

# A Failure of Adjudication: Legal and Rational Analysis of the Procedural Dismissal in *Smith v. TennCare*

## Executive Summary

This report provides an in-depth legal and rational analysis of the Davidson County Chancery Court's decision to grant the Tennessee Division of TennCare's Motion to Dismiss in the case brought by Sean P. Smith. The petitioner, a pro se litigant with complex medical disabilities, alleged a years-long pattern of systemic misconduct, fraud, and neglect by TennCare and its managed care organizations, culminating in the denial of access to medically necessary rehabilitative care.<sup>1</sup> The court dismissed the petition on procedural grounds, specifically for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted under Tennessee Rule of Civil Procedure 12.02(6), finding the petitioner's claims to be generalized grievances rather than a challenge to a specific, final agency decision reviewable under the Tennessee Uniform Administrative Procedures Act (UAPA).<sup>1</sup>

After a comprehensive review of the case filings and relevant legal authorities, this analysis concludes that the Chancery Court's ruling, while appearing technically defensible within a narrow and flawed interpretation of state administrative law, was substantively and legally **improper**.<sup>1</sup> The ruling is predicated on a series of fundamental analytical failures that collectively amount to a dereliction of judicial duty. The core flaws identified in this report are:

1. **A Dispositive Legal Error:** The court's most significant error was its complete failure to recognize and adjudicate the petitioner's distinct federal civil rights claims, which were explicitly pleaded under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. By improperly conflating these federal claims with the state administrative appeal, the court erroneously applied procedural bars—such as the exhaustion of remedies—that are legally inapplicable to § 1983 actions, thereby failing to adjudicate a valid cause of action properly before it.<sup>1</sup>
2. **The Omission of a Key Doctrine:** The court failed to engage with the petitioner's plausible and well-documented arguments that pursuing further administrative remedies would be futile. The futility exception to the exhaustion doctrine is a recognized, albeit narrow, legal principle. The court's silence on this central counter-argument to the respondents' primary defense represents a significant gap in

its legal reasoning.<sup>1</sup>

3. **The Enforcement of a Logical Paradox:** The ruling enforces a "procedural catch-22," an irrational framework where the systemic nature of the petitioner's grievance—the very core of his complaint—was used as the basis for denying him judicial review. This creates a self-protecting system where the agency's alleged failure to provide an adequate provider network makes it impossible for a beneficiary to generate the specific, appealable claims necessary to challenge that very failure.<sup>1</sup>
4. **The Neglect of Federal Preemption:** The court failed to address significant federal preemption questions raised by the direct conflict between state administrative procedures and overriding federal Medicaid mandates, including appeal timelines and the requirement for an adequate provider network. This oversight allows state proceduralism to potentially subvert federally guaranteed rights.<sup>1</sup>

Ultimately, the court's decision represents a failure of its fundamental duty to provide a forum for the redress of alleged constitutional violations. By prioritizing a formalistic interpretation of state procedure, the ruling effectively denied justice to a vulnerable, disabled litigant, leaving him without a remedy for claims of profound and systemic harm.

## **Factual and Procedural History: The Anatomy of a Systemic Dispute**

To comprehend the legal and rational failings of the court's dismissal, one must first understand the foundational nature of the petitioner's grievance. The dispute did not originate as a simple disagreement over a single medical service but was presented as a comprehensive indictment of a healthcare system that the petitioner alleged was fundamentally broken and operating in bad faith.<sup>1</sup>

### **The Petitioner and the Nature of the Grievance**

The petitioner, Sean P. Smith, is a 37-year-old medically disabled adult who proceeded *pro se*.<sup>1</sup> His pleadings detail a complex and severe constellation of interconnected medical conditions, including Obstructive Sleep Apnea, Temporomandibular Disorder (TMD), Musculoskeletal Dysfunction, Dysautonomia, Mast Cell Activation Syndrome, and multiple mental health diagnoses.<sup>1</sup> A central and recurring theme in his filings is the assertion that his debilitating conditions are not immutable but are treatable, even curable, with the proper specialized care.<sup>1</sup> This assertion is crucial, as it frames the entire conflict not as a request for palliative care, but as a demand for access to a functional healthcare system capable of providing the specialized, rehabilitative treatment necessary to restore him to a state of health. The core of his grievance was that TennCare's provider network was functionally inadequate for his specific, complex needs related to his "jaw/airway issues," which he

