filed March 2, 2009; Mr. Sneed's Application to the Supreme Court requesting the consideration, vacation, or modification of the Order of Enforcement with attachments filed March 10, 2009; the BPR's Responses to Michael Sneed's Motion to Stay Order of Enforcement and to Sneed's Application Requesting Consideration, Vacation or Modification of Order of Enforcement, both filed March 18, 2009; and the entire record, from all of which the Court finds the Objection, Motion, and Application are not well taken and all must be denied. The Judgment in this case was filed in the trial court on April 10, 2006. Apparently numerous post-trial motions were filed by the Respondent, though not all of those have been made a part of the record before this Court. One of those motions, attached as Exhibit 2 to Mr. Sneed's Objection, is his "Motion to Alter or Amend Final Judgment Filed May 12, 2006". However, many of the requests that it makes concern other issues, such as whether the technical record should be included. Petitioner's supplement to his "Motion to Alter or Amend Final Judgment" was not filed until April 7, 2008. However, that motion actually alleges that the record is not complete and that, therefore, Petitioner is entitled to a new trial or dismissal of the charges against him.

On July 31, 2008, the trial court heard the matter and on August 1, 2008, filed an order containing several rulings. That order specifically overruled a motion to reconsider a particular matter. The order further provided "No further motions will be considered by the court in this matter. If the petitioner is dissatisfied with this court's rulings, his remedy is to appeal, not to continue filing motions." No further action was taken by the Petitioner either in the trial court or in this Court.

This Court has determined that the order entered August 1, 2008, was a final order intended to dispose of all motions pending in the trial court. No appeal having been taken from that order, and a proper Order of Enforcement now having been filed in this Court, the Objection to Order of Enforcement, Motion to Stay Order of Enforcement, and Application to the Supreme Court Requesting Consideration, Vacation or Modification of the Order of Enforcement, shall be, and are hereby, denied. The Order of Enforcement originally entered February 24, 2009, is in all respects reaffirmed, including the taxation of all costs to Respondent, for which execution may issue if necessary.

FOR THE COURT:

Cornelia A. Clark
CORNELIA A. CLARK
JUSTICE