



# OHIO

CRIMINAL SENTENCING COMMISSION

## Appellate Report: Juvenile Dispositions 2015 To 2024

Commission staff and interns reviewed the years 2015 through 2024 for juvenile appellate reversals to identify trends or patterns in the types of errors that result in reversals. This document discusses the following: total numbers and categories of all reversals by year; total numbers of the five most common categories of reversals by year; total numbers of reversals by district; total numbers of the five most common categories of reversals by district; the percentage of the five most common categories of reversals by district; and finally, the types of reversals are described in a narrative version for each year.

## Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission

Chief Justice Sharon L. Kennedy, *Supreme Court of Ohio, Chair*

Darren Shulman, *City Attorney, City of Upper Arlington, Vice Chair*

Director Amy Ast, *Ohio Department of Youth Services*

Brooke M. Burns, *Office of the Ohio Public Defender, Youth Defense Department*

Director Annette Chambers-Smith, *Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction*

Chief Charles Chandler, *Westerville Division of Police*

Judge Robert DeLamatre, *Erie County Common Pleas Court, Juvenile Division*

Judge Julia L. Dorrian, *Ohio 10th District Court of Appeals*

Lieutenant Kyle Erdeljac, *Columbus Division of Police*

Judge Timothy France, *Coshocton Municipal Court*

Sheriff John Hinton, *Morrow County Sheriff's Office*

Gwen Howe-Gebers, *Henry County Prosecuting Attorney, Juvenile*

Representative Latyna Humphrey, *Ohio House of Representatives*

Senator Catherine Ingram, *Ohio Senate*

Judge Kristen Johnson, *Hancock County Common Pleas Court, Probate and Juvenile Divisions*

Colonel Charles A. Jones, *Superintendent, Ohio State Highway Patrol*

Teri LaJeunesse, *Victim Witness Division Director, Greene County Prosecutor's Office*

Timothy Lanzendorfer, *Attorney at Law, Ohio State Bar Association*

Senator Nathan Manning, *Ohio Senate*

Charles T. "Chip" McConville, *Knox County Prosecuting Attorney*

Judge Stephen McIntosh, *Franklin County Common Pleas Court*

Elizabeth Miller, *State Public Defender, Office of the Ohio Public Defender*

Judge Jennifer Muench-McElfresh, *Butler County Common Pleas Court*

Judge Kyle Rohrer, *Delaware Municipal Court*

Judge Nick Selvaggio, *Champaign County Common Pleas Court*

Judge Helen Wallace, *Montgomery County Common Pleas Court, Juvenile Division*

Representative Josh Williams, *Ohio House of Representatives*

Commissioner Donnie Willis, *Jackson County Commissioner*

Judge Tyrone Yates, *Hamilton County Municipal Court*

## Staff

Melissa A. Knopp, Esq., *Executive Director*

Michael Crofford, M.Ed., LPC, *Research Specialist*

William J. Davies, Esq., *Criminal Justice Counsel*

Angela Kay Garvey, *Coordinator*

Emily S. Haynes, Esq., M.L.S., (Lead Author) *Criminal Justice Counsel*

Todd Ives, MPA, *Research Specialist*

Alex T. Jones, Esq., *Criminal Justice Counsel*

**The Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission would like to thank the following externs/interns for their contributions to the research and analysis that is included in this report:**

Isabella Bonville

Makenzie Shiller

Alaina Finan

Brenna Schaffer

David Haines

## Appellate Districts and Corresponding Counties






Table 1 in Appendix A shows the total numbers and categories of all reversals by year. Please note that given the small numbers of decisions resulting in reversals, these categories are not just related to sentencing but are comprehensive to give the reader an overall picture of appellate review of delinquency for the last ten years. Subsequent tables and charts drill down into more specific categories of reversals.

Figures 1 and 2 show the total reversals by year for the most common assignments of errors: confinement credit/jail-time credit, evidence, sex offender registration/classification, discretionary bindover and mandatory bindover. Reading the chart from left to right by year, the lightest color is 2015, and the darkest is 2024. While the relatively small numbers of cases make it difficult to show a statistical difference, it is clear from these charts that reversals pertaining to confinement credit/jail-time credit,<sup>1</sup> evidence and sex offender registration/classification are trending down. Discretionary bindover remains static, while mandatory bindover is trending upwards.

