



Charles Tingler &lt;charleslawrencetinglerohio@gmail.com&gt;

---

**Medina County Sheriff's Office**

2 messages

**Charles Tingler** <charleslawrencetinglerohio@gmail.com>  
To: ekinney@medinaoh.org

Mon, Aug 29, 2022 at 2:44 PM

**Medina Police Department:**

I would like to file a complaint against Sheriff Terry Grice. The Sheriff's Office has been misusing funds from the Furtherance of Justice Fund. Specifically, the Sheriff's Office has been using the funds for personal expenses unrelated to law enforcement or furtherance of justice purposes, such as purchasing food, candy, cakes, and other miscellaneous items. This has the appearance of impropriety and is almost certainly embezzlement.

Charles Tingler  
208 W. Main Street  
Bellevue, Ohio 44811  
(567)-219-5658

---

 **F.O.J. (2017 - 2022).pdf**  
2578K**Charles Tingler** <charleslawrencetinglerohio@gmail.com>  
To: ekinney@medinaoh.org

Mon, Aug 29, 2022 at 3:22 PM

The Ohio Supreme Court has offered the following general guidelines to be applied in determining whether a particular expenditure constitutes a public purpose. *State ex rel. McClure v. Hagerman*, 155 Ohio St. 320, 98 N.E.2d 835 (1951). First, the test is whether the expenditure is required for the general good of all the inhabitants. "Generally, a public purpose has for its objective the promotion of the public health, safety, morals, general welfare, security, prosperity, and contentment of all the inhabitants. . . . 11 Id. at 325, 98 N.E.2d at 838. Second, if the primary objective is to further a public purpose, it is immaterial that, incidentally, private ends may be advanced. Third, the determination of what constitutes a public purpose is primarily a legislative function, and a legislative determination of a public purpose will not be disturbed except where such determination is palpable and manifestly arbitrary and incorrect. The legislative enactment, O.R.C. 325.071, does not authorize expenditures for the aforementioned purposes.

The Attorney General's Opinions are not binding precedent on courts. *Ohio v. U.S. Dep't of Educ.*, 377 F. Supp. 3d 823 (S.D. Ohio 2019); *State ex rel. Data Trace Information Servs., L.L.C. v. Cuyahoga Cty. Fiscal Officer*, 131 Ohio St. 3d 255, 268, 963 N.E.2d 1288 (2012). Likewise, Auditor of State Technical Bulletins, and advisory materials are also not legally binding.

[Quoted text hidden]

--