

**KING DEVELOPMENT COMPANY ET AL., APPELLANTS, v. FRANKLIN COUNTY
BOARD OF REVISION ET AL., APPELLEES.**

**CHATTERTON CLUB, L.P. APPELLANT, v. FRANKLIN COUNTY BOARD OF
REVISION ET AL., APPELLEES.**

**C.O.A. HOUSING, INC., APPELLANT, v. VAN WERT COUNTY BOARD OF
REVISION ET AL., APPELLEES.**

[Cite as *King Dev. Co. v. Franklin Cty. Bd. of Revision*, 1997-Ohio-198.]

*Unauthorized practice of law—Preparation and filing of a complaint with a board
of revision constitute the practice of law.*

(Nos. 96-541, 96-542 and 96-545—Submitted April 1, 1997—Decided May 21,
1997.)

APPEAL from the Board of Tax Appeals, Nos. 93-T-28, 93-T-29, 93-T-49, 93-T-
50, 93-T-51 and 93-T-52, in case No. 96-541.

APPEAL from the Board of Tax Appeals, No. 93-A-172, in case No. 96-542.

APPEAL from the Board of Tax Appeals, No. 94-P-759, in case No. 96-545.

Todd W. Sleggs, for appellants King Development Co., Crofton Partners I,
Crofton Partners II, Chatterton Club, L.P., and C.O.A. Housing, Inc.

James R. Gorry, Assistant County Prosecutor, for appellees Franklin
County Board of Revision and Franklin County Auditor and Van Wert County
Board of Revision and Van Wert Auditor.

Teaford, Rich, Coffman & Wheeler, Jeffrey A. Rich and Karol Cassell Fox,
for appellees Board of Education of the Reynoldsburg City School District Board
of Education and the Groveport Madison Local School District Board of Education.

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

{¶ 1} *Sua sponte*, the causes are consolidated. The orders of the Board of Tax Appeals are affirmed on the authority of *Sharon Village Ltd. v. Licking Cty. Bd. of Revision* (1997), ___ Ohio St.3d ___, ___ N.E.2d ___, decided today.

MOYER, C.J., DOUGLAS, RESNICK, F.E. SWEENEY, PFEIFER, COOK and LUNDBERG STRATTON, JJ., concur.
