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DEAR OHIOANS:

NUMBERS CAN TELL A COMPELLING STORY.

In the pages of this Supreme Court of Ohio annual report, numbers form the foundation of articles large and small that recap a year of significant decisions from the bench, rule changes for courts, forays into civic education, and accomplishments that reflect the character and diverse work of our staff.

The year 2017 began with a welcoming of two new members to the Court. Justices Patrick F. Fischer and R. Patrick DeWine took office following their statewide elections the previous November to full six-year terms.

Education at many levels is reflected in the numbers. For the calendar year, nearly 23,000 Ohioans were educated through more than 200 Ohio Judicial College course offerings.

As part of our administration of the practice of law in Ohio, the Court registered more than 44,000 active attorneys during 2017’s biennial registration period. Separately, the Court administered the Ohio bar exam twice last year to nearly 1,400 individuals.

Staff services were stepped up, and the numbers reflect it. The Court focused on further development and certification of specialized dockets in local courts to meet the changing, and often dire, needs of defendants. We certified court interpreters for non-English-speaking, deaf, and hard-of-hearing individuals who find themselves in court proceedings. We examined case flow and case management to ensure the timely adjudication of justice in local courts.

I’m pleased to present this annual report, and I encourage you to read on, paying particular attention to how numbers tell the stories of the Supreme Court of Ohio’s work in 2017.

God Bless,

Maureen O’Connor
Chief Justice
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Ohio Supreme Court Justices

Chief Justice Maureen O’Connor

Chief Justice Maureen O’Connor is the first woman and 10th chief justice in Ohio history. She was re-elected to her second term as the head of Ohio’s judiciary in 2016. Since becoming chief justice, she has led significant reforms and improvements in the Ohio judicial system, including improving access to justice by advocating for reasonable court fines, fees, and bail practices, especially for economically disadvantaged communities. She also established a task force to study grand-jury proceedings in Ohio, created a committee to examine the administration of the death penalty, and leads efforts for an eight-state initiative to combat the nation’s opioid epidemic. She is president of the national Conference of Chief Justices (CCJ) and chair of the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) Board of Directors. Chief Justice O’Connor joined the Ohio Supreme Court as a justice in January 2003.

Justice Terrence O’Donnell

Since joining the Ohio Supreme Court in 2003, Justice Terrence O’Donnell has led statewide efforts to increase professionalism among lawyers and judges. Previously, he served on the common pleas and appellate benches and worked as a school teacher. He also served as chairman of the Ohio Legal Rights Service Commission, which oversees the protection and advocacy of the developmentally disabled and mentally ill statewide.

Justice Sharon L. Kennedy

A former Butler County Domestic Relations Court judge, Justice Sharon L. Kennedy won election to an unexpired term on the Supreme Court in November 2012, and was elected to her first full six-year term in 2014. She served on the bench in Butler County from 1999 to 2012, where, as administrative judge, she improved its case management system to ensure the timely resolution of cases for families and children. Before becoming a judge, she was special counsel to the attorney general and a part-time magistrate. She began her career as a police officer.

Justice Judith L. French

Former appellate judge Judith L. French became the 155th justice of the Ohio Supreme Court in January 2013, after a gubernatorial appointment. She won election to her first full six-year term on the Supreme Court in 2014. Before serving as an appellate judge, she was chief legal counsel to Gov. Bob Taft, as well as an assistant attorney general and then chief counsel to the attorney general. She argued before the U.S. Supreme Court twice, including on behalf of the state in a Cleveland school-vouchers case.

Justice William M. O’Neill

A former Army officer, Vietnam veteran, reporter, registered nurse, and appellate judge, Justice William M. O’Neill – a member of the Ohio Veterans Hall of Fame – joined the Ohio Supreme Court in January 2013. He is a retired Army lieutenant colonel and a retired Judge Advocate General (JAG) lieutenant colonel in the Ohio National Guard. He received the Bronze Star and the Army Commendation Medal for his service in Vietnam. Justice O’Neill resigned from the Supreme Court in January 2018, about a year short of his term’s end.

Justice Patrick F. Fischer

Justice Patrick F. Fischer began his first term on the Supreme Court on Jan. 1, 2017, following his election in 2016. Previously, he was elected to Ohio’s First District Court of Appeals in 2010, and was re-elected in 2012. Respected within the state’s legal community, he served as president of the Ohio State Bar Association from 2012 to 2013, and served on the OSBA’s board of governors. While practicing law for 30 years, Justice Fischer tried cases throughout the country and was named to Best Lawyers in America and Ohio Super Lawyers.

Justice R. Patrick DeWine

Justice Pat DeWine began his first term on the Supreme Court on Jan. 2, 2017, following his election in 2016. Before joining the Supreme Court, Justice DeWine served on the First District Court of Appeals and also served on the Hamilton County Common Pleas Court. Before becoming a judge, he practiced law for 13 years and began his legal career as a law clerk for the Honorable David A. Nelson on the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. He served in local government, as a member of the Hamilton County Board of Commissioners and Cincinnati City Council.
Supreme Court Decisions

The Supreme Court issued many opinions in 2017, some dealing with highly anticipated legal issues. Here is a sampling 2017’s most noteworthy rulings.
Restrictions to Use of Red-Light Cameras Ruled Unconstitutional

Three of the many provisions of a 2015 state law regulating the use of red-light and speed cameras are unconstitutional because they infringe upon municipal authority without serving an overriding state interest, the Court ruled on July 26.

In a 5-2 judgment, the Court agreed with the city of Dayton’s constitutional challenge to parts of Senate Bill 342, which took effect more than two years ago. In Justice Patrick F. Fischer’s lead opinion, the Court found the regulations were not “general laws” that apply evenly throughout the state but instead were regulations that improperly “limit legislative power of a municipal corporation” to set police, sanitary, or similar regulations.

Landowners Can Challenge Increased Property Tax Value Placed on Woodlands

The Court ruled on Dec. 7 that landowners who complain that their agricultural lands are overtaxed may challenge their land values before the Ohio Board of Tax Appeals. In a pair of decisions, the Court rejected arguments by the tax commissioner that the BTA lacked jurisdiction to hear objections to the current agricultural use values (CAUV) because the commissioner’s entry was not a “final determination.” Under guidelines established by administrative rules, the tax commissioner sets the CAUVs after consulting with an expert advisory committee. The values are adopted in a “journal entry.” Justice R. Patrick DeWine’s majority opinion noted that the entry is the last step in the process of setting CAUVs, so it is a final determination under the plain language of the law. The BTA has jurisdiction to hear final determinations and must hear the landowner’s challenges, he wrote.

Duke Can Charge Customers to Clean Up Long-Closed Gas Plants

Duke Energy of Ohio can recover $55.5 million from customers to pay for cleaning up pollution at two long-closed manufactured gas plant (MGP) sites near downtown Cincinnati, the Court ruled on June 29. The funds are to be recovered through a rider added to customer bills.

In a 4-3 decision, the Court affirmed a Public Utilities Commission of Ohio decision to allow Duke to recover the costs of environmental remediation of two sites, one of which was selected to be in the pathway of a new Ohio-Kentucky interstate highway bridge. Writing for the majority, Justice Judith L. French ruled that state law allows the company to recover the expense as a “necessary and current cost of doing business” because it voluntarily agreed to clean up pollution that under federal law it was responsible for containing.

Statute Requiring Disclosure of HIV-Positive Status to Sexual Partners Is Constitutional

The Court on Oct. 26 unanimously upheld the constitutionality of Ohio’s HIV-disclosure statute, which makes it a crime for a person who has tested positive for HIV to knowingly engage in sexual conduct with another without disclosing that information, concluding that it does not violate either the free speech provision of the First Amendment or the equal protection clauses of the United States or Ohio constitutions.

