

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF GEORGIA

WAYLAND BRAXTON WILLIS

Petitioner,

v.

HON. SHERYL B. JOLLY

Respondent.

Trial Court Case No. 2025EDR0053

APPENDIX IN SUPPORT OF
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix A – Order Immediately Suspending Visitation (Nov. 24, 2025)	1-2
Appendix B – Order Following Status Conference (Dec. 9, 2025)	3
Appendix C – Consent Order (Dec. 17, 2025)	4-5
Appendix D – Email to Guardian Ad Litem (Dec. 19, 2025)	6
Appendix E – Motion For Written Findings (Jan. 11, 2026)	7-12
Appendix F – Administrative Email Correspondence (Jan. 30, 2026)	13
Appendix G – Letter to Judicial Assistant (Oct. 29, 2025)	14

Appendix A
Order Immediately Suspending Visitation (November 24, 2025)

FILED IN OFFICE
CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT
COLUMBIA COUNTY, GEORGIA

2025EDR0053

NOV 24, 2025 04:35 PM

Cindy Mason
Cindy Mason, Clerk
Columbia County, Georgia

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF COLUMBIA COUNTY
STATE OF GEORGIA**

**HALEY CROWE,
PETITIONER,**

*

*

*

*

CASE NO.: 2025EDR0053

*

v.

*

*

**WAYLAND BRAXTON WILLIS,
RESPONDENT.**

*

*

ORDER IMMEDIATELY SUSPENDING VISITATION

On November 20, 2025, this Court received an email from the Guardian, Renee Bell, requesting the Court to immediately suspend the Respondent’s visitation. The Respondent submitted to a hair follicle drug screen test on October 16, 2025, and the report was not completed and distributed to the Attorneys or Guardian until October 29, 2025. After receiving the test results, the Guardian suspended visitation. The Respondent submitted to another drug test on November 11, 2025 which he passed. Upon receipt of the November 11 testing report, the Guardian tried to reinstate supervised visitation on her own. However, the weekend of November 15th, the Guardian had concerns that the Respondent was not sober. The Court hereby finds that it is in the best interest of the child for visitation to be suspended entirely until further order by this Court.

This 24th day of November, 2025.

Sheryl B. Jolly

SHERYL B. JOLLY
Chief Judge, Superior Court
Columbia Judicial Circuit

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


This is to certify that I, Sarah Elizabeth Strickland, on this day have served a copy of the foregoing **ORDER** upon the following by way of hand delivery, electronic mail, statutory electronic service by using PeachCourt's electronic service system pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 9-11-5(f) and via email to the following; or United States Mail in a properly addressed envelope with adequate postage affixed for safe and proper delivery to the following:

TISDALE, MIDDLETON, LAND
Adam Land
207 North Belair Road
Evans, GA 30809
adam@tisdalelawfirm.com
tonnia@tisdalelawfirm.com

DAVIS, CHAPMAN, AND WILDER, LLC
Holly G. Chapman
1143 Laney Walker Blvd., Suite 201
Augusta, GA 30901
hchapman@dcwattorneys.com

Renee Bell
kidsgal@aol.com

This 24 of November, 2025.




/s/SE Strickland
Sarah Elizabeth Strickland
Staff Attorney to Chief Judge
Sheryl B. Jolly

Office of Judge Sheryl B. Jolly
Columbia Judicial Circuit
640 Ronald Reagan Drive
Evans, Georgia 30809
T: 706-447-6733

Appendix B
Order Following Status Conference (December 9, 2025)

COLUMBIA COUNTY, SUPERIOR COURT
STATE OF GEORGIA

 **EFILED IN OFFICE**
CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT
COLUMBIA COUNTY, GEORGIA
2025EDR0053

DEC 09, 2025 03:45 PM


Cindy Mason, Clerk
Columbia County, Georgia

HALEY CROWE)	
)	
Plaintiff)	CIVIL ACTION FILE
)	
v.)	NO. 2025 EDR 53
)	
WAYLAND WILLIS)	
Defendant)	

ORDER

Based upon evidence presented to the Court, and in order to determine matters relevant to this case, the Court orders **WAYLAND WILLIS** to submit to a

17 PANEL HAIR FOLLICLE & PETH TEST

drug screen at:

Analyze America Labs
1840 Wrightsboro Rd
(706) 738-3145
MUST CALL FOR APPOINTMENT


BEFORE 4:30 pm Tuesday, December 9, 2025.

