

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

February 3, 2004

MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

2000-1001. State v. Scott.

Stark C.P. 1999CR1154. Upon consideration of the motion filed by counsel for appellant to stay the execution of sentence in the above-styled cause pending the timely filing of a petition for a writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court of the United States and pending the exhaustion of state post-conviction remedies,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that said motion be, and hereby is, granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that compliance with the mandate and execution of sentence be, and hereby are, stayed pending the timely filing of the petition in the Supreme Court of the United States.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if such petition is timely filed, this stay shall continue for an indefinite period pending final disposition of this cause by the Supreme Court of the United States.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that this stay shall remain in effect until exhaustion of all state post-conviction proceedings, including any appeals.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that counsel for the appellant and for the appellee shall notify this court upon a final disposition by the Supreme Court of the United States or when all proceedings for post-conviction relief before courts of this state have been exhausted, whichever occurs later.

2003-1845. Simpson v. Lakewood.

Cuyahoga App. No. 82624, 2003-Ohio-4953. This cause came on for further consideration upon appellant's motion for emergency relief. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, that the motion be, and hereby is, denied as moot.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

2003-1396. Haney v. Motorists Mut. Ins. Co.

Tuscarawas App. No. 2002AP110093, 2003-Ohio-3412. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Tuscarawas County. 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.

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------|
| In re Report of the Commission on | : | |
| Continuing Legal Education. | : | |
| | : | O R D E R |
| Lewis M. Tingle | : | |
| (#0033436), | : | |
| Respondent. | : | |

This matter originated in this court on the filing of a report by the Commission on Continuing Legal Education (the "commission") pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(A)(1)(b) and (A)(2)(d). The commission recommended the imposition of sanctions against certain attorneys and judges, including the above-named respondent, for failure to comply with the applicable continuing legal education provisions of Gov.Bar R. X and Gov.Jud.R. IV for the 2001-2002 reporting period.

On September 24, 2003, this court issued to the respondent an order to show cause why the commission's recommendation should not be adopted and an order so entered against the respondent. Respondent filed objections to the commission's recommendation, the commission filed an answer brief, and this cause was considered by the court. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, sua sponte, that this cause be, and hereby is, dismissed. Pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(A)(1), respondent is ordered to pay the \$120 late compliance fee imposed by the commission. Upon payment of such fee, the commission shall update respondent's records pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(A)(1).

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------|
| In re Report of the Commission on | : | |
| Continuing Legal Education. | : | |
| | : | ORDER |
| Judd Joseph Uhl | : | |
| (#0002275), | : | |
| Respondent. | : | |

This matter originated in this court on the filing of a report by the Commission on Continuing Legal Education (the “commission”) pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(A)(1)(b) and (A)(2)(d). The commission recommended the imposition of sanctions against certain attorneys and judges, including the above-named respondent, for failure to comply with the applicable continuing legal education provisions of Gov.Bar R. X and Gov.Jud.R. IV for the 2001-2002 reporting period.

On September 24, 2003, this court issued to the respondent an order to show cause why the commission's recommendation should not be adopted and an order so entered against the respondent. Respondent filed objections to the commission's recommendation, the commission filed an answer brief, and this cause was considered by the court. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, sua sponte, that this cause be, and hereby is, dismissed. Pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(A)(1), respondent is ordered to pay the \$100 late compliance fee imposed by the commission. Upon payment of such fee, the commission shall update respondent’s records pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(A)(1).