Justice Terrence O’Donnell’s majority opinion concluded that because R.C.2903.11(B) (1) regulates conduct, not speech, it does not violate the First Amendment, and because it is rationally related to the state’s legitimate interest in preventing the transmission of HIV to sexual partners who may not be aware of the risk, it does not violate equal protection.

Pike County May Withhold Portions of Autopsy Reports from Press

Portions of a county coroner’s autopsy reports that are part of an open homicide investigation are not public records and not available for public inspection until investigators release them, the Court ruled on Dec. 14.

In a 4-3 decision, the Court determined the Pike County Coroner’s Office properly denied the Cincinnati Enquirer and the Columbus Dispatch unredacted versions of the autopsy reports for eight members of the Rhoden and Gilley families, who were murdered in April 2016. Writing for the majority, Chief Justice Maureen O’Connor stated the legislature amended the law regarding coroner records in 2009 to exempt “confidential law enforcement investigatory records (CLEIR),” and that the portions redacted by the coroner met the exemption.

Justice Terrence O’Donnell’s majority opinion concluded that because R.C.2903.11(B) (1) regulates conduct, not speech, it does not violate the First Amendment, and because it is rationally related to the state’s legitimate interest in preventing the transmission of HIV to sexual partners who may not be aware of the risk, it does not violate equal protection.

justice T. O’Donnell’s majority opinion concluded that because R.C.2903.11(B) (1) regulates conduct, not speech, it does not violate the First Amendment, and because it is rationally related to the state’s legitimate interest in preventing the transmission of HIV to sexual partners who may not be aware of the risk, it does not violate equal protection.
Strip Club Not Liable for Auto Accident Injuries Caused by Intoxicated Dancer

Ohio’s “Dram Shop Act” limits the legal responsibility of liquor permit holders not only for acts of an intoxicated customer who causes an accident after leaving the establishment where drinks are sold, but also for acts of any intoxicated worker or person after they leave, the Court ruled on Sept. 6.

The 6-1 decision found the Dram Shop Act applied in a case where a dancer at a Dayton strip club was provided drinks by patrons and on her drive home hit a vehicle in which the passenger suffered multiple injuries and incurred more than $1 million in medical expenses. The Court affirmed a Second District Court of Appeals decision that found the injured passenger could only pursue a claim against the club and its owner under the Dram Shop Act (R.C. 4399.18).

Justice R. Patrick DeWine’s majority opinion concluded that the law holds a club responsible in limited circumstances, including if the owner or an employee knowingly sold drinks to a “noticeably intoxicated person.” The trial court ruled correctly that the strip club dancer was not noticeably intoxicated when she left the premises and found the club was not liable for the damage, he wrote.

2016-0790. Johnson v. Montgomery
151 Ohio St.3d 75, 2017-Ohio-7443

Mandatory Sentences for Juveniles Constitutional

State laws mandating sentences for juveniles are constitutional, the Court ruled on July 6. A longer penalty imposed for a juvenile convicted at trial than for a codefendant who pleaded guilty is not a trial penalty, the Court also ruled.

Both rulings were handed down in the case of Ricky Anderson. Justice Terrence O’Donnell’s majority opinion pointed out that Anderson was convicted of four felony offenses and received a longer prison term than his codefendant who pleaded guilty to three felonies and agreed to testify against him at trial. Hence, the sentence was not a penalty or “trial tax.” Anderson’s sentence was within the range authorized by law, and Anderson faced a potential 50-year sentence, the Court ruled. The Court also upheld Ohio’s mandatory bindover law that allowed Anderson to be tried.

2016-0317. State v. Anderson
151 Ohio St.3d 212, 2017-Ohio-5656

Court Affirms Sentences for Crimes Committed by Juvenile

If a juvenile is convicted of committing a crime that, when charged, required the case to be transferred from the juvenile division to the general division of a common pleas court, the juvenile will be sentenced by the general division for all convictions in that case, the Court ruled on July 27.

The 6-1 ruling allowed a nine-year prison sentence to stand for a Montgomery County juvenile who was 17 years old when he used a
firearm to commit two aggravated robberies at two restaurants and forced multiple people into confined spaces against their will.

Justice Patrick F. Fischer, writing for the majority, explained the decision resolves a conflict among Ohio appeals courts in cases regarding a “reverse bindover,” where the juvenile offender is convicted on at least one charge that mandated transfer to the general division and convicted on additional charges that otherwise would be adjudicated in the juvenile division.

The lower courts’ dispute centered on what happens in such cases where the convictions include one that requires a mandatory transfer, but others that do not. The opinion noted the law states it is “the case” and not “the convictions” that determines what happens. The Court concluded that once the general division determines a 16- or 17-year-old was convicted of a crime that is subject to mandatory transfer, a court must then sentence the juvenile for all convictions in that case.

Guardian Ad Litem Must Be Appointed for Juveniles if Parents Are Deceased

A juvenile whose parents are deceased does not need to request that a guardian ad litem (GAL) be appointed for an “amenability” hearing in juvenile court. A judge must appoint one as required by law, the Court ruled Sept. 13.

In juvenile proceedings, a GAL is appointed to represent the “best interests of a child.” If the judge fails to make the appointment, the juvenile must prove the error affected the outcome of the trial. In a 4-3 ruling, the Supreme Court decided a 16-year-old Columbus male did not prove the failure to have a GAL appointed would have changed the result of his amenability hearing. After that hearing, he was transferred to the general division of the court of common pleas, pleaded guilty to several charges, and was sentenced to 18 years in prison.

Justice Sharon L. Kennedy’s majority opinion declared that the nature of an “amenability hearing,” where a juvenile court determines whether a minor can be rehabilitated in the juvenile system or transferred to the general division of common pleas court to face adult charges, has criminal aspects. To overturn a decision based on a plain error made by the judge, the minor must prove the outcome would have been different had the error not occurred.

Juvenile Court Can Dismiss Sexual Crimes Committed by Young Children

The rules of juvenile court allow a judge to dismiss criminal gross sexual imposition charges against a minor under age 13 who engages in sexual conduct with a child close in age, the Court ruled on Oct. 25.

The Court ruled that a Franklin County Common Pleas Court judge had the power to dismiss a delinquency charge against a boy who was 12 years old at the time he engaged in sexual conduct with another boy who was almost 10. Justice William M. O’Neill’s lead opinion stated that Juvenile Rule 9(A) gives the juvenile court the power to end the criminal prosecution and order treatment at an early stage of the proceedings, instead of taking formal action.

The juvenile court judge in this case noted that since the children were close in age and the incident involved no threat of force or violence, it would be arbitrary to determine that one child should face delinquency charges, but not the other. The juvenile judge concluded that alternative methods to treat the needs of both children would be better than formal court action, and if the parents would not provide the treatment, the county could take action to treat the children.

Guardian Ad Litem Must Be Appointed for Juveniles if Parents Are Deceased

A juvenile whose parents are deceased does not need to request that a guardian ad litem (GAL) be appointed for an “amenability” hearing in juvenile court. A judge must appoint one as required by law, the Court ruled Sept. 13.

In juvenile proceedings, a GAL is appointed to represent the “best interests of a child.” If the judge fails to make the appointment, the juvenile must prove the error affected the outcome of the trial. In a 4-3 ruling, the Supreme Court decided a 16-year-old Columbus male did not prove the failure to have a GAL appointed would have changed the result of his amenability hearing. After that hearing, he was transferred to the general division of the court of common pleas, pleaded guilty to several charges, and was sentenced to 18 years in prison.

Justice Patrick F. Fischer, writing for the majority, explained the decision resolves a conflict among Ohio appeals courts in cases regarding a “reverse bindover,” where the juvenile offender is convicted on at least one charge that mandated transfer to the general division and convicted on additional charges that otherwise would be adjudicated in the juvenile division.
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2016-0907. In re D.S. 152 Ohio St.3d 109, 2017-Ohio-8289


2015-0192. State v. D.B. 150 Ohio St.3d 452, 2017-Ohio-6952


2015-0192. State v. D.B. 150 Ohio St.3d 452, 2017-Ohio-6952
The Supreme Court resolved cases dealing with contested searches and questioning of suspects by law enforcement or government officials.