Figure 1. Total Reversals by Year (2015-2024)






Figure 2. Total Reversals by Year (2015-2024)





Figure 3 shows the total numbers of reversals but through the lens of each district. Note that First District (Hamilton) and the 8th District (Cuyahoga) are outliers for number of reversals. Hamilton County’s 2025 population is estimated at 831,732, while Cuyahoga’s is 1,225,089. Interestingly, although the 10th District (Franklin) is one of the lowest in terms of reversals, Franklin County’s population is comparable to Cuyahoga County, at 1,334,729. More information and analysis are needed to determine the reasons behind this difference.

Figure 3. Total Reversals by District, All Years (2015-2024)





Figures 4-8 show the five most common categories of reversals. Although sex offender registration and classification reversals seem to have been an issue in the Fifth District, one trend to note is the consistently high numbers of reversals of the First and Eighth Districts.

Figure 4. Confinement/Jail-Time Credit Reversals by District, All Years (2015-2024)




Figure 5. Evidence Reversals by District, All Years (2015-2024)






Figure 6. Sex Offender Registration/Classification Reversals by District, All Years (2015-2024)




Figure 7. Discretionary Bindover Reversals by District, All Years (2015-2024)







Figure 8. Mandatory Bindover Reversals by District, All Years (2015-2024)



Finally, Table 2 in Appendix B shows the percentage of each reversed appeal category by district. Darker values of green in the table shows higher percentages of reversals.

**2015 Cases**

The following pages provide more details and citations for reversals in a narrative version for each year. In 2015, 22 out of 61 delinquency cases were reversed/remanded (36%). The 22 cases were spread across the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 7th, 8th, 11th, and 12th Districts.

The most common assignment of error was sufficiency of evidence, with 8 of them being overturned. Specifically, these cases involved insufficient evidence of theft,<sup>2</sup> escape,<sup>3</sup> breaking and entering,<sup>4</sup> falsification of concealed carry,<sup>5</sup> traffic infractions,<sup>6</sup> secure facilities,<sup>7</sup> the admissibility of statements by victims to children and family services,<sup>8</sup> and gross sexual imposition.<sup>9</sup>

Other assignments of error were restitution,<sup>10</sup> Miranda Rights,<sup>11</sup> jurisdiction,<sup>12</sup> hearing issues,<sup>13</sup> discretionary bindover,<sup>14</sup> merger,<sup>15</sup> appointment of guardian ad litem,<sup>16</sup> and confinement/jail-time credit.<sup>17</sup>

**2016 Cases**

In 2016, 27 out of 72 delinquency cases were reversed/remanded (38%). The 27 cases were spread across the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 8th, 10th, 11th, and 12th Districts.

The most common assignment of error was sex offender registration/classification, with 8 cases being overturned. Specifically, these cases involved the implementation of the Adam Walsh Act,<sup>18</sup> statutory factors for classifying the juvenile as a sex offender,<sup>19</sup> the age of the juvenile,<sup>20</sup> constitutionality of R.C. 2512.83(A),<sup>21</sup> jurisdiction over the juvenile,<sup>22</sup> secure or non-secure facilities,<sup>23</sup> and sufficiency of evidence.<sup>24</sup>

Other assignments of error were confinement/jail time credit,<sup>25</sup> sufficiency of evidence,<sup>26</sup> Juv. R. 40 (D) (4) (d),<sup>27</sup> escape from a secured facility,<sup>28</sup> mandatory terms<sup>29</sup> Juv. R. 29 (D),<sup>30</sup> merger,<sup>31</sup> hearing issues,<sup>32</sup> restitution,<sup>33</sup> and mandatory bindover.<sup>34</sup>



### 2017 Cases

In 2017, 32 out of 81 delinquency cases were reversed/remanded (40%). The 32 cases were spread across the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 11th Districts.

The most common assignment of error was sex offender registration/classification, with 6 cases being overturned. Specifically, these cases involved the age of the offender,<sup>35</sup> jurisdiction,<sup>36</sup> jail-time credit,<sup>37</sup> polygraph admission,<sup>38</sup> and accepting guilty pleas.<sup>39</sup>

Other assignments of error were confinement/jail-time credit,<sup>40</sup> mandatory bindover,<sup>41</sup> sufficiency of evidence,<sup>42</sup> imposing State v. Hand,<sup>43</sup> record sealing,<sup>44</sup> nunc pro tunc/clerical errors,<sup>45</sup> mandatory terms,<sup>46</sup> firearm specification,<sup>47</sup> Juv. R. 29 (D),<sup>48</sup> Juv. R. 29 (F) (1),<sup>49</sup> Juv. R. 22 (F),<sup>50</sup> jurisdiction,<sup>51</sup> and imposing a single term instead of multiple terms.<sup>52</sup>

### 2018 Cases

In 2018, 21 out of 67 delinquency cases were reversed/remanded (31%). The 21 cases were spread across the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 11th, and 12th Districts.

