

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

COLUMBUS

ANNOUNCEMENT

MONDAY
January 24, 2000

MOTION DOCKET

99-1864. Archer v. Payne.

Muskingum App. No. CT980043. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and claimed appeal of right. On October 15, 1999, appellant filed a notice that a motion to certify a conflict was pending in the court of appeals and, pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(A), this court stayed consideration of the jurisdictional memoranda filed in this appeal. Whereas appellant has neither notified this court that the court of appeals determined that a conflict does not exist as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(B), nor filed a copy of the court of appeals' order certifying the existence of a conflict as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(C),

IT IS ORDERED by the court, *sua sponte*, that appellant show cause within ten days of the date of this entry why this court should not proceed to consider the jurisdictional memoranda in this appeal pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. II(6).

DISCIPLINARY DOCKET

99-1957. Disciplinary Counsel v. Zingarelli.

Upon consideration of respondent's motion to consolidate this case with Supreme Court case No. 97-1753, *Disciplinary Counsel v. Zingarelli*, respondent's motion to extend time for oral argument; and respondent's motion to participate in oral argument *pro se*,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion to consolidate and motion to extend time for oral argument be, and hereby are, denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that the motion to participate in oral argument *pro se* be, and hereby is, granted.