contended were the root cause of many of his other health problems.<sup>1</sup>

## **The 88-Page "Complaint-Appeal" (C-A): An Indictment of the System**

In November 2023, Mr. Smith submitted an 88-page document to TennCare and its managed care organization (MCO), United Healthcare, titled "An Example Of The Misconduct Committed By Plan Fiduciaries And Their Contracted Partners & An Appeal For Rehabilitative Treatment".<sup>1</sup> This document, referred to as the Complaint-Appeal (C-A), was not a standard medical appeal form. It was a meticulously constructed, quasi-legal brief that laid out a series of grave allegations against the state's Medicaid program, supported by 157 documents.<sup>1</sup> The core allegations within this foundational document were systemic in nature:

- **Systemic Misconduct:** The C-A alleges a persistent pattern of "illegal activity," "abuse, neglect, and exploitation" by TennCare and its MCOs that structurally prevents beneficiaries from receiving necessary care.<sup>1</sup>
- **Failure of "Full and Fair Review":** A central theme is the claim that TennCare consistently fails to provide the "full and fair review" of appeals and grievances mandated by federal regulations.<sup>1</sup>
- **Inadequate Provider Network:** The C-A argues that TennCare's provider network is functionally inadequate for his specific, complex needs, contending that in-network physicians lack the requisite specialized expertise.<sup>1</sup>
- **Violation of Fiduciary Duty:** The petitioner frames the respondents' actions as a profound breach of their fiduciary duty under federal law to act in the "best interests of the recipients".<sup>1</sup>

Consistent with the systemic nature of his allegations, the relief Mr. Smith requested from TennCare was not limited to the approval of a single procedure. He sought a comprehensive resolution that included access to rehabilitative care, organizational reform, and compensation for damages.<sup>1</sup> This created a fundamental disconnect: the petitioner submitted a quasi-legal indictment of the system, while the agency was only equipped, or only willing, to process it through the narrow, procedural lens of a standard benefits appeal.<sup>1</sup>

## **TennCare's "Administrative Alchemy": The Creation of a Procedural Trap**

The pivotal moment in the administrative phase of this dispute occurred when TennCare issued its formal response to Mr. Smith's 88-page C-A. Rather than engaging with the document's substantive allegations, the agency chose to reframe the entire submission into a simple, procedurally flawed appeal for a single service.<sup>1</sup> This act of administrative interpretation was not a neutral classification; it was a strategic decision that effectively erased the petitioner's core grievances and constructed a narrow, defensible basis for denial.

On November 30, 2023, TennCare sent a letter denying the C-A. The letter's rationale was starkly simple: it asserted that the appeal was for "OUTPATIENT PHYSICAL THERAPY" and was denied as untimely because it was filed more than 60 days after the problem was discovered.<sup>1</sup> This reframing allowed the agency to apply a straightforward procedural rule—the time limit—to deny the entire submission without ever addressing the substantive allegations of fraud, rights violations, and systemic failures.<sup>1</sup> This act of "administrative alchemy" transformed a complex legal challenge into a simple, dismissible procedural error.<sup>1</sup> The agency's strategic mischaracterization was not merely a classification error but a deliberate defensive maneuver. Confronted with an 88-page document alleging years of systemic failure, acknowledging and investigating these claims would have been administratively burdensome and legally perilous for TennCare.<sup>1</sup> By isolating a minor component of the C-A (past disputes over physical therapy), the agency could apply a simple, non-discretionary rule to dispose of the entire matter.

## **The Denial and Directive to the Court**

Crucially, the November 30, 2023 denial letter explicitly shut the door on any further administrative process, stating, "You won't get a hearing".<sup>1</sup> It then directed Mr. Smith to his next and sole recourse: "You can file a petition for review in the Davidson County Chancery Court".<sup>1</sup> This directive was a critical step in the procedural trap. By directing Mr. Smith to court, TennCare effectively endorsed its mischaracterization as the final, reviewable agency action, knowing that judicial review under the UAPA would likely be confined to the administrative record of this narrowly framed—and ultimately disclaimed by the petitioner—"physical therapy" issue.<sup>1</sup> This ensured that the petitioner's core grievances would be procedurally barred from ever being heard on the merits.