The most common assignment of error was sex offender registration/classification, with 6 cases being overturned. Specifically, these cases involved secure and nonsecure facilities,<sup>53</sup> the application of R.C. 2952.86,<sup>54</sup> incorrectly requiring registration with the county sheriff,<sup>55</sup> jurisdiction due to age of child,<sup>56</sup> and the authority of the court to enforce its prior no-contact order.<sup>57</sup>

Other assignments of error were sufficiency of evidence involving self-defense,<sup>58</sup> juvenile traffic offender,<sup>59</sup> Miranda Rights,<sup>60</sup> sexual act and force or restraint,<sup>61</sup> rape,<sup>62</sup> merger,<sup>63</sup> knowing, intelligent, and voluntary plea,<sup>64</sup> restitution,<sup>65</sup> SYO,<sup>66</sup> mandatory bindover,<sup>67</sup> Juv. R. 29 (D),<sup>68</sup> the court's mistaken belief that DYS could reduce a sentence,<sup>69</sup> discretionary bindover,<sup>70</sup> and confinement/jail-time credit.<sup>71</sup>

### 2019 Cases

In 2019, 27 out of 65 delinquency cases were reversed/remanded (42%). The 27 cases were spread across the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th, 9th, 10th, and 12th Districts.

The most common assignment of error was sex offender registration and classification, with 6 cases being overturned. Specifically, these cases involved the court not having the authority to hold a hearing,<sup>72</sup> timing of classification,<sup>73</sup> statutory factors not included on record,<sup>74</sup> and secure facilities.<sup>75</sup> Other common assignments of error were bindovers involving discretionary bindover and amenability,<sup>76</sup> reverse bindover,<sup>77</sup> and mandatory bindover R.C. 2152 procedures.<sup>78</sup>

Other assignments of error were abuse of discretion,<sup>79</sup> nunc pro tunc,<sup>80</sup> evidence,<sup>81</sup> Terry stop,<sup>82</sup> confinement credit,<sup>83</sup> Juv. R. 29 (D),<sup>84</sup> record sealing,<sup>85</sup> jurisdiction of out-of-state acts,<sup>86</sup> conceded error by the state in placing a child in an adult facility,<sup>87</sup> and restitution.<sup>88</sup>



### **2020 Cases**

In 2020, 16 out of 56 delinquency cases were reversed/overturned (29%). The 16 cases were spread across the 1st, 2nd, 6th, 8th, 11th, and 12th Districts.

The most common assignments of error was sufficiency of evidence that involved burglary,<sup>89</sup> SYO,<sup>90</sup> and sex offender classification.<sup>91</sup>

Other assignments of error were sex offender registration and classification,<sup>92</sup> confinement/jail-time credit,<sup>93</sup> discretionary bindover,<sup>94</sup> mandatory bindover,<sup>95</sup> firearm specification,<sup>96</sup> speedy trial grounds,<sup>97</sup> Miranda Rights,<sup>98</sup> and nunc pro tunc/clerical errors.<sup>99</sup>

### **2021 Cases**

In 2021, 17 out of 50 delinquency cases were reversed/remanded (34%). The 17 cases were spread across the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 8th, and 12th Districts.

The most common assignment of error was sex offender registration and classification, with 4 cases being overturned. Specifically, these cases involved the timing of classification<sup>100</sup> and hearing issues.<sup>101</sup>

Other assignments of error were discretionary bindover,<sup>102</sup> mandatory bindover,<sup>103</sup> evidence,<sup>104</sup> merger,<sup>105</sup> nunc pro tunc/clerical errors,<sup>106</sup> probation,<sup>107</sup> pleas,<sup>108</sup> and life imprisonment.<sup>109</sup>

### **2022 Cases**

In 2022, 17 out of 44 delinquency cases were reversed/remanded (39%). The 17 cases were spread across the 1st, 2nd, 7th, 8th, 10th, 11th, and 12th Districts.

