

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

August 25, 2003

MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

2003-0814. Rucker v. Everen Securities, Inc.

Cuyahoga App. No. 81540, 2003-Ohio-1166. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Cuyahoga County. It appearing to the court that the record in this case was filed on August 14, 2003, but that the receipt of the record inadvertently was not docketed until August 21, 2003,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, sua sponte, that appellant's merit brief shall be due forty days from the date of this entry and that the parties shall otherwise proceed in accordance with S.Ct.Prac.R. VI.

2003-1229. EOP-BP Tower, L.L.C. v. Cuyahoga Cty. Bd. of Revision.

Board of Tax Appeals, Nos. 2003-M-281, 2003-M-282, 2003-M-283 and 2003-M-288. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Board of Tax Appeals. Upon consideration of appellant's motion for extension of time to file merit brief pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. XIV(6)(C),

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion for extension of time be, and hereby is, granted, and appellant's merit brief is due on or before September 30, 2003.

DISCIPLINARY CASES

2002-0720. Toledo Bar Assn. v. Cook.

On application for reinstatement. Linda S. Cook, Attorney Registration No. 0061876, is reinstated to the practice of law.

2002-1274. Disciplinary Counsel v. Mount.

On September 26, 2002, this court suspended respondent for a period of one year, stayed the suspension, and placed respondent on probation for a period of one year. This cause came on for consideration upon the filing, on August 18, 2003, of respondent's application for termination of probation. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that respondent's application be denied because respondent has not yet served the entire one-year period of probation imposed in the order of September 26, 2002.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

2003-1054. State v. Young.

Montgomery App. Nos. 19472 and 19473, 2003-Ohio-2205. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and cross-appeal. It appears from the records of this court that appellee/cross-appellant has not filed a memorandum in response and in support of cross-appeal, due July 16, 2003, in compliance with the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court and therefore has failed to prosecute this case with the requisite diligence. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the cross-appeal be and hereby is dismissed sua sponte.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that the appeal of the state of Ohio remain pending.