IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO TENTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

State of Ohio, :

Plaintiff-Appellee, :

v. : No. 14AP-1058 (C.P.C. No. 13CR-6294)

Sar I,

(REGULAR CALENDAR)

Defendant-Appellant. :

DECISION

Rendered on June 11, 2015

Ron O'Brien, Prosecuting Attorney, and Barbara A. Farnbacher, for appellee.

Timothy Young, Public Defender, and Valerie Kunze, for appellant.

APPEAL from the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas

TYACK, J.

 $\{\P\ 1\}$ Sar I is appealing from the consecutive sentences ordered based upon his convictions for murder and tampering with evidence. He assigns a single error for our consideration:

A trial court commits reversible error when it imposes consecutive prison terms without satisfying the statutory mandates that authorize consecutive sentences. *State v. Bonnell*, 140 Ohio St.3d 209, 2014-Ohio-3177, 16 N.E.3d 659; R.C. 2929.14(C)(4); Crim.R. 32.

 $\{\P\ 2\}$ The trial court judge who sentenced Sar I did in fact make the findings required by R.C. 2929.14(C) and *State v. Bonnell*, 140 Ohio St.3d 209, 2014-Ohio-3177

No. 14AP-1058

during the sentencing hearing. *Bonnell* is quite emphatic about the fact no specific words need to be used. Appropriate words were utilized here.

- {¶ 3} The *Bonnell* case added a new requirement to sentencing proceedings by mandating that the findings for R.C. 2929.14(C) be reflected in the sentencing entry. The sentencing entry here does not include these findings. However, *Bonnell* permits the sentencing entry to be corrected with a nunc pro tunc entry. The effect of a nunc pro tunc entry adding the necessary language to the trial court's entry is to relate back to the original entry, not replacing it, but applying retrospectively to the judgment it corrects. *State v. Thompson*, 141 Ohio St.3d 254, 261, 2014-Ohio-4751.
- $\{\P\ 4\}$ We, therefore, overrule appellant's assignment of error and remand the case for the journalization of a new sentencing entry that includes the needed language nunc pro tunc. The judgment of the trial court is otherwise affirmed.

Appeal dismissed on its merits and matter remanded for nunc pro tunc entry.

DORRIAN and BRUNNER, JJ., concur.