**Book Bag Search that Led to Discovery of Gun at School Was Permissible**

The constitutional rights of a student who had bullets in his book bag were not violated when a high school used this discovery to search another of the student’s bags and found a handgun, the Court ruled on May 11.

The Court’s unanimous decision reversed a Tenth District Court of Appeals ruling. The appeals panel had agreed with a trial court that the gun was inadmissible as evidence because the search violated the U.S. Constitution’s Fourth Amendment guarantees against unlawful search and seizure.

But the Supreme Court, in a decision by Justice Sharon L. Kennedy, wrote that schools have a compelling interest in protecting students from harm, making it reasonable for the school to conduct a warrantless search of property, like a book bag, to identify the owner and ensure the contents were not dangerous. 2016-0271. State v. Polk 150 Ohio St.3d 29, 2017-Ohio-2735

**No Rights Warnings Required to Question Intoxicated Driver in Police Vehicle Front Seat**

Placing a suspect in the front seat of a police cruiser during a traffic stop does not alone determine if the officer needs to read the suspect his rights before questioning, the Court ruled on July 19.

In a 6-1 decision, the Supreme Court declined to draw a “bright-line rule” that requires an officer to provide the commonly known Miranda warnings to a suspect who has been removed from a stopped vehicle and placed into a police car. Instead, the Court offered guidelines that help determine if the stop is the type of “custodial interrogation” that mandate the warnings.

The decision reversed an Eighth District Court of Appeals ruling that an Ohio State Highway Patrol trooper improperly questioned a Cleveland driver about his alcohol consumption when he pulled the man over and sat him in the front seat of the cruiser. The trooper did not read the man his Miranda rights before questioning and the Eighth District ruled the statements were inadmissible evidence. Chief Justice Maureen O’Connor’s majority opinion concluded the trooper only asked the typical questions of a routine traffic stop where alcohol is suspected to be a factor, and was not “the kind of interrogation — designed to pressure a suspect to confess to illegal conduct — that was of particular concern” to the U.S. Supreme Court when it decided Miranda v. Arizona in 1966. 2016-0172 and 2016-0282. Cleveland v. Oles 152 Ohio St.3d 1, 2017-Ohio-5834

**Evidence Can Be Used When Police with Warrant Improperly Enter Premises**

If a police officer with a search warrant violates Ohio’s “knock-and-announce” law, the criminal evidence obtained during the search still can be used to prosecute the suspect, the Supreme Court ruled on Oct. 10.

A Court majority found the exclusionary rule, which is used to prevent the use of illegally obtained evidence, is not the appropriate remedy for a knock-and-announce violation. The ruling allows the use of evidence collected by Boardman police who burst into the home of a suspected heroin dealer without announcing they had a warrant to search the apartment where he was living. Justice William M. O’Neill’s majority opinion explained the exclusionary rule was designed to protect against unconstitutional warrantless or illegal searches. The purpose of knock-and-announce is to protect the safety, property, and privacy of those on the premises “that can be destroyed by a sudden entrance.” 2016-0238. State v. Bembry 151 Ohio St.3d 502, 2017-Ohio-8114
Rule Changes

The Court enacted a number of rule changes in 2017, including those that dealt with commercial dockets, post-conviction DNA testing, and the practice of law by military spouses.

**Commercial Dockets**

Amendments to the rules governing commercial dockets included altering the process for appointing judges, their qualifications, term lengths, and education requirements and took effect March 1. Previously, the process required the chief justice to appoint a judge for a common pleas court with a commercial docket. The amendments transfer the appointment responsibility to the local court, which would select commercial docket judges by majority vote of the judges of the general division of that court.

**DNA Testing**

A person sentenced to death may appeal the rejection of an application for post-conviction DNA testing directly to the Ohio Supreme Court as of June 1. The change is a result of a 2016 case (*State v. Noling*) in which the Court found that part of the state law that limits the appeals of capital offenders seeking DNA testing after a conviction was unconstitutional.

**Mediation for Stalking Orders**

The Court developed temporary rule changes so that a group of pilot courts around the state could test the concept of mediating a subset of civil stalking protection order cases. Beginning on June 1, the rules enabled the courts to mediate menacing disputes occurring between coworkers or neighbors, but cases involving domestic violence or sexually oriented offenses are not eligible.

**Military Spouses**

Ohio joined 21 other states when it adopted rule amendments enabling an attorney-spouse of an active duty member of the U.S. military temporarily stationed in Ohio to be admitted temporarily to practice law under certain conditions. The Court’s Task Force on Access to Justice and the Ohio State Bar Association recommended the amendment, which took effect on July 1.

**Magistrates**

New rules require magistrates to register annually with the Court’s Office of Attorney Services, take an oath of office upon appointment, and complete 40 continuing legal education hours. Additionally, the rules, which took effect on Jan. 1, 2018, require a court’s administrative judge to notify Attorney Services upon a magistrate’s appointment or termination.

**Other Rules**

Other rule amendments governing civil, criminal, and juvenile proceedings, and rules of evidence were approved. The Supreme Court’s Commission on the Rules of Practice and Procedure adopted several rules that received legislative approval, including one that established a new procedure for appointment of experts for indigent capital cases, as well as new standards for discovery in post-conviction relief in such cases.
Patrick F. Fischer won election in November 2016 to an open seat on the Ohio Supreme Court and began his first six-year term as the 157th Supreme Court justice on Jan. 1, 2017. His judicial experience includes six years on the First District Court of Appeals.

Justice Fischer took his ceremonial oath of office during a March 1 Courtroom ceremony surrounded by family and friends.

In his remarks, Justice Fischer listed four factors that make a good judge or justice: impartiality, independence, integrity, and professionalism. Noting his Jesuit high school education, he mentioned the order’s motto, “A Man for Others,” and the importance to him of the Jesuit tradition of service.

“It is this ability of one person who shall stand up for all others, sometimes alone, which is the gift of independence. And, for me, it is only with that independence that a judge can stand up for every person seeking justice,” he said.

Justice Fischer thanked his late parents for sacrificing, saving, and scrimping for his education and that of his five siblings. Three of the Fischer children became lawyers.

“My parents’ gift that education makes the future, and their importance on learning how to learn made all the difference,” he said. “And, to me, it is only with that continuous learning that the law can maintain its integrity.”

Justice Pat DeWine won election in November 2016 to an open seat on the Court and began his first six-year term as the 158th justice on Jan. 2, 2017.

His judicial experience includes nearly four years on the First District Court of Appeals and four years on the Hamilton County Common Pleas Court.

Chief Justice Maureen O’Connor administered the oath of office during a Feb. 9 Courtroom ceremony.
The Supreme Court dedicated the portrait of recently retired Justice Judith Ann Lanzinger during a Courtroom ceremony on Feb. 6, honoring her 12 years on the state’s highest court.

Justice Lanzinger is the only person in Ohio history to be elected to every level of the state’s judiciary. She could not run for re-election to the Court because of constitutional age restrictions for judges.

During the dedication celebration, Lanzinger used numbers — courts, campaigns, colleagues, staff, and jury trials — to quantify her career while acknowledging that they don’t tell the whole story.

“Each of the cases before me has told a story of dispute or conflict or even crime,” she told the attendees, including many family members. “These are all subjects for the law to resolve. We know that law is based on abstract principles, but in my view, at its center, law is also a helping profession because every story involves people. And I’ve been very privileged over the last 31 years to serve as a judge for the people of Ohio.”

Artist Jeffrey Klopping, Lanzinger’s cousin, spent six years completing the portrait after spending two years in the planning stages. After the family unveiled the portrait, Chief Justice Maureen O’Connor accepted it on behalf of the Court.

