

# The Supreme Court of Ohio

---

## CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

August 1, 2011

[Cite as *08/01/2011 Case Announcements*, 2011-Ohio-3740.]

---

### **SLIP OPINIONS REPLACED BY OHIO OFFICIAL REPORTS VERSIONS AS OF AUGUST 1, 2011**

The official versions of the opinions listed below, which were previously released as slip opinions, have been published in the August 1, 2011 Ohio Official Reports advance sheet. These opinions should now be cited using the Ohio Official Reports citation format.

**2010-0298. *New Destiny Treatment Ctr., Inc. v. Wheeler*, 129 Ohio St.3d 39, 2011-Ohio-2266.**

**2010-0562. *The Chapel v. Testa*, 129 Ohio St.3d 21, 2011-Ohio-545.**

**2010-0849. *State v. Williams*, 129 Ohio St.3d 19, 2011-Ohio-232.**

**2010-1401. *State ex rel. Electronic Classroom of Tomorrow v. Cuyahoga Cty. Court of Common Pleas*, 129 Ohio St.3d 30, 2011-Ohio-626.**

**2010-1533. *In re Application of Columbus S. Power Co.*, 129 Ohio St.3d 46, 2011-Ohio-2383.**

**2010-1693. *Disciplinary Counsel v. Character*, 129 Ohio St.3d 60, 2011-Ohio-2902.**

**2010-1805. *Disciplinary Counsel v. Hoppel*, 129 Ohio St.3d 53, 2011-Ohio-2672.**

**2010-2020. State ex rel. Dehler v. Mohr, 129 Ohio St.3d 37, 2011-Ohio-959.**

## **MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS**

**2011-0874. Chesler v. Dollar Bank, Fed. Sav. Bank.**

Cuyahoga App. No. 95435, 2011-Ohio-1743. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and claimed appeal of right.

Upon consideration of appellee's motion to strike the notice of appeal and memorandum in support of jurisdiction, it is ordered by the court that the motion is denied in part. The motion is granted to the extent that appellee may file a memorandum in response to the memorandum in support of jurisdiction within 30 days of the date of this entry.

**2011-0811. State v. Smith**

Warren App. No. CA2010-06-057, 2011-Ohio-1188. On review of order certifying a conflict. The court determines that a conflict exists. The parties are to brief the following issue, as modified from the issue certified in the court of appeals' entry filed April 18, 2011:

“[W]hether a sentencing court's failure to inform an offender, as required by R.C. 2947.23(A)(1), that community service could be imposed if the offender fails to pay the costs of prosecution or “court costs” presents an issue ripe for review even though the record does not show that the offender has failed to pay such costs or that the trial court has ordered the offender to perform community service as a result of failure to pay.”

McGee Brown, J., dissents.

The conflict case is *State v. Moss*, 186 Ohio App.3d 787, 2010-Ohio-1135.