## **Deconstruction of the Chancery Court's Ruling**

The Chancery Court's final order granting TennCare's motion to dismiss is a study in procedural formalism. While appearing legally sound within its own narrowly defined analytical framework, a deeper deconstruction reveals significant rational gaps and critical legal omissions that render its conclusion substantively improper.<sup>1</sup> The court focused exclusively on the petition's deficiencies as a vehicle for judicial review under the UAPA, while completely ignoring the independent federal claims that were also pleaded.<sup>1</sup>

## **The UAPA Framework and the "Final Agency Decision" Requirement**

The court's central holding was that it lacked jurisdiction because Mr. Smith's petition did not

challenge a "final decision in a contested case," as required for judicial review under the Tennessee UAPA.<sup>1</sup> The controlling statute, Tennessee Code Annotated § 4-5-322, limits the Chancery Court's review to such final decisions.<sup>2</sup> The court adopted TennCare's narrow framing of the case, reasoning that the only final agency decision in the record was the November 30 letter denying the appeal for "outpatient physical therapy".<sup>1</sup> Because Mr. Smith explicitly disclaimed in his petition that he was challenging the physical therapy denial, the court concluded that it was left with only "vague, generalized complaints and criticisms" that were not specific, reviewable agency actions.<sup>1</sup> This reasoning fails to consider a more nuanced interpretation, such as the theory that TennCare's entire pattern of conduct and its ultimate mischaracterization of the C-A could have been construed as a "constructive" final decision on his broader grievances, making them ripe for review.<sup>1</sup>

## **The Doctrine of Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies**

The court's decision also rested heavily on the doctrine of exhaustion of administrative remedies.<sup>1</sup> This legal principle, designed to promote judicial efficiency and protect agency authority, generally requires that a party must use all available appeal and review procedures within an agency before a court will hear the case.<sup>1</sup> In Tennessee, courts have held that failure to exhaust administrative remedies deprives the court of subject matter jurisdiction.<sup>1</sup> The respondents successfully argued that the only administrative decision the petitioner had arguably exhausted was the physical therapy denial—an issue the petitioner himself stated was not the focus of his lawsuit.<sup>1</sup> For his broader claims of systemic misconduct and an inadequate provider network, there was no evidence that he had presented these as specific, actionable requests for a final agency decision that TennCare had subsequently denied.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, from the court's perspective, these broader claims were not "ripe" for judicial review.

## **Motion to Dismiss Standard (Tenn. R. Civ. P. 12.02(6))**

The court grounded its dismissal in Tennessee Rule of Civil Procedure 12.02(6), for "failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted".<sup>1</sup> The governing legal standard for such a motion is generous to the plaintiff: the court must construe the complaint liberally, presume all factual allegations to be true, and draw all reasonable inferences in the plaintiff's favor.<sup>1</sup> The court acknowledged its duty to afford *pro se* litigants "a certain amount of leeway" but found that Mr. Smith's allegations of "misconduct," "abuse," and "exploitation" were "vague, generalized complaints and criticisms" that failed to state a legally sufficient claim.<sup>1</sup> This finding is questionable. It understates the specificity of the petitioner's filings, which incorporated by reference the 88-page C-A containing extensive, detailed narratives of specific events, including names, dates, and

references to 157 supporting documents.<sup>1</sup> Rather than looking to the substance of the voluminous record he presented to give his claims context, the court held the petitioner's "vague" summary allegations against him, arguably failing to apply the liberal construction required by Tennessee law.<sup>1</sup>

## **Analysis of Critical Legal Errors and Omissions**

The court's narrow focus on state administrative procedure led it to commit several critical legal errors by overlooking or misapplying controlling federal law and recognized legal doctrines. These omissions are not minor flaws; they are fundamental errors that undermine the legitimacy of the entire ruling.