WATCH CEREMONY VIDEO AT ohiochannel.org
The Ohio Supreme Court didn’t step tentatively into its Off-Site Court Program. The late Chief Justice Thomas J. Moyer wanted to enhance student knowledge about Ohio’s judicial system by taking the Court directly to the schools and their communities. At launch, the Court scheduled seven sessions in 18 months away from its Columbus Courtroom. The bold start began in October 1987.

The Court organized the inaugural off-site session in Marietta, which in 1987 was celebrating 200 years since becoming the first permanent settlement in the Northwest Territory. The tradition of the Supreme Court traveling to different locations across the state continues today. To commemorate the program’s 30th anniversary, the Supreme Court returned to Marietta on Oct. 18, 2017, to hear oral arguments in front of hundreds of Washington County students at Marietta High School.

As part of the Court’s civic education outreach, the Off-Site Court Program targets high school students to build understanding about how the Ohio Supreme Court, and the state’s judicial system in general, operate. The bench and bar in local communities invite the Supreme Court to their county for an off-site session, and, as of October 2017, 68 counties had hosted the Court.

Bringing Court to Life

Much goes into planning a session involving seven justices and crowds of students, from security, lodging, and food for the justices to coordinating the flow of students through the Court’s session and preparing them ahead of time for the experience. Teachers and staff discuss with students the appropriate behavior for the formality of a court proceeding, and practice entering and exiting the venues that are transformed into a courtroom.
In the weeks leading up to every off-site court session, students study the judicial system’s levels and the specific cases they will hear argued before the Court that day. Teachers and local attorneys volunteer to discuss the background of the scheduled cases with the students.

Court officials, teachers, and attorneys who’ve arranged past off-site court sessions across the state report that the Supreme Court session and educational activities in their communities made positive impressions on their students.

Numerous High Points

Many participants appreciate the unscripted question-and-answer discussion that the justices have with students before Court begins. Each justice typically delivers a brief personal history and speaks candidly when talking with students.

Others highlight the “debriefings” after the Court’s session, when the attorneys who argued the cases discuss with the students the oral arguments and the legal points.

After the Supreme Court heads home, court officials and educators often find themselves inspired to keep the productive dialogue going between courts and youth. Some local judges take time to speak with students. Various courts regularly host student groups for a Q&A session with judges, jail staff, attorneys, and probation officers. Some courts offer tours to youth and allow students to attend court hearings. Local bar associations also play a role, for example, by identifying guest speakers from the legal field to periodically visit schools and talk with students.

Organizers said that it’s a community gathering well worth the work.
Civic Education

The Ohio Supreme Court is dedicated to promoting greater understanding of the courts and the judicial branch of government. In 2017, the justices acknowledged the considerable hours that volunteers devote to educating visitors to the Supreme Court, and staff developed an educational packet about the justice system for teachers.

Fourteen volunteers were honored in September at the Thomas J. Moyer Ohio Judicial Center for their service giving tours to hundreds of visitors each year. All seven justices were on hand for the luncheon, and Chief Justice O’Connor surprised the group with a special pin depicting the historic building they guide visitors through each week. From young school children to adults, these volunteers teach the public about the role and the responsibilities of the judicial branch of government.

“It’s an exceptional group that really cares about what they are teaching,” said Toba Feldman, who’s been giving tours for 12 years. “And providing information on the building, but more importantly about the judges, legal system, courts, lawyers, I think everyone finds it valuable and I wouldn’t be doing it otherwise.”

In 2017, guides volunteered approximately 533 hours, leading tours of the building and the Court’s Visitor Education Center.

“Your knowledge and enthusiasm are appreciated by the staff and the justices. I want you to know that,” Chief Justice O’Connor told the volunteers. “Those of us who work here are extremely proud of the building and proud of what you do for us in showcasing the building and this institution.”

PICTURED (from left): David Binkovitz, Galen Graham, Karen Saffle, Paul Braunsdorf, Susan Voorhees-Murphy, Phil Smith, Toba Feldman, Elise Porter, Sara Stiffler (Civic Education & Outreach Program Coordinator), Catherine Stroup, Kate Graham, Martha Lighttiser, Monica Leck, and Dan Bennington. Not pictured: Patricia Davidson
An educational packet made available to teachers in 2017 is designed to teach students about the state’s judicial branch and how courts work.

The teaching guides, developed by the Court’s Civic Education Section, give children of all ages a fun way to learn. The packet includes strategies to teach students about the justice system and lesson plans designed specifically to meet state educational standards.

Courts also can use the packets to facilitate discussion and activities when conducting outreach with schools in their communities or when students visit their courts.

In the packet, a note from Chief Justice O’Connor explains that the materials, including graphic novels developed by the National Center for State Courts, give students the chance to learn more about the least-understood branch of government — the judiciary. “You are learning some of the most important things that any American can learn: how your government works, how you can protect your rights, and how important it is that you become an active and engaged citizen,” she wrote.

The judicial branch education packet is free. Teachers, courts, and the public have immediate access to the materials from the Court’s website. (Go to sc.ohio.gov, click “Civic Education,” then “Judicial Branch Education Resources.”) Files can be downloaded as PDFs, and some can be viewed as digital magazines. Teachers and courts may order print copies or obtain more information by emailing CivicEd@sc.ohio.gov.

What’s Inside

An array of educational resources are tucked into the Supreme Court’s practical, colorful packet. From graphic novels about the different roles of courts to bookmarks about the state’s judicial system, the packet includes multiple tools to teach students about the justice system.

- The Supreme Court of Ohio & the Ohio Judicial System Brochure
- Judicial Education Resources for Teachers Brochure
- Supreme Court Bookmarks
- National Center for State Courts Graphic Novels
- Ohio Curriculum Lesson Plans
Staff Notes
Ohio Supreme Court employees are guided in their work by a vision statement, a mission statement, and three strategic directives.

Vision Statement
For the Supreme Court of Ohio to administer justice with integrity and provide leadership for the Judicial Branch of Ohio government.

Mission Statement
The Supreme Court will accomplish its vision by:
• Applying and promoting standards of impartiality and fairness
• Strengthening the judiciary, courts, and bar of Ohio
• Fostering collaboration with its justice system partners
• Serving as a catalyst for the strategic direction of the justice system.

Strategic Directives
• Foster Uniformity
• Achieve Internal Efficiencies
• Support the Judiciary

SENIOR STAFF

Graubner Nelson Promoted to Court Services Director

In August 2017, Stephanie Graubner Nelson was named director of court services. She has been employed by the Court since August 2009. The Court Services Division supports trial and appellate courts with the administration of justice in Ohio. In her role as the division director, Graubner Nelson oversees several sections and programs that provide traditional and innovative services to the courts.

Graubner Nelson brought her experience working in two sections to her new position. She served as manager and as policy counsel for the Children and Families Section, and as policy counsel for the Case Management Section. She was appointed interim director of the division in October 2016.

In 2014, she earned the certified court manager credential from the Court Management Program of the National Center for State Courts. Graubner Nelson helped form the Ohio chapter of the Association of Family and Conciliation Courts and has participated in mock trial activities for the Ohio Center for Law-Related Education.

Long Selected to Lead Legal Resources Office

Elisabeth Long was promoted in May 2017 to director of legal services. In that position, she provides oversight and administrative direction for the Office of Legal Resources, which assists the Supreme Court justices in researching complex legal issues and preparing written analyses of those issues.

Long, who joined the Court in March 2013, acted as interim director of the office from November 2016 until her promotion. Before that, she specialized in death penalty and tax issues as a master commissioner.

Dedicated to public service, Long has worked in all three branches of government at the state and federal levels.

In 2017, she graduated from the Court Management Program of the National Center for State Courts as a certified court manager. She is licensed to practice law in the District of Columbia, Minnesota, Ohio, and Virginia, and is a member of the Ohio Association of Court Administrators and the Ohio State Bar Association.
New Ohio Fiscal Academy Graduate

**Tim Gaunt**, fiscal officer in the Office of Fiscal Resources, graduated in September 2017 from the Ohio Fiscal Academy, a nine-month academic program offered through the State of Ohio. With his graduation, Gaunt earned the certified-fiscal-professional credential.