The most common assignment of error involved bindover, with 7 cases being overturned. Specifically, these cases involved discretionary bindover and amenability,<sup>110</sup> mandatory bindover and jurisdiction,<sup>111</sup> discretionary bindover and right to council,<sup>112</sup> mandatory bindover and right to council,<sup>113</sup> and reverse bindover and jurisdiction.<sup>114</sup>

Other assignments of error were evidence,<sup>115</sup> Miranda Rights,<sup>116</sup> inconsistent language with R.C. 2929.02 (B),<sup>117</sup> consecutive terms,<sup>118</sup> the age of the offender,<sup>119</sup> sex offender registration and classification,<sup>120</sup> and SYO issues related to speedy trial grounds<sup>121</sup> and the adult portion of the requirements not being met.<sup>122</sup>

### **2023 Cases**

In 2023, 25 out of 55 delinquency cases were reversed/remanded (45%). The 25 cases were spread across the 1st, 3rd, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th Districts.

The most common assignment of error involved bindover, with 8 cases being overturned. Specifically, these cases involved mandatory bindover and evidence,<sup>123</sup> discretionary bindover and amenability,<sup>124</sup> mandatory bindover and reverse bindover jurisdiction,<sup>125</sup> and discretionary bindover and timing of dispositions.<sup>126</sup>

Other assignments of error that were overturned related to sufficiency of evidence,<sup>127</sup> record sealing,<sup>128</sup> sex offender registration and classification,<sup>129</sup> Terry Stop,<sup>130</sup> Miranda Rights,<sup>131</sup> consecutive terms,<sup>132</sup> SYO,<sup>133</sup> and Juv. R. 29 (D).<sup>134</sup>



### **2024 Cases**

In 2024, 19 out of 54 delinquency cases were reversed/remanded (35%). The 19 cases were spread across the 1st, 2nd, 8th, 10th, and 12th Districts.

The most common assignment of error involved bindover, with 8 cases being overturned. Specifically, these cases involved mandatory bindover and evidence,<sup>135</sup> discretionary bindover and amenability,<sup>136</sup> discretionary bindover and nunc pro tunc,<sup>137</sup> and mandatory bindover and second evaluations.<sup>138</sup>

Other assignments of error that were overturned related to sufficiency of evidence,<sup>139</sup> confinement/jail-time credit,<sup>140</sup> restitution,<sup>141</sup> record sealing,<sup>142</sup> hearing issues,<sup>143</sup> subject matter jurisdiction/jurisdiction,<sup>144</sup> and the constitutionality of the weapons-under-disability statute.<sup>145</sup>

## Appendix A

Table 1. Reversal Type by Year

Appeal Type	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total
Abuse of Discretion	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Age of Offender	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Applicability of State v. Patrick	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Confinement/Jail-Time Credit	1	6	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	2	16
Consecutive Terms	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3
Discretionary Bindover	2	0	0	1	3	2	2	3	3	3	19
Escape from Secure Facility	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Evidence	8	4	4	5	2	3	2	3	5	3	39
Firearm Specification	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Hearing Issues	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
Imposing Single Term	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Imposing State v. Hand	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Inconsistent Language	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Jurisdiction	3	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	8
Juv R. 22 (F)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Juv R. 29 (D)	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	7
Juv R. 29 (F)(1)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Juv R. 40 (D)(4)(d)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mandatory Bindover	0	1	5	1	2	1	1	3	5	5	24
Mandatory Terms	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Merger	2	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	7
Miranda Rights	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	4
Miscellaneous	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mistaken Belief DYS Could Reduce a Sentence	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Nunc Pro Tunc/Clerical Errors	0	0	1	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	8
Placing Child in Adult Facility	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pleas	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Probation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Appeal Type	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total
Record Sealing	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	6
Restitution	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	7
Reverse Bindover	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Sex Offender Registration/ Classification	0	8	6	6	6	3	4	1	2	0	36
Speedy Trial	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
SYO	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	5
Terms	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terry Stop	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Weapons Under Disability Statute	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	22	27	32	21	27	16	17	17	25	19	223

## Appendix B

Table 2. Appeal Type by District, in Percentages

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
Confinement/Jail-Time Credit	18.8%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	56.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	12.5%
Discretionary Bindover	15.8%	21.1%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	10.5%	31.6%	0.0%	5.3%	5.3%	0.0%
Evidence	35.9%	5.1%	0.0%	2.6%	2.6%	2.6%	5.1%	30.8%	0.0%	0.0%	12.8%	2.6%
Mandatory Bindover	16.7%	8.3%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	45.8%	4.2%	8.3%	4.2%	4.2%
Sex Offender Registration/ Classification	19.4%	2.8%	5.6%	8.3%	27.8%	5.6%	0.0%	19.4%	2.8%	2.8%	5.6%	0.0%

This table illustrates the percentage of each reversed appeal type by district. The percentages are by the total row value. For example, 56.3% of all “Confinement/Jail-Time Credit” reversals come from the 8th district.



