

COURT OF APPEALS  
MUSKINGUM COUNTY, OHIO  
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

STATE OF OHIO	:	JUDGES:
	:	
	:	Hon. John W. Wise, P.J.
Plaintiff-Appellee	:	Hon. Patricia A. Delaney, J.
	:	Hon. Craig R. Baldwin, J.
-vs-	:	
	:	Case No. CT2017-0091
	:	
RICHARD KING	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
Defendant-Appellant	:	<u>OPINION</u>

CHARACTER OF PROCEEDING: Appeal from the Muskingum County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. CR2004-0327

JUDGMENT: AFFIRMED

DATE OF JUDGMENT ENTRY: April 30, 2018

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff-Appellee:  
  
D. MICHAEL HADDOX  
MUSKINGUM COUNTY PROSECUTOR  
  
GERALD V. ANDERSON II  
27 North Fifth St., P.O. Box 189  
Zanesville, OH 43702-0189

For Defendant-Appellant:  
  
RICHARD KING, PRO SE  
#489-103  
North Central Correctional Institution  
P.O. Box 1812  
Marion, OH 43302

*Delaney, J.*

{¶1} Defendant-Appellant Richard King appeals the November 3, 2017 judgment entry of the Muskingum County Court of Common Pleas.

### **FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

{¶2} On November 10, 2004, the Muskingum County Grand Jury indicted King on sixty-two counts of pandering obscenity involving a minor in violation of R.C. 2907.321(A)(1) and (5). The charges were felonies of the second and fourth degrees. A jury trial commenced on January 25, 2005. The jury found King guilty of all of the charges except one, which was dismissed. As memorialized in an entry filed on March 7, 2005, the trial court sentenced King to an aggregate term of 36 ½ years in prison and classified him as a sexual predator/habitual sexual offender.

{¶3} King filed an appeal. Pursuant to an Opinion filed on January 19, 2006, this Court affirmed King's convictions, but remanded the matter to the trial court to comply with the mandates of R.C. 2929.14(E)(4). *State v. King*, 5th Dist. Muskingum App. No. CT05–0017, 2006–Ohio–226.

{¶4} Upon remand, the trial court resentenced King to the same sentence as memorialized in an entry filed on March 8, 2006. King filed an appeal. This Court affirmed the resentencing. *State v. King*, 5th Dist. Muskingum App. No. CT06–0020, 2006–Ohio–6566.

{¶5} On October 20, 2005, August 15, 2006, October 8, 2008, March 13, 2009, September 15, 2009, November 2, 2010, and July 14, 2011, King filed motions/petitions for postconviction relief on several issues including resentencing, evidentiary issues, ineffective assistance of counsel, and request for new trial. The trial court denied the

motions/petitions and King filed appeals. This Court affirmed the trial court's decisions. *State v. King*, 5th Dist. Muskingum No. CT2006–0021, 2007–Ohio–2810; *State v. King*, 5th Dist. Muskingum No. CT2007–0004, 2007–Ohio–5297; *State v. King*, 5th Dist. Muskingum No. CT2008–0062, 2009–Ohio–412; *State v. King*, 5th Dist. Muskingum No. CT09–CA–22, 2009–Ohio–3854; *State v. King*, 5th Dist. Muskingum No. CT2009–0047, 2010–Ohio–798; *State v. King*, 5th Dist. Muskingum No. CT2011–0006, 2011–Ohio–4529; *State v. King*, 5th Dist. Muskingum No. CT2012–0018, 2012–Ohio–4070.

{¶6} On September 29, 2015, King filed a Motion to Vacate Void Conviction, challenging the trial court's subject matter jurisdiction because the indictment was invalid or void. By Journal Entry filed on October 20, 2015, the trial court denied the motion. King then appealed. Pursuant to an Opinion filed on April 29, 2016 in *State v. King*, 5th Dist. Muskingum No. CT2015–0058, 2016–Ohio–2788, this Court affirmed the judgment of the trial court.

{¶7} King, on September 27, 2016, filed a Motion to Correct Void Sentence. King argued in his motion that his sentence was void because the trial court, in its March 8, 2006 entry, did not make findings pursuant to R.C. 2929.13. Pursuant to an entry filed on October 6, 2016, the trial court denied King's motion, finding that King's sentence was not void. We affirmed on appeal pursuant to an opinion filed January 27, 2017. *State v. King*, 5th Dist. Muskingum No. CT2017–0021.

