

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

August 20, 2010

[Cite as *08/20/2010 Case Announcements*, 2010-Ohio-3887.]

MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

2009-1735. Engel v. Univ. of Toledo College of Medicine.

Franklin App. No. 09AP-53, 184 Ohio App.3d 669, 2009-Ohio-3957. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Franklin County. Upon consideration of appellee's motion for continuance of oral argument scheduled for September 29, 2010,

It is ordered by the court that the motion is granted, and oral argument will be rescheduled at a later date.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

2010-1114. Rettig v. Rettig.

Wood App. No. WD-09-040, 2010-Ohio-2122. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal. Upon consideration of appellant's application for dismissal,

It is ordered by the court that the application for dismissal is granted. Accordingly, this cause is dismissed.

2010-1195. State v. Layne.

Clermont App. No. CA2009-07-043, 2010-Ohio-2308. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and claimed appeal of right. Upon consideration of appellant's application for dismissal,

It is ordered by the court that the application for dismissal is granted. Accordingly, this cause is dismissed.

DISCIPLINARY CASES

2007-0492. Disciplinary Counsel v. Squire.

This cause came on for further consideration upon the filing by respondent, Carole Hutchins Squire, of a request for extension of time to pay costs. Upon consideration thereof,

It is ordered by this court that respondent's request for extension of time is hereby denied. It is further ordered that this matter is referred to Office of the Attorney General for commencement of collections proceedings.

Pfeifer and O'Donnell, JJ., dissent.

2010-0851. Disciplinary Counsel v. Pullins.

The Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline filed its final report in this court on May 12, 2010, recommending that pursuant to Gov.Bar R. V(6)(B)(2), the respondent, Scott Pullins, be indefinitely suspended from the practice of law. A show cause order was issued by the court and in response, respondent filed objections and the relator filed an answer. On July 14, 2010, respondent filed a request for judicial notice under Evid.R. 201. On July 19, 2010, respondent filed a motion to strike counts five, six, and seven and for sanctions for frivolous conduct and discovery violations against relator. On July 22, 2010, respondent filed a second request for judicial notice of the decision of the Knox County Court of Appeals in *Pullins v. Harmer*. On July 28, 2010, respondent filed a motion to strike relator's memo opposing the motion to strike counts five, six, and seven. On August 9, 2010, respondent filed a second motion for judicial notice under Evid.R. 201. Relator filed memoranda in opposition to all of respondent's motions and requests. Upon consideration thereof,

It is ordered by the court that respondent's request for judicial notice under Evid.R. 201; respondent's motion to strike counts five, six, and seven and for sanctions for frivolous conduct and discovery violations; respondent's second request for judicial notice of the decision of the Knox County Court of Appeals in *Pullins v. Harmer*; respondent's motion to strike relator's memo opposing the motion to strike counts five, six, and seven; and respondent's second motion for judicial notice under Evid.R. 201 are denied.

2010-1424. In re Resignation of Larson.

On affidavit of resignation from the practice of law of Robert Kendal Larson Jr., Attorney Registration No. 0042368, and on report filed under seal by Disciplinary Counsel. Resignation accepted with disciplinary action pending.

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS

In re Report of the Commission
on Continuing Legal Education.

Case No. CLE-2002-13516

Stephen Manion Connor
(#0013516),
Respondent.

O R D E R

This cause came on for further consideration upon the filing by respondent, Stephen Manion Connor, of a motion to vacate this court's January 27, 2003 order imposing a \$610 monetary sanction against him. A memo in opposition was filed by the Commission on Continuing Legal Education. Upon consideration thereof,

It is ordered by this court that respondent's motion is denied.