## Endnotes

- 1 These cases reflect only the credit errors that had to be litigated in a court of appeals. The vast majority of credit errors are rectified through post-disposition proceedings often initiated by the filing of a motion for recalculation of confinement credit and/or jail time credit filed in the committing court.
- 2 In re D.L. 2015-Ohio-4747 (1st Dist.)
- 3 State v. Thomas. 2015-Ohio-187 (1st Dist.)
- 4 In re M.B. 2015-Ohio-1912 (1st Dist.)
- 5 State v. Hottenstein. 2015-Ohio-4787 (2nd Dist.)
- 6 In re K.S.F. 2015-Ohio-5592 (7th Dist.)
- 7 In re T.W. 2015-Ohio-5213 (11th Dist.)
- 8 In re CA. 2015-Ohio-4768 (8th Dist.)
- 9 In re R.A.H. 2015-Ohio-3342 (8th Dist.)
- 10 In re Z.N. 2015-Ohio-1213 (11th Dist.); In re T.C. 2015-Ohio-4384 (8th Dist.); State v. T.J. 2015-Ohio-2881 (2nd Dist.)
- 11 In re K.C. 2015-Ohio-1613 (1st Dist.)
- 12 In re H.C. 2015-Ohio-3676 (8th Dist.); In re C.G.S. 2015-Ohio-2386 (8th Dist.); State v. Cauthen. 2015-Ohio-272 (1st Dist.)
- 13 In re G.S. 2015-Ohio-1285 (4th Dist.)
- 14 State v. Mack. 2015-Ohio-4148 (7th Dist.); State v. D.H. 2015-Ohio-3259 (2nd Dist.)
- 15 In re M.P.R. 2015-Ohio-3102 (12th Dist.); State v. Simon. 2015-Ohio-970 (12th Dist.)
- 16 In re D.R.B. 2015-Ohio-3346 (8th Dist.)
- 17 In re J.K.S. 2015-Ohio-1312 (8th Dist.)
- 18 State v. Schulze, 2016-Ohio-470 (1st Dist.)
- 19 In re T.N., 2016-Ohio-7258 (3rd Dist.)
- 20 In re C.B., 2016-Ohio-4779 (5th Dist.); In re J.C., 2016-Ohio-5362 (4th Dist.)
- 21 In re R.H., 2016-Ohio-746 (3rd Dist.)
- 22 In re J.B., 2016-Ohio-98 (5th Dist.)
- 23 In re R.H., 2016-Ohio-7379 (5th Dist.)
- 24 In re D.S., 2016-Ohio-2810 (10th Dist.)
- 25 State v. Cockrell. 2016-Ohio-5797 (1st Dist.); State v. Curtis. 2016-Ohio-6978 (3rd District.); State v. Sampson. 2016-Ohio-4560 (8th Dist.); In re J.C.E. 2016-Ohio-7843 (11th Dist.); State v. Rice. 2016-Ohio-5372 (12th Dist.); In re M.P.R. 2016-Ohio-3107 (12th Dist.)
- 26 In re E.B. 2016-Ohio-1507 (1st Dist.); In re D.L. 2016-Ohio-5934 (8th Dist.); In re K.E.W. 2016-Ohio-7844 (11th Dist.); In re T.R.J. 2016-Ohio-7160 (11th Dist.)
- 27 In re N.D., 2016-Ohio-7620 (1st Dist.)
- 28 State v. Clark, 2016-Ohio-8508 (2nd Dist.)
- 29 State v. Smith, 2016-Ohio-7101 (2nd Dist.)
- 30 In re T.W., 2016-Ohio-8371 (5th Dist.)
- 31 In re R.A.H., 2016-Ohio-8301 (8th Dist.); In re A.G., 2016-Ohio-5616 (8th Dist.)
- 32 In re C.H., 2016-Ohio-4965 (8th Dist.)
- 33 In re M.A. 2016-Ohio-1161 (11th Dist.)
- 34 Turner v. Hooks. 2016-Ohio-3083 (4th Dist.)
- 35 In re S.J. 2017-Ohio-5499 (2nd Dist.)
- 36 In re B.H. 2017-Ohio-6966 (5th Dist.); In re R.D. 2017-Ohio-589 (5th Dist.)
- 37 State v. Golson. 2017-Ohio-4438 (8th Dist.)
- 38 In re L.M. 2017-Ohio-8067 (8th Dist.)
- 39 In re K.A. 2017-Ohio-6979 (8th Dist.)
- 40 In re A.M. 2017-Ohio-7624 (1st Dist.)
- 41 State v. D.F. 2017-Ohio-2882 (2nd Dist.); State v. Jones. 2017-Ohio-342 (6th Dist.); State v. Rosser. 2017-Ohio-5572 (8th Dist.); State v. Armstead-Williams. 2017-Ohio-1004 (11th Dist.); State v. Ferguson. 2017-Ohio-7930 (2nd Dist.)
- 42 In re J.B. 2017-Ohio-406 (6th Dist.); In re B.W. 2017-Ohio-9220 (7th Dist.); State v. Hunter. 2017-Ohio-4180 (8th Dist.); In re B.J.M. 2017-Ohio-8202 (11th Dist.)
- 43 State v. Jackson. 2017-Ohio-4197 (2nd Dist.); State v. Boyer. 2017-Ohio-4199 (2nd Dist.); State v. Ortiz. 2017-Ohio-9157 (8th Dist.); State v. Parker. 2017-Ohio-7484 (8th Dist.)
- 44 In re C.L. 2017-Ohio-2654 (11th Dist.)



