APPENDIX

INDEX OF APPENDICES

ORDERS AND EXHIBITS CITED IN THE PETITION

A. Georgia Supreme Court order denying certiorari, No. S26C1212, July 7, 2026 (cited as; Ex. V-10)

B. Georgia Supreme Court order denying reconsideration, No. S26C1212, Aug. 11, 2026

C. Georgia Court of Appeals order denying discretionary review, No. A26D0390, Mar. 26, 2026 (cited as Ex. V-7)

D. Superior Court Omnibus Order, Feb. 18, 2026, Dkt. #119 (Ex. S-5)

E. Final Judgment and Decree of Divorce, July 23, 2025, Dkt. #40 (cited as Ex. K-2, refiled Dkt. #129)

F. Order of Continuance, May 7, 2025, Dkt. #36

G. Order Clarifying the Record, Aug. 8, 2025, Dkt. #56 (Ex. S-4, Dkt. #106)

H. Order granting in forma pauperis status, Aug. 26, 2025, Dkt. #64 (Ex. V; refiled Dkt. #92)

I. Amended Final Parenting Plan, Dec. 23, 2025, Dkt. #98 (Ex. S-2, Dkt. #104)

J. Omnibus Order on reconsideration, vacatur, and support modification, Dec. 23, 2025, Dkt. #99 (Ex. S-3, Dkt. #105)

K. Ex. B: Email correspondence among the court, opposing counsel, and Petitioner (Emails 1, 3, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 27, 28, 32). Dkt. #68 (refiled #89, #110, #127, #133).

L. Ex. B-2: January 2, 2026 email exchange between Petitioner and court staff. Dkt. #111.

M. Ex. B-3: January 22, 2026 email from court staff to Petitioner. Dkt. #117 (certificate of service Dkt. #116).

N. Ex. S-6: Clerk-stamped table of contents and financial summaries filed January 27 and May 19, 2025. Dkt. #132 and #141 (original filings Dkt. #15-26 and #37-38).

O. Ex. S-8: Clerk-stamped 2024 tax returns (relevant pages only). Dkt. #126 and #143 (original filing Dkt. #38).

P. Ex. T-1: Transcript excerpt, April 8, 2025 hearing (Tr. 138:8-24, 139:16-18). Dkt. #95 and #130.

Q. Ex. T-2: Transcript excerpt, May 6, 2025 hearing (Tr. 7:8-9). Dkt. #96 and #131.

SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA
Case No. S26C1212

July 07, 2026

The Honorable Supreme Court met pursuant to adjournment.

The following order was passed:

CHRISTOPHER R. MATHIS v. JULIE M. MATHIS.

The Supreme Court today denied the petition for certiorari in this case.

All the Justices concur.

Court of Appeals Case No. A26D0390

Exhibit V-10

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA
Clerk's Office, Atlanta

I certify that the above is a true extract from the minutes of the Supreme Court of Georgia.

Witness my signature and the seal of said court hereto affixed the day and year last above written.

Thiina A Bamba, Clerk

SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA
Case No. S26C1212

August 11, 2026

The Honorable Supreme Court met pursuant to adjournment.

The following order was passed:

CHRISTOPHER R. MATHIS v. JULIE M. MATHIS.

Upon consideration of the Motion for Reconsideration filed in this case, it is ordered that it be hereby denied.

All the Justices concur.

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA
Clerk's Office, Atlanta

I certify that the above is a true extract from the minutes of the Supreme Court of Georgia.

Witness my signature and the seal of said court hereto affixed the day and year last above written.

Thiina A Banna, Clerk

App. B-1

Court of Appeals
of the State of Georgia

ATLANTA, March 26, 2026

The Court of Appeals hereby passes the following order

A26D0390. CHRISTOPHER R MATHIS v. JULIE M MATHIS.

Upon consideration of the Application for Discretionary Appeal, it is ordered that it be hereby DENIED.

LC NUMBERS:

SUCV2024000466

Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia
Clerk's Office, Atlanta, March 26, 2026.

