- 1 Gaskins, Appellant, v. Shiplevy, Warden, Appellee.
- 2 [Cite as Gaskins v. Shiplevy (1995), Ohio St. 3d .]
- 3 Petition for writ of habeas corpus seeking release from Lima Correctional
- 4 Institution -- Writ allowed when petition states potentially good
- 5 cause of action alleging that court of common pleas lacked
- 6 jurisdiction over juvenile petitioner because of improper bindover
- 7 procedure -- Juvenile law -- Without proper bindover procedure
- 8 under R.C. 2151.26, juvenile court's jurisdiction is exclusive and
- 9 cannot be waived.
- 10 (No. 95-879 -- Submitted September 12, 1995 -- Decided December
- 11 6, 1995.)
- 12 Appeal from the Court of Appeals for Allen County, No.
- 13 CA95030015.
- On March 29, 1995, appellant, Keith A. Gaskins, filed a petition for a
- writ of habeas corpus in the Court of Appeals for Allen County, alleging
- that he was unlawfully restrained by appellee, Carol Shiplevy, Warden of
- 17 the Lima Correctional Institution, by reason of being placed twice in
- 18 jeopardy in his 1983 conviction for burglary. He claimed he was fifteen at
- 19 the time of conviction and that jeopardy had attached in juvenile court
- before he was bound over for trial as an adult. He attached a 1983 journal

- 1 entry from the Court of Common Pleas of Seneca County, showing that he
- 2 had pled guilty to burglary and was sentenced to an indeterminate term of
- 3 two to fifteen years.
- 4 On April 12, 1995, appellant moved to amend the petition to add a
- 5 claim of improper bindover from the Seneca County Juvenile Court, which,
- 6 he alleged, prevented the Seneca County Common Pleas Court from
- 7 acquiring jurisdiction. On April 19, 1995, without ruling on petitioner's
- 8 motion to amend, the court of appeals dismissed the petition under authority
- 9 of Wenzel v. Enright (1993), 68 Ohio St. 3d 63, 623 N.E. 2d 69, which held
- that double jeopardy claims do not state a cause of action in habeas corpus.
- 11 Appellant appeals from this judgment.
- 13 Keith A. Gaskins, pro se.
- 15 Per Curiam. We reverse the judgment of the court of appeals and
- 16 remand the cause.

12

14

- 17 Insofar as the court of appeals held that appellant's double jeopardy
- 18 claim did not state a cause of action in habeas corpus, we agree. Wenzel v.

- 1 Enright, supra. However, the court of appeals disregarded appellant's
- 2 motion to add the improper bindover claim. Civ. R. 15 (A) states in part:
- 3 "A party may amend his pleading once as a matter of course at any
- 4 time before a responsive pleading is served * * *."
- 5 The Civil Rules may apply to habeas cases where not "clearly
- 6 inapplicable" by their nature. Pegan v. Crawmer (1995), 73 Ohio St. 3d
- 7 607, 608, 653 N.E. 2d 659, 660. We do not find Civ. R. 15 (A) clearly
- 8 inapplicable to habeas cases. Therefore, we hold that the court of appeals
- 9 should have allowed the motion to amend and considered the bindover
- 10 issue.
- On appeal, appellant argues that improper bindover deprived the
- 12 common pleas court of jurisdiction. This issue was not considered by the
- 13 court of appeals and appears to have facial merit. Appellant states, among
- other things, that in November 1983 he was unrepresented by counsel at a
- 15 juvenile adjudication hearing, which the court converted into a bindover
- hearing. Juv. R. 3 stated in 1983:

- 1 "A child's right to be represented by counsel at a hearing to determine
- 2 whether the juvenile court shall relinquish its jurisdiction for purposes of
- 3 criminal prosecution may not be waived."
- 4 Appellant also claims that he was given no mental and physical
- 5 examination, as required by R.C. 2151.26. In the last half of 1983, R.C.
- 6 2151.26 stated in part (and still states in substance):
- 7 "After a complaint has been filed alleging that a child is a delinquent
- 8 child by reason of having committed an act that would constitute a felony if
- 9 committed by an adult, the court at a hearing may transfer the case for
- 10 criminal prosecution to the appropriate court having jurisdiction of the
- offense, after making the following determinations:
- 12 "* * *
- 13 "(3) After an investigation, including a mental and physical
- examination of the child made by a public or private agency, or a person
- 15 qualified to make the examination, that there are reasonable grounds to
- 16 believe that:

- 1 "(a) He is not amenable to care or rehabilitation or further care or
- 2 rehabilitation in any facility designed for the care, supervision, and
- 3 rehabilitation of delinquent children;
- 4 "(b) The safety of the community may require that he be placed
- 5 under legal restraint, including, if necessary, for the period extending
- 6 beyond his majority." (140 Ohio Laws, Part I, 585-586.)
- 7 In State v. Wilson (1995), 73 Ohio St. 3d 40, 652 N.E. 2d 196, we
- 8 held that, without a proper bindover procedure under R.C. 2151.26, a
- 9 juvenile court's jurisdiction is exclusive and cannot be waived. *Id.* at
- paragraphs one and two of the syllabus. Accordingly, we hold that
- appellant's amended petition stated a potentially good cause of action in
- habeas corpus, alleging, as it did, that the court of common pleas lacked
- 13 jurisdiction over appellant because of improper bindover. Therefore, we
- reverse the judgment of the court of appeals and remand the cause for the
- 15 court of appeals to allow the writ, require appellee to make a return, and
- 16 determine whether the bindover was improper. See *Hammond v. Dallman*
- 17 (1992), 63 Ohio St. 3d 666, 668, 590 N.E. 2d 744, 746, fn. 7.

- We are aware that *Wilson* was not a habeas case and that we have
- 2 stated that habeas will not lie when there is an adequate remedy at law.
- 3 State ex rel. Pirman v. Money (1994), 69 Ohio St. 3d 591, 593-594, 635
- 4 N.E. 2d 26, 29. Nevertheless, when a court's judgment is void because it
- 5 lacked jurisdiction, habeas is still an appropriate remedy despite the
- 6 availability of appeal. In re Lockhart (1952), 157 Ohio St. 192, 195, 47
- 7 O.O. 129, 131, 105 N.E. 2d 35, 37, and paragraph three of the syllabus.
- 8 Judgment reversed
- 9 and cause remanded.
- MOYER, C.J., DOUGLAS, WRIGHT, RESNICK, F.E. SWEENEY, PFEIFER
- 11 and COOK, JJ., CONCUR.

12