

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

June 19, 2015

[Cite as *06/19/2015 Case Announcements*, 2015-Ohio-2418.]

MERIT DECISIONS WITHOUT OPINIONS

2014-1695. State ex rel. Arroyo v. Sloan.

Ashtabula App. No. 2014-A-0037, 2014-Ohio-3770. This cause, here on appeal from the Court of Appeals for Ashtabula County, was considered in the manner prescribed by law. On consideration thereof, the judgment of the court of appeals is affirmed, consistent with the opinion rendered on June 4, 2015. Pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. 18.02(A), the parties may file a motion for reconsideration within ten days of the date of this entry.

It is further ordered that a mandate be sent to and filed with the clerk of the Court of Appeals for Ashtabula County.

MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

2013-0312. Disciplinary Counsel v. Rammelsberg.

This cause came on for further consideration upon the filing by respondent's counsel of a motion to modify record to reflect counsel's withdrawal. Motion denied.

2014-1027. Columbus City Schools Bd. of Edn. v. Franklin Cty. Bd. of Revision.

Board of Tax Appeals, No. 2013-4911. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Board of Tax Appeals.

Upon consideration of the joint motion to remand the appeal to the Franklin County Board of Revision in order to implement a settlement, it is ordered by the court that the cause is remanded to the Franklin County Board of Revision to take further action as appropriate.

It is further ordered that mandates be sent to and filed with the Board of Tax Appeals and the Franklin County Board of Revision.

2015-0192. State v. Brookshire.

Montgomery App. No. 25859, 2014-Ohio-5368. This cause is pending before the court on the certification of a conflict by the Court of Appeals for Montgomery County.

Upon consideration of appellant's motion to correct typographical error, it is ordered by the court that the motion is granted. The issue to be briefed by the parties is corrected as follows:

“Once an adult court determines under R.C. 2152.121(B)(4) that at least one charge for which the juvenile was convicted is subject to mandatory transfer, is that court permitted to sentence the juvenile under R.C. Chapter 2929 on all charges in the case, or must the adult court complete a separate analysis under R.C. 2152.121(B) for each charge individually?”