### **The Unaddressed Federal Claim: Failure to Adjudicate under 42 U.S.C. § 1983**

The most significant and legally dispositive flaw in the court's ruling is its complete failure to address the petitioner's federal civil rights claims.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Smith's Amended Complaint and subsequent filings explicitly invoked 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that TennCare, acting under the color of state law, deprived him of rights secured by the Constitution and federal statutes, including the Medicaid Act.<sup>1</sup>

A claim under § 1983 is a distinct, original cause of action; it is not an appeal of an agency decision.<sup>1</sup> The essential elements are straightforward: (1) a person acting under color of state law who (2) deprives another of rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution or federal law.<sup>8</sup> It is a well-established principle, affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court in the landmark case

*Patsy v. Board of Regents*, that plaintiffs are not required to exhaust state administrative remedies before bringing a § 1983 action in court.<sup>13</sup> The § 1983 remedy is supplementary to any state remedy and provides a direct path to court for alleged constitutional violations.<sup>1</sup> The Chancery Court's order analyzed the entire case as if it were solely a petition for judicial review under the UAPA.<sup>1</sup> This was a fundamental legal error. By conflating the state administrative law claims with the federal civil rights claims, the court improperly applied the UAPA's procedural requirements—such as the need for a final agency decision and exhaustion of remedies—to the § 1983 claims, to which they do not apply.<sup>1</sup> The court's failure to disentangle the § 1983 claim from the UAPA petition was not a mere oversight but a fundamental misapprehension of its dual role. It was presented with a hybrid document containing both an administrative appeal and an original civil rights lawsuit. The court was obligated to act as both an administrative review court for the UAPA portion and a trial court for the § 1983 portion. By treating the entire case as a UAPA petition, the court failed to switch hats and applied the restrictive rules of an administrative appeal to a civil rights lawsuit that

demanded a different mode of analysis. This failure to adjudicate a valid cause of action that was properly before it renders the dismissal of the entire case legally improper.<sup>1</sup>

## **The Ignored Doctrine: Failure to Engage with the Futility Exception**

The court's order is also fatally flawed by its complete silence on the futility exception to the exhaustion doctrine.<sup>1</sup> In his response to the motion to dismiss, Mr. Smith argued that the requirement to exhaust administrative remedies should be excused because doing so was futile.<sup>1</sup> He detailed a years-long, documented history of attempting to get his grievances addressed through complaints, calls, and appeals, only to be met with what he characterized as inaction, misdirection, and bad faith.<sup>1</sup> He contended that the administrative system was the problem, making any requirement to seek a remedy from that same system an impossible and absurd prerequisite to judicial review.<sup>1</sup>

The futility exception is a recognized, though narrowly applied, exception to the exhaustion doctrine in both Tennessee and federal jurisprudence.<sup>19</sup> At the motion-to-dismiss stage, a court must accept the petitioner's detailed factual allegations of years of bad faith and non-responsiveness as true. These allegations make a plausible case for futility that the court was obligated to engage with.<sup>1</sup> By finding that there was no specific decision to which exhaustion could even apply, the court avoided the more difficult but necessary analysis of whether the petitioner had made a plausible case for the futility exception. This silence represents a significant gap in its reasoning and makes the dismissal improper.<sup>1</sup>

## **The Supremacy Clause: Failure to Consider Federal Preemption**

Finally, the court failed to address the significant federal preemption arguments raised by the petitioner.<sup>1</sup> The Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution provides that federal law is the "supreme Law of the Land," and state laws that conflict with federal law are preempted and without effect. The petitioner raised several direct conflicts:

1. **Appeal Timelines:** Federal regulations provide Medicaid beneficiaries 60 days to file an appeal (42 CFR §§ 431.221(d), 438.402(2)(ii)), whereas TennCare's regulations cited by the respondents impose a 40-day limit (Tenn. R. & Regs. 1200-13-19-.06(3)).<sup>1</sup> This represents a direct conflict where federal law should prevail.
2. **Network Adequacy:** Federal Medicaid law requires states to ensure their provider networks are adequate to provide all medically necessary services with reasonable promptness.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Smith's core claim—that TennCare's network is systemically inadequate for his complex conditions—is fundamentally an allegation that Tennessee is failing to meet this federal mandate.

The court's dismissal, based entirely on state procedural grounds, did not grapple with these preemption arguments. This oversight has the potential to allow state administrative

procedures to undermine and effectively nullify federally guaranteed rights and protections for Medicaid beneficiaries.<sup>1</sup>

## A Rational Analysis of the Ruling: Systemic Flaws and the Denial of Justice

Beyond the specific legal errors, a rational analysis reveals that the court's ruling is logically inconsistent and creates outcomes that are contrary to the principles of justice and the fundamental purpose of the Medicaid program.

