

2022-1533

---

IN THE SUPREME COURT  
OF OHIO

---

ORIGINAL ACTION IN MANDAMUS

---

STATE ex rel. CHARLES TINGLER,  
*Relator,*

v.

LUCAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE  
*Respondent.*

---

RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS

---

Charles Tingler  
C/o 208 W. Main St.  
God's Caring Heart Homeless Shelter  
Bellevue, Ohio 44881  
Pro se Relator

Julia R. Bates  
Lucas County Prosecuting Attorney  
John A. Borell (0016461)  
Kevin A. Pituch (0040167)  
Assistant Prosecuting Attorneys  
700 Adams Street, Suite 250  
Toledo, OH 43624  
Telephone: (419) 213-2001  
Telecopy: (419) 213-2011  
E-mail: [jaborell@co.lucas.oh.us](mailto:jaborell@co.lucas.oh.us)  
E-mail: [kpituch@co.lucas.oh.us](mailto:kpituch@co.lucas.oh.us)  
Counsel for Respondent  
Lucas County Sheriff's Office

Respondent Lucas County Sheriff's Office hereby moves the Court, pursuant to *Sup. Ct. Prac. R. 12.01(A)(2)(b)* and *12.04(A)(1)* and *Rule 12(B)(6)*, *Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure*, to dismiss Relator Charles Tingler's *Complaint for Writ of Mandamus*. The grounds for the LCSO's motion are that none of the claims set forth in Tingler's *Mandamus Complaint* are cognizable in mandamus. As a result, the LCSO is entitled to dismissal since Tingler can prove no set of facts that would entitle him to mandamus relief and the LCSO asks the Court to dismiss his *Mandamus Complaint* with prejudice. The LCSO's motion is supported by the factual allegations of Tingler's *Mandamus Complaint* along with the exhibits attached thereto, including the *Decision and Judgment Entry* issued in *Danny Brown v. State of Ohio*, 6<sup>th</sup> Dist. Lucas No. L-05-1050, 2006-Ohio-1393, certain matters of public record, and its memorandum of law below.

Respectfully submitted,

JULIA R. BATES  
LUCAS COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY

By: /s/ Kevin A. Pituch  
John A. Borell (0016461)  
Kevin A. Pituch (0040167)  
Assistant Prosecuting Attorneys  
Counsel for Respondent Lucas County Sheriff's Office

#### MEMORANDUM OF LAW

##### I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

Relator Charles Tingler needs a different hobby—one other than filing frivolous mandamus lawsuits. Just for December of 2022, he has filed 50 such lawsuits with this Court. See, Exhibit No.1 attached hereto (Ohio Supreme Court list of Tingler's Mandamus Complaints). With this one, Tingler has frivolously sued Respondents Lucas County Sheriff's Office (LCSO) and the City of Toledo Police Department regarding an alleged failure to investigate an alleged perjury offense

(under *Ohio Revised Code* §2921.11) supposedly committed 16 years ago by the Lucas County Prosecutor, Julia R. Bates. See, *Mandamus Complaint*, Ohio Supreme Court Case No. 2022-1533 (Dec. 14, 2022).

In 2002, Danny Brown filed a lawsuit seeking compensation from the State of Ohio on the ground that he was a “wrongfully imprisoned” individual pursuant to *Ohio Revised Code* §2743.48. See, *Mandamus Complaint*, ¶¶1-3 with attached Exhibits. The Lucas County Common Pleas Court granted summary judgment in the State’s favor dismissing Danny Brown’s §2743.48 claim due, in part, to an affidavit filed in the case by then Assistant Lucas County Prosecutor Dean Mandros (who is now Judge Dean Mandros of the Lucas County Common Pleas Court). *Id.* The Sixth District Court of Appeals affirmed that judgment in 2006. *Id.*; see also, *Danny Brown v. State of Ohio*, 6<sup>th</sup> Dist. Lucas No. L-05-1050, 2006-Ohio-1393 ¶12 attached as an Exhibit to the *Mandamus Complaint*. In 2015, Danny Brown again sued the State of Ohio seeking compensation under §2743.48 and that claim was dismissed via summary judgment as well. See, *Danny Brown v. State of Ohio*, 6<sup>th</sup> Dist. Lucas No. L-18-1044, 2019-Ohio-1194.

