

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

March 9, 2011

[Cite as *03/09/2011 Case Announcements, 2011-Ohio-1030.*]

MERIT DECISIONS WITH OPINIONS

2009-2298. In re Application of Columbus S. Power Co., Slip Opinion No. 2011-Ohio-958.

Public Utilities Commission, No. 08-917-EL-SSO. Order affirmed.

O'Connor, C.J., and Pfeifer, Lundberg Stratton, O'Donnell, Lanzinger, Cupp, and McGee Brown, JJ., concur.

2010-1888. Disciplinary Counsel v. Smith, Slip Opinion No. 2011-Ohio-957.

On Certified Report by the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline, No. 10-029. Joseph Harold Smith, Attorney Registration No. 0041412, is indefinitely suspended from the practice of law in Ohio, with credit for time served under the interim suspension imposed on April 24, 2009.

O'Connor, C.J., and Pfeifer, Lundberg Stratton, O'Donnell, Lanzinger, Cupp, and McGee Brown, JJ., concur.

2010-2020. State ex rel. Dehler v. Mohr, Slip Opinion No. 2011-Ohio-959.

Franklin App. No. 09AP-703, 2010-Ohio-5436. Judgment of the court of appeals affirmed.

O'Connor, C.J., and Lundberg Stratton, O'Donnell, Lanzinger, Cupp, and McGee Brown, JJ., concur.

Pfeifer, J., concurs in judgment only.

MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

In re Bozsik.

On June 4, 2008, this court found Steven A. Bozsik to be a vexatious litigator under S.Ct.Prac.R. 14.5(B). This court further ordered that Bozsik was prohibited from continuing or instituting legal proceedings in this court without first obtaining leave. On March 2, 2011, Bozsik submitted a motion for leave to commence an original action in prohibition. Upon review of the proffered filing, the court finds it to be without merit.

Accordingly, it is ordered by the court that Steven A. Bozsik's March 2, 2011 motion for leave is denied.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

2010-2182. State v. Grant.

Cuyahoga App. No. 94101, 2010-Ohio-5241. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and claimed appeal of right. It appears from the records of the court that the appellant has not filed a memorandum in support of jurisdiction, due March 4, 2011, in compliance with the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court and therefore has failed to prosecute this cause with the requisite diligence.

Upon consideration thereof, it is ordered by the court that this cause is dismissed.