

**THE STATE OF OHIO, APPELLANT, v. CHANDLER, APPELLEE.**

**THE STATE OF OHIO, APPELLANT, v. TATE, APPELLEE.**

**[Cite as *State v. Chandler*, 103 Ohio St.3d 132, 2004-Ohio-4779.]**

*Court of appeals' judgments affirmed on authority of State v. Brooks.*

(Nos. 2003-0765 and 2003-0766 — Submitted July 20, 2004 — Decided  
September 22, 2004.)

APPEAL from the Court of Appeals for Hamilton County, No. C-020253.

APPEAL from the Court of Appeals for Hamilton County, No. C-020188.

---

**{¶1}** The judgments of the court of appeals are affirmed on the authority  
of *State v. Brooks*, 103 Ohio St.3d 134, 2004-Ohio-4746, \_\_\_ N.E.2d \_\_\_.

MOYER, C.J., RESNICK, F.E. SWEENEY, PFEIFER and O'CONNOR, JJ.,  
concur.

LUNDBERG STRATTON, J., concurs in part and dissents in part.

O'DONNELL, J., dissents.

---

**LUNDBERG STRATTON, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part.**

**{¶2}** I concur with respect to the finding that pursuant to R.C.  
2929.19(B)(5), the trial court is required to deliver the statutorily detailed  
notifications at the sentencing hearing. However, I continue to disagree with the  
majority's holding that R.C. 2929.15(B) and 2929.19(B)(5) require the trial court  
to notify the offender of the *specific* prison term that may be imposed for a  
violation of the conditions of the sanction as a prerequisite to imposing a prison  
term on the offender for a later violation. Therefore, I continue to dissent from  
the application of that holding consistent with my dissenting opinion in *State v.*  
*Brooks*, 103 Ohio St.3d 134, 2004-Ohio-4746, \_\_\_ N.E.2d \_\_\_.

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

---

Michael K. Allen, Hamilton County Prosecuting Attorney, and Rebecca L.  
Collins, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for appellant.  
Chris McEvelley and Bryan R. Perkins, for appellees.

---