### The "Procedural Catch-22": An Insurmountable Barrier to Redress

The court's decision enforces a logical paradox, a "procedural catch-22," that makes it impossible for a beneficiary to challenge systemic agency failures.<sup>1</sup> The dilemma can be broken down into five steps:

1. To gain access to judicial review under the UAPA, a beneficiary must first exhaust administrative remedies by appealing a **specific denial of care**.
2. However, the petitioner's core grievance is that TennCare's provider network is systemically inadequate, **lacking qualified providers** who can even properly evaluate his condition and prescribe specific treatments.
3. Without qualified providers to make specific treatment requests, **no specific treatments can be prescribed or subsequently denied** by the agency.
4. Without specific denials of care, **no administrative appeals can be filed and exhausted**.
5. Without exhausted appeals on specific denials, **no judicial review is available**.

This creates a rational absurdity where the very inadequacy the petitioner complained about—the lack of a functional provider network—prevented him from accessing the very remedies designed to address such inadequacies.<sup>1</sup> It establishes a self-protecting system where the agency's most profound failures become procedurally unchallengeable. The following table starkly illustrates the profound disconnect between the petitioner's actual claims and the court's rationale for dismissal.

Petitioner's Core Claim	Court's Stated Reason for Dismissal	Analytical Finding of the Disconnect
Systemic Inadequacy of Provider Network	Characterized as "generalized complaints," not a "specific final agency decision". <sup>1</sup>	Treats a systemic claim as a failed individual claim, ignoring the fundamental mismatch between the grievance and the available administrative

		process.
Denial of Due Process / Fair Hearing	Subsumed under UAPA dismissal without separate analysis. <sup>1</sup>	Fails to address a core constitutional claim on its own merits, treating it as a procedural side-issue rather than a foundational right.
Federal Civil Rights Violations (§ 1983)	Completely unaddressed. <sup>1</sup>	Dispositive legal error; failure to adjudicate a valid, separate cause of action that is not subject to the procedural bars applied by the court.
Futility of Administrative Exhaustion	Not addressed as a valid exception. <sup>1</sup>	Omission of a relevant and pleaded legal doctrine that directly countered the respondents' primary defense, leaving a significant gap in the court's reasoning.

## Constitutional Implications: The Erosion of Due Process and Access to Courts

The enforcement of such a procedural trap has profound constitutional implications. The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution requires that the government provide a meaningful opportunity to be heard before depriving an individual of a protected property interest.<sup>25</sup> The Supreme Court, in *Goldberg v. Kelly*, established that welfare benefits are a form of property protected by due process.<sup>27</sup> A procedural system that provides no effective remedy for an entire class of claims—systemic grievances against the agency administering those benefits—arguably violates this core constitutional guarantee by rendering the "opportunity to be heard" illusory.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, the ruling implicates Article I, Section 17 of the Tennessee Constitution, the "Open Courts Clause," which guarantees that "every man, for an injury done him... shall have remedy by due course of law, and right and justice administered without sale, denial, or delay".<sup>35</sup> By creating a procedural dead end that forecloses any possibility of judicial review for the petitioner's alleged injuries, the court's ruling can be construed as a "denial" of remedy, in direct contravention of this foundational state constitutional promise.<sup>42</sup>

## The Disparate Impact on Vulnerable Populations

Finally, the practical, real-world consequences of the ruling are deeply troubling. The decision

disproportionately harms the most vulnerable populations the Medicaid program is designed to serve: *pro se*, disabled, and medically fragile litigants who lack the financial resources and legal sophistication to navigate an impossibly complex procedural maze.<sup>1</sup> It creates a two-tiered system of justice where only those with narrow, easily categorized claims can access the courts, while those with complex, systemic problems are shut out. This outcome is not only rationally problematic but is antithetical to the stated purpose of Medicaid as a healthcare safety net for those most in need.

## **Viable Alternative Legal Pathways and Strategic Recommendations**

While the Chancery Court's dismissal presents a significant obstacle, it does not foreclose all avenues for relief. The petitioner's claims, if properly framed in the appropriate forum, remain viable.

