

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

COLUMBUS

ANNOUNCEMENT

WEDNESDAY
July 3, 1996

MERIT DOCKET

96-1492. State ex rel. Wireman v. Warren.

In Prohibition. This cause originated in this court on the filing of a complaint for a writ of prohibition and was considered in a manner prescribed by law. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the writ of prohibition be, and hereby is, denied, and this cause is dismissed.

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

MOTION DOCKET

96-1482. State ex rel. Litty v. Leskovyansky.

In Prohibition. This cause originated in this court on the filing of a complaint for a writ of prohibition. Upon consideration of relator's motion for issuance of alternative writ,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that an alternative writ be, and hereby is, granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that the following briefing schedule is set for presentation of evidence and filing of briefs pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. X:

The parties shall file any evidence they intend to present on or before July 23, 1996; relator shall file her brief within ten days after the filing of evidence; respondent shall file his brief within twenty days after the filing of relator's brief; and relator may file a reply brief within five days after the filing of respondent's brief.

Pfeifer and Cook, JJ., dissent and would dismiss the cause.

RECONSIDERATION DOCKET

96-952. Daigle v. Fed. Correctional Inst., Inc.

In Habeas Corpus. On May 13, 1996, this court dismissed this cause. On June 13, 1996, petitioner filed a document titled "Declaration and Demand to Immediately Issue Writ of Habeas Corpus."

IT IS DETERMINED by the court that petitioner's document is, in essence, a motion for reconsideration of this court's order of May 13, 1996, and, as such, is untimely. Accordingly,

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

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

96-648. State ex rel. Heyduk v. Westlake.

Cuyahoga County, No. 69443. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Cuyahoga County. Upon consideration of appellant's application for dismissal,

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

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

96-1296. Baur v. Carlson.

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.

96-1452. 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.

96-1480. Young v. United State of Am.

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.