The results of that test will be provided to the person being tested and this Court at the following address:

Hon. Sheryl B. Jolly	
Judge, Superior Court	FAX No. 706/312-7365
640 Ronald Reagan Drive	Office 706/312-7231
Evan, GA 30809	

The **Defendant** shall be responsible for the cost of the test.

SO ENTERED this 9th day of December, 2025.


SHERYL B. JOLLY
JUDGE, SUPERIOR COURT
COLUMBIA JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Appendix C
Consent Order (Filed December 17, 2025)

FILED IN OFFICE
CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT
COLUMBIA COUNTY, GEORGIA
2025EDR0053

DEC 17, 2025 10:48 AM


Cindy Mason, Clerk
Columbia County, Georgia

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF COLUMBIA COUNTY
STATE OF GEORGIA
DOMESTIC RELATIONS DIVISION


HALEY CROWE,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action File No.:
vs.)	2025EDR0053
)	
WAYLAND BRAXTON WILLIS,)	
Defendant.)	
)	

CONSENT ORDER FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Defendant in the above-captioned matter shall submit to a psychological evaluation to be completed by Dr. Amy Holsten. The Defendant is **ORDERED** to comply with the directions and requests of Dr. Holsten, and to cooperate with her in all regards concerning her work. The costs of the evaluation shall be paid by the Defendant.

Upon completion of the evaluation, a copy of the report regarding the evaluation will be forwarded to the Court as well as to counsel for the Plaintiff, the Defendant, and the Guardian Ad Litem.

SO ORDERED. This 16 day of December, 2025


Honorable Sheryl B. Jolly
Judge, Superior Court
Columbia Judicial Circuit

Order for Psychological Evaluation
Haley Crowe vs. Wayland Braxton Willis
2025EDR0053

Order presented by:



Adam D. Land
Georgia Bar Number: 775211
Attorney for Plaintiff
207 N. Belair Road
Evans, Georgia 30809
Telephone (706) 869-1348
Facsimile (706) 869-9464
adam@tisdalelawfirm.com

Order for Psychological Evaluation
Haley Crowe vs. Wayland Braxton Willis
2025EDR0053

Page 2

Appendix D

Email To Guardian Ad Litem Notifying The Court Of Lab Unavailability (December 19, 2025)



Wayland Braxton Wills <bhbwillis@gmail.com>

Re: Scheduling Update

Renee Bell <kidsgal@aol.com>

Fri, Dec 19, 2025 at 4:57 PM

To: Wayland Braxton Wills <bhbwillis@gmail.com>

Mr. Willis,

The court only uses certain labs. I am trying to find out information for the other lab now. You will need a court order.

Thanks,

Renee

Renee Bell
PO Box 16578
Augusta, GA 30919
706-825-8828

On Dec 19, 2025, at 4:05 PM, Wayland Braxton Wills <bhbwillis@gmail.com> wrote:

Ms. Bell,

I wanted to promptly update you regarding hair follicle testing. I contacted Analyze America to schedule additional testing and was informed that they do not currently have availability for next week and suggested seeking an alternative independent lab.

I am actively pursuing other options, including physician-ordered testing, and will provide updates as soon as scheduling is confirmed.

Best,

Wayland Willis

This information is provided for court records.

