



SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA
Case No. S26A0410

December 30, 2025

The Honorable Supreme Court met pursuant to adjournment.

The following order was passed:

SIERRAH CORONELL et al. v. STATE OF GEORGIA.

Appellants Sierrah Coronell and Diane Holsey—along with organizational plaintiff Women on the Rise, which subsequently voluntarily dismissed its claims—filed, in May 2025, a “Verified Class Action Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief” against the State, alleging that the recently passed Georgia Senate Bill 63 (“SB 63”), which, among other things, expanded the list of “bail-restricted offenses” found at OCGA § 17-6-12, violated the rights to procedural and substantive due process under Ga. Const. of 1983, Art. I, Sec. I, Par. I, and as such, should be declared unconstitutional. The State responded with a motion to dismiss, arguing, among other things, that the claims of plaintiffs Coronell and Holsey became moot when they were released from jail two days after the filing of their complaint. Following a hearing, the trial court entered an order granting the State’s motion to dismiss and denying as moot the plaintiffs’ motion for class certification. The court concluded that plaintiffs’ facial challenge to SB 63 failed, as to both the procedural and substantive due process claims. The court further concluded that plaintiffs’ challenges to SB 63 were now moot, given Coronell and Holsey’s release from jail, specifically concluding that “Plaintiffs’ release from jail deprives the court of jurisdiction to entertain their *facial* constitutional challenge.”

The appellants have now filed the instant notice of appeal, which they directed to this Court on the basis that this is a case “in which the constitutionality of a law ... has been drawn into question.” See Ga. Const. of 1983, Art. VI, Sec. VI, Par. II(1). However, when, as here, a trial court only ruled on a constitutional challenge in the alternative, while also rejecting the constitutional challenge on other grounds, the alternative merits ruling is insufficient to invoke this Court’s constitutional question jurisdiction. See generally *Brinkley v. State*, 291 Ga. 195, 198–200 (2012) (holding that trial court’s decision to address constitutional question it should not have addressed does not control this Court’s jurisdiction and the ruling on that constitutional question fails to invoke the Court’s jurisdiction), disapproved on other grounds by *Veal v. State*, 298 Ga. 691, 701 (2016). As this appeal, therefore, does not invoke this Court’s constitutional question jurisdiction, and as no other basis for invoking this Court’s appellate jurisdiction is apparent from the record, see Ga. Const. of 1983, Art. VI, Sec. VI, Par. II-III; OCGA § 15-3-3.1, the Court transfers this appeal to the Court of Appeals. If the Court of Appeals determines that the trial court erred in its jurisdictional ruling, it should remand the case to the trial court for the entry of a proper order on the other issues raised in the motion to dismiss.

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.

 , Clerk