Fast forward to 2022-- Tingler now seeks a writ of mandamus from this Court ordering the LCSO and the City of Toledo Police Department to: “to file a police report, conduct a criminal investigation, request the appointment of a special prosecutor from the Lucas County Common Pleas Court, and forward the results of the investigation to the special prosecutor.” *Mandamus Complaint, supra* regarding the aforementioned perjury offense. Tingler seeks all this even though he has an adequate remedy at law, under *Ohio Revised Code* §2935.09-10, for his claim, as a private citizen, to seek such a criminal investigation and prosecution, even though his own Exhibits show that there is no basis for such a criminal investigation of an alleged perjury offense given that Prosecutor Bates did not provide an affidavit in the Danny Brown case, and even though the

statute of limitations, under *Ohio Revised Code* 2901.13(A)(1)(a), has long expired for a perjury offense that allegedly occurred in 2005. As will be established in somewhat greater detail below, Tingler's *Mandamus Complaint* does not state viable claims against the LCSO under Ohio law and the Court should dismiss it with prejudice.

## II. LAW AND ARGUMENT

### A. Introduction

#### 1. Standard for granting a motion to dismiss pursuant to *Civil Rule 12(B)(6)*.

A motion to dismiss, pursuant to *Rule 12(B)(6)* of the *Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure*, is a procedural device for testing the sufficiency of a complaint or a petition filed in an original action with an appellate court. *State ex rel. Hanson v. Guernsey County Board of Commissioners*, 65 Ohio St.3d 545, 548, 605 N.E.2d 378 (1992). A motion to dismiss should be granted when, after examining the complaint, it appears beyond doubt that the non-moving party can prove no set of facts which would entitle him to the requested relief. *York v. Ohio State Highway Patrol*, 60 Ohio St.3d 143, 144, 573 N.E.2d 1063 (1991). The Court must accept as true all of the factual allegations contained in the petition. *Mitchell v. Lawson Milk Company*, 49 Ohio St.3d 190, 192, 532 N.E.2d 753 (1988). However, conclusions of law are not considered admitted and are insufficient to withstand a motion to dismiss. *Mitchell*, 40 Ohio St.3d at 193, 532 N.E.2d at 756; *State ex rel. Hickman v. Capots*, 45 Ohio St.3d 324, 324, 544 N.E.2d 639 (1989).

In addition, when assessing a *Civil Rule 12* dismissal motion, the Court may also consider as evidence the documents attached to the pleadings and matters of public record. *State ex rel. Everhart v. McIntosh*, 115 Ohio St.3d 195, 874 N.E.2d 516 (2007)(a court may take judicial notice of appropriate matters, including judicial opinions and public records accessible from the internet); *Bath Manor Special Care Centre v. Obasogie*, 9th Dist. No. 29507, 2021-Ohio-2227, 175 N.E.3d

658 ¶6 (in deciding a *Civil Rule* 12(C) motion, a trial court reviews only the material allegations in the pleadings and any attachments thereto); *Draughon v. Jenkins*, 4th Dist. Ross No. 16CA3528, 2016-Ohio-5364 ¶26 ("both the trial court and this court can take judicial notice of [appellant's] prior appellate cases, which are readily accessible on the internet"). Thus, in considering the LCSO's motion to dismiss, in addition to the factual allegations of Tingler's *Mandamus Complaint*, the Court may consider the documents attached thereto and documents from the public record as well.