National Editorial Appointment

In September 2017, **Tasha Ruth**, case management program manager in the Office of Court Services, was named editor of *Court Manager*, a publication of the National Association for Court Management.

Staff Earn National Court Management Credentials

Five Supreme Court employees earned national certification in 2017, after completing a three-year program of courses offered through the Supreme Court’s Judicial College and the National Center for State Courts’ Institute for Court Management.

- **Certified Court Managers**
  - Elisabeth A. Long
    Director, Legal Resources Division
  - Melissa M. Ferguson
    Case Management Counsel, Clerk’s Office

- **Certified Court Executives**
  - Gina White Palmer
    Director, Attorney Services Division
  - Diana Ramos-Reardon
    Policy Counsel, Office of Court Services
  - Jeremy Johnson
    Senior Network Administrator, Office of Information Technology

The Supreme Court’s 13th annual ceremony honoring employee excellence and service recognized nearly three dozen staff members in a Courtroom ceremony on Feb. 28. Highlights of the event were the presentations of the Court’s Professional Excellence Awards. Four employees were recognized with the highest honors given to Supreme Court employees (pictured L to R): **Katie Monahan**, graphic design editor in the Office of Public Information; **Jess Mosser**, staff attorney in the Office of Chief Legal Counsel; **Erick Gale**, master commissioner in the Office of Legal Resources; and **Kelly Peters**, executive assistant to Justice French. Another 31 employees were honored for 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 years of service to the Court.
JANUARY 4
The Ohio Supreme Court opens its third annual technology grant application process for local courts statewide.

JANUARY 10
The Court convenes oral arguments with new Justices Patrick F. Fischer and R. Patrick DeWine.

JANUARY 31
Chief Justice Maureen O’Connor announces support for prescription database access for drug courts.

FEBRUARY 6
The Court dedicates former Justice Judith Ann Lanzinger’s portrait during a special Courtroom ceremony.

FEBRUARY 9
The Court holds a celebratory swearing-in ceremony for Justice DeWine.

FEBRUARY 9
Civics teachers participating in the OCLRE Ohio Government in Action program tour the Moyer Judicial Center, observe oral arguments, and meet with several justices.

FEBRUARY 14
The Court unveils a shared resources website to encourage local courts to collaborate on projects to save time and money while still meeting their needs.
Review

FEBRUARY 27
Clarence G. Newsome, president of the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center, speaks about freedom and the rule of law during the Court’s annual Black History Month event.

FEBRUARY 28
The Court recognizes four employees with its annual Professional Excellence Awards, and presents 31 staff with awards for years of service.

MARCH 1
Justice Patrick F. Fischer takes his ceremonial oath of office surrounded by family and friends at the Moyer Judicial Center.

MARCH 13
The Court debuts a new Visitor Education Center exhibit, “Eye in the Sky,” about law enforcement use of a tracking device to uncover a drug deal.

APRIL 6
The justices hear oral arguments in McConnelsville (Morgan County) as part of the Off-Site Court program.

APRIL 20 & 21
Chief Justice O’Connor addresses a Harvard law panel on the need to improve fines, fees, and bail processes that prey on the poor.

APRIL 26
The Court awards $2.8 million in technology grants to 70 local courts.

APRIL 28
The Court announces that 224 applicants (54 percent) pass the February Ohio bar exam.

MAY 15
More than 200 new lawyers are sworn in to the Ohio bar during a ceremony at the Palace Theater in Columbus.

MAY 30
The Ohio Judicial College launches OhioCourtEDU, a new website where judges, attorneys, guardians, and others can register for online courses.

44,473
Attorneys registered during biennial registration period

191
Attorneys SUSPENDED for failure to register

159
Attorneys SANCTIONED for CLE non-compliance

MENTORING PROGRAM
623
Attorney Mentors

623
New Lawyers

225
SPECIALIZED DOCKETS

24
Certified in 2017

87
Recertified in 2017

7
COURT INTERPRETERS certified by the Court in 2017

104
Certified Court Interpreters in Ohio

51
CASE MANAGEMENT consultations with local courts

21
Trainings

44
Days

345
Mediation Sessions

11
Training Sessions

17
Reviews of Court Locations

7
Consultations

225
Certified Court Interpreters in Ohio

MENTORING PROGRAM

CASE MANAGEMENT

COURT SECURITY

SERVICES FOR LOCAL COURTS

COURT SECURITY

SERVICES FOR LOCAL COURTS

COURT SECURITY

SERVICES FOR LOCAL COURTS

COURT SECURITY

SERVICES FOR LOCAL COURTS

COURT SECURITY

SERVICES FOR LOCAL COURTS

COURT SECURITY

SERVICES FOR LOCAL COURTS
JULY 12
Justice Judith French meets with Ohio State University Mandela Washington Fellows — a group of young African leaders who practice in the medical field, but have many questions on how law is carried out in the United States, specifically in Ohio.

The Court creates the Civil Justice Program Fund to provide direct civil legal assistance and increased access to assistance for Ohioans’ civil legal needs, such as housing, healthcare, and economic security, among other areas.

JULY 25–27
More than 900 prospective lawyers sit for the three-day Ohio bar exam.

AUGUST 10
Two dozen teachers and administrators from Saudi Arabia visit the Court as part of a Kent State University program designed to build leadership through engagement with other cultures.

AUGUST 21
A pair of legal delegates from Greece and the Democratic Republic of Congo meet with Court employees and tour the Moyer Judicial Center as part of the Columbus International Program’s “Rule of Law.”

AUGUST 29
President Warren G. Harding’s family donates a plaster cast of his face to the Court. The plaster, which was sculpted by a Columbus artist, served as a mold for the bronze bas relief of President Harding that hangs in the judicial center’s grand concourse.

AUGUST 31
Chief Justice O’Connor addresses courthouse safety; fines, fees, and bail; and the opioid crisis in her annual State of the Judiciary address.

SEPTEMBER 8
The Court’s Children & Families Section releases two new toolkits to help juvenile court and child welfare staff assess best practices.

SEPTEMBER 22
The justices recognize the substantial contributions of the many volunteers who conduct tours of the Moyer Judicial Center during a special ceremony.

SEPTEMBER 22
The Civic Education Section releases free judicial branch education resources for teachers, including bookmarks, “comic” books with corresponding lesson plans, and information on the Ohio judicial system.

OCTOBER 9
Chief Justice O’Connor welcomes more than 30 young visitors as part of the Court’s annual Take Your Child to Work Day program.

YEAR IN REVIEW

Ohio Judicial College

832 FACULTY
(includes Court staff)

22,818 PEOPLE EDUCATED

7,463 ADULT GUARDIANS EDUCATED DURING

26 GUARDIAN AD LITEM TRAINING SESSIONS

44% COMPLETED COURSEWORK ONLINE

19 TRAINING SESSIONS
OCTOBER 18
The Court commemorates the 30th anniversary of its Off-Site Court Program by holding oral arguments in Marietta — where the program began in 1987.

OCTOBER 20
Justices attend the 2017 Red Mass at the Cathedral of St. John the Evangelist in Cleveland to congratulate Justice Terrence O’Donnell, the year’s recipient of the St. Thomas More Award.

OCTOBER 26
Students from the University of Iceland’s School of Law and Ohio Northern University’s Pettit College of Law visit the Court and talk with Administrative Director Michael Buenger about differences between the legal systems in the U.S. and Iceland.

OCTOBER 23 & 24
More than 500 court personnel from around the state gather to exchange ideas at the annual Specialized Dockets Conference, hosted by the Court.