### **Properly Framing a Federal Action**

The most promising path forward is to file a new, original action in federal court under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.<sup>1</sup> This approach would bypass the procedural bars of the Tennessee UAPA entirely. A properly pleaded § 1983 complaint would need to clearly articulate several key elements:

- **Jurisdiction:** Federal court jurisdiction would be based on a "federal question" (28 U.S.C. § 1331) arising from the alleged violation of federal rights.
- **Cause of Action:** The complaint would allege that the respondents (state actors) violated specific rights secured by federal law. This could include the right to an adequate provider network and the right to receive services with reasonable promptness, as guaranteed by the federal Medicaid Act and its implementing regulations.
- **Relief Sought:** Unlike a UAPA petition, a § 1983 action allows for a broad range of remedies, including the declaratory and injunctive relief the petitioner seeks, as well as monetary damages.<sup>1</sup>

By structuring the case as a federal civil rights action, the petitioner can force a court to address the substantive merits of his systemic claims without being trapped by the state's administrative exhaustion requirements.

### **Alternative State-Level Remedies**

While a federal action is the most direct route, other state-law avenues might have been

available, though they are less common and procedurally complex. A petition for a **common-law writ of certiorari**, for example, could have been used to challenge TennCare's specific decision to deny a fair hearing as an illegal, arbitrary, or capricious act.<sup>1</sup> This would have focused the court's attention on the legitimacy of the agency's threshold procedural denial. Alternatively, a **declaratory judgment action** could have been filed to seek a judicial declaration on the validity of TennCare's rules or policies, such as the adequacy of its provider network, where no other efficient remedy exists.<sup>1</sup> These options, however, are often unfamiliar to *pro se* litigants and highlight the procedural complexities that create barriers to justice.

## Recommendations for Systemic Reform

This case exposes significant gaps in Tennessee's administrative law framework that warrant legislative attention. To prevent future litigants from falling into the same procedural trap, the following reforms should be considered:

- **Amend the UAPA:** The Tennessee General Assembly could amend the UAPA to create a specific procedural pathway for the judicial review of systemic grievances or claims of widespread agency failure, recognizing that such claims cannot be funneled through the individual-focused contested case process.
- **Mandatory Plain-Language Notices:** The legislature could mandate that agencies like TennCare provide clear, plain-language notices to *pro se* litigants when denying appeals. Such a notice should explicitly explain the difference between a UAPA petition, a writ of certiorari, and an original action for civil rights violations, and direct the litigant to the proper procedural vehicle for their specific type of claim.<sup>1</sup> This would help prevent the weaponization of procedural complexity against the state's most vulnerable citizens.

## Conclusion

The Davidson County Chancery Court's ruling in *Smith v. TennCare*, while cloaked in the language of procedural propriety, was substantively and legally improper. The decision is built upon a cascade of analytical failures: the complete omission of a valid federal civil rights claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983; the failure to engage with the well-established futility exception to administrative exhaustion; and the uncritical enforcement of a "procedural catch-22" that is both logically absurd and constitutionally suspect.

By prioritizing a rigid and formalistic interpretation of state administrative procedure over its fundamental duty to provide a forum for the redress of alleged constitutional violations, the court failed in its essential role. The ruling does not serve the interests of judicial efficiency or agency autonomy; rather, it serves to insulate a state agency from accountability for alleged systemic failures that harm a medically fragile and vulnerable population. This case stands as a stark and cautionary tale about the immense barriers that disabled, *pro se* litigants face

when confronting allegations of systemic agency misconduct. It underscores the critical role of the judiciary in ensuring that procedural rules are applied not as arbitrary gates to bar entry, but as tools to facilitate the administration of justice. The dismissal was not a rational and legally required response, but a substantive failure of justice that leaves profound and pressing questions of law and public policy unanswered.