{¶8} King filed a “Motion to Resentence” on February 23, 2017, arguing the jury verdict form did not contain sufficient information to make his conviction on count one a second degree felony, and therefore it should have been reduced to a fourth degree

felony. He argued his sentence was void pursuant to R.C. 2945.75(A)(2). The trial court overruled the motion, finding it was an untimely, successive petition for postconviction relief, and further that the motion was barred by the doctrine of *res judicata*. We affirmed the trial court's judgment in *State v. King*, 5th Dist. Muskingum No. CT2017-0021, 2017-Ohio-4258.

{¶9} King filed a "Motion to Correct Sentence" on July 10, 2017. He argued his sentence of eight years for his conviction on count one, a second degree felony in violation of R.C. 2907.321(A)(1), was contrary to law. He argued he should have been sentenced to an 18-month prison term. An 18-month prison term is commensurate with a fourth degree felony. The trial court denied the motion on November 3, 2017, finding the motion was an untimely successive petition for postconviction relief and barred by *res judicata*.

{¶10} It is from this decision King now appeals.

### **ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR**

{¶11} King raises one Assignment of Error:

{¶12} "THE APPELLANT'S SENTENCE IS CONTRARY TO LAW AND THE TRIAL COURT ERRED WHEN IT DENIED HIS MOTION TO CORRECT SENTENCE BY TREATING IT AS A PETITION FOR POST-CONVICTION RELIEF AND STATING IT WAS BARRED BY THE DOCTRINE OF RES JUDICATA."

### **ANALYSIS**

{¶13} The State contends King raises the identical arguments in the July 10, 2017 motion entitled "Motion to Correct Sentence" as he did in his February 23, 2017 motion entitled "Motion to Resentence." In both motions, King argued he was improperly

convicted and sentenced on count one. The trial court denied his February 23, 2017 motion as a successive petition for postconviction relief and as barred by *res judicata*. We affirmed the decision in *State v. King*, 2017-Ohio-4258. The trial court denied the July 10, 2017 motion as a successive petition for postconviction relief and found it was also barred by the doctrine of *res judicata*. Upon review of the motions, we agree he raises the same arguments.

{¶14} Based upon King's past filings, the July 10, 2017 motion was a successive petition for postconviction relief. R.C. 2953.23 governs successive petitions and states the following in pertinent part, as subsection (A)(2) is not applicable sub judice:

(A) Whether a hearing is or is not held on a petition filed pursuant to section 2953.21 of the Revised Code, a court may not entertain a petition filed after the expiration of the period prescribed in division (A) of that section or a second petition or successive petitions for similar relief on behalf of a petitioner unless division (A)(1) or (2) of this section applies:

(1) Both of the following apply:

(a) Either the petitioner shows that the petitioner was unavoidably prevented from discovery of the facts upon which the petitioner must rely to present the claim for relief, or, subsequent to the period prescribed in division (A)(2) of section 2953.21 of the Revised Code or to the filing of an earlier petition, the United States Supreme Court recognized a new federal or state right that applies retroactively to persons in the petitioner's situation, and the petition asserts a claim based on that right.

(b) The petitioner shows by clear and convincing evidence that, but for constitutional error at trial, no reasonable factfinder would have found the petitioner guilty of the offense of which the petitioner was convicted or, if the claim challenges a sentence of death that, but for constitutional error at the sentencing hearing, no reasonable factfinder would have found the petitioner eligible for the death sentence.

{¶15} In reviewing appellant's motion/petition for postconviction relief, we find King did not satisfy the requirements of R.C. 2953.23.

{¶16} We further find that King's motion for postconviction relief is barred by the doctrine of *res judicata*. Pursuant to the doctrine of *res judicata*, a final judgment of conviction bars a convicted defendant who was represented by counsel from raising and litigating in any proceeding except an appeal from that judgment, any defense or any claimed lack of due process that was raised or could have been raised on direct appeal from that judgment. *State v. Perry*, 10 Ohio St.2d 175, 226 N.E.2d 104, paragraph nine of the syllabus (1967). King has filed eleven appeals subsequent to his resentencing at the direction of this Court in 2006, and has had ample opportunity to raise issues related to that sentencing.

{¶17} King's sole Assignment of Error is overruled.

**CONCLUSION**

{¶18} The judgment of the Muskingum County Court of Common Pleas is affirmed.

By: Delaney, J.,

Wise, P.J. and

Baldwin, J., concur.