I certify that the above is a true extract from the minutes of the Court of Appeals of Georgia.

Witness my signature and the seal of said court hereto affixed the day and year last above written.

Christina Ashley Smith, *Clerk.*

Exhibit V-7

EFILED IN OFFICE
CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT
STEPHENS COUNTY, GEORGIA
SUCV2024000466
WO
FEB 18, 2026 03:21 PM
Tim Quick, Clerk
Stephens County, Georgia

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF STEPHENS COUNTY

STATE OF GEORGIA

CHRISTOPHER RANDALL MATHIS, **Plaintiff,** **v.** **JULIE MAE MATHIS,** **Defendant.**	**CIVIL FILE ACTION NO.:** **SUCV2024000466**

OMNIBUS ORDER ON PENDING MOTIONS

Before the Court for consideration are the following pending motions filed in the above-captioned matter:

1. Plaintiff's **Motion for Mistrial**, filed December 22, 2025;
2. Plaintiff's **Motion to Recuse Judge William R. Oliver**, filed December 26, 2025;
3. Defendant's **Motion to Amend Final Judgment and Decree Within the Same Term of Court and Motion to Correct Scrivener's Error**, filed December 29, 2025; and
4. Defendant's **Motion for Attorney's Fees**, filed February 6, 2026.

Procedural History

The above-captioned matter was initiated on November 13, 2024, upon the filing of Plaintiff's Complaint for Divorce. One minor child is at issue in this action.

A Final Decree and Judgment of Divorce was entered on July 23, 2025. Plaintiff subsequently filed a Notice of Appeal on July 31, 2025. The Court of Appeals dismissed the appeal on September 30, 2025.

Thereafter, Plaintiff filed additional motions challenging the Final Decree and Judgment of Divorce, and Defendant likewise sought amendment of the Parenting Plan entered in conjunction with the Final Decree. An Omnibus Order addressing those matters was entered on December 23, 2025.

The Court now issues this Order as it relates to the new and pending Motions filed by the parties.

1. **Motion for Mistrial**

Plaintiff brings the instant Motion for Mistrial pursuant to O.C.G.A. §§ 5-5-25 and 9-11-60(d)(2). Specifically, Plaintiff relies upon O.C.G.A. § 9-11-60(d)(2), which provides for relief from a judgment based upon "[f]raud, accident, or mistake or the acts of the adverse party unmixed with the negligence or fault of the movant."

In support of his Motion, Plaintiff submits, among other items, booking photographs related to his own arrest, unverified screen captures purporting to reflect "Straight Talk" payments, email correspondence with the Court regarding the submission of proposed orders, and excerpts of a transcript.

Accordingly, upon consideration of the filings, exhibits, applicable law, and the record as a whole, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that Plaintiff's Motion is **DENIED**.

2. **Motion to Recuse Judge William R. Oliver**

Plaintiff moves for recusal of the presiding Judge pursuant to Uniform Superior Court Rule 25.1 and Rule 2.11(A) of the Georgia Code of Judicial Conduct. Uniform Superior Court Rule 25.1 provides, in relevant part, that all motions to recuse or disqualify a judge shall be timely filed in writing and supported by accompanying

affidavit(s) which fully assert the facts upon which the motion is founded. The Rule further requires that filing and presentation to the judge occur no later than five (5) days after the affiant first learned of the alleged grounds for disqualification.

The accompanying affidavit must clearly state the facts and reasons for the belief that bias or prejudice exists and must be definite and specific as to the time, place, persons, and circumstances. The affidavit must consist of more than bare conclusions, opinions, or generalized assertions. Before further consideration of the merits of a recusal motion, the Court must assess both the timeliness of the motion and the legal sufficiency of the supporting affidavit. Only if the affidavit is legally sufficient must the motion be referred to another judge for determination.

Rule 2.11(A) of the Georgia Code of Judicial Conduct further provides that a judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned. The standard is an objective one—whether a reasonable person, fully informed of the facts, would harbor significant doubt about the judge's impartiality.