## 2. Writ of Mandamus

The purpose of a writ of mandamus is to compel a public officer to perform the duties imposed on that officer by law. *State ex rel. Brown v. Bd. of Cty. Comm'rs*, 21 Ohio St.2d 62, 65, 255 N.E.2d 244 (1970); *State ex rel. Scott v. Materson*, 173 Ohio St. 402, 404, 183 N.E.2d 376, 379 (1962). Thus, in order to grant a writ of mandamus, the Court must find, by clear and convincing evidence: (1) a clear legal right to the requested relief; (2) a clear legal duty on the part of respondents to provide it; and (3) the lack of an adequate remedy in the ordinary course of the law. *State ex rel. Evans v. Tieman*, 157 Ohio St.3d 99, 101, 131 N.E.3d 930 (2019); *State ex rel. Walker v. State*, 142 Ohio St.3d 365, 368, 30 N.E.3d 947 (2015). Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy "to be issued with great caution and discretion and only when the way is clear." *State ex rel. Manley v. Walsh*, 142 Ohio St.3d 384, 387, 31 N.E.3d 608 (2014); *State ex rel. Taylor v. Glasser*, 50 Ohio St.2d 165, 166, 364 N.E.2d 1 (1977). Lastly, mandamus cannot be used to supplant or supersede any other form of remedy so that mandamus cannot be had where the claimant possesses an adequate legal or equitable remedy for his claims. *Manley, supra*; *Walker, supra*; see also, *State ex rel. Marshall v. Glavas*, 98 Ohio St.3d 297, 300, 784 N.E.2d 97 (2003)(mandamus is not a substitute for an unsuccessful appeal).

B. Tingler's mandamus claims are not cognizable under Ohio law.

First, Tingler has an adequate remedy at law—via *Ohio Revised Code* §2935.09-10-- regarding his desire, as a private citizen, to have criminal charges brought against the Lucas County Prosecutor. Sections 2935.09 and 2935.10 permit a private citizen to cause the arrest or prosecution of a person charged with committing an offense if the citizen complies with the requirements of these sections. *State v. Mbodji*, 129 Ohio St.3d 325, 326, 951 N.E.2d 1025 (2011); see also, *State ex rel. Whittaker v. Lucas Cty. Prosecutor's Office*, 164 Ohio St.3d 151, 152, 172 N.E.3d 143 (Lucas Co. 2021)(§2935.09 allows a private citizen to file an affidavit alleging a criminal offense); *State ex rel. Kirin v. Krichbaum*, 7th Dist. Mahoning No. 16 MA 0011, 2016-Ohio-887 ¶7(“concerning Relator's desire to pursue criminal charges, he possesses an adequate remedy at law through §2935.09(D) which provides a formal mechanism by which a private citizen can seek to have criminal charges filed). Because he has an adequate remedy at law for his desire to see a criminal investigation commenced against the Lucas County Prosecutor, Tingler's *Mandamus Complaint* should be dismissed. See, *Evans, supra*; *Manley, supra*; *Walker, supra*.

Second, Tingler has failed to comply with *S. Ct. Prac. R.* 12.02(B)(1) and (2) as well as *Ohio Revised Code* §2731.04 when he failed to include an affidavit with his *Mandamus Complaint*. While he insists that an affidavit is unnecessary, Ohio law is to the contrary. See, *State ex rel. Maras v. LaRose*, --Ohio St.3d--, 2022-Ohio-3295, --N.E.3d-- ¶16 (a complaint in an original action before this Court must be supported by an affidavit specifying the facts on which the claim for relief is based); *State ex rel. Hackworth v. Hughes*, 97 Ohio St.3d 110, 113, 776 N.E.2d 1050 (2002)(“we have routinely dismissed original actions, other than habeas corpus, that were not supported by an affidavit expressly stating that the facts in the complaint were based on the affiant's personal knowledge”).

Third, Tingler has not even complied with the requirements of §2935.09-10 in that he has failed to provide the affidavit required for anyone seeking a criminal prosecution under §2935.09. *Mbodji*, 129 Ohio St.3d at 329, 951 N.E.2d 1025(“We emphasize, however, that R.C. 2935.09 is intended to govern the method by which a private citizen may cause the arrest or prosecution of a person”); *City of Washington Court House/State v. Myers*, 12th Dist. Fayette No. CA2018-12-027, 2019-Ohio-4914 ¶¶17-18(private citizen's filing of complaint in municipal court against appellant failed to comply with the requirements of §2935.09(D) where he had not filed an affidavit with a reviewing official as required by this section); *Davis v. Davis*, 11th Dist. Geauga No. 2017-G-0129, 2018-Ohio-1889 ¶51(“Charles did not file an affidavit, but instead filed a motion to refer Sandra for prosecution and because Charles did not satisfy the statutory prerequisite in §2935.09(D), the trial court had no obligation to refer the matter for prosecution or to assess whether the allegations had merit”).

