

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO
ELEVENTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
LAKE COUNTY**

LACIE SAMPSON,

Petitioner-Appellee,

- vs -

RAYMOND SAMPSON,

Respondent-Appellant.

CASE NO. 2026-L-0010

Civil Appeal from the
Court of Common Pleas,
Domestic Relations Division

Trial Court No. 2024 DV 000195

OPINION AND JUDGMENT ENTRY

Decided: August 17, 2026

Judgment: Affirmed

Lacie N. Sampson, pro se, 1299 West Jackson Street, Painesville, OH 44077 (Petitioner-Appellee).

Raymond E. Sampson, pro se, 300 East Walnut Avenue, Painesville, OH 44077 (Respondent-Appellant).

JOHN J. EKLUND, J.

{¶1} Appellant, Raymond Sampson, pro se, appeals the January 29, 2026 judgment of the Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Domestic Relations Division, denying the ten motions, affidavits, and objections he filed between November 17, 2025, and January 26, 2026. Appellant’s aim is to reverse the trial court’s September 4, 2024 Domestic Violence Civil Protection Order (CPO) in favor of Appellee, Lacie Sampson.

{¶2} We previously addressed Appellant’s repeated motions filed in the trial court to reconsider the CPO in *Sampson v. Sampson*, 2025-Ohio-4912 (11th Dist.) (“*Sampson I*”), where we held that Appellant had never directly appealed the trial court’s order

granting the CPO. We held that his appeal from post-CPO judgments denying his motions to modify or terminate the CPO was merely an attempt to “bootstrap” an untimely direct appeal of the CPO. *Id.* at ¶ 30.

{¶3} In this appeal, Appellant is using the same ruse. His assignments of error again attempt to relitigate the imposition of the CPO. They do not relate to the trial court’s January 26, 2026 Judgment Entry. Appellant failed to directly appeal the order granting the CPO. His time to do so expired in October 2024. Appellant again tries to bootstrap the CPO issue to a groundless appeal of a peripheral Judgment Entry. In doing so, Appellant is abusing the judicial process.

{¶4} Therefore, we affirm the judgment of the Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Domestic Relations Division.

Substantive and Procedural History

{¶5} On July 29, 2024, Appellee filed a pro se Petition for Domestic Violence Civil Protection Order pursuant to R.C. 3113.31. Appellee alleged that she was the former spouse of Appellant and that he had made threats against her and their children. The trial court issued an ex parte order of protection.

{¶6} On August 12, 2024, the trial court held a hearing on the CPO before a magistrate.

{¶7} On August 19, 2024, the magistrate issued a Magistrate’s Order stating that the matter proceeded to hearing as scheduled on August 12. Both Appellant and Appellee testified. However, Appellee wished to call the parties’ minor son, B.S. (DOB 11-05-2009), as a witness. Therefore, the magistrate ordered that the hearing continue on August 30, 2024.

{¶8} On September 4, 2024, the trial court granted the CPO. The entry granting the CPO stated that Appellant did not appear for the August 30, 2024 hearing and that he did not otherwise contact the trial court. According to the entry, Appellee testified that Appellant had threatened her and said, “she needs to be ‘put down’ and further that she needs a bullet between the eyes.” B.S. testified that Appellant had threatened him with a gun. The trial court found B.S.’s testimony to be credible and granted the CPO for Appellee and the parties’ two minor children.

{¶9} Appellant did not file a notice of appeal from that judgment.

{¶10} Between September 5, 2024, and May 13, 2025, Appellant filed 15 Motions to Modify or Terminate the CPO. The trial court denied each of them.

{¶11} On May 28, 2025, Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal from the trial court’s May 13, 2025 Judgment Entry dismissing his May 2 and May 5, 2025 Motions to Modify or Terminate. He did not appeal any other judgment of the trial court.

{¶12} On October 27, 2025, this Court released *Sampson I*. In that case, we held that Appellant’s failure to directly appeal the trial court’s order granting the CPO prevented him from “bootstrapping” his appeal “to allow a second bite at the apple.” *Id.* at ¶ 28. We said that “bootstrapping” was a legal procedure to use a subsequent order ““to indirectly and untimely appeal a prior order that was never directly appealed.”” *Id.* at ¶ 28, quoting *State v. Forro*, 2024-Ohio-2604, ¶ 25 (11th Dist.), quoting *State v. Williamson*, 2015-Ohio-5135, ¶ 9 (8th Dist.). We found Appellant’s assignments of error to be without merit because his arguments were “outside the scope of this appeal and not properly before this court.” *Id.* at ¶ 30.

