

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

COLUMBUS

ANNOUNCEMENT

WEDNESDAY

August 30, 1995

MOTION DOCKET

94-2511. Roberts v. United States Fid. & Guar. Co.
Erie County, No. E-93-35. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal and cross-appeal from the Court of Appeals for Erie County. Upon consideration of appellant/cross-appellee's motion for leave to file reply memorandum in support of motion to reject appellee/cross-appellant's merit brief,

IT IS ORDERED by the court the motion be, and hereby is, denied, effective August 29, 1995.

RECONSIDERATION DOCKET

95-997. LaGuta v. Anderson.
Richland County, No. 95-CA-16. Reported at 72 Ohio St.3d 1555, 651 N.E.2d 1013. On August 23, 1995, appellant filed a motion for relief from judgment. Appellant's motion is, in substance, a request for reconsideration of this court's entry of July 13, 1995, and, as such, is untimely. S.Ct.Prac.R. XIV(1)(C) prohibits the filing of a document that is not timely tendered for filing. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, sua sponte, that appellant's motion for relief from judgment be and hereby is, stricken, effective August 29, 1995.

95-1033. State v. Collins.
Cuyahoga County, No. 64186. Reported at 72 Ohio St.3d 1556, 651 N.E.2d 1012. IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion for reconsideration of this court's dismissal for want of prosecution be, and is hereby, denied, effective August 29, 1995.

95-1208. State v. Sledge.
Summit County, No. 15293. Reported at 73 Ohio St.3d 1430, ___ N.E.2d ___. IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion for reconsideration of this court's dismissal for want of prosecution be, and is hereby, denied, effective August 29, 1995.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

95-1635. State v. Finfrock.

Montgomery County, No. 14578. Appellant has filed an untimely appeal of the court of appeals' decision affirming the trial court's overruling of his petition for post-conviction relief and a motion for delayed appeal. This appeal involves a civil, post-conviction matter and not an appeal of a felony case to which the provisions for delayed appeal in S.Ct.Prac.R. II(2)(A)(4) apply. Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, sua sponte, that the motion for delayed appeal be, and hereby is, stricken.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court, sua sponte, that, in that appellant failed to perfect an appeal pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. II(2)(A)(1), this case be, and hereby is, dismissed for lack of jurisdiction, effective August 29, 1995.