Fourth, Tingler’s *Mandamus Complaint* states no factual or legal basis to seek a criminal investigation of Lucas County Prosecutor, Julia R. Bates. Using his own Exhibits, the affidavit from the Danny Brown case that he claims is sufficient to perjury offense was not written by her. Instead, Tingler’s own Exhibit, in paragraph 12 of the 2006 Danny Brown *Decision and Judgment Entry*, reveals that the affidavit was authored by then Assistant Lucas County Prosecutor and now Judge Dean Mandros. Further, under *Ohio Revised Code* §2901.13(A)(1)(a), the statute of limitations for a perjury offense, which is a felony of the third degree under *Ohio Revised Code* §2921.11(F)) is six years. The alleged perjury regarding the affidavit in the Danny Brown case occurred in 2005; thus, such an offense would be barred by the statute of limitations so that a claim seeking a criminal investigation of that affidavit is not a claim asserted in good faith. See, *State ex rel. Dominguez v. State*, 129 Ohio St.3d 203, 951 N.E.2d 77 (2011)(for Dominguez's affidavit,

“the clerk also had no duty to file it because it established that the claimed perjury charges occurred in 1995, which was outside the six-year statute of limitations in §2901.13(A)(1)(a) to commence prosecution of the claimed felony offenses”); *State v. Gravelle*, 6th Dist. Huron Nos. H-06-042, H-06-043, H-06-044, and H-06-045, 2008-Ohio-4031 ¶25 (indictment dismissed where it alleged that appellees committed perjury was returned in February 2006, approximately three years after the statute of limitations lapsed).

Finally, the Court may wish to measure Tingler’s *Mandamus Complaint* and the other 49 similar actions filed with this Court in connection with *S. Ct. Prac. R. 4.03(A)*. *Rule 4.03(A)* states:

“If the Supreme Court, sua sponte or on motion by a party, determines that an appeal or other action is frivolous or is prosecuted for delay, harassment, or any other improper purpose, it may impose appropriate sanctions on the person who signed the appeal or action, a represented party, or both. The sanctions may include an award to the opposing party of reasonable expenses, reasonable attorney fees, costs or double costs, or any other sanction the Supreme Court considers just. An appeal or other action shall be considered frivolous if it is not reasonably well-grounded in fact or warranted by existing law or a good-faith argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law.”

In this case, Tingler’s *Mandamus Complaint* surely constitutes frivolous conduct. Advancing the time-barred perjury claim described above (against someone not involved with the publication of the affidavit in question) is not reasonably well-grounded in fact or warranted by existing law nor has Tingler advanced good-faith arguments for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law.

### III. CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, the LCSO’s motion to dismiss is well-taken and should be granted. Therefore, the LCSO moves the Court to dismiss Tingler’s *Mandamus Complaint* with prejudice on the ground that it does not state a claim or cause of action in mandamus upon which relief can be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

JULIA R. BATES  
LUCAS COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY

By: /s/ Kevin A. Pituch  
John A. Borell  
Kevin A. Pituch  
Assistant Prosecuting Attorneys  
Counsel for Respondent Lucas County Sheriff's Office

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

A copy of the foregoing Motion to Dismiss was sent by Ordinary U.S. mail and electronic mail on the 27<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2022 to:

Charles Tingler  
C/o 208 W. Main St.  
God's Caring Heart Homeless Shelter  
Bellevue, Ohio 44881  
charleslawrencetinglerohio@gmail.com

Jeffrey B. Charles  
City of Toledo Law Dept.  
One Government Center Suite 2250  
Toledo, Ohio 43604  
jeffrey.charles@toledo.oh.gov

Pro se Relator

Counsel for Respondent City of Toledo  
Police Department

By: /s/ Kevin A. Pituch  
John A. Borell  
Kevin A. Pituch  
Assistant Prosecuting Attorneys  
Counsel for Respondent Lucas County Sheriff's Office

## EXHIBIT 1

*This database includes cases filed in the Supreme Court of Ohio on or after January 1, 1985, and practice of law cases filed in the Supreme Court of Ohio on or after January 1, 1989.*

# Search for Supreme Court of Ohio Cases

 [Back to Search Options](#)

Results: (51)

