

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

COLUMBUS

ANNOUNCEMENT

TUESDAY
May 2, 2000

MOTION DOCKET

99-1633. Columbia Gas of Ohio v. Tracy.

Board of Tax Appeals, Nos. 97-K-545, 97-K-546 and 97-K-547. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Board of Tax Appeals. Upon consideration of appellant's motion to continue oral argument scheduled for May 9, 2000, pending settlement,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion to continue oral argument scheduled for May 9, 2000, be, and hereby is, granted.

00-563. State ex rel. Norris v. Ghee.

In Mandamus. This cause originated in this court on the filing of a complaint for a writ of mandamus. Upon consideration of respondent's motion to withdraw answer,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion to withdraw answer be, and hereby is, granted.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

00-308. Indus. Energy Users – Ohio v. Pub. Util. Comm.

Public Utilities Commission, No. 98-1636-EL-UNC. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. It appears from the records of this court that appellants have not filed a merit brief, due April 24, 2000, in compliance with the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court and therefore have failed to prosecute this case with the requisite diligence. Upon consideration thereof,

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

00-467. State v. Skinner.

Franklin App. No. 99AP-1411. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and a claimed appeal of right. 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.

00-748. State v. Lawson.

Butler App. No. CA99-01-003. On April 25, 2000, appellant filed a notice of appeal of a decision entered by the court of appeals on April 4, 2000, in court of appeals case No. CA99-01-003. Appellant's memorandum in support of jurisdiction does not contain a copy of a decision entered April 4, 2000, and therefore does not meet the requirements of S.Ct.Prac.R. III(1)(D). Appellant's memorandum in support of jurisdiction does contain a decision of the court of appeals dated February 28, 2000; an appeal of a decision entered February 28, 2000, is untimely under S.Ct.Prac.R. II(2)(A)(1), if filed after April 13, 2000. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, *sua sponte*, that appellant's appeal be, and hereby is, dismissed, for failure to comply with S.Ct.Prac.R. III(1)(D) and S.Ct.Prac.R. II(2)(A)(1).