PAVAN V. PARIKH
Clerk of Courts

Office of the Clerk
Supreme Court of Ohio
65 South Front Street, 8th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3431

October 21,2026

Dear Sir or Madam;

Enclosed please find a certified copy of an order entered in our Court declaring plaintiff Sharnee Walker a vexatious litigator.

Very truly,

PAVAN V. PARIKH
Clerk of Courts

Scott Sellins
Common Pleas Division Chief

Email: ssellins@hamcoclerkoh.gov
Phone: 513-946-5699
1000 Main Street, Room 315
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

RECEIVED
OCT 26 2026
CLERK OF COURT
SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

FOR COURT USE ONLY
S.C. Line #: 18

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO
CIVIL DIVISION

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
ENTER
HON. WENDE C. CROSS
THE CLERK SHALL SERVE NOTICE TO PARTIES PURSUANT TO CIVIL RULE 58 WHICH SHALL BE TAXED AS COSTS HEREIN.

ENTERED
OCT 20 2026

SHARNEE WALKER,	:	**Case No. A 2602202**
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	**JUDGE WENDE C. CROSS**
	:	
vs.	:	**ENTRY DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND GRANTING DEFENDANTS' CROSS-MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**
TIMOTHY C. SULLIVAN, et al.	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	

This case is before the Court on competing Motions for Summary Judgment on Defendants' Counterclaim.[1] Having considered the Motions, the parties' memoranda, and being fully advised in the premises, the Court hereby **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion and Renewed Motion for Summary Judgment. In considering Defendants' Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment, the Court hereby **GRANTS** said Motion for the reasons outlined in Defendants' Memorandum in Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment and for the reasons stated herein.

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

On April 23, 2026, Plaintiff filed her *pro se* complaint against Defendants arising out of Defendants' alleged conduct in Hamiliton County Municipal Court Case No. 25CV38984. In particular, Sharnee Walker alleges that counsel made false statements in Defendant's Motion to Dismiss. Defendants filed an amended answer and counterclaim alleging that Ms. Walker is a

[1] Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment was filed on May 8, 2026, and her Renewed Motion for Summary Judgment was filed on May 25, 2026. Defendants' Memorandum in Opposition and Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment was filed on June 2, 2026.

A TRUE COPY ATTEST
CLERK OF THE HAMILTON COUNTY COURT, HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO
DEPUTY

D149696869

vexatious litigator pursuant to R.C. § 2323.52. Plaintiff subsequently filed a Motion for Summary Judgment and a Renewed Motion for Summary Judgment on Defendants' Amended Counterclaim, and Defendants filed their own Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment.

II. STANDARD OF LAW

Summary Judgment is used "to determine from the evidentiary materials whether triable factual issues exist, regardless of whether the facts of a case are complex."[2] Summary judgment is appropriate if (1) there is no genuine issue of any material fact; (2) the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law; and (3) reasonable minds can come to but one conclusion, and that conclusion is adverse to the party against whom the motion for summary judgment is made.[3] The burden falls on the party requesting summary judgment to show that no genuine issue exists.[4] The moving party must be able to point to evidence "which affirmatively demonstrates that the nonmoving party has no evidence to support the nonmoving party's claims."[5] Disputes over genuine material facts will preclude the Court from granting summary judgment.[6]

III. DISCUSSION

"'Vexatious litigator' means any person who has habitually, persistently, and without reasonable grounds engaged in vexatious conduct in a civil action or actions, whether in the court of claims or in a court of appeals, court of common pleas, municipal court, or county court, whether the person or another person instituted the civil action or actions, and whether the vexatious conduct was against the same party or against different parties in the civil action or actions."[7] A two-pronged test must be satisfied before a trial court may declare a litigant a vexatious litigator:

---

[2] *R&S Distrib. v. Hartge Smith Nonwovens, LLC.*, 2010-Ohio-3992, ¶ 18 (1st Dist.).
[3] *Ditech Fin., LLC v. Balimunkwe*, 2019-Ohio-3806, ¶ 5 (1st Dist.).
[4] *Id.* at 6.
[5] *Torrance v. Cincinnati Metro. Hous. Auth.*, 2010-Ohio-1330, ¶ 11 (1st Dist.).
[6] *R&S Distrib.* at ¶ 18.
[7] R.C. 2323.52(A)(3).

