

[Cite as *State ex rel. Cotton v. Russo*, 125 Ohio St.3d 449, 2010-Ohio-2111.]

THE STATE EX REL. COTTON, APPELLANT, v. RUSSO, JUDGE, APPELLEE.

[Cite as *State ex rel. Cotton v. Russo*, 125 Ohio St.3d 449, 2010-Ohio-2111.]

*Appeal from dismissal of a petition for a writ of mandamus or procedendo —
Adequate remedy at law — No error in sentencing entry — Judgment
affirmed.*

(No. 2010-0108 — Submitted May 12, 2010 — Decided May 19, 2010.)

APPEAL from the Court of Appeals for Cuyahoga County,

No. 94116, 2010-Ohio-16.

Per Curiam.

{¶ 1} We affirm the judgment of the court of appeals denying the claim of appellant, Milton Cotton, for a writ of mandamus or procedendo to compel appellee, Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas Judge John Russo, to issue a new sentencing entry in Cotton’s criminal case to comply with Crim.R. 32(C). Cotton’s sentencing entry fully complied with Crim.R. 32(C), as specified in *State v. Baker*, 119 Ohio St.3d 197, 2008-Ohio-3330, 893 N.E.2d 163, syllabus. See also *State ex rel. Agosto v. Cuyahoga Cty. Court of Common Pleas*, 119 Ohio St.3d 366, 2008-Ohio-4607, 894 N.E.2d 314, ¶ 10. And insofar as Cotton attempted to raise claims of sentencing error, he had an adequate remedy by appeal to raise them. *Smith v. Smith*, 123 Ohio St.3d 145, 2009-Ohio-4691, 914 N.E.2d 1036, ¶ 1. Finally, neither res judicata nor the law of the case precluded the court of appeals’ denial of the writs.

Judgment affirmed.

BROWN, C.J., and PFEIFER, LUNDBERG STRATTON, O’CONNOR,
O’DONNELL, LANZINGER, and CUPP, JJ., concur.

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

Milton Cotton, pro se.

William D. Mason, Cuyahoga County Prosecuting Attorney, and James E.
Moss, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for appellee.
