The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

October 1, 2012

[Cite as 10/01/2012 Case Announcements, 2012-Ohio-4477.]

SLIP OPINIONS REPLACED BY OHIO OFFICIAL REPORTS VERSIONS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2012

The official versions of the opinions listed below, which were previously released as slip opinions, have been published in the October 1, 2012 Ohio Official Reports advance sheet. These opinions should now be cited using the Ohio Official Reports citation format.

2011-0132. State ex rel. Vindicator Printing Co. v. Wolff, 132 Ohio St.3d 481, 2012-Ohio-3328.

2011-0673. Cincinnati City School Dist. Bd. of Edn. v. Conners, 132 Ohio St.3d 468, 2012-Ohio-2447.

2011-2056. Columbus Bar Assn. v. Watson, 132 Ohio St.3d 496, 2012-Ohio-3830.

2011-2194. Ohio State Bar Assn. v. Immigration Assoc., L.L.C., 132 Ohio St.3d 476, 2012-Ohio-3304.

2012-0206. State ex rel. Bridge v. Franklin Cty. Court of Common Pleas, 132 Ohio St.3d 494, 2012-Ohio-3327.

2012-0396. State ex rel. Hart v. Turner, 132 Ohio St.3d 479, 2012-Ohio-3305.

2012-0465. State ex rel. Culgan v. Kimbler, 132 Ohio St.3d 480, 2012-Ohio-3310.

MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

In re Bozsik.

On June 4, 2008, this court found Steven A. Bozsik to be a vexatious litigator under S.Ct.Prac.R. 14.5(B). This court further ordered that Bozsik was prohibited from continuing or instituting legal proceedings in this court without first obtaining leave. On September 17, 2012, Bozsik submitted an application for leave to file a complaint in mandamus to challenge the Ohio Vexatious Litigator Statute ("OVLS") being applied against him in his criminal case.

It is ordered by the court that the application for leave is denied.

2012-1264. State ex rel. Motor Carrier Serv., Inc. v. Williams.

Franklin App. No. 10AP-1178, 2012-Ohio-2590. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Franklin County.

It is hereby ordered by the court, sua sponte, that this cause is consolidated with Supreme Court case No. 2012-1394, *State ex rel. Motor Carrier Serv., Inc. v. Rankin,* and that the briefing in case Nos. 2012-1264 and 2012-1394 shall be consolidated. The parties shall file two originals of each of the briefs permitted under S.Ct.Prac.R. 6.2 through 6.4 and include both case numbers on the cover page of the briefs. The parties shall otherwise comply with the requirements of S.Ct.Prac.R. 6.1 through 6.4.

It is further ordered by the court that the briefing schedule for this case is set as follows: Appellant-relator shall file its brief and evidence within 30 days of the date of this entry; appellees-respondents shall file their brief and evidence within 30 days after the filing of appellant-relator's brief and evidence; and appellantrelator may file a reply brief within 20 days after the filing of appelleesrespondents' brief.

2012-1394. State ex rel. Motor Carrier Serv., Inc. v. Rankin.

In Mandamus. This cause originated in this court on the filing of a complaint for a writ of mandamus.

Upon consideration pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R 10.5, it is ordered by the court that an alternative writ is granted and the following briefing schedule is set for presentation of evidence and filing of briefs pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. 10.6:

Relator-appellant shall file its brief and evidence within 30 days of the date of this entry; respondents-appellees shall file their brief and evidence within 30 days after the filing of relator-appellant's brief and evidence; and relator-appellant may file a reply brief within 20 days after the filing of respondents-appelleees' brief and evidence.

Upon consideration of relator's motion to consolidate with Supreme Court case No. 2012-1264, *State ex rel. Motor Carrier Serv., Inc. v. Williams,* it is ordered by the court that the motion is granted and that the briefing in case Nos. 2012-1394 and 2012-1264 shall be consolidated. The parties shall file two originals of each of the briefs permitted under S.Ct.Prac.R. 6.2 through 6.4 and include both case numbers on the cover page of the briefs. The parties shall otherwise comply with the requirements of S.Ct.Prac.R. 6.1 through 6.4.