

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

December 8, 2025

[Cite as *12/08/2025 Case Announcements*, 2025-Ohio-5452.]

SLIP OPINIONS REPLACED BY *OHIO OFFICIAL REPORTS* VERSIONS AS OF DECEMBER 8, 2025

The official versions of the opinions listed below, which were previously released as slip opinions, are being published in the December 8, 2025 *Ohio Official Reports* advance sheet. The *Official Reports* volume and initial page numbers are provided after the citation for reference.

2023-1636. State ex rel. Ware v. Sheldon, [2025-Ohio-1768](#). (180 Ohio St.3d 1)

2024-0108. State v. Staffrey, [2025-Ohio-2889](#). (180 Ohio St.3d 18)

2024-1075. State ex rel. LeadingAge Ohio v. Ohio Dept. of Medicaid, [2025-Ohio-3066](#). (180 Ohio St.3d 41)

2024-1155. State ex rel. Urban v. Wano Expiditing, Inc., [2025-Ohio-3009](#). (180 Ohio St.3d 31)

2024-1162. State ex rel. Dodson v. Smith, [2025-Ohio-1878](#). (180 Ohio St.3d 6)

2024-1425. State ex rel. Springfield City School Dist. Bd. of Edn. v. Hamilton, [2025-Ohio-4427](#). (180 Ohio St.3d 62)

2024-1728. Columbus Bar Assn. v. Bryant, [2025-Ohio-1879](#). (180 Ohio St.3d 14)

2024-1771. State ex rel. Harris v. Trelka, 2025-Ohio-4453. (180 Ohio St.3d 71)

2025-1061. State ex rel. Nelsonville v. Athens Cty. Bd. of Elections, 2025-Ohio-4363. (180 Ohio St.3d 52)

MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

2025-0753. Sheetz, Inc. v. Centerville.

Certified Question of State Law, United States District Court, Southern District of Ohio, Western Division, No. 3:24-cv-59. On issuance of a corrected entry on review pursuant to Rule 9.05(B), the court will answer the following question: “Whether a party must bring affirmative claims for damages and declaratory relief within an R.C. [Ch.] 2506 administrative appeal to avoid res judicata.” Petitioners’ “motion to strike [respondent] Mark R. Chilson’s merit brief” denied.

DeWine, J., dissents in part and would decline to answer the question and would deny the motion as moot.

Brunner, J., dissents in part and would grant the motion in part and would strike respondent Mark Chilson’s name from the brief.