Case Number	2022-1616
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Upper Sandusky Police Department, Upper Sandusky Mayor's Office
Date Filed	12-23-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1615
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Ross County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-23-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1612
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Franklin County Prosecutor's Office, Ohio State Highway Patrol
Date Filed	12-22-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1611
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Portage County Sheriff's Office, Portage County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-22-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	

Case Number	2022-1610
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Ravenna Police Department
Date Filed	12-22-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1609
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler, v. Bureau of Criminal Investigation
Date Filed	12-22-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1608
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Noble County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-21-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1607
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Ottawa County Sheriff's Office, Ottawa County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-21-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1606
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel
Date Filed	12-21-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1605
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Port Clinton Police Department
Date Filed	12-21-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	

Case Number	2022-1596
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Ottawa County Probation Department, Ottawa County Treasurer's Office
Date Filed	12-20-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1592
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Noble County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-20-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1591
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Richland County Sheriff's Office
Date Filed	12-20-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1590
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Elyria Police Department, Lorain County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-20-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1589
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Medina Police Department, Medina County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-20-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus

Prior Jurisdiction

Case Number	2022-1587
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Williams County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1586
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Huron County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1584
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Huron County Sheriff's Office
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1576
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Prosecutor Gwen Howe-Gebers
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	(None)
Case Number	2022-1575
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Bowling Green Police Department, Wood County Sheriff's Office
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	

Case Number	2022-1574
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Defiance County Sheriff's Office, Defiance County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	(None)
Case Number	2022-1573
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Sheriff Michael Bodenbender
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	
Case Number	2022-1572
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Sheriff Tracy Evans
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	
Case Number	2022-1571
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Mansfield Police Department-Crime Lab
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	(None)
Case Number	2022-1570
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Butler County Sheriff's Office
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	
Case Number	2022-1569
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Lucas County Coroner's Office
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus

Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1568
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Prosecutor Robert Junk
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	(None)
Case Number	2022-1567
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Prosecutor Michael Gmoser
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1566
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Sandusky County Sheriff's Office
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1565
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Kettering Police Department, Montgomery County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	(None)
Case Number	2022-1564
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Ottawa County Sheriff's Office, Ottawa County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	

Case Number	2022-1563
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Cincinnati Police Department, Hamilton County Sheriff's Office
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1562
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Ohio Attorney General's Office
Date Filed	12-19-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	(None)
Case Number	2022-1561
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Medina County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-16-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1559
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Cuyahoga County Prosecutor's Office
Date Filed	12-16-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1558
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Bucyrus Police Department and Crawford County Sheriff's Office
Date Filed	12-16-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	

Case Number	2022-1557
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Port Clinton Police Department and Ottawa County Sheriff's Office
Date Filed	12-16-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	(None)
Case Number	2022-1554
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Upper Sandusky Police Department and Wyandot County Sheriff's Office
Date Filed	12-15-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	
Case Number	2022-1552
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Prosecutor Forrest Thompson
Date Filed	12-15-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	
Case Number	2022-1546
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Prosecutor Lindsey Angler
Date Filed	12-14-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	
Case Number	2022-1544
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction
Date Filed	12-14-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	
Case Number	2022-1541
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Prosecutor James VanEerten
Date Filed	12-14-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus

Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1540
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Assistant Prosecutor Gerhard Gross
Date Filed	12-14-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1539
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Prosecutor Gwen Howe-Gebers
Date Filed	12-14-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1534
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Franklin County Prosecutor's Office, Ohio State Highway Patrol
Date Filed	12-14-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1533
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Toledo Police Department and Lucas County Sheriff's Office
Date Filed	12-14-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1532
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler vs. Judge Beverly McGookey
Date Filed	12-13-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction Case Number	2022-1528
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Ohio State Highway Patrol
Date Filed	12-13-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	

Case Number	2022-1526
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Perkins Township Police Department
Date Filed	12-13-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	(None)
Case Number	2022-1525
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Sandusky Police Department, Erie County Sheriff's Office
Date Filed	12-13-2022
Status	Open
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	
Case Number	2022-1244
Caption	State ex rel. Charles Tingler v. Prosecutor Robert Junk
Date Filed	10-06-2022
Status	Disposed
Case Type	Original Action in Mandamus
Prior Jurisdiction	(None)

Results per page:

100

