

**THE STATE EX REL. MARTIN, APPELLANT, v. OHIO ADULT PAROLE  
AUTHORITY, APPELLEE.**

**[Cite as *State ex rel. Martin v. Ohio Adult Parole Auth.*,  
126 Ohio St.3d 506, 2010-Ohio-4727.]**

*Appeal from denial of a complaint for a writ of prohibition — Imposition of  
postrelease control by Adult Parole Authority is not an exercise of judicial  
or quasi-judicial authority — Judgment affirmed.*

(No. 2010-0676 — Submitted September 28, 2010 — Decided October 6, 2010.)

APPEAL from the Court of Appeals for Cuyahoga County,  
No. 94645, 2010-Ohio-1582.

---

**Per Curiam.**

{¶ 1} We affirm the judgment of the court of appeals dismissing the complaint of appellant, Tramaine E. Martin, for a writ of prohibition to prevent appellee, Ohio Adult Parole Authority (“APA”), from continuing its supervision of him on postrelease control. Martin’s prohibition claim lacks merit because “neither the APA nor its parole officers exercised judicial or quasi-judicial authority in imposing postrelease control” on him. *State ex rel. McGrath v. Ohio Adult Parole Auth.*, 100 Ohio St.3d 72, 2003-Ohio-5062, 796 N.E.2d 526, ¶ 7. In addition, Martin “had an adequate remedy by way of direct appeal from his sentence to raise his claim that he did not receive proper notification about postrelease control at his sentencing hearing.” *Briseno v. Cook*, 121 Ohio St.3d 38, 2009-Ohio-308, 901 N.E.2d 798, ¶ 1.

Judgment affirmed.

BROWN, C.J., and PFEIFER, LUNDBERG STRATTON, O’CONNOR,  
O’DONNELL, LANZINGER, and CUPP, JJ., concur.

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

---

Tramaine E. Martin, pro se.

Richard Cordray, Attorney General, and Ashley D. Rutherford, Assistant  
Attorney General, for appellee.

---