- 45 In re J.T. 2017-Ohio-7723 (8th Dist.)
- 46 State v. Wilson. 2017-Ohio-7223 (2nd Dist.);  
State v. McComb. 2017-Ohio-4010 (2nd Dist.)
- 47 In re C.J. 2017-Ohio-4198 (2nd Dist.)
- 48 In re D.P. 2017-Ohio-606 (3rd Dist.); In re A.R.  
2017-Ohio-8058 (8th Dist.)
- 49 In re D.D. 2017-Ohio-9021 (8th Dist.)
- 50 In re T.W. 2017-Ohio-8875 (8th Dist.)
- 51 State v. Rickard. 2017-Ohio-8614 (6th Dist.);  
State v. Baker. 2017-Ohio-7795 (7th Dist.)
- 52 State v. Delp. 2017-Ohio-8879 (8th Dist.)
- 53 In re H.M. 2018-Ohio-2201 (5th Dist.); In re  
O.P. 2018-Ohio-580 (8th Dist.)
- 54 In re D.F. 2018-Ohio-1792 (5th Dist.)
- 55 In re L.S. 2018-Ohio-5005 (6th Dist.)
- 56 In re L.N. 2018-Ohio-3982 (6th Dist.)
- 57 In re T.M. 2018-Ohio-2450 (11th Dist.)
- 58 In re B.M. 2018-Ohio-1733 (1st Dist.)
- 59 In re Z.E.N. 2018-Ohio-2208 (4th Dist.)
- 60 In re M.H. 2018-Ohio-4848 (8th Dist.)
- 61 In re T.W. 2018-Ohio-3275 (8th Dist.)
- 62 In re D.C. 2018-Ohio-163 (8th Dist.)
- 63 State v. Evans. 2018-Ohio-3129 (1st Dist.)
- 64 In re K.B. 2018-Ohio-1908 (4th Dist.)
- 65 In re B.K. 2018-Ohio-864 (2nd Dist.)
- 66 In re M.P. 2018-Ohio-5035 (8th Dist.)
- 67 State v. Strowder. 2018-Ohio-1292 (8th Dist.)
- 68 In re L.S. 2018-Ohio-4758 (6th Dist.); In re A.H.  
2018-Ohio-364 (12th Dist.)
- 69 In re K.E. 2018-Ohio-3100 (7th Dist.)
- 70 State v. Carberry. 2018-Ohio-1060 (1st Dist.)
- 71 State v. Thomas. 2018-Ohio-4106 (8th Dist.)
- 72 In re I.B. 2019-Ohio-4489 (1st Dist.)
- 73 In re R.B. 2019-Ohio-3298 (1st Dist.); In re  
K.M.B. 2019-Ohio-4436 (4th Dist.)
- 74 In re M.W. 2019-Ohio-4564 (5th Dist.); In re J.E.  
2019-Ohio-4587 (5th Dist.)
- 75 In re P.C. 2019-Ohio-2603 (9th Dist.)
- 76 In re D.J. 2019-Ohio-288 (1st Dist.); In re J.L.S.  
2019-Ohio-4173 (10th Dist.)
- 77 State v. Weaver. 2019-Ohio-2477 (6th Dist.)
- 78 In re M.J. 2019-Ohio-1651 (8th Dist.); State v.  
Grant. 2019-Ohio-3561 (9th Dist.)
- 79 In re T.M. 2019-Ohio-4552 (1st Dist.)
- 80 In re C.N. 2019-Ohio-179 (8th Dist.); State v.  
Smith. 2019-Ohio-4671 (8th Dist.); State v.  
Strowder. 2019-Ohio-4573 (8th Dist.)
- 81 In re C.W. 2019-Ohio-5262 (1st Dist.); In re  
C.I.R. 2019-Ohio-335 (12th Dist.)
- 82 In re J.C. 2019-Ohio-4815 (1st Dist.)
- 83 In re K.M.P. 2019-Ohio-4551 (1st Dist.); In re  
A.S. 2019-Ohio-1362 (8th Dist.)
- 84 In re A.Y. 2019-Ohio-2589 (2nd Dist.)
- 85 In re C.M. 2019-Ohio-2446 (8th Dist.)
- 86 In re O.V. 2019-Ohio-4628 (12th Dist.)
- 87 In re D.P. 2019-Ohio-2752 (8th Dist.)
- 88 In re A.S. 2019-Ohio-2558 (1st Dist.)
- 89 In re D.O. 2020-Ohio-6862 (1st Dist.)
- 90 In re O.M. 2020-Ohio-5433 (8th Dist.)
- 91 In re J.W. 2020-Ohio-4065 (8th Dist.)
- 92 In re T.R. 2020-Ohio-4445 (1st Dist.); In re S.N.  
2020-Ohio-3958 (1st Dist.); In re T.B. 2020-  
Ohio-5389 (11th Dist.)
- 93 In re C.H. 2020-Ohio-5188 (8th Dist.); In re  
A.T. 2020-Ohio-5191 (8th Dist.); State v. Harris.  
2020-Ohio-4303 (8th Dist.)
- 94 State v. Nicholas. 2020-Ohio-3478 (2nd Dist.);  
State v. Philpot. 2020-Ohio-104 (8th Dist.)
- 95 State v. Jackson. 2020-Ohio-80 (1st Dist.)
- 96 In re J.M. 2020-Ohio-5498 (1st Dist.)
- 97 In re T.G. 2020-Ohio-2764 (6th Dist.)
- 98 In re A.L. 2020-Ohio-4061 (8th Dist.)
- 99 State v. Kimbrough. 2020-Ohio-3175 (8th Dist.)



