Court of Appeals of Ohio

EIGHTH APPELLATE DISTRICT COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA

JOURNAL ENTRY AND OPINION **No. 93517**

STATE OF OHIO EX REL., LASHAWN ATKINSON

RELATOR

VS.

BOB REID, SHERIFF

RESPONDENT

JUDGMENT: WRIT DENIED

Writ of Habeas Corpus Motion No. 423855 Order No. 428909

RELEASE DATE: December 11, 2009

FOR RELATOR

Lashawn Atkinson, pro se Cuyahoga County Jail P.O. Box 5600 1215 W. 3rd Street Cleveland, Ohio 44101

Lashawn Atkinson, pro se 11308 Durant Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44108

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

William D. Mason Cuyahoga County Prosecutor

BY: Thorin Freeman Assistant County Prosecutor 8th Floor Justice Center 1200 Ontario Street Cleveland, Ohio 44113

ANN DYKE, J.:

{¶ 1} Petitioner, Lashawn Atkinson, is the defendant in *State v. Atkinson*, Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas Case No. CR-456940. Atkinson was sentenced to three years. When he was released from prison in January 2008, the Ohio Adult Parole Authority ("APA") placed Atkinson on postrelease control for five years.¹

¹ A review of the docket in Case No. CR-456940 reflects that the trial court issued a resentencing entry on July 31, 2009. Atkinson's appeal of that judgment is pending as *State v. Atkinson*, Case No. 93855.

- {¶2} At the time he filed this action, Atkinson averred that he was in the custody of respondent sheriff because APA issued a postrelease control detainer arising from Case No. CR-456940. Atkinson argues that APA did not have the authority to place him on postrelease control because he was not informed of postrelease control at his sentencing hearing. That is, Atkinson contends that his sentence is void. As a consequence, he requests that this court grant relief in habeas corpus and order respondent to release him from custody.
- {¶ 3} Respondent has filed a motion for summary judgment. For the reasons stated below, we grant the motion for summary judgment and enter judgment for respondent.
- {¶4} In support of the motion for summary judgment, respondent cites to *Patterson v. Ohio Adult Parole Auth.*, 120 Ohio St.3d 311, 2008-Ohio-6147, 898 N.E.2d 950.
- {¶5} "Patterson is particularly instructive * * *. In that case, Patterson commenced a habeas corpus to contest his post-release control sanctions. He claimed that the trial judge failed to notify him of post-release control during the sentencing hearing, although the judge included it in the sentencing entry. The Supreme Court of Ohio upheld the dismissal of the habeas corpus action on the grounds of adequate remedy at law. 'Patterson had an adequate remedy by way of direct appeal from his sentence to raise his claim that he did not receive proper notification about postrelease control at his sentencing hearing. E.g., Watkins v.

-4-

Collins, 111 Ohio St.3d 425, 2006-Ohio-5082, 857 N.E.2d 78, ¶ 45 ("The remedy

for improper notification about postrelease control at the sentencing hearing is

resentencing-not release from prison" and ¶ 53 ("habeas corpus is not available

to contest any error in the sentencing entries, and petitioners have or had an

adequate remedy by way of appeal to challenge the imposition of postrelease

control").' Patterson at ¶ 8." Jackson v. Phillips, Cuyahoga App. No. 91963,

2009-Ohio-125, at ¶10 (denying an application for habeas corpus).

{¶ 6} Obviously, this case presents the same issue as *Patterson*: whether

relief lies in habeas corpus if, as Atkinson avers in the complaint, a defendant

was not informed at sentencing that he was subject to postrelease control, but the

sentencing entry did include the imposition of postrelease control. In light of the

holding in *Patterson*, therefore, we must conclude that appeal is the remedy that

Atkinson should pursue or should have pursued, not habeas corpus.

{¶7} Accordingly, respondent's motion for summary judgment is granted.

Petitioner to pay costs. The clerk is directed to serve upon the parties notice of

this judgment and its date of entry upon the journal. Civ.R. 58(B).

Writ denied.

ANN DYKE, PRESIDING JUDGE