NOVEMBER 1
The Office of Attorney Services releases its 2017 fiscal year report, which shows nearly $9 million in fees collected from Ohio lawyers.

Pakistani and Indian visitors from the Legislative Fellows Program, sponsored by the U.S. State Department, tour the Moyer Judicial Center and learn about the U.S. judiciary.

NOVEMBER 7
The Lawyers’ Fund for Client Protection annual report shows $841,227 in reimbursements for 158 claims of attorney theft by dishonest conduct in fiscal year 2017.

NOVEMBER 13
About 600 successful applicants participate in the bar admissions ceremonies at the Ohio Theatre in Columbus.

NOVEMBER 15
The application period for a new round of Supreme Court technology grants opens, allowing courts to apply for technology projects designed to remove barriers to justice.

NOVEMBER 20
More than 35 Ohio court professionals achieve national certification upon graduating from the three-year Ohio Court Management Program.

DECEMBER 11-14
More than 50 new judges attend a three-day orientation session hosted by the Ohio Judicial College.

DECEMBER 21
The Court’s Commission on Continuing Legal Education issues sanctions for 159 attorneys who failed to comply with CLE requirements.

**YEAR IN REVIEW**

- **204 COURSES OFFERED**
- **9 WEBINARS/WEB CONFERENCES**
- **12 BROADCASTS**
- **39 ONLINE MODULES**
- **144 ONSITE/LIVE**
Administrative Division
The Administrative Division is the lead division of the Supreme Court. It assists in developing and communicating the long-term vision, values, and direction of the Court and the judicial branch of Ohio government. The Administrative Division includes the offices of the Administrative Director, Chief Legal Counsel, Fiscal Resources, Human Resources, Public Information, and the Law Library. This division also oversees Court communication and outreach and provides support to the Court and Ohio judiciary in the areas of fiscal, human resources, and records management.

Clerk's Division
The clerk of the court supervises the filing of all case-related items and maintains all case files in matters pending before the Supreme Court. In addition, the office maintains case dockets, the Court’s journal, and relevant trial, appellate, board, and agency records. The office prepares and issues Court orders, schedules oral arguments and other case-related matters for the Court’s consideration, and coordinates interagency communication in death-penalty cases. The division includes the Office of the Reporter, which publishes Supreme Court, appellate, and trial court opinions.

Attorney Services Division
The Attorney Services Division assists the Supreme Court in its regulation of the practice of law in Ohio. This division includes the Office of Bar Admissions.

Legal Resources Division
The Office of Legal Resources assists in resolving complex legal issues pending before the Supreme Court.

Judicial & Education Services Division
The Judicial & Education Services Division, which includes the Ohio Judicial College, supports all Ohio appellate and local courts in the administration of justice by helping develop policies and procedures, training judicial offices and court staff, and providing access to funding and resources.

Court Services Division
The Office of Court Services supports trial and appellate courts in the administration of justice. Its staff, through four sections and two additional programs, oversees and provides traditional and innovative services in response to and with respect for the needs of the courts and the public.

Facilities Management Division
The Facilities Management Division ensures the secure and efficient operation of the Moyer Judicial Center and maintains internal and external comfort, cleanliness, and building standards. The division provides building management services to Supreme Court employees and other building tenants, ensures the safety and comfort of guests, and offers security assessments and assistance to Ohio courts. The division includes the Office of Court Security.

Information Technology Division
The Information Technology Division operates the Supreme Court's information technology systems and processes. The division also develops and implements the Ohio Courts Network, provides guidance to Ohio courts on technology-related matters, and facilitates the development of statewide information-technology standards for Ohio courts.

AFFILIATED OFFICES: In addition to its eight divisions, the Supreme Court has four affiliated offices with a quasi-independent status because of the nature of their work: the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, the Board of Professional Conduct, the Lawyers’ Fund for Client Protection, and the Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission. Complete descriptions of these offices are available at sc.ohio.gov/AdminOffices.
Case Statistics

More than 1,800 cases were filed with the Ohio Supreme Court in 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictional Appeals</th>
<th>Merit Cases</th>
<th>Practice of Law Cases</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases Filed</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Dispositions</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

831 Cases PENDING on Jan. 1, 2017

883 Cases PENDING on Dec. 31, 2017

97% CLEARANCE RATE

Cases filed by LEGAL CATEGORY 2017

- 53% Criminal
- 20% Miscellaneous¹
- 18% Civil
- 5% Practice of Law
- 4% Domestic Relations, Probate & Juvenile

¹ Miscellaneous cases include certified conflict cases, certified questions of state law, direct appeals, original actions, and administrative appeals.
Cases Filed in 2017

1,365  Jurisdictional Appeals
  1,256  Jurisdictional Appeals
  3    Death Penalty Postconviction Appeals
  20   Appeals Involving Termination of Parental Rights/Adoption
  83   Appeals from App.R. 26(B) Applications
  3    Petition to Transfer Board of Tax Appeals Appeal from Court of Appeals

370  Merit Cases
  162  Original Actions
  44   Habeas Corpus Cases
  81   Direct Appeals (Cases Originating in Court of Appeals)
  20   Certified Conflicts
  0    Certified Conflicts Involving Termination of Parental Rights/Adoption
  38   Appeals from Board of Tax Appeals
  8    Appeals from Public Utilities Commission
  2    Appeals from Power Siting Board
  4    Death Penalty Cases
  0    Appeals from App.R. 26(B) Application in Death Penalty Case
  4    Certified Questions of State Law
  1    Appeal from Denial of DNA Testing in Capital Case
  0    Appeals of Contest of Election under R.C. 3515.15
  0    Petition Challenges pursuant to Article II, Section 1g of the Ohio Constitution
  0    Contests of an Election pursuant to R.C. 3515.08
  6    Cases Purporting to Invoke Unspecified Original Jurisdiction

93  Practice of Law Cases
  84   Disciplinary Cases
  3    Bar Admission Cases
  4    Unauthorized Practice of Law Cases
  2    Other Matters Relating to Practice of Law

1,828  Total Cases Filed
2017 Final Dispositions

1,260 Jurisdictional Appeals

1,152 Jurisdictional Appeals
17 Death Penalty Postconviction Appeals
18 Appeals Involving Termination of Parental Rights/Adoption
72 Appeals from App.R. 26(B) Applications
1 Petition to Transfer Board of Tax Appeals Appeal from Court of Appeals

423 Merit Cases

148 Original Actions
49 Habeas Corpus Cases
83 Direct Appeals (Cases Originating in Court of Appeals)
15 Certified Conflicts
0 Certified Conflicts Involving Termination of Parental Rights/Adoption
75 Appeals from Board of Tax Appeals
6 Appeals from Public Utilities Commission
1 Appeals from Power Siting Board
5 Death Penalty Cases
0 Appeal from App.R. 26(B) Application in Death Penalty Case
2 Certified Questions of State Law
0 Appeal from Denial of DNA Testing in Capital Case
0 Appeals of Contest of Election under R.C. 3515.15
0 Petition Challenges pursuant to Article II, Section 1g of the Ohio Constitution
6 Other Merit Cases
33 Jurisdictional Appeals Accepted for Merit Review

93 Practice of Law Cases

84 Disciplinary Cases
3 Bar Admission Cases
4 Unauthorized Practice of Law Cases
2 Other Matters Relating to Practice of Law

1,776 Total Final Dispositions

2 This category includes dispositions where the Court declined to accept jurisdiction and did not review the merits of the case.
### Cases Pending on December 31, 2017

556  **Jurisdictional Appeals**
- 532    Jurisdictional Appeals
  - 1    Death Penalty Postconviction Appeals
  - 2    Appeals Involving Termination of Parental Rights/Adoption
  - 19   Appeals from App.R. 26(B) Applications
  - 2    Petition to Transfer Board of Tax Appeals Appeal from Court of Appeals