Timeliness

Plaintiff's Motion for Recusal was filed on December 26, 2025. The Final Decree and Judgment in this matter was entered on July 23, 2025. A hearing was conducted on October 8, 2025, and an additional hearing was held on December 11, 2025. An Amended Parenting Plan was entered on December 23, 2025. Because Plaintiff filed the present Motion within five (5) days of the entry of the Amended Parenting Plan, the Court finds that the Motion satisfies the timeliness requirement of Uniform Superior Court Rule 25.1.

Legal Sufficiency of the Affidavit

The Court next considers the legal sufficiency of the accompanying affidavit. In Section 3 of the affidavit, Plaintiff characterizes the Court's conduct as abrupt,

preemptive, hostile, precipitous, and dismissive. These statements, however, are conclusory in nature.

In support of these assertions, Plaintiff attaches email correspondence, including responses authored by Plaintiff himself, the Amended Parenting Plan, the Omnibus Order entered on December 23, 2025, and an Order Clarifying the Record entered on August 8, 2025. These materials reflect judicial rulings and routine case administration. They do not identify specific extrajudicial statements or conduct demonstrating personal bias or prejudice.

The affidavit does not provide definite and specific facts concerning time, place, persons, or circumstances evidencing bias arising from an extrajudicial source. Rather, the allegations arise from dissatisfaction with judicial rulings and procedural decisions within the course of the proceedings. As a matter of law, adverse rulings, standing alone, do not constitute grounds for recusal.

Applying the objective standard under Rule 2.11(A), the Court further finds that a reasonable person, fully informed of the facts and procedural history of this case, would not harbor a significant doubt as to the Court's impartiality.

Because the accompanying affidavit is legally insufficient under Uniform Superior Court Rule 25.1, referral of the Motion to another judge is not required.

Accordingly, after consideration of the Motion, the supporting affidavit, the record as a whole, and applicable law, it is hereby **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Recusal is **DENIED.**

3. **Motion to Amend Final Judgment and Decree Within the Same Term of Court and Motion to Correct Scrivener's Error**

Defendant moves to amend the Final Decree and Judgment entered on July 23, 2025, seeking revised language to address what Defendant contends is the potential for Plaintiff's non-cooperation and to eliminate any reliance upon Plaintiff's future actions.

App. D-4

Defendant also seeks correction of a clerical error in the attorney's fees provision, which presently reflects that Defendant is responsible for payment when the Court's intent was that Plaintiff be responsible for such fees.

Accordingly, after consideration of the filings, the proffers, and the arguments of counsel, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that Defendant's Motion is **DENIED** in part and **GRANTED** in part. The Final Decree and Judgment shall remain in full force and effect as entered, except that the provision regarding attorney's fees shall be amended as follows:

Original Language (Miscellaneous Provisions, Page 5):

"The Court hereby awards the Defendant reasonable and necessary attorney's fees pursuant to the authority of O.C.G.A. § 9-15-14(b). Defendant shall pay the amount of $2,500.00..."

Amended Language:

"The Court hereby awards the Defendant reasonable and necessary attorney's fees pursuant to the authority of O.C.G.A. § 9-15-14(b). Plaintiff shall pay the amount of $2,500.00..."

All other provisions of the Final Decree and Judgment shall remain unchanged.

4. **Motion for Attorney's Fees**

Defendant seeks further attorney's fee due to the numerous post judgment motions filed by Plaintiff.

Accordingly, after consideration of the proffers and arguments of counsel, it is hereby **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that the Defendant's Motion is **DENIED**.

The Clerk of Court is directed to ensure receipt of this order on all parties to the matter.

SO ORDERED this 18th day of February 2026.

HON. WILLIAM R. OLIVER, CHIEF JUDGE
Mountain Judicial Circuit

OR: Clerk, Stephens County Superior Court

CC: Christopher R. Mathis, Plaintiff

Casey Wilson, Counsel for Defendant

App. D-6

Additional material from this filing is available in the Clerk's Office.