A TRUE COPY ATTEST
CLERK OF THE HAMILTON COUNTY
COURT, HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO
DEPUTY

1) "the statute requires that the litigant must have 'engaged in vexatious conduct in a civil action or actions;'" and 2) "the vexatious conduct must have been 'habitual[], persistent[], and without reasonable grounds,' keeping the focus on repeated abuses of the legal system."[8] Vexatious conduct is defined as any one of the following: 1) "conduct [that] obviously serves merely to harass or maliciously injure another party to the civil action"; 2) "conduct [that] is not warranted under existing law and cannot be supported by a good faith argument for an extension, modification, or reversal of existing law"; or 3) "conduct [that] is imposed solely for delay."[9]

When determining whether a litigant should be declared a vexatious litigator, the conduct across the entirety of the cases and nature of the actions must be evaluated.[10] The number of actions may be relevant in determining whether an individual engages in habitually and persistent vexatious conduct.[11] Vexatious conduct includes "filing unnecessary, inappropriate or supernumerary pleadings and motions which raise or re-raise arguments that have been repeatedly rejected by the courts" and includes the "consistent repetition of arguments and legal theories that have been rejected by the court numerous times."[12]

Once a person is declared a vexatious litigator, access to the courts is limited.[13] The First District Court of Appeals has made clear that "given the magnitude of the right at stake–access to the courts–the elements of R.C.§ 2323.52(A)(3) must be established by clear and convincing evidence."[14] A vexatious litigator determination constitutes an extraordinary remedy that should be applied in limited circumstances.[15]

---

[8] *Chia-Chi Ho v. Evans*, 2024-Ohio-5184, ¶ 9 (1st Dist.); R.C.§ 2323.52(A)(3).
[9] R.C.§ 2323.52(A)(2)(a)-(c).
[10] *Chia-Chi Ho*, 2024-Ohio-5184, ¶ 9, citing *Borger v. McErlane*, 2001-Ohio-4030 (1st Dist.).
[11] *Uh Oh Ohio, LLC v. Buchanan*, 2024-Ohio-11, ¶ 15 (1st Dist.).
[12] *Id.*, quoting *Howdyshell v. Battle*, 2019-Ohio-5232, ¶ 18 (1st Dist.); *Id.*, quoting *Prime Equip. Group, Inc. v. Schmidt*, 2016-Ohio-3472, ¶ 40 (10th Dist.)
[13] *Chia-Chi Ho*, 2024-Ohio-5184, ¶ 10, citing *City of Maderia v. Oppenheimer*, 2021-Ohio-2958 ¶ 8 (1st Dist.).
[14] *Id.*
[15] *Id.*

A TRUE COPY ATTEST
CLERK OF THE HAMILTON COUNTY
COURT, HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO
DEPUTY

In the instant matter, Plaintiff has filed numerous documents, including:

1. Amended Complaint, filed on April 24, 2026;
2. Motion for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint, filed on May 8, 2026;
3. Motion for Leave to Join Additional Party Defendant and Leave to File Third Amended Complaint, filed on May 19, 2026;
4. Motion for Sanctions, filed on May 8, 2026;
5. Motion for Summary Judgment, filed on May 8, 2026;
6. Renewed Motion for Summary Judgment, filed on May 25, 2026;
7. Plaintiff's Supplemental Memorandum addressing Defendants' Civ.R. 12(C) Motion, filed on May 27, 2026;
8. Motion for Leave to File Sur Reply, filed on June 15, 2026;
9. Plaintiff's Objection to and Motion to Strike Defendants' Notice of Additional Authority, filed on July 6, 2026; and
10. Motion for leave to File Sur-reply, filed on September 18, 2026.