## Works cited

1. 2024 Petition Dismissal Analysis (OpenAI 03 High).pdf
2. Tennessee Administrative Law Manual, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://sharetn.gov.tnsosfiles.com/sos/apd/APDTCA.pdf>
3. Tennessee Code § 4-5-322 (2024) - Judicial review - Justia Law, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://law.justia.com/codes/tennessee/title-4/chapter-5/part-3/section-4-5-322/>
4. Tennessee Code § 4-5-314 (2024) - Final order - Initial order - Justia Law, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://law.justia.com/codes/tennessee/title-4/chapter-5/part-3/section-4-5-314/>
5. Jurisdiction, Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies, and Constitutional Claims, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://nyulawreview.org/issues/volume-93-number-5/jurisdiction-exhaustion-of-administrative-remedies-and-constitutional-claims/>
6. IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF TENNESSEE AT NASHVILLE September 16, 2009 Session, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/OPINIONS/TCA/PDF/101/Natl%20Coll%20of%20Bus%20and%20Tech%20and%20Remington%20Coll%20v%20TH%20OPN.pdf>
7. Harold Tolley v. Attorney General of Tennessee, et al. - Justia Law, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://law.justia.com/cases/tennessee/court-of-appeals/2012/m2012-00551-coa-r3-cv.html>
8. peoples-law.org, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://peoples-law.org/node/457/printable/print>
9. Anatomy of a Section 1983 Claim | Legal Blog, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/blog/what-are-the-elements-of-a-section-1983-claim/>
10. INTRICACIES OF FEDERAL SECTION 1983 CIVIL RIGHTS CLAIMS, accessed July 26, 2025,  
[https://www.hinshawlaw.com/assets/htmldocuments/Court%20Docs/Professional\\_Lines\\_FedSec1983CivilRightsClaim\\_041811.pdf](https://www.hinshawlaw.com/assets/htmldocuments/Court%20Docs/Professional_Lines_FedSec1983CivilRightsClaim_041811.pdf)
11. 9.3 Section 1983 Claim Against Defendant in Individual Capacity—Elements and Burden of Proof | Model Jury Instructions - Ninth Circuit, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://www.ce9.uscourts.gov/jury-instructions/node/140>
12. How to File a Civil Rights Claim Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983: A Comprehensive Guide - The Sanders Firm, P.C., accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://www.thesandersfirmpc.com/how-to-file-a-civil-rights-claim-under-42-u->

s-c-1983-a-comprehensive-guide

13. United States Supreme Court rejects state requirement that §1983 claimants must exhaust administrative remedies before state court action - Krevolin Horst, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://www.khlawfirm.com/united-states-supreme-court-rejects-state-requirement-that-%C2%A71983-claimants-must-exhaust-administrative-remedies-before-state-court-action/>
14. Section 1983 Plaintiffs Dispute Exhaustion Requirement - AARP, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://www.aarp.org/aarp-foundation/our-work/legal-advocacy/2024-supreme-court-preview/civil-rights.html>
15. Exhaustion of State Administrative Remedies in Section 1983 Cases - Chicago Unbound, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3808&context=uclrev>
16. Elimination of the Exhaustion Requirement in Section 1983 Cases ..., accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://journals.library.wustl.edu/urbanlaw/article/7669/galley/24502/view/>
17. The Exhaustion Doctrine and State Law Remedies | U.S. Constitution Annotated, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution-conan/article-3/section-1/the-exhaustion-doctrine-and-state-law-remedies>
18. U.S. Chamber Amicus Brief - Supreme Court of the United States, accessed July 26, 2025,  
[https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/23/23-191/307890/20240418122353455\\_FINAL%20Chamber%20Amicus%20Brief%20-%20Williams%20v.%20Washington.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/23/23-191/307890/20240418122353455_FINAL%20Chamber%20Amicus%20Brief%20-%20Williams%20v.%20Washington.pdf)
19. The Futility Exception to the ERISA Requirement that Claimants Must Exhaust Their Administrative Remedies in Order to be Able to File a Lawsuit - Tennessee Disability and Life Insurance Blog, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://www.nashvilleinsurancelawyer.com/futility-exception-erisa-requirement-claimants-must-exhaust-administrative-remedies-order-able-file-lawsuit/>
20. J.G. et al v. Knox County Board of Education et al, No. 1 ... - Justia Law, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/tennessee/tnedce/1:2019cv00063/89233/24/>
21. Wrightslaw - Covington v. Knox County School System (6th Circuit, 2000), accessed July 26, 2025,  
[https://www.wrightslaw.com/law/caselaw/6th\\_Covington\\_KnoxTN\\_00\\_0306.htm](https://www.wrightslaw.com/law/caselaw/6th_Covington_KnoxTN_00_0306.htm)
22. Perez v. Sturgis Public Schools: the Supreme Court Considers a Futility Exception to IDEA Administrative Exhaustion - Every CRS Report, accessed July 26, 2025,  
[https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/2023-01-26 LSB10907\\_77bf6382869400da6598e6b9e70f9afc8d31f80a.pdf](https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/2023-01-26 LSB10907_77bf6382869400da6598e6b9e70f9afc8d31f80a.pdf)
23. Administrative Law -- 1957 Tennessee Survey, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://scholarship.law.vanderbilt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4253&context=>