{¶13} On October 31, 2025, Appellant filed an Application for Reconsideration of our decision. On November 20, 2025, we overruled his Application for Reconsideration.

{¶14} Between November 17, 2025, and January 26, 2026, Appellant filed ten motions, affidavits, and objections in the trial again seeking to relitigate the trial court's imposition of the CPO.

{¶15} On January 29, 2026, the trial court denied each of these filings.

{¶16} Appellant timely appealed raising six assignments of error. Appellee has not filed an answer brief.

Assignments of Error and Analysis

{¶17} Appellant's first assignment of error states: "THE AUGUST 30, 2024 PROCEEDING VIOLATED DUE PROCESS BECAUSE IT WENT FORWARD IN APPELLANT'S ABSENCE WHILE HE WAS INCARCERATED AND NOT TRANSPORTED."

{¶18} Appellant's second assignment of error states: "APPELLANT WAS DENIED A MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO CONFRONT AND CROSS-EXAMINE HIS SUBPOENAED SON."

{¶19} Appellant's third assignment of error states: "THE RECORD IS MATERIALLY DEFICIENT: CRITICAL TRANSCRIPTS WERE NOT PROPERLY TRANSMITTED, CRITICAL DATES WERE NOT PROPERLY REFLECTED, AND THE JANUARY 21, 2025 HEARING IS MISSING."

{¶20} Appellant's fourth assignment of error states: "THE FAILURE TO MEANINGFULLY ADDRESS APPELLANT'S MOTIONS AND OBJECTIONS COMPOUNDED THE PREJUDICE."

{¶21} Appellant's fifth assignment of error states: "RES JUDICATA CANNOT BAR APPELLANT'S CLAIMS WHERE HE WAS DENIED A FULL AND FAIR OPPORTUNITY TO LITIGATE."

{¶22} Appellant's sixth assignment of error states: "THE CUMULATIVE DEFECTS AMOUNT TO STRUCTURAL UNFAIRNESS THAT REQUIRES REVERSAL OR, AT MINIMUM, REMAND FOR A NEW AND PROPERLY PRESERVED HEARING."

{¶23} Each of Appellant's assignments of error relates to the trial court's September 4, 2024 Judgment Entry granting Appellee's request for a CPO. Appellant does not directly address the trial court's January 29, 2026 Judgment Entry denying the filings he made between November 17, 2025, and January 26, 2026.

{¶24} As in *Sampson I*, Appellant is attempting to use this appeal to bootstrap appellate review of the trial court's granting the CPO on September 4, 2024. *Id.* at ¶ 30. "Bootstrapping," in this context, is a practice that utilizes a subsequent order "to indirectly and untimely appeal a prior order that was never directly appealed." *Forro*, 2024-Ohio-2604, at ¶ 25 (11th Dist.), quoting *Williamson*, 2015-Ohio-5135, at ¶ 9 (8th Dist.).

{¶25} Appellant failed to file a notice of appeal within 30 days from the September 4, 2024 judgment. See App.R. 4(A). Because he failed to timely appeal that judgment, we are without jurisdiction to review his assignments of error insofar as they each challenge an order from which no timely appeal was taken. See *Forro* at ¶ 29.

{¶26} When viewed independently of the unappealed Judgment Entry granting the CPO, Appellant's assignments are untethered to any other action the trial court took and are therefore meritless. See *id.* at ¶ 28.

{¶27} For the foregoing reasons, the judgment of the Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Domestic Relations Division, is affirmed.

MATT LYNCH, P.J.,

ROBERT J. PATTON, J.,

concur.

JUDGMENT ENTRY

For the reasons stated in the opinion of this court, Appellant's assignments of error are without merit. It is the judgment and order of this court that the judgment of the Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Domestic Relations Division, is affirmed.

Costs to be taxed against Appellant.

JUDGE JOHN J. EKLUND

PRESIDING JUDGE MATT LYNCH,
concur

JUDGE ROBERT J. PATTON,
concur

THIS DOCUMENT CONSTITUTES A FINAL JUDGMENT ENTRY
--

A certified copy of this opinion and judgment entry shall constitute the mandate pursuant to Rule 27 of the Ohio Rules of Appellate Procedure.