- 100 In re D.F. 2021-Ohio-3109 (4th Dist.); In re E.S. 2021-Ohio-3722 (5th Dist.)
- 101 In re D.R. 2021-Ohio-1797 (1st Dist.); In re Z.M. 2021-Ohio-1492 (8th Dist.)
- 102 In re T.S. 2021-Ohio-1889 (1st Dist.); In re D.M.S. 2021-Ohio-1214 (2nd Dist.)
- 103 In re J.R. 2021-Ohio-2272 (8th Dist.)
- 104 In re R.B. 2021-Ohio-3749 (1st Dist.); In re D.M. 2021-Ohio-354 (5th Dist.)
- 105 In re B.J. 2021-Ohio-3926 (8th Dist.); In re L.S. 2021-Ohio-3353 (8th Dist.)
- 106 State v. Converse. 2021-Ohio-1274 (1st Dist.); In re J.K.O. 2021-Ohio-1215 (2nd Dist.); State v. Smith. 2021-Ohio-2982 (12th Dist.)
- 107 In re N.S. 2021-Ohio-427 (1st Dist.)
- 108 In re J.L. 2021-Ohio-3823 (8th Dist.)
- 109 State v. Watson. 2021-Ohio-1361(5th Dist.)
- 110 State v Ellis. 2022-Ohio-147 (2nd Dist.); In re S.G. 2022-Ohio-897 (7th Dist.)
- 111 State v. Macklin. 2022-Ohio-4400 (8th Dist.); State v. Lewis. 2022-Ohio-2357 (8th Dist.)
- 112 State v. J.R. 2022-Ohio-1664 (8th Dist.)
- 113 State v. Taylor. 2022-Ohio-2877 (10th Dist.)
- 114 State v. Hollie. 2022-Ohio-872 (12th Dist.)
- 115 In re J.H. 2022-Ohio-3987 (1st Dist.); In re D.C. 2022-Ohio-4086 (8th Dist.); State v. Nicholson. 2022-Ohio-2037 (8th Dist.)
- 116 In re S.W. 2022-Ohio-854 (1st Dist.)
- 117 State v. Miree. 2022-Ohio-3664 (8th Dist.)
- 118 State v. Jones. 2022-Ohio-4202 (8th Dist.)
- 119 In re E.J.W. 2022-Ohio-4215 (8th Dist.)
- 120 In re C.P. 2022-Ohio-4087 (8th Dist.)
- 121 In re C.C. 2022-Ohio-2264 (8th Dist.)
- 122 In re J.P. 2022-Ohio-2102 (11th Dist.)
- 123 In re M.T. 2023-Ohio-2140 (1st Dist.); In re K.B. 2023-Ohio-1644 (1st Dist.); In re I.S. 2023-Ohio-3975 (8th Dist.); In re B.A.T. 2023-Ohio-3366 (8th Dist.)
