

## IN THE SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT FOR DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE

RAYMOND ALAN SHIELDS,

Plaintiff,

v.

25c1446

FIRST FINANCIAL CORPORATION,  
*et al.*,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER**

---

This cause came before the Court on November 21, 2025 for hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Complaint. The Court, having considered the Motion, the record in this case, and applicable law, finds the following. Under Tennessee Rules of Civil Procedure 15.01, leave to amend is freely given when justice so requires. Finding insufficient reason to deny the amendment, the Court will allow the amendment, and the Proposed Second Amended Complaint attached as an Exhibit to the filing of the Motion to Amend will be the operative Complaint in this case.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED, ADJUDGED** and **DECREED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Complaint is granted.

Additionally, the Court would like to caution Plaintiff's Counsel on the following incorrect citations:

- *Doe v. Roe*, No. M2018-01746-COA-R3-CV (Tenn. Ct. App. 2019) in Plaintiff's Motion for Limited Discovery Pg. 5. There is no *Doe v. Roe* case in the Tennessee Court of Appeals in 2019 and No. M2018-01746-COA-R3-CV returns *Jones v. Jones*, No. M201801746COAR3CV, 2019 WL 1036077 (Tenn. Ct. App. Mar. 5, 2019).
- *Nandigam Neurology, PLC v. Beavers*, No. M2021-01280-COA-R9-CV, 2022 WL

1512346, at \*5 (Tenn. Ct. App. May 13, 2022) in Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's Motion to Compel Pg. 2. There is a *Nandigam Neurology, PLC v. Beavers*, 639 S.W.3d 651 (Tenn. Ct. App. 2021), but neither 2022 WL 1512346 nor No. M2021-01280-COA-R9-CV return any case in Tennessee.

- Tenn. R. Civ. P. 6(a)(1) in *Id* Pg. 4. There is no Tennessee Rule of Civil Procedure that is simply Rule 6 with those subsections; Rule 6 contains Rule 6.01 to Rule 6.05.
- *Doe v. Roe*, 477 S.W.3d 321, 326 (Tenn. Ct. App. 2015) in *Id* Pg. 4. There is no *Doe v. Roe* in the Tennessee Court of Appeals in 2015 and the reporter number corresponds to *Ford v. State*, 477 S.W.3d 321 (Tex. Crim. App. 2015).
- *Schultz v. Davis*, 495 S.W.3d 821, 827 (Tenn. 2016) in Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Pg. 4. There is no *Schultz v. Davis* case in 2016 and the reporter number corresponds to *State v. Dixon*, 495 S.W.3d 812 (Mo. Ct. App. 2016).
- *Vincent v. Yelverton*, 194 F. App'x 303, 307 (6th Cir. 2006) in *Id* Pg. 4. There is no *Vincent v. Yelverton* in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit in 2006 and the reporter number corresponds to *United States v. Younes*, 194 F. App'x 302 (6th Cir. 2006).

These manners of incorrect citations are characteristic of Artificial Intelligence use in the research of law. Whether Plaintiff's Counsel used AI or not in the drafting of her filings, the Court would like to caution her to verify that any citations to law are correct both in reference and content.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



THOMAS W. BROTHERS, JUDGE

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I have served a copy of the foregoing by postage prepaid, U.S. Mail upon the following:

Kimberly Cross Shields  
638 Freedom Place  
Nashville, TN 37209

Brittany Gates  
1525 Plymouth Dr.  
Brentwood, TN 37027

Sarah Martin  
4016 Westlawn Dr.  
Nashville, TN 37209

This, the 21 day of November, 2025.

  
Deputy Clerk