

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

September 16, 2025

[Cite as *09/16/2025 Case Announcements #2*, 2025-Ohio-3301.]

APPEALS NOT ACCEPTED FOR REVIEW

2025-0902. State v. Jordan.

Montgomery App. No. 30477.

Fischer, J., concurs, with an opinion.

FISCHER, J., concurring.

{¶ 1} I agree that this appeal does not present a suitable proposition of law for our review. However, in reviewing appellant James Jordan’s memorandum in support of jurisdiction, part of the reason for his delay in seeking to appeal the trial court’s resentencing judgment seems to be his desire to have taken a more active role in the resentencing proceedings. Jordan contends that he was effectively precluded from taking an active role in the resentencing proceedings after the trial court appointed him counsel. He argues that this, combined with communication issues with counsel, contributed to the delay.

{¶ 2} I previously explained that in a proper case, this court should reconsider its decisions regarding a criminal defendant’s right to standby counsel or hybrid representation under the Ohio Constitution. *See State v. Hackett*, 2020-Ohio-6699, ¶ 22-46 (Fischer, J. concurring). Although the issue is not presented in this appeal, greater clarification from this court about a defendant’s potential right to standby counsel or hybrid representation may have been helpful in the proceedings below.