<Screenshot 2025-12-19 160036.png>

Appendix E

Petitioner's Motion For Written Findings Of Fact And Conclusions Of Law (January 11, 2026)

FILED IN OFFICE
CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT
COLUMBIA COUNTY, GEORGIA
2025EDR0053

JAN 11, 2026 04:02 PM

Cindy Mason
Cindy Mason, Clerk
Columbia County, Georgia

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF COLUMBIA COUNTY
STATE OF GEORGIA
DOMESTIC RELATIONS DIVISION**

HALEY CROWE)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
WAYLAND WILLIS,)
Defendant.)
_____)

Civil Action File No.:
2025EDR0053

**DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR WRITTEN FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS
OF LAW & CLARIFICATION REGARDING GUARDIAN AD LITEM AUTHORITY**

COMES NOW the Defendant, Wayland Braxton Willis, appearing pro se, and respectfully moves this Honorable Court for limited and procedural relief in order to complete the factual and legal record and to clarify the scope of authority governing decisions that affect the father-child relationship in this matter. In support thereof, Defendant shows the Court as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THIS MOTION

This Motion is brought for a limited and specific purpose. The Defendant respectfully requests that the Court complete the factual and legal record by issuing written Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as required by Georgia law where a child's regular contact with a parent has been interrupted, and that the Court clarify the scope and limits of authority governing decisions that affect the father-child relationship in this case.

This matter has involved extended temporary measures, reliance on historical allegations, and significant procedural complexity affecting the child's ongoing relationship with Defendant. The Defendant submits this Motion not to relitigate prior allegations or revisit matters already before the Court, but to ensure that adjudicated facts are clearly distinguished from unadjudicated assertions, and that the Court's reasoning and intent are clearly articulated so that all parties may act in accordance with written judicial authority.

MOTION FOR FINDINGS & GAL CLARITY
CROWE V WILLIS
CASE NO. 2025EDR0053

Clarification and completion of the record are necessary to ensure proportionality, transparency, and consistency in decisions affecting the parent-child relationship, and to provide a clear framework for future compliance and review.

II. LEGAL AUTHORITY REQUIRING WRITTEN FINDINGS

Georgia law requires the entry of written findings of fact and conclusions of law when properly requested by a party in an action tried without a jury. O.C.G.A. § 9-11-52(a). This requirement exists to ensure that the factual basis for judicial decisions is clearly articulated and capable of meaningful review.

In matters affecting custody, visitation, and the parent-child relationship, Georgia law imposes an additional obligation. O.C.G.A. § 19-9-3(a)(8) requires the Court to set forth specific findings explaining the factual basis for its decision and why the resulting order serves the best interests of the child. This requirement is particularly significant where a child's regular contact with a parent has been interrupted or restricted.

Georgia appellate courts have repeatedly emphasized that the absence of written findings following a timely request—especially in cases involving the suspension or substantial limitation of a parent-child relationship—constitutes reversible error. Written findings are essential to distinguish adjudicated facts from allegations, to demonstrate proportionality in the relief imposed, and to preserve the integrity of the judicial process.

III. NECESSITY OF FINDINGS

Prior to January 9, 2025, the child's daily life included regular, hands-on care by Defendant as a stable and integral component of the child's routine. From infancy forward, Defendant was consistently and substantially involved in the child's upbringing, including providing daily care and supervision; managing meals, schedules, and routines; participating in early childhood education decisions; maintaining communication with caregivers and teachers; and attending to the child's day-to-day needs.

Defendant's role in the child's life was not limited to discrete periods of contact, but reflected an ongoing parental presence embedded in the child's normal home and family environment. The child's extended family on Defendant's side likewise constituted a consistent and supportive presence in the child's life until the interruption of contact in January 2025.

Beginning January 9, 2025, the child's relationship with Defendant was abruptly disrupted following the filing of a third petition by Mother. For a period thereafter, Defendant was not permitted to have contact with the child. Following the appointment of the Guardian ad Litem and the involvement of counsel, contact between the child and Defendant resumed only in a constrained and supervised form, limited in frequency and scope as compared to the child's prior lived experience.

