

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

May 1, 2007

[Cite as *05/01/2007 Case Announcements, 2007-Ohio-2063.*]

MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

2003-0565. State v. Newton.

Richland C.P. No. 02-CR-48H. By warrant of reprieve issued by the Governor on January 19, 2007, appellant's sentence of death was reprieved until May 24, 2007. In order to facilitate this court's timely consideration of any matters relating to the execution of appellant's sentence,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the Chief Justice may suspend application of any provisions of the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court, including, but not limited to, the filing requirements imposed by S.Ct.Prac.R. XIV(1).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that service of documents as required by S.Ct.Prac.R. XIV(2), shall be personal, by facsimile transmission, or by e-mail.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that counsel of record for the parties shall provide this court with a copy of any document relating to this matter that is filed in, or issued by, any other court in this state or any federal court, as well as any commutation, pardon, or warrant of reprieve issued by the Governor. A copy of the document shall be delivered to the office of the Clerk as soon as possible, either personally, by facsimile transmission, or by e-mail.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

2006-0279. Baughman v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.

Summit App. No. 22204, 2005-Ohio-6980. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Summit County. Upon consideration of the joint application for dismissal,

It is ordered by the court that the application for dismissal is granted. Accordingly, this cause is dismissed.

2007-0727. State v. Mallette.

Cuyahoga App. No. 87984, 2007-Ohio-715. On April 23, 2007, appellant filed a notice of appeal and memorandum in support of jurisdiction. Appellant's documents were filed more than 45 days after the App.R. 22(E) journalization of the court of appeals' judgment entry, and therefore appellant has failed to properly perfect an appeal in accordance with S.Ct.Prac.R. II(2)(A)(1)(a). Accordingly,

It is ordered by the court, sua sponte, that this cause is dismissed.

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS

In re Report of the Commission	:	CLE-2006-10239
on Continuing Legal Education	:	
	:	
John Patrick Hyland	:	E N T R Y
(#0010239),	:	
Respondent.	:	

This matter originated in this court on the filing of a report by the Commission on Continuing Legal Education pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(A)(1)(b) and (A)(2)(d). The commission recommended the imposition of sanctions against certain attorneys, including the above-named respondent, for failure to comply with the provisions of Gov.Bar R. X, Attorney Continuing Legal Education, for the 2004-2005 reporting period.

On April 27, 2007, the commission filed a motion to dismiss, requesting that the recommendation that respondent be sanctioned for noncompliance with Gov.Bar R. X for the 2004-2005 reporting period be dismissed. Upon consideration thereof,

It is ordered by the court that the motion to dismiss is granted, and this cause is dismissed.

In re Report of the Commission	⋈	CLE-1995-33560
On Continuing Legal Education.	⋈	
Stephanie Jo Meckler	⋈	E N T R Y
(#0033560),	⋈	
Respondent.	⋈	

This matter originated in this court on the filing of a report by the Commission on Continuing Legal Education (“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, including the above-named respondent, for failure to comply with the provisions of Gov.Bar R. X, Attorney Continuing Legal Education, for the 1993-1994 reporting period.

On August 12, 1996, this court adopted the recommendation of the commission, imposed a sanction fee upon the respondent, and suspended the respondent from the practice of law pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(B)(3) and (5)(A)(4). The court further ordered that respondent shall not be reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio until respondent complies with the requirements for reinstatement set forth in Gov.Bar R. X(7), respondent complies with the Supreme Court Rules for the Government of the Bar of Ohio, respondent complies with this and all other orders of the court, and this court orders respondent reinstated.

On April 25, 2007, the commission filed a recommendation pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(7)(B)(2) finding that the respondent has paid all fees assessed for noncompliance, has made up all deficiencies and is now in full compliance with all requirements of Gov.Bar R. X, and recommending that the respondent be reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio. The commission certified that respondent had completed the credit hours of continuing legal education required during her suspension by this court’s order of suspension. Respondent has satisfied all the requirements of this court’s order of suspension. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the recommendation of the commission is adopted, and respondent, Stephanie Jo Meckler, is hereby reinstated to the practice of law.