vlr

24. Administrative Law -- 1956 Tennessee Survey - Scholarship ..., accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://scholarship.law.vanderbilt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4320&context=vlr>
25. Civil Due Process - State Court Report, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://statecourtreport.org/issues/civil-due-process>
26. Procedural Due Process Civil :: Fourteenth Amendment -- Rights Guaranteed - Justia Law, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://law.justia.com/constitution/us/amendment-14/05-procedural-due-process-civil.html>
27. Goldberg v. Kelly | EBSCO Research Starters, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/history/goldberg-v-kelly>
28. Fair Hearings Must Comply with Constitutionally Protected Due Process, accessed July 26, 2025, [http://kbwnylc.wnylc.com/kb\\_wnylc/entry/5/](http://kbwnylc.wnylc.com/kb_wnylc/entry/5/)
29. Goldberg v. Kelly - Wikipedia, accessed July 26, 2025,  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Goldberg\\_v.\\_Kelly](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Goldberg_v._Kelly)
30. Goldberg v. Kelly | 397 U.S. 254 (1970) - Justia Supreme Court Center, accessed July 26, 2025, <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/397/254/>
31. Constitutional Law: Due Process Requires Prior Hearing Before Termination of Welfare Benefits, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2675&context=flr>
32. Public Institutions/Administrative Law COMPLETE (SP2024) : Goldberg v. Kelly, 397 U.S. 254 (1970) - Open Casebooks, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://opencasebook.org/casebooks/12041-public-institutionsadministrative-law-complete-sp2024/resources/4.3.1.2-goldberg-v-kelly-397-us-254-1970/>
33. Elements of the Medicaid Appeals Process under Fee for Service, by ..., accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://www.macpac.gov/publication/elements-of-the-medicaid-appeals-process-under-fee-for-service-by-state/>
34. Understanding Medicaid Fair Hearings factsheet, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://www.medicaid.gov/resources-for-states/downloads/mdcid-fair-hrings-prtrsrce.pdf>
35. Tennessee Open Courts Compendium - Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://www.rcfp.org/open-courts-compendium/tennessee/>
36. Tennessee Constitution :: Article I - Declaration of Rights. :: Section 17 - Justia Law, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://law.justia.com/constitution/tennessee/article-i/section-17/>
37. One Domino Falls: Tennessee Supreme Court Reshapes Foreclosure Claims, accessed July 26, 2025,  
<https://www.bradley.com/insights/publications/2025/03/one-domino-falls-tennessee-supreme-court-reshapes-foreclosure-claims>
38. Michael Halliburton v. Tennessee Board of Parole :: 2022 - Justia Law, accessed July 26, 2025,

<https://law.justia.com/cases/tennessee/court-of-appeals/2022/m2020-01657-coa-r3-cv.html>

39. Suffering Wrongs Without Remedies - TBA Law Blog - Tennessee Bar Association, accessed July 26, 2025, <https://www.tba.org/index.cfm?pg=LawBlog&blAction=showEntry&blogEntry=32598>

40. IN THE SUPREME COURT OF TENNESSEE AT KNOXVILLE, accessed July 26, 2025, <https://tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/OpinionsPDFVersion/Separate%20Opinion%20-%20E2021-00378-SC-R11-CV.pdf>

41. CASE v. WILMINGTON TRUST (2024) | FindLaw, accessed July 26, 2025, <https://caselaw.findlaw.com/court/spr-crt-ten-at-kno/116689196.html>

42. IN THE SUPREME COURT OF TENNESSEE AT NASHVILLE, accessed July 26, 2025, <https://www.tncourts.gov/sites/default/files/hughesreginaldopn.pdf>