# The Supreme Court of Ohio

# CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

# August 27, 2012

[Cite as 08/27/2012 Case Announcements, 2012-Ohio-3870.]

# MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

## 2012-0535. Cullen v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.

Cuyahoga App. No. 95925, 2011-Ohio-6621. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Cuyahoga County.

Upon consideration of appellant's motions to file portions of the supplement under seal and to supplement the record with filed documents not transmitted by the Cuyahoga County Clerk of Courts, it is ordered by the court that the motions are granted.

It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court for the Supreme Court of Ohio shall supplement the record with the exhibits attached to the motion to supplement the record.

## 2012-0873. Rymers v. Rymers.

Lake App. No. 2011-L-064, 2012-Ohio-1675. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal.

Upon consideration of appellant's motion to refer the case to mediation, it is ordered by the court that the motion is denied.

## 2012-1292. Hinton v. Franke.

Hamilton App. No. C-120353. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and claimed appeal of right.

Upon consideration of appellant's motion to refer the case to mediation, it is ordered by the court that the motion is denied.

## **DISCIPLINARY CASES**

## 2012-1054. Disciplinary Counsel v. Margulies.

On certified order of the State of New York, Appellate Division of the Supreme Court for the First Judicial Department, No. M-5482. James Warren Margulies, Attorney Registration No. 0063680, is permanently disbarred from the practice of law in Ohio.

O'Connor, C.J., and Pfeifer, Lundberg Stratton, O'Donnell, Lanzinger, Cupp, and McGee Brown, JJ., concur.

#### MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

## 2012-0096. Target Corp. v. Lake Cty. Bd. of Revision.

Board of Tax Appeals, No. 2008-M-1088. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Board of Tax Appeals.

Upon consideration of the joint motion to remand this case to the Board of Tax Appeals, it is ordered by the court that the motion is granted, in part. Accordingly, this cause is dismissed and this case is remanded to the Board of Tax Appeals so that the board may take further action as appropriate.

#### 2012-0887. Crockett Homes, Inc. v. Hamilton.

Stark App. No. 2011-CA-00222, 2012-Ohio-2162. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal.

Upon consideration of appellants' application for dismissal, it is ordered by the court that the application for dismissal is granted. Accordingly, this cause is dismissed.

#### 2012-1293. Ayersville Water & Sewer Dist. v. Geiger.

Defiance App. Nos. 4-11-19 and 4-11-20, 2012-Ohio-2689. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and claimed appeal of right.

Upon consideration of appellants' application for dismissal, it is ordered by the court that the application for dismissal is granted. Accordingly, this cause is dismissed.

#### **MEDIATION MATTERS**

The following cases have been returned to the regular docket pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. 17.1(E):

# 2012-0480. Bradley v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.

Franklin App. Nos. 11AP-409 and 11AP-410, 2012-Ohio-451.

# 2012-0883. Sapina v. Cuyahoga Cty. Bd. of Revision.

Board of Tax Appeals, No. 2009-K-667. The court hereby returns this case to the regular docket under S.Ct. Prac.R. 17.1. Appellants shall file a brief within 40 days of the date of this entry and the parties shall otherwise proceed in accordance with S.Ct.Prac.R. 6.2 through 6.7. As provided in S.Ct.Prac.R. 6.7, the court may dismiss this case or take other action if the parties fail to timely file merit briefs.

# 2012-0992. State ex rel. Luken v. Corp. for Findlay Market of Cincinnati.

Hamilton App. No. C-100437, 2012-Ohio-2074. The court hereby returns this case to the regular docket under S.Ct.Prac.R. 17.1. Appellant shall file a brief within 40 days of the date of this entry and the parties shall otherwise proceed in accordance with S.Ct. Prac.R. 6.2 through 6.7. As provided in S.Ct.Prac.R. 6.7, the court may dismiss this case or take other action if the parties fail to timely file merit briefs.