

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

October 29, 2012

[Cite as *10/29/2012 Case Announcements*, 2012-Ohio-4988.]

SLIP OPINIONS REPLACED BY OHIO OFFICIAL REPORTS VERSIONS AS OF OCTOBER 29, 2012

The official versions of the opinions listed below, which were previously released as slip opinions, have been published in the October 29, 2012 Ohio Official Reports advance sheet. These opinions should now be cited using the Ohio Official Reports citation format.

2010-1363. Moore v. Middletown, 133 Ohio St.3d 55, 2012-Ohio-3897.

2011-0120. Cincinnati Bar Assn. v. Sigalov, 133 Ohio St.3d 1, 2012-Ohio-3868.

2011-0199. Coleman v. Portage Cty. Engineer, 133 Ohio St.3d 28, 2012-Ohio-3881.

2011-1284. Gaston v. Medina Cty. Bd. of Revision, 133 Ohio St.3d 18, 2012-Ohio-3872.

2011-1426. Disciplinary Counsel v. Burchinal, 133 Ohio St.3d 38, 2012-Ohio-3882.

2011-1504 and 2011-1593. State v. Hobbs, 133 Ohio St.3d 43, 2012-Ohio-3886.

2011-1526. PHH Mtge. Corp. v. Prater, 133 Ohio St.3d 91, 2012-Ohio-3931.

2011-2045. Disciplinary Counsel v. Meehan, 133 Ohio St.3d 51, 2012-Ohio-3894.

2011-2049. Disciplinary Counsel v. Seabrook, 133 Ohio St.3d 97, 2012-Ohio-3933.

2011-2069. State ex rel. Byers v. Miami Cty. Sheriff's Office, 133 Ohio St.3d 78, 2012-Ohio-3916.

2012-0276. Dayton Bar Assn. v. Nowicki, 133 Ohio St.3d 74, 2012-Ohio-3912.

2012-0388. State ex rel. Lisboa v. Fuerst, 133 Ohio St.3d 76, 2012-Ohio-3913.

2012-0430. In re Application of Burch, 133 Ohio St.3d 82, 2012-Ohio-3935.

2012-0586. State ex rel. Bevins v. Johnson, 133 Ohio St.3d 80, 2012-Ohio-3922.

2012-0601. Sullivan v. Bunting, 133 Ohio St.3d 81, 2012-Ohio-3923.

MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

In re Buoscio.

On December 21, 2011, this court found appellant Samuel L. Buoscio to be a vexatious litigator under S.Ct.Prac.R. 14.5(B). This court further ordered that appellant was prohibited from continuing or instituting legal proceedings in the court without obtaining leave. On October 22, 2012, Buoscio presented an application for leave to file.

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

Pfeifer, Acting C.J.

O'Connor, C.J., not participating.

1998-1475. State v. Hartman.

Summit Cty. Court of Common Pleas, No. CR97091987. Pursuant to a warrant of reprieve issued by the governor and filed with this court on July 21, 2011, it was ordered that Brett Hartman's sentence be carried into execution on Tuesday, November 13, 2012. 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 Acting 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. 14.1.

It is further ordered that service of documents as required by S.Ct.Prac.R. 14.2 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.

Pfeifer, Acting C.J.

O'Connor, C.J., not participating.

2012-1344. Cool v. Turner.

Marion App. No. 9-12-28. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Marion County.

Upon consideration of appellant's motion to supplement the record, it is ordered by the court that the motion is denied and the transcripts attached to appellant's merit brief are stricken.

Pfeifer, Acting C.J.

O'Connor, C.J., not participating.

2012-1526. State ex rel. Eubank v. McDonald.

Lucas App. No. L-12-1143, 2012-Ohio-3728. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Lucas County.

Upon consideration of appellant's motion for appointment of counsel, it is ordered by the court that the motion is denied.