

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

COLUMBUS

ANNOUNCEMENT

WEDNESDAY
February 10, 1999

MOTION DOCKET

98-207. Tanzi v. Nahigian.

Cuyahoga App. No. 71872. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal. On March 2, 1998, this court granted appellant's motion for stay on the ground that Judge Michael Watson of the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas stayed all actions pending against insureds of PIE Mutual Insurance Company. On June 11, 1998, appellant filed a notice that Judge Watson had ordered that the stay remain in effect until September 23, 1998. It appearing to the court that the stay granted by Judge Watson has expired,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, *sua sponte*, that the stay granted by this court be, and hereby is, lifted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court, *sua sponte*, that appellees may file a memorandum in response within thirty days of the date of this entry.

98-497. State v. Pilgrim.

Pickaway App. Nos. 97CA2 and 97CA4. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal. On March 11, 1998, appellant filed a notice of a motion to certify a conflict pending in the Court of Appeals for Pickaway County. Pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(A), this court stayed consideration of the jurisdictional memoranda in this appeal until the court of appeals determined whether to certify a conflict. Whereas a copy of a court of appeals' order certifying a conflict has not been filed pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(1), and the appellant has not filed a notice

that the court of appeals determined that a conflict does not exist pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(B),

IT IS ORDERED by the court, *sua sponte*, that appellant show cause within ten days of the date of this order why this court should not proceed to consider the jurisdictional memoranda in this appeal pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. III.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

98-1519. Sharwell v. Wimberly.

Cuyahoga App. No. 73299. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and claimed appeal of right. It appears from the records of this court that appellant has not filed a memorandum in support of jurisdiction, due August 10, 1998, 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*.