

# The Supreme Court of Ohio

---

## CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

January 27, 2012

[Cite as *01/27/2012 Case Announcements, 2012-Ohio-284.*]

---

## MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

### **2011-1963. State ex rel. Turner v. Brunzman.**

Warren App. No. CA2011-07-080. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Warren County. The records of this court indicate that appellant has not filed a merit brief, due January 23, 2012, in compliance with the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court of Ohio 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.

### **2011-2071. State v. Green.**

Stark App. No. 2011 CA 00127, 2011-Ohio-5611. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and claimed appeal of right.

Upon review of appellant's memorandum in support of jurisdiction, it is ordered by the court, sua sponte, that pages 16 through 21 are stricken for exceeding the page limit imposed by S.Ct.Prac.R. 3.1(C).

## MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS

### **In re Buoscio.**

On December 21, 2011, this court found Samuel L. Buoscio to be a vexatious litigator under S.Ct.Prac.R. 14.5(B). This court further ordered that Buoscio was prohibited from continuing or instituting legal proceedings in the court without obtaining leave.

On January 12, 2012, Buoscio filed two applications for leave to file petitions for writs of mandamus. Upon consideration thereof, it is ordered by the court that the applications for leave are denied.

Pfeifer, Acting C.J.  
O'Connor, C.J., not participating.

**In re Howard.**

On September 24, 2004, this court found Gregory T. Howard to be a vexatious litigator under S.Ct.Prac.R. 14.5(B). This court further ordered that Howard was prohibited from continuing or instituting legal proceedings in the court without obtaining leave.

On January 11, 2012, Howard presented a “Motion for Leave to File a Rule 11.2 Motion for Reconsideration.” Upon consideration thereof, it is ordered by the court that the motion for leave is denied.

**In re Report of the Commission  
On Continuing Legal Education.**

**Case No. CLE-2007-74008**

**Darran David Winslow  
(#0074008),  
Respondent.**

**ORDER OF REINSTATEMENT**

This matter originated in this court on the filing of a report by the Commission on Continuing Legal Education (“commission”) pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(A)(1)(b) and (A)(2)(d). The commission recommended the imposition of sanctions against certain attorneys, including the above-named respondent, for failure to comply with the provisions of Gov.Bar R. X, Attorney Continuing Legal Education, for the 2005-2006 reporting period.

On June 16, 2008, this court adopted the recommendation of the commission, imposed a sanction fee upon respondent and suspended respondent from the practice of law pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(B)(3) and (5)(A)(4). The court further ordered that respondent shall not be reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio until respondent complies with the requirements for reinstatement set forth in Gov.Bar R. X(7); respondent complies with the Supreme Court Rules for the Government of the Bar of Ohio; respondent complies with this and all other orders of the court; and this court orders respondent reinstated.

On January 17, 2012, the commission filed a recommendation pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(7)(B)(2), finding that respondent has paid all fees assessed for noncompliance, has made up all deficiencies and is now in full compliance with all requirements of Gov.Bar R. X, and recommending that respondent be reinstated to the practice of law in Ohio. The commission certified that respondent had completed the credit hours of continuing legal education required during the

suspension by this court's order of suspension. Respondent has satisfied all the requirements of this court's order of suspension.

Upon consideration thereof, it is ordered by the court that the recommendation of the commission is adopted and respondent, Darran David Winslow, is hereby reinstated to the practice of law.