

ATTENTION

DIRECT ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE ANNOUNCEMENT TO WALTER S. KOBALKA,  
REPORTER OF DECISIONS, AND DEBORAH J. BARRETT AT (614) 466-4961 OR  
1-800-826-9010.

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

COLUMBUS

ANNOUNCEMENT

FRIDAY  
May 5, 1995

MOTION DOCKET

95-696. Berea Planning Comm. v. Wolohan.  
Cuyahoga County, No. 66702. This cause is pending before the court  
as a discretionary appeal and a claimed appeal of right. Upon  
consideration of appellant's motion to continue the stay of  
execution and bond as ordered by the Cuyahoga County Common Pleas  
Court pending final resolution of this appeal and motion to expedite  
ruling,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motions be, and hereby are,  
granted, effective May 3, 1995.

Douglas, J., dissents.

95-832. State v. Larsen.  
Medina County, No. 2363-M. This cause is pending before the court  
as a discretionary appeal and a claimed appeal of right. Upon  
consideration of appellant's motion to stay execution of sentence  
pending appeal,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion to stay execution of  
sentence be, and hereby is, denied, effective May 3, 1995

Wright, J., dissents.

DISCIPLINARY DOCKET

95-139. Disciplinary Counsel v. Vedatsky.  
On Certified Order of the Supreme Court of New Jersey, No. D-30-94.  
This cause is pending before the Supreme Court of Ohio in accordance

with the reciprocal discipline provisions of Gov.Bar R. V(11)(F).

On January 19, 1995, the Office of Disciplinary Counsel of the Supreme Court of Ohio filed with this court a certified copy of an order of the Supreme Court of New Jersey in In the Matter of Robert J. Vedatsky, case No. D-30-94, reprimanding respondent, Robert J. Vedatsky, a.k.a., Robert Jay Vedatsky, effective November 29, 1994.

On January 26, 1995, this court ordered respondent to show cause why identical or comparable discipline should not be imposed in this state. Respondent did not file a response to said show cause order and this cause was considered by the court. On consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED by this court, effective May 1, 1995, that pursuant to Gov.Bar R. V(11)(F)(4), respondent, Robert J. Vedatsky, Attorney Registration No. 0054960, last known address in Voorhees, New Jersey, be publicly reprimanded.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of this court issue certified copies of this order as provided for in Gov.Bar R. V(8)(D)(1), that publication be made as provided for in Gov.Bar R. V(8)(D)(2), and that respondent bear the costs of publication.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, sua sponte, that service shall be deemed made on respondent by sending this order, and all other orders in this case, by certified mail to the most recent address respondent has given to the Attorney Registration Office.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of this court issue certified copies of this order as provided for in Gov.Bar R. V(8)(D)(1), that publication be made as provided for in Gov.Bar R. V(8)(D)(2), and that respondent bear the costs of publication.

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

#### MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

93-1053. State ex rel. Shaniuk v. Painter.

Allen County, No. 1-93-21. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Allen County. Appellant's merit brief was due July 12, 1993. It appears from the records of this court that appellant has not filed a merit brief in compliance with the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court and therefore has failed to prosecute this cause with the requisite diligence. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that this cause be, and hereby is, dismissed sua sponte, effective May 4, 1995.

94-2489. State v. Hall.

Cuyahoga County, No. 63771. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Cuyahoga County. Appellant's merit brief or notice of adoption of the memorandum in support of jurisdiction as the brief was due April 21, 1995. It appears from the records of this court that appellant has not filed a merit brief or notice of adoption in compliance with the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court and therefore has failed to prosecute this cause with the requisite diligence. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that this cause be, and hereby is, dismissed sua sponte, effective May 3, 1995.

94-2596. State v. Costilla.

Lucas County, No. L-93-204. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Lucas County. Appellant's merit brief was due April 21, 1995. It appears from the records of this court that appellant has not filed a merit brief in compliance with the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court and therefore has failed to prosecute this cause with the requisite diligence. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that this cause be, and hereby is, dismissed sua sponte, effective May 3, 1995.

95-370. Shaker Hts. Pub. Library Bd. of Trustees v. Ozanne Constr. Co.

Cuyahoga County, No. 67578. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal. Upon consideration of the joint application for dismissal,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the application for dismissal be, and hereby is, granted, effective May 3, 1995.

95-409. State ex rel. Loral Defense Sys. v. Indus. Comm. Franklin County, No. 93APD10-1397. This cause is pending before the Court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Franklin County. On April 26, 1995, Loral Defense Systems and the Industrial Commission of Ohio filed a stipulation to an extension of time for filing appellant's merit brief and supplement to merit brief. Pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. VI, appellant's brief was due April 25, 1995, and under S.Ct.Prac.R. XIV(3), any stipulation must be filed within the time prescribed for filing the brief that is the subject of the stipulation. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, sua sponte, effective May 2, 1995, that the stipulation for extension of time to file appellant's merit brief and supplement to merit brief be, and hereby is, stricken.

WHEREAS, appellant has not filed a merit brief in compliance with the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court and therefore has failed to prosecute this cause with the requisite diligence,

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that this cause be, and hereby is, dismissed sua sponte, effective May 2, 1995.

95-601. State v. Jones.

Franklin County, No. 90AP-790. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Franklin County. Appellant's merit brief was due April 26, 1995. It appears from the records of this court that appellant has not filed a merit brief in compliance with the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court and therefore has failed to prosecute this cause with the requisite diligence. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that this cause be, and hereby is, dismissed sua sponte, effective May 2, 1995.

95-754. State v. Davenport.

Hamilton County, No. C-940057. Appellant has filed an untimely appeal of the court of appeals' decision denying appellant's 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, effective May 3, 1995, 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.