

# The Supreme Court of Ohio

---

## CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

September 17, 2013

[Cite as *09/17/2013 Case Announcements*, 2013-Ohio-4001.]

---

## MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

### **2013-0431. Williams v. Matthews.**

Cuyahoga App. No. 98136, 2013-Ohio-483. This cause is pending before the court as a jurisdictional appeal.

Upon consideration of appellant's motion to file under seal due to new circumstance, it is ordered by the court that the motion is denied.

### **2013-0579. In re D.M.**

Hamilton App. No. C-120794, 2013-Ohio-668. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Hamilton County.

Upon consideration of the motion for admission pro hac vice of Nadia Natasha Seeratan, it is ordered by the court that the motion is granted. Pursuant to Gov.Bar R. XII(4), counsel shall file a notice of permission to appear pro hac vice with the Supreme Court's Office of Attorney Services within 30 days of the date of this entry.

### **2013-0729. State v. Wright.**

Mahoning App. No. 11-MA-14, 2013-Ohio-1424. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal. On May 9, 2013, appellant filed a notice that a motion to certify a conflict was pending in the court of appeals, and pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. 4.4(A)(4), this court stayed consideration of the jurisdictional memoranda filed in this appeal.

Whereas appellant has neither notified this court that the court of appeals determined that a conflict does not exist as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. 4.4(B), nor filed a copy of the court of appeals' order certifying the existence of a conflict as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. 4.4(C), it is ordered by the court, sua sponte, that

appellant inform the court of the status of the motion to certify a conflict, in writing, within 14 days of the date of this entry, or this court shall proceed to consider the jurisdictional memoranda in this appeal pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. 3.6.

**2013-1234. State ex rel. Elmwood Place v. Ruehlman.**

In Mandamus and Prohibition. This cause originated in this court on the filing of a complaint for a writ of mandamus and prohibition.

Upon consideration of relator's motion to strike the motion to dismiss, it is ordered by the court that the motion is denied as moot.

### **MEDIATION MATTERS**

The following cases have been referred to mediation pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. 19.01(A):

**2013-1426. Cincinnati School Dist. Bd. of Edn. v. Testa.**

Board of Tax Appeals, No. 2012-Q-1047.

**2013-1432. Diley Ridge Med. Ctr. v. Fairfield Cty. Bd. of Revision.**

Board of Tax Appeals, No. 2012-L-429.

**2013-1455. State ex rel. Strayer v. Franklin Cty. Commrs.**

Franklin App. No. 12AP-855, 2013-Ohio-3601.

**2013-1457. Carter Lumber Dev. Co. v. Medina Cty. Bd. of Revision.**

Board of Tax Appeals, No. 2011-W-4160.