[Cite as State ex rel. McDuffie v. Strickland-Saffold, 2019-Ohio-1128.]

Court of Appeals of Ohio

EIGHTH APPELLATE DISTRICT COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA

JOURNAL ENTRY AND OPINION No. 108092

STATE OF OHIO, EX REL. MAURICE McDUFFIE

RELATOR

VS.

JUDGE SHIRLEY STRICKLAND-SAFFOLD

RESPONDENT

JUDGMENT: WRIT DENIED

Writ of Procedendo Motion No. 525169 Order No. 525943

RELEASE DATE: March 22, 2019

FOR RELATOR

Maurice McDuffie, pro se Inmate No. A650882 Lake Erie Correctional Institution P.O. Box 8000 501 Thompson Road Conneaut, Ohio 44030

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

Michael C. O'Malley Cuyahoga County Prosecutor By: James E. Moss Assistant County Prosecutor The Justice Center 1200 Ontario Street Cleveland, Ohio 44113

FRANK D. CELEBREZZE, JR., J.:

{¶1} Relator, Maurice McDuffie, seeks a writ of procedendo compelling respondent, Judge Shirley Strickland Saffold, to rule on a motion to credit community service toward court costs. Respondent filed a motion for summary judgment, contending that a ruling on the motion had been entered and the action was, therefore, moot. We grant respondent's motion for summary judgment and find that the action is moot.

I. Facts and Procedural History

{¶2} Relator was tried and convicted of felonious assault in an underlying criminal case before respondent in 2013. On September 17, 2018, relator filed a motion to credit prison community work service towards court costs and fines. The state filed a response, but a ruling on the motion was not forthcoming.

{¶3} On January 10, 2019, relator filed the instant complaint for a writ of procedendo. Respondent filed a motion for summary judgment asserting that a journal entry granting relator's motion was entered on January 22, 2019, which was attached. Respondent argued that the action was moot as a result. Relator failed to timely respond to the motion for summary judgment.

II. Law and Analysis

- {¶4} The extraordinary writ of procedendo is available when a court has refused to or unnecessarily delayed in rendering judgment. *State ex rel. Sherrills v. Cuyahoga Cty. Court of Common Pleas*, 72 Ohio St.3d 461, 462, 650 N.E.2d 899 (1995). "A writ of procedendo will not issue unless the relator establishes a clear legal right to that relief and that there is no adequate remedy at law." *Id.*, citing *State ex rel. Brown v. Shoemaker*, 38 Ohio St.3d 344, 345, 528 N.E.2d 188 (1988). In order to accomplish this, relator must demonstrate that respondent has a clear legal duty that remains unfulfilled, to which relator has a clear legal right, and there is no other adequate remedy at law. *State ex rel. Doe v. Gallia Cty. Common Pleas Court*, 153 Ohio St.3d 623, 2018-Ohio-2168, 109 N.E.3d 1222, ¶16, quoting *State ex rel. Ward v. Reed*, 141 Ohio St.3d 50, 2014-Ohio-4512, 21 N.E.3d 303, ¶9. Further, the writ of procedendo cannot be used to control judicial discretion. *Sherrills* at 462, quoting *State ex rel. Hansen v. Reed*, 63 Ohio St.3d 597, 600, 589 N.E.2d 1324 (1992), quoting *State ex rel. Davey v. Owen*, 133 Ohio St. 96, 106, 12 N.E.2d 144 (1937).
- {¶5} Once a ruling is made on the filing that is the subject of a writ of procedendo, the action becomes moot. *State ex rel. Bortoli v. Dinkelacker*, 105 Ohio St.3d 133, 2005-Ohio-779, 823 N.E.2d 448, ¶ 3 ("A writ of procedendo will not issue to compel the performance of a duty

that has already been performed."); *State ex rel. Pettway v. Cuyahoga Cty. Court of Common Pleas*, 8th Dist. Cuyahoga No. 98699, 2012-Ohio-5423.

{¶6} Here, respondent has provided a certified copy of a journal entry granting relator's motion that is the subject of this action. Therefore, the action is moot. Respondent's motion for summary judgment is granted. Relator's request for a writ of procedendo is denied as moot. Costs assessed against respondent; costs waived. The clerk is directed to serve upon the parties notice of this judgment and its date of entry upon the journal. Civ.R. 58(B).

 $\{\P7\}$ Writ denied.

FRANK D. CELEBREZZE, JR., JUDGE

SEAN C. GALLAGHER, P.J., and PATRICIA ANN BLACKMON, J., CONCUR