A majority of the motions/filings were filed before the first Initial Case Management Conference on July 16, 2026, and within two months of filing the initial complaint.

Further, the following are actions filed by Sharnee Walker – many of which were dismissed.[16]

	Case Number	Case Name	Court	Outcome
1	A 2502150	Sharnee J. Walker v. J.P. Morgan Chase Bank	Common Pleas	Dismissed and affirmed by the First District Court of Appeals
2	A 2504575	Sharnee J. Walker v. Navy Federal Credit Union	Common Pleas	Dismissed
3	A 2601025	Sharnee Walker v. Sharefax Credit Union	Common Pleas	Pending
4	A 2602203	Sharnee Walker v. Thomas Wietholter	Common Pleas	Dismissed and pending appeal to the First District Court of Appeals.
5	A 2505229	Sharnee Walker v. Fidelity Investments Institutional Operations Company, LLC	Common Pleas	Dismissed and affirmed by the First District Court of Appeals.

[16] A Court can take judicial notice of filings in cases before it and may take judicial notice of opinions and public records accessible on the internet. *Huber Heights Veterans Club, Inc.v. Grande Voiture D'Ohio La Societe Des 40 Hommes Et 8 Chevaux*, 2021-Ohio-2695, ¶ 33 (2nd Dist.). Here, the Court takes judicial notice of the public records of Ms. Walker's Court filings in Hamilton County Common Pleas Court, Municipal Court, and the First District Court of Appeals.

A TRUE COPY ATTEST
CLERK OF THE HAMILTON COUNTY
COURT, HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO
DEPUTY

6	25CV3894	Sharnee Walker v. Fidelity Investments	Municipal Court	Dismissed and pending appeal to the First District Court of Appeals.

Here, the Court finds that Sharnee Walker is a vexatious litigator as defined within R.C. § 2323.52. Defendants have provided clear and convincing evidence of Ms. Walker's vexatious conduct in their filings. For instance, multiple actions and motions have been filed by plaintiff that are not supported by fact or existing Ohio law. Nevertheless, the filings still require a response from Defendants. The Court also notes that most of the above-mentioned matters ended in the Court granting a Motion to Dismiss. The Court finds the vexatious conduct has been habitual, persistent, and without reasonable grounds. Ms. Walker has filed numerous filings in her cases. In this instant matter, a majority of the filings were before the first court setting and in the very early stages of the case. Based on the nature of the claims and number of filings, this Court finds Defendants have satisfied both prongs to declare Ms. Walker a vexatious litigator under R.C. § 2323.52.

Accordingly, it is the Order of this Court that Sharnee Walker, as outlined by R.C. § 2323.52(D), shall be prohibited from doing the following without first obtaining the leave of the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas to proceed:

(a) Instituting legal proceedings in the court of claims or in a court of common pleas, municipal court, or county court;

(b) Continuing any legal proceedings that the vexatious litigator had instituted in any of the courts specified in the above paragraph (a) prior to the entry of this order;

(c) Making any application, other than an application for leave to proceed under R.C. 2323.52(F)(1), in any legal proceedings instituted by the vexatious litigator or another person in any of the courts specified in paragraph (a).

Thus, Defendants' Cross-Motion for Summary judgment to declare Sharnee Walker a vexatious litigator is hereby **GRANTED**. The December 3, 2026 (Case Management Conference),

A TRUE COPY ATTEST
CLERK OF THE HAMILTON COUNTY
COURT, HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO
DEPUTY

October 7, 2027 (pretrial conference), and October 25, 2027 (jury trial) dates are hereby **VACATED.**

The Clerk of Courts shall send a certified copy of this Order to the Supreme Court of Ohio for publication deemed appropriate for enforcement of this Order.

This is a final appealable order as there is no just cause for delay.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 10/19/2026

Wende C. Cross
JUDGE WENDE C. CROSS

A TRUE COPY ATTEST
CLERK OF THE HAMILTON COUNTY
COURT, HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO
DEPUTY