- 124 State v. Bush. 2023-Ohio-4473 (3rd Dist.); State v. Carter. 2023-Ohio-4310 (8th Dist.)
- 125 State v. McCray. 2023-Ohio-4814 (1st Dist.)
- 126 In re D.L. 2023-Ohio-4029 (11th Dist.)
- 127 In re J.A. 2023-Ohio-4388 (1st Dist.); In re S.J. 2023-Ohio-3441 (1st Dist.); In re J.C. 2023-Ohio-3074 (1st Dist.); In re D.W. 2023-Ohio-3887 (8th Dist.); In re O.E. 2023-Ohio-1946 (11th Dist.)
- 128 In re S.S. 2023-Ohio-4197 (1st Dist.); In re I.J. 2023-Ohio-2024 (1st Dist.); In re L.P. 2023-Ohio-949 (1st Dist.)
- 129 In re S.D. 2023-Ohio-3039 (1st Dist.); In re A.B. 2023-Ohio-1047 (8th Dist.)
- 130 In re J.T. 2023-Ohio-2695 (1st Dist.)
- 131 In re D.T. 2023-Ohio-4832 (9th Dist.)
- 132 State v. Turner. 2023-Ohio-2874 (8th Dist.); In re K.D. 2023-Ohio-699 (10th Dist.)
- 133 In re S.H. 2023-Ohio-2543 (11th Dist.); In re S.I.G. 2023-Ohio-2912 (12th Dist.)
- 134 In re D.P. 2023-Ohio-3120 (11th Dist.)
- 135 In re J.C. 2024-Ohio-5918 (8th Dist.); State v. Scott. 2024-Ohio-975 (8th Dist.); In re H.R. 2024-Ohio-739 (8th Dist.); In re C.J.H. 2024-Ohio-1233 (12th Dist.)
- 136 State v. T.S. 2024-Ohio-4898 (8th Dist.); State v D.T. 2024-Ohio-4482 (8th Dist.)
- 137 State v. Walker. 2024-Ohio-729 (8th Dist.)
- 138 State v. S.B. 2024-Ohio-2080 (10th Dist.)
- 139 In re D.B. 2024-Ohio-3391 (1st Dist.); In re L.M. 2024-Ohio-2974 (1st Dist.); In re G.E. 2024-Ohio-1074 (2nd Dist.)
- 140 State v. Perryman. 2024-Ohio-4587 (8th Dist.); In re L.A. 2024-Ohio-3107 (8th Dist.)
- 141 In re K.C. 2024-Ohio-5081(1st Dist.)
- 142 In re L.B. 2024-Ohio-1255 (1st Dist.)
- 143 State v. Lavender. 2024-Ohio-229 (1st Dist.)
- 144 In re E.K. 2024-Ohio-5291 (1st Dist.); In re D.A. 2024-Ohio-2975 (1st Dist.)
- 145 State v. Ware. 2024-Ohio-4655 (1st Dist.)