

[Cite as *State v. Wade*, 2021-Ohio-2949.]

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO  
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT  
MONTGOMERY COUNTY**

STATE OF OHIO

Plaintiff-Appellee

**V.**

CHARLES WADE

## Defendant-Appellant

1  
 2  
 3  
 4  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100  
 101  
 102  
 103  
 104  
 105  
 106  
 107  
 108  
 109  
 110  
 111  
 112  
 113  
 114  
 115  
 116  
 117  
 118  
 119  
 120  
 121  
 122  
 123  
 124  
 125  
 126  
 127  
 128  
 129  
 130  
 131  
 132  
 133  
 134  
 135  
 136  
 137  
 138  
 139  
 140  
 141  
 142  
 143  
 144  
 145  
 146  
 147  
 148  
 149  
 150  
 151  
 152  
 153  
 154  
 155  
 156  
 157  
 158  
 159  
 160  
 161  
 162  
 163  
 164  
 165  
 166  
 167  
 168  
 169  
 170  
 171  
 172  
 173  
 174  
 175  
 176  
 177  
 178  
 179  
 180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188  
 189  
 190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198  
 199  
 200  
 201  
 202  
 203  
 204  
 205  
 206  
 207  
 208  
 209  
 210  
 211  
 212  
 213  
 214  
 215  
 216  
 217  
 218  
 219  
 220  
 221  
 222  
 223  
 224  
 225  
 226  
 227  
 228  
 229  
 230  
 231  
 232  
 233  
 234  
 235  
 236  
 237  
 238  
 239  
 240  
 241  
 242  
 243  
 244  
 245  
 246  
 247  
 248  
 249  
 250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263  
 264  
 265  
 266  
 267  
 268  
 269  
 270  
 271  
 272  
 273  
 274  
 275  
 276  
 277  
 278  
 279  
 280  
 281  
 282  
 283  
 284  
 285  
 286  
 287  
 288  
 289  
 290  
 291  
 292  
 293  
 294  
 295  
 296  
 297  
 298  
 299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304  
 305  
 306  
 307  
 308  
 309  
 310  
 311  
 312  
 313  
 314  
 315  
 316  
 317  
 318  
 319  
 320  
 321  
 322  
 323  
 324  
 325  
 326  
 327  
 328  
 329  
 330  
 331  
 332  
 333  
 334  
 335  
 336  
 337  
 338  
 339  
 340  
 341  
 342  
 343  
 344  
 345  
 346  
 347  
 348  
 349  
 350  
 351  
 352  
 353  
 354  
 355  
 356  
 357  
 358  
 359  
 360  
 361  
 362  
 363  
 364  
 365  
 366  
 367  
 368  
 369  
 370  
 371  
 372  
 373  
 374  
 375  
 376  
 377  
 378  
 379  
 380  
 381  
 382  
 383  
 384  
 385  
 386  
 387  
 388  
 389  
 390  
 391  
 392  
 393  
 394  
 395  
 396  
 397  
 398  
 399  
 400  
 401  
 402  
 403  
 404  
 405  
 406  
 407  
 408  
 409  
 410  
 411  
 412  
 413  
 414  
 415  
 416  
 417  
 418  
 419  
 420  
 421  
 422  
 423  
 424  
 425  
 426  
 427  
 428  
 429  
 430  
 431  
 432  
 433  
 434  
 435  
 436  
 437  
 438  
 439  
 440  
 441  
 442  
 443  
 444  
 445  
 446  
 447  
 448  
 449  
 450  
 451  
 452  
 453  
 454  
 455  
 456  
 457  
 458  
 459  
 460  
 461  
 462  
 463  
 464  
 465  
 466  
 467  
 468  
 469  
 470  
 471  
 472  
 473  
 474  
 475  
 476  
 477  
 478  
 479  
 480  
 481  
 482  
 483  
 484  
 485  
 486  
 487  
 488  
 489  
 490  
 491  
 492  
 493  
 494  
 495  
 496  
 497  
 498  
 499  
 500  
 501  
 502  
 503  
 504  
 505  
 506  
 507  
 508  
 509  
 510  
 511  
 512  
 513  
 514  
 515  
 516  
 517  
 518  
 519  
 520  
 521  
 522  
 523  
 524  
 525

Appellate Case No. 29017

Trial Court Case Nos. 2020-CR-1551  
and 2020-CR-1595

(Criminal Appeal from  
Common Pleas Court)

## OPINION

Rendered on the 27th day of August, 2021.