In mid-October 2025, the child's already limited contact with Defendant was again interrupted following verbal direction communicated by the appointed Guardian ad Litem. This interruption was later formalized by written order entered on November 24, 2025. The written order did not include findings identifying the specific evidence relied upon, whether any allegations were adjudicated as fact, whether Defendant was found to pose an immediate danger to the child, or the conditions, if any, required for restoration of regular contact between the child and Defendant.

The periods during which the child has been separated from Defendant have only occurred in connection with allegations initiated by Mother. Those allegations resulted in multiple proceedings and investigations, none of which produced findings by any court or agency that Defendant abused, neglected, endangered, or otherwise posed any form of risk to the child.

Complete interruption of a child's relationship with a parent is an extraordinary measure and is disfavored where less restrictive alternatives exist. In the absence of articulated findings explaining the duration, scope, and necessity of the interruption imposed in this case, the record remains incomplete.

IV. FINDINGS REQUESTED

To complete the record and to ensure clarity regarding the basis for decisions affecting the parent-child relationship,

Defendant respectfully requests that the Court enter written findings addressing the following limited issues:

1. The nature and extent of Defendant's involvement in the child's life prior to January 9, 2025, including the child's routine and caregiving environment during that period;
2. Whether any investigation, proceeding, or protective order resulted in adjudicated factual findings sufficient to warrant interruption of the child's regular contact with Defendant;
3. The specific facts, if any, relied upon by the Court in connection with the interruption of the child's regular contact with Defendant;
4. Whether the Court found that Defendant posed an immediate or ongoing condition requiring interruption of the child's regular contact with Defendant, and the specific factual basis for such a finding;
5. Whether any evidence considered by the Court was preliminary, corrected, sealed, or otherwise subject to limitation, and the manner in which such evidence was weighed;
6. Why less restrictive alternatives to a complete interruption of the child's relationship with Defendant were deemed insufficient under the circumstances; and
7. The conditions, if any, required for restoration of regular contact between the child and Defendant.

These findings are requested solely to ensure that the record accurately reflects the factual and legal basis for orders affecting the parent-child relationship and to provide clarity for future compliance and review.

V. CLARIFICATION REGARDING GUARDIAN AD LITEM AUTHORITY

On March 18, 2025, the Court appointed a Guardian ad Litem in this matter pursuant to Uniform Superior Court Rule 24.9. Under that Rule, a Guardian ad Litem serves in an investigatory and advisory capacity to assist the Court by gathering information and making recommendations regarding the child's best interests.

Uniform Superior Court Rule 24.9 expressly provides that a Guardian ad Litem's recommendations are not binding upon the Court, and that authority to suspend, restrict, restore, or otherwise alter a child's contact with a parent rests exclusively with the Court through written order. The Guardian ad Litem does not possess independent authority to impose or implement conditions affecting the parent-child relationship absent such an order.

Given the procedural history of this case, the absence of sufficient communication, and extended duration of temporary measures affecting the child's relationship with Defendant, clarification of authority is necessary to ensure that all parties act consistently with judicial direction and to prevent future misunderstanding regarding the source and scope of decisions affecting the child's contact with Defendant.

Accordingly, Defendant respectfully requests that the Court clarify and direct that:

- a.** Decisions affecting the continuation, restriction, suspension, or restoration of the child's regular contact with Defendant may be made only by the Court through written order;
- b.** Recommendations or communications from the Guardian ad Litem do not constitute enforceable authority unless and until adopted by the Court;
- c.** Any Guardian ad Litem recommendation affecting the child's regular contact with Defendant shall be reduced to writing and submitted to the Court for consideration prior to implementation; and
- d.** Absent a written order supported by articulated findings to the contrary, the Court may direct that the child's regular contact with Defendant be restored pursuant to the last controlling order previously entered by the Court, or otherwise reestablished in a manner consistent with the child's best interests.

