

[Until this opinion appears in the Ohio Official Reports advance sheets, it may be cited as *Dixon v. Bowerman*, Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-3049.]

NOTICE

This slip opinion is subject to formal revision before it is published in an advance sheet of the Ohio Official Reports. Readers are requested to promptly notify the Reporter of Decisions, Supreme Court of Ohio, 65 South Front Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215, of any typographical or other formal errors in the opinion, in order that corrections may be made before the opinion is published.

SLIP OPINION NO. 2020-OHIO-3049

DIXON, APPELLANT, v. BOWERMAN, WARDEN, APPELLEE.

[Until this opinion appears in the Ohio Official Reports advance sheets, it may be cited as *Dixon v. Bowerman*, Slip Opinion No. 2020-Ohio-3049.]

Habeas corpus—Successive habeas corpus petition barred by res judicata—Court of appeals’ dismissal of petition affirmed.

(No. 2019-1600—Submitted March 10, 2020—Decided May 27, 2020.)

APPEAL from the Court of Appeals for Lucas County,
No. L-19-1155, 2019-Ohio-4435.

Per Curiam.

{¶ 1} In 2006, appellant, William Dixon, was sentenced to an aggregate prison term of 21 years after being convicted of multiple crimes. *State v. Dixon*, 2d Dist. Montgomery No. 21823, 2008-Ohio-755, ¶ 13. His convictions and sentences were affirmed on direct appeal. *Id.* at ¶ 53.

{¶ 2} In 2018, Dixon filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the Sixth District Court of Appeals asserting multiple grounds for relief. *State ex rel. Dixon*

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

v. Bowerman, 156 Ohio St.3d 317, 2019-Ohio-716, 126 N.E.3d 1086, ¶ 2. The Sixth District dismissed the petition, *id.* at ¶ 3, and this court affirmed, *id.* at ¶ 5.

{¶ 3} In 2019, Dixon filed another petition seeking habeas relief. The Sixth District dismissed that petition as well, holding that Dixon’s claims are barred under the doctrine of res judicata and that he had an adequate remedy at law. 2019-Ohio-4435, ¶ 10-11. Dixon appeals to this court as of right.

{¶ 4} Because “[r]es judicata bars petitioners from filing successive habeas corpus petitions,” *Bevins v. Richard*, 144 Ohio St.3d 54, 2015-Ohio-2832, 40 N.E.3d 1108, ¶ 4, we affirm. Dixon’s motion for leave to file an amended brief is denied.

Judgment affirmed.

O’CONNOR, C.J., and KENNEDY, FRENCH, FISCHER, DEWINE, DONNELLY, and STEWART, JJ., concur.

William Dixon, pro se.

Dave Yost, Attorney General, and William H. Lamb, Assistant Attorney General, for appellee.