287  **Merit Cases**
- 61    Original Actions
- 8    Habeas Corpus Cases
- 66    Direct Appeals (Cases Originating in Court of Appeals)
- 12   Certified Conflicts
- 66    Appeals from Board of Tax Appeals
- 11    Appeals from Public Utilities Commission
- 2    Appeals from Power Siting Board
- 11    Death Penalty Cases
- 4    Certified Questions of State Law
- 0    Appeals from App.R. 26(B) Application in a Death Penalty Case
- 1    Appeal from Denial of DNA Testing in Capital Case
- 1    Other Merit Cases
- 44   Jurisdictional Appeals Accepted for Merit Review

40   **Practice of Law Cases**
- 37    Disciplinary Cases
- 2    Bar Admission Cases
- 1    Unauthorized Practice of Law Cases
- 0    Other Matters Relating to Practice of Law

883  **Total Cases Pending**
Judiciary/Supreme Court Operating Expenditures

The Supreme Court of Ohio/Judiciary GRF budget accounts for $162.6 million, which is used to support the operation of the Moyer Judicial Center, home to the Supreme Court, as well as the payment of the salaries of Ohio judges and district courts of appeals staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDICIARY</th>
<th>Expenditures FY 2017*</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Budgeted FY 2018**</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courts of Appeals Judges</td>
<td>$12,571,442</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>$13,545,966</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Court Judges</td>
<td>$79,151,246</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>$85,134,414</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OHIO JUDICIARY</td>
<td>$91,722,688</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>$98,680,380</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURTS OF APPEALS STAFF</td>
<td>$27,253,430</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>$30,587,296</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPREME COURT</th>
<th>Expenditures FY 2017*</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Budgeted FY 2018**</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court of Ohio Operations</td>
<td>$40,195,460</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>$45,438,629</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Center for Law-Related Education</td>
<td>$166,172</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>$166,172</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Courts Network Initiative</td>
<td>$3,242,635</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>$3,350,000</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Justice Program Fund</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPREME COURT TOTAL</td>
<td>$43,604,267</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>$49,304,801</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OHIO JUDICIARY &amp; SUPREME COURT TOTAL</th>
<th>Expenditures FY 2017*</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>Budgeted FY 2018**</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$162,580,385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$178,572,477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes encumbrances and all fund sources.
** Budget is as of January, fiscal year 2017.

NOTE: Numbers may be rounded up to the nearest dollar.
SOURCE: State of Ohio OAKS Fin System
Ohio Judiciary/Supreme Court
Fiscal Year 2017 Total Expenditures

- $91,722,688 Ohio Judiciary
- $43,604,267 Supreme Court
- $27,253,430 Courts of Appeals Staff

Supreme Court of Ohio
Fiscal Year 2017 Total Expenditures

- $40,195,460 Ohio Supreme Court Operations
- $3,242,635 Ohio Courts Network Initiative
- $166,172 Ohio Center for Law-Related Education
Boards, Commissions, Advisory Committees, and Task Forces

The Court relies on the volunteer services of dozens of committed judges, attorneys, clerks, court administrators, and private citizens who serve on the Supreme Court’s many boards, commissions, advisory committees, and task forces. These bodies help the Court provide oversight to Ohio courts, regulate the practice of law, and provide efficient and helpful services to the judicial branch of Ohio government. To learn more about these bodies and the nature of their work, refer to supremecourt.ohio.gov.

**Boards**

**BOARD OF BAR EXAMINERS**
Lee Ann Ward, Secretary
Michael M. Briley
Hon. Thomas F. Bryant
Lisa Weekley Coulter
Jennifer E. Day
Hon. Michael Donnelly
Patricia Gajda
Julie A. Jones
Shawn Judge
Kevin J. Kenney
Edward F. Kozelek
Hon. R. Scott Krichbaum
Robert M. Morrow
Michael E. Murman
William J. O’Neill

**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS ON CHARACTER & FITNESS**
Lee Ann Ward, Secretary
Gregory L. Arnold
Mary Asbury
Darrell A. Clay
John C. Fairweather
John E. Gamble
Lynn A. Grimshaw
Susan Gwinn

**BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT**
Richard A. Dove, Director
Hon. Pamela A. Barker
Hon. Eric Blaine
John R. Carle
James D. Caruso

**413 Board, commission, advisory committee, and task force members who volunteered their time in 2017.**

**6** **COMMISSIONS**

**11** **ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

**2** **TASK FORCES**

**Chair**

**Co-Chair**
Boards, Commissions, Advisory Committees, and Task Forces

Hon. Eugene A. Lucci
Hon. Lee McClelland
Velta Moisio
Hon. Tom S. Moulton Jr.
David Phillips
Marlon Primes
Hon. Arlene Singer
Hon. James Stevenson
Brandie Swickrath
Hon. Diane Vettori
Hon. James T. Walther
Roger Wilson
Hon. Mary Pat Zitter
David Zoll

COMMISSION ON APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL IN CAPITAL CASES
Tammy J. White
SECRETARY
Ann M. Baronas
Richard A. Cline
Jefferson E. Liston
John T. Martin*
Joann M. Sahl

COMMISSION ON DISPUTE RESOLUTION
Catherine Geyer
STAFF LIAISON
Richard Altman*
Hon. Ted Barrows
Hon. Mary Boyle
Terrence Donnellon
Lenny Eliason
Hon. Colleen Falkowski
Marc Fishel
Hon. Robert Fragale
Frank J. Gilha
Douglas N. Godshall
Hon. Jeffrey Hooper
Peggy Foley Jones
Hon. Joyce V. Kimbler
Diane Lease
Bryan Long
Hon. Alice McCollum
Marcie Patzak-Vendetti
James Petas
Hon. Guy Reece II
Hon. Pamela Rintala
Brian Stewart

COMMISSION ON SPECIALIZED DOCKETS
Monica Kagey
STAFF LIAISON
Lara N. Baker-Morris
Hon. Teresa Ballinger
Mary Bower
Hon. Kim Burke
Hon. Joyce A. Campbell
Hon. J. Mark Costine
Hon. Theresa Dellick
Hon. Charlotte Coleman
Eufinger
Scott Fulton
Susan L. House
Hon. John P. Kolesar
Marie Lane
Dawn Lucey
Laura Lynd-Robinson
Wade Melton
Rob Menke
Hon. Charles L. Patton
Hon. Noah Powers
Hon. Jeffrey L. Reed
Hon. James Shriver*
Hon. Elizabeth Lehig
Thomakos
Hon. Mark Wiest
Hon. Annalisa Stubbs
Williams

OHIO CRIMINAL SENTENCING COMMISSION
Sara Andrews
DIRECTOR
Chrystal Alexander
Lara N. Baker-Morris
Frederick Benton Jr.
Kristin Boggs
Paula Brown
Hon. Robert C. DeLamatre
Derek W. DeVine
Paul Dobson
Hon. Gary Dumm
John Eklund
Hon. Robert D. Fragale
Hon. Scott Gwin
Hon. Terri Jamison
Hon. Thomas M. Marcelain
Charles “Chip” McConville
Hon. Steve McIntosh
Gary Mohr
Aaron Montz
Hon. Maureen O’Connor*
Paul Pride
Harvey Reed
Jeffrey Rezabek
Albert J. Rodenberg
Hon. Nick A. Selvaggio
Larry Sims
Hon. Kenneth Spanagel
Cecil Thomas
Timothy Young

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CASE MANAGEMENT
Tasha R. Ruth
STAFF LIAISON
Hon. Craig R. Baldwin
Gretchen Beers
Russell Brown
Hon. Kim A. Browne
Hon. Timothy Cannon
Hon. Anthony Capizzi
Hon. Rocky A. Coss
Hon. Carol J. Dezso
Hon. Gary Dumm
Hon. Richard A. Frye
Hon. Laura J. Gallagher
Lisa M. Gorrasi
Hon. Michael T. Hall
Hon. Kristen K. Johnson
Hon. Jerome J. Metz Jr.*
Hon. Diane M. Palos
Hon. Tom Pokorny
Elizabeth W. Stephenson
Hon. Terri L. Stupica
Susan Sweeney
C. Michael Walsh
Hon. Curt Werren
Hon. Gene A. Zmuda
Hon. Joseph J. Zone