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Defendant respectfully requests that this Court:

1. Enter written Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law addressing the matters set forth in Section IV of this Motion;
2. Clarify and direct the scope and limits of Guardian ad Litem authority as set forth in Section V of this Motion;
3. Provide such clarification and direction as the Court deems necessary to ensure consistency, transparency, and proportionality in decisions affecting the child's relationship with Defendant; and
4. Grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper;

Respectfully submitted this **11th** day of **January, 2026**.



Wayland Braxton Willis
Defendant, Pro Se
806 Whispering Willow Ct.
Grovetown, Georgia 30813
c: (706) 631-0526
e: bhbwillis@gmail.com

Appendix F

Administrative Email Correspondence Reflecting Laboratory Unavailability (January 30, 2026)

From: Renee Bell kidsgal@aol.com
Subject: Re: 2025EDR0053 - Crowe v. Willis - Drug Screen - Mr. Willis
Date: January 30, 2026 at 3:36 PM
To: Jo Lynn Harris JHARRIS@columbiacountyga.gov
Cc: Adam D. Land adam@tisdalelawfirm.com, Wayland Braxton Wills bhbwillis@gmail.com, Tonnia DeBord tonnia@tisdalelawfirm.com

The order was for 17 panel hair and a PETH test. Med Now/Urgent MD does not do these tests and I cannot find anyone else in the area who does them.

I will reach out to OpAns and Juvenile Court for other options.

Thanks,

Renee

Renee Bell
PO Box 16578
Augusta, GA 30919
706-825-8828

On Jan 30, 2026, at 11:21 AM, Harris, Jo Lynn <JHARRIS@columbiacountyga.gov> wrote:

What type of screen? Is Med Now OK? Thanks

Jo L. Harris
Judicial Assistant to Judge Sheryl B. Jolly
Columbia County Justice Center
640 Ronald Reagan Drive, Suite 1039
Evans, Georgia 30809
706-312-7231 phone
706-312 -7365 fax

Reminders: Please ensure the case number is in the subject line on every email. Please remember to “respond all” to emails as well. Any voicemail that is left without a case number and reason for the call will not be returned. We seek to work as efficiently as possible, and these guidelines assist us in doing that.

From: Renee Bell <kidsgal@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2026 10:06 AM
To: Harris, Jo Lynn <JHARRIS@columbiacountyga.gov>; Adam D. Land <adam@tisdalelawfirm.com>; Wayland Braxton Wills <bhbwillis@gmail.com>
Cc: Tonnia DeBord <tonnia@tisdalelawfirm.com>
Subject: 2025EDR0053 - Crowe v. Willis - Drug Screen - Mr. Willis

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Columbia County email system. Please exercise caution before clicking links, opening attachments, replying, or providing information to the sender.

Good morning,

May we please have a drug screen order today which includes another lab for Mr. Willis to use? Analyze America thinks it is best for Mr. Willis to use a different lab for his drug screens.

Appendix G

Petitioner's Letter to Judicial Assistant J. Harris (October 29, 2025)

Dear Mrs. Harris,

I hope you'll forgive me for reaching out directly — I realize this might not be the usual way to handle things, and I'm nervous about doing so. I'm just at a point where I don't know what else to do.

My name is Wayland Willis and I'm a party in CROWE/WILLIS Case #2025EDR0053. I've repeatedly reached out to my attorney, Holly Chapman, and the guardian ad litem, Renee Bell, to confirm visitation for this upcoming weekend. Despite sending detailed written requests and giving them time to respond, I still haven't heard anything.

I've done everything required of me — including completing and submitting the court-ordered drug testing numerous times, to which Ms. Bell confirmed she received. But I have no written confirmation or direction on what happens next. After everything that's happened in this case, the continued silence has left me feeling helpless and unsure of my standing.

I don't want to do anything that might be seen as inappropriate or out of line with the court, but I also don't want to miss my visitation or violate an order by acting without guidance. Could you please let me know the proper way to proceed — whether that would be filing a Motion for Enforcement or an Emergency Motion for Clarification?

Thank you for your time and understanding.

Sincerely,

Wayland Braxton Willis

706-631-0526

bhbwillis@gmail.com