

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

May 22, 2006

[Cite as *05/22/2006 Case Announcements*, 2006-Ohio-2481.]

MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

2005-2385. State v. Copeland.

Butler App. No. CA2003-12-320, 2005-Ohio-5899. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and claimed appeal of right. On December 10, 2005, 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 fourteen 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. III(6).

DISCIPLINARY CASES

2005-0382. Richland Cty. Bar Assn. v. Akers.

On application for reinstatement of Eric J. Akers, Attorney Registration No. 0019706. Application granted and respondent reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

2005-2052. State v. Heyman.

Sandusky App. No. S-04-016, 2005-Ohio-5565 and 2005-Ohio-6244. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal. It appears from the records of the court that the appellant has not filed a memorandum in support of jurisdiction, due December 1, 2005, in compliance with the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court and therefore has failed to prosecute this cause with the requisite diligence. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that this cause is dismissed sua sponte.