Stephanie Graubner Nelson
STAFF LIAISON
Edna Brown
Hon. Anthony Capizzi
Carla Carpenter
Hon. Denise N. Cubbon
Hon. Glenn H. Derryberry
Michelle Edgar
Serpil Ergun
Hon. Colleen A. Falkowski
Ryan Gies
Hon. Elizabeth Gill
Hon. Rosemarie A. Hall
Catherine Hill
Matthew Kurtz
Hon. Denise Herman
McColley**
Adrian McMocomore
Pam Meermans
Hon. Dixilene Park
Hon. Matthew P. Puskarich
Nicole Rodriguez

* Chair  ** Co-Chair
Boards, Commissions, Advisory Committees, and Task Forces

Doug Schonauer
Michael Smalz
Hon. Matt C. Staley**
Craig Treneff

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON COURT SECURITY
James Cappelli,
John Groom & Terry Lyons
STAFF LIAISONS
Hon. Mark A. Betleski
Tony Brigano
Hon. Beth W. Cappelli
David Edelblute
Hon. Robert D. Fragale
Hon. Rosemary G. Gold
Hon. W. Scott Gwin* 
Hon. Robert C. Hickson Jr.
Hon. Jim D. James
Hon. Terri Jamison
Hon. Linda J. Jennings
David T. Marcelli
Carol O’Brien
Hon. Cynthia W. Rice
Hon. Christopher Roberts
David Shaffer
Hon. Lee Sinclair
Hon. Robert W. Stewart
Horst Wudi

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON LANGUAGE SERVICES
Bruno G. Romero
STAFF LIAISON
Hon. David Hejmanowski*
James W. Lewis**
Edward H. Chyun
Lidia Ebersole
Rosalind C. Florez
Hon. Jenifer A. French
Jennifer Goodman
Becky A. Guzman
John Homolak
Michael E. Kochera
Glenn A. Martinez
Kevin Mercado
Hon. Denise L. Moody
John Moore
Hon. Andrea C. Peebles
Hon. Margaret M. Quinn
Hon. Beth A. Smith
Hon. Thomas Teodosio
Hon. Diane Vettori
Hon. Gary L. Yost

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
Diana Ramos-Reardon
STAFF LIAISON
Cynthia Bailey
Hon. Thomas Capper
Micaela Deming
Hon. M. Margaret Evans
Douglas Francis
Hon. Jeffrey Hooper
Anthony Ingram
Richard Ketcham
Hon. Andrea Peebles
Hon. Kathleen Rodenberg
Hon. John Rohrs III*

Alexandria Ruden
Bruce Smallheer
Hon. Laura Smith
Travis Vieux
Hon. Michelle Wagner
Linda Warner
Hon. Bruce Winters
Hon. Gary Yost
Karen Zajkowski
Sharon Hickson
Susan Ingraham
Bill Jennings
Robert Lanzinger
Vernon Pringle
Krystine Puskarich
Laurie Repp
Cheryl Sieve
Sue Strausbaugh
Sue Wolaver
Tom Zitter

COURT PERSONNEL
EDUCATION & TRAINING
COMMITTEE
Alyssa Guthrie
STAFF LIAISON
Vallie Bowman-English
Rick Brunner
Richard Dana
Tim Gorman*
Susan Hany

Sara Andrews
DIRECTOR
Jill Beeler
Douglas Berman
Kari Bloom
Jim Cole
Lori Criss
Beth Cwalina
Steve Gray
Jim Lawrence
John Leutz
Brian Martin

Cynthia Mausser
Jason McGowan
Michele Miller
Karlton Moore
Chris Nicastro
Hon. Paul Pfeifer
David Picken
Keith Spaeth
Cary Williams
Michael Williams

COURT PERSONNEL
EDUCATION & TRAINING
COMMITTEE
Dawn Bischoff
Melinda S. Cooper
David K. Edelblute
Susan Horak
Cathie Kuhl
Thomas F. Mulgrew
Michele K. Mumford
Gregory M. Popovich
Juli Rice
Vicky Unger
Andrea White

TASK FORCES

TASK FORCE ON THE
OHIO BAR EXAMINATION
John S. VanNorman
STAFF LIAISON
D. Benjamin Barros*
Hon. R. Patrick DeWine
Rachel Janutis
Katrina Kramer
Alan C. Michaels
Sarah Polly
Suzanne Richards
Andrew L. Strauss
Lee Ann Ward

OHIO SENTENCING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Sara Andrews
DIRECTOR
Jill Beeler
Douglas Berman
Kari Bloom
Jim Cole
Lori Criss
Beth Cwalina
Steve Gray
Jim Lawrence
John Leutz
Brian Martin

Erin Waltz
STAFF LIAISON
Richard Aynes*
Hon. James Cissell
Hon. C. Ellen Connally
Barb Powers
Theodore Prasse
Nancy Recchie
Thomas Schuck
Fred Vierow
Bill Weisenberg
According to the Ohio Constitution, in the event of a recusal by a justice from a pending case, the chief justice can select any of the 69 sitting Ohio appellate court judges to sit temporarily on the Supreme Court. The Court thanks the court of appeals judges who served as visiting judges for Supreme Court oral arguments in 2017.
Hon. Craig R. Baldwin
Fifth District
Dayton v. State
Case No. 2015-1549
January 10

Hon. Eileen T. Gallagher
Eighth District
State v. Wogenstahl
Case No. 1995-0042
April 4

Hon. Sean C. Gallagher
Eighth District
Clendenin v. Girl Scouts of W. Ohio
Case No. 2015-1993
January 11

Hon. Donna J. Carr
Ninth District
State v. Wogenstahl
Case No. 1995-0042
April 4

Hon. Patricia A. Delaney
Fifth District
Clendenin v. Girl Scouts of W. Ohio
Case No. 2015-1993
January 11

Hon. Arlene Singer
Sixth District
Rush v. University of Cincinnati Physicians
Case No. 2016-0636
May 3

Hon. Jennifer L. Brunner
Tenth District
McGowan v. Medpace
Case No. 2015-1756
February 8

Hon. Robert P. Ringland
Twelfth District
State v. Beasley
Case No. 2016-1020
May 16

Hon. Timothy P. Cannon
Eleventh District
McGowan v. Medpace
Case No. 2015-1756
February 8

Hon. Thomas R. Wright
Eleventh District
State v. Batista
Case No. 2016-0903
May 17

Hon. J. Timothy McCormack
Eighth District
Ashbula County Bar Assn. v. Brown
Case No. 2016-1147
February 8

Hon. William A. Klatt
Tenth District
State v. Noling
Case No. 2014-1377
June 20

Hon. Marie C. Moraleja Hoover
Fourth District
State v. Rahab
Case No. 2015-1892
February 9

Hon. Carol Ann Robb
Seventh District
LGR Realty, Inc. v. Frank and London Insurance Agency
Case No. 2016-1307
September 12

Hon. Mark L. Pietykowski
Sixth District
Thomasson v. Thomasson
Case No. 2016-1629

IMO Adoption of M.G.B.-E., et al.
Case No. 2017-0039

Disc. Counsel v. Mancino
Case No. 2017-1079
November 21

Hon. Cynthia Westcott Rice
Eleventh District
State v. Myers
Case No. 2014-1862
State v. Upkins
Case No. 2016-1742
State v. Paige
Case No. 2016-1848
December 5

Hon. Anita Laster Mays
Eighth District
In the Matter of App. of Dayton Power and Light Co.
Case No. 2017-0241
State v. Moore
Case No. 2017-0483
Disc. Counsel v. Engel
Case No. 2017-1087
December 6