

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

COLUMBUS

ANNOUNCEMENT

THURSDAY
August 15, 1996

MOTION DOCKET

94-681. State v. Frazier.
Cuyahoga County, No. 62557.

Upon consideration of the motion filed by counsel for appellant to continue stay of execution in the above-styled cause pending the exhaustion of state post-conviction remedies, and it appearing from the exhibits to the motion that a petition for post-conviction relief has been filed by appellant with the Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Court,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that compliance with the mandate and execution of sentence be, and the same are hereby, stayed pending the exhaustion of all proceedings for post-conviction relief before courts of this state.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that counsel for the appellant and for the appellee shall notify this court when all proceedings for post-conviction relief before courts of this state have been exhausted.

96-677. State v. Smith.

Butler County, No. CR95-05-047. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal and cross-appeal from the Court of Common Pleas of Butler County. Upon consideration of appellant/cross-appellee's motions to supplement the record,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motions to supplement the record be, and hereby are, granted.

96-1850. Martell v. Pontesso.

In Habeas Corpus. This cause originated in this court on the filing of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus and was considered in a manner prescribed by law. Upon consideration thereof,

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

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

96-502. Bar-Tec, Inc. v. Ohio Dept. of Liquor Control.

Franklin County, No. 95APE10-1331. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Franklin County. It appears from the records of this court that appellant has not filed a merit brief, due August 7, 1996, 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.

96-1357. State ex rel. Siefke v. Indus. Comm.

Franklin County, No. 95APD08-1036. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Franklin County. It appears from the records of this court that appellant has not filed a merit brief, due August 7, 1996, 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.