MATHIAS H. HECK, JR., by J. JOSHUA RIZZO, Atty. Reg. No. 0099218, Assistant  
Prosecuting Attorney, Montgomery County Prosecutor's Office, Appellate Division,  
Montgomery County Courts Building, 301 West Third Street, Dayton, Ohio 45422  
Attorney for Plaintiff-Appellee

MICHAEL J. SCARPELLI, Atty. Reg. No. 0093662, 210 West Main Street, Troy, Ohio  
45373  
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant

WELBAUM, J.

{¶ 1} Defendant-appellant, Charles Wade, appeals from the judgments of the Montgomery County Court of Common Pleas revoking his community control sanctions. For the reasons outlined below, the judgments of the trial court will be affirmed.

### **Facts and Course of Proceedings**

{¶ 2} On July 14, 2020, Wade pled guilty in Montgomery C.P. No. 2020-CR-1595 to one count of domestic violence in violation of R.C. 2919.25(A), a fourth-degree felony. Wade also pled guilty in Montgomery C.P. No. 2020-CR-1551 to one count of harassment with a body substance in violation of R.C. 2921.38(B), a fifth-degree felony. Following Wade's guilty pleas, on July 28, 2020, the trial court sentenced Wade to serve a term of community control sanctions not to exceed five years for both cases.

{¶ 3} As part of his community control sanctions, the trial court required Wade to abide by several conditions, including that he attend and complete the MonDay Program. The trial court also advised Wade that if he violated any condition of his community control, or violated any law, it could impose a longer time under the same sanction, a more restrictive sanction, 12 months of local incarceration, or up to a total term of 30 months in prison, i.e., 18 months for domestic violence and 12 months for harassment with a bodily substance, served consecutively.

{¶ 4} On November 2, 2020, Wade's probation officer filed notices of violation of community control in both cases asserting that Wade had failed to complete the MonDay Program as ordered by the trial court. The notices indicated that Wade had been clinically discharged from the MonDay Program on October 30, 2020.

{¶ 5} On December 22, 2020, the trial court held a revocation hearing. During this hearing, the State presented testimony from Wade's probation officer, Ryan Addison. Addison testified that completing the MonDay Program was a condition of Wade's community control and that Wade had violated that condition when he was unsuccessfully discharged from the MonDay Program due to his noncompliant behavior. During his testimony, Addison identified State's Exhibit 4, which was a discharge summary prepared by Wade's clinician at the MonDay Program. Addison testified that the discharge summary outlined the reasons for Wade's unsuccessful discharge. The clinician who authored the discharge summary did not testify at the revocation hearing. The discharge summary was admitted into evidence without any objection from Wade.

{¶ 6} The only other witness to testify at the revocation hearing was Wade himself. During his testimony, Wade claimed that he suffered from certain physical and mental ailments that negatively affected his performance in the MonDay Program. Wade also testified that he performed every task that had been required of him and that he had not willfully violated his community control sanctions.

{¶ 7} After the revocation hearing, the trial court issued its decision from the bench and revoked Wade's community control sanctions. The trial court based its decision on the information contained in the discharge summary. Specifically, the trial court stated:

I give Mr. Wade great credit for the comments that he made during his \* \* \* testimony. And I have to weigh that against the information from MonDay Program provided in its discharge of Mr. Wade, as well. And some of that information includes that he minimally participated in individual and group treatment; and while he did complete mandatory assignments,

his treatment work was done quickly and with no internal thought; he did not complete his parenting or anger management workbooks as required for the completion of those classes; his work was lacking of depth about his court issues; he did not apply the information, coping strategies or intervention from his treatment into practice or how to deal with life stressors; and while he did participate in individual sessions with this clinician, frequently the session would devolve into complaints about MonDay, complaints about his unresolved medical issues or threats of pending lawsuits against MonDay; he would make statements like [cognitive behavioral therapy] doesn't work and I won't fake it to make it.

When he entered the Program, he reported that he didn't need to be there because his only problem was alcohol and he had already obtained sobriety prior to entry and efforts to have him address those alcohol issues and other problematic behaviors were largely unsuccessful. And he had significant difficulty getting along with others in the Program specifically the staff at the MonDay Program. And they concluded that his prognosis for success in the Program was poor and, therefore, the MonDay Program made the determination to unsuccessfully discharge him from the MonDay Program. And there's no dispute that he was unsuccessfully discharged from the MonDay Program.

