

OPINIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

**** SUBJECT TO FURTHER EDITING ****

The full texts of the opinions of the Supreme Court of Ohio are being transmitted electronically beginning May 27, 1992, pursuant to a pilot project implemented by Chief Justice Thomas J. Moyer.

Please call any errors to the attention of the Reporter's Office of the Supreme Court of Ohio. Attention: Walter S. Kobalka, Reporter, or Deborah J. Barrett, Administrative Assistant. Tel.: (614) 466-4961; in Ohio 1-800-826-9010. Your comments on this pilot project are also welcome.

NOTE: Corrections may be made by the Supreme Court to the full texts of the opinions after they have been released electronically to the public. The reader is therefore advised to check the bound volumes of Ohio St.3d published by West Publishing Company for the final versions of these opinions. The advance sheets to Ohio St.3d will also contain the volume and page numbers where the opinions will be found in the bound volumes of the Ohio Official Reports.

The State of Ohio, Appellee, v. Erwin, Appellant.

[Cite as State v. Erwin (1994), Ohio St. 3d .]
Appellate procedure -- Application for reopening appeal from judgment and conviction based on claim of ineffective assistance of appellate counsel -- Application denied when applicant fails to show good cause for failure to file the motion within ninety days from journalization of the court of appeals' decision affirming the conviction, as required by App.R. 26(B)(1).

(No. 94-1685--Submitted November 29, 1994 -- Decided December 23, 1994.)

Appeal from the Court of Appeals for Licking County, No. 93-CA-8.

Appellant, Max R. Erwin, Sr., was convicted of felonious sexual penetration and gross sexual imposition in 1993 and sentenced to eight to twenty-five years in prison. He appealed, alleging admission of improper hearsay evidence, which the prosecuting attorney improperly used in his closing argument. The court of appeals affirmed the conviction. State v. Erwin, Sr. (Oct. 4, 1993), Licking App. No. 93-CA-8, unreported. On June 6, 1994, he filed an application for reopening of his appeal pursuant to App. R. 26 (B), alleging ineffective assistance of appellate counsel and other issues. The court of appeals denied the motion, holding inter alia that appellant had not shown good cause for failure to file the motion within ninety days from the journalization of the court of appeals's decision affirming the convictions, as required by App. R. 26 (B) (1). Appellant appeals from that decision.

Robert L. Becker, Licking County Prosecuting Attorney, and Matthew W. McFarland, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for appellee.

Max R. Erwin, Sr., pro se.

Per Curiam. We affirm the judgment of the court of

appeals for the reason stated in its opinion.

Judgment affirmed.

Moyer, C.J., A.W. Sweeney, Douglas, Wright, Resnick, F.E.
Sweeney and Pfeifer, JJ., concur.