He was there for 80 days, filed 25 grievances while he was there, also stopped staff on the day floor several times to complain about his various concerns, submitted 19 requests to see staff which exceeded the

typical resident requests. And although he did successfully complete the two behavioral contracts that he was placed upon, the determination was made by the MonDay Program that the level of attention and care that Mr. Wade needed simply exceeded the ability of the Program. And so it unsuccessfully discharged him from the Program.

And it is that unsuccessful discharge from the MonDay Program that is the basis for the petitions to revoke him from supervision. And, therefore, as a result, the Court will find that there is substantial and significant evidence that Mr. Wade has violated the terms and conditions of his supervision and it is appropriate then at this time to impose an alternative sentence upon him.

Hearing Trans. (Dec. 22, 2020), p. 58-60.

{¶ 8} Following its decision to revoke Wade's community control sanctions, the trial court sentenced Wade to serve 18 months in prison for domestic violence in Case No. 2020-CR-1595 and 12 months in prison for harassment with a bodily substance in Case No. 2020-CR-1551. The trial court ordered these sentences to be served concurrently for a total term of 18 months in prison. Wade now appeals from the trial court's judgment revoking his community control sanctions and sentencing him to prison, raising two assignments of error for our review.

### **First Assignment of Error**

{¶ 9} Under his first assignment of error, Wade contends that the trial court committed plain error by relying solely on hearsay evidence, i.e., the discharge summary,

to revoke his community control sanctions. To support this claim, Wade contends that the admission and consideration of the discharge summary violated his due process right to confront adverse witnesses. Upon review, we find no plain error that necessitates reversal in this case.

{¶ 10} “ ‘Revocation hearings are not subject to the rules of evidence, thus allowing for the admission of hearsay evidence.’ ” *State v. McDargh*, 2d Dist. Clark No. 2015-CA-27, 2016-Ohio-1132, ¶ 12, quoting *State v. Westrick*, 196 Ohio App.3d 141, 2011-Ohio-1169, 962 N.E.2d 818 (3d Dist.). (Other citation omitted.) This is because a “ ‘revocation hearing is an informal proceeding, not a criminal trial[.]’ ” *Id.*, quoting *Columbus v. Bickel*, 77 Ohio App.3d 26, 36, 601 N.E.2d 61 (10th Dist.1991), citing *State v. Miller*, 42 Ohio St.2d 102, 106, 326 N.E.2d 259 (1975). Therefore, during revocation hearings, “ ‘the trier of fact should be able to consider any reliable and relevant evidence to determine whether the [defendant] has violated the conditions of his [supervision].’ ” *Id.*

{¶ 11} “Nevertheless, in some circumstances, the admission of hearsay evidence at a revocation hearing can deny the defendant his due process right to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses.” *State v. Brandon*, 2d Dist. Montgomery No. 23336, 2010-Ohio-1902, ¶ 19, citing *State v. Dunning*, 2d Dist. Greene No. 08-CA-07, 2009-Ohio-691, ¶ 10. This includes, for example, instances where “ ‘[hearsay] evidence is the only evidence presented and is crucial to a determination of a probation violation.’ ” *McDargh* at ¶ 13, quoting *State v. Ryan*, 3d Dist. Union No. 14-06-55, 2007-Ohio-4743, ¶ 9, citing *State v. Ohly*, 166 Ohio App.3d 808, 2006-Ohio-2353, 853 N.E.2d 675 (6th Dist.).

{¶ 12} As noted above, Wade contends that the trial court’s decision revoking his

community control sanctions was based solely on hearsay evidence, i.e., the discharge summary, thereby violating his right to due process. Wade, however, did not object to the admission of the discharge summary into evidence, let alone claim that its admission violated his due process rights. “The failure to object to a due process violation during a community control revocation hearing waives all but plain error.” *State v. Hatton*, 2d Dist. Montgomery No. 25959, 2014-Ohio-3354, ¶ 10, citing *State v. Blakeman*, 2d Dist. Montgomery No. 18983, 2002 WL 857659, \*3 (May 3, 2002). “For plain error to exist, the defect in the trial proceedings must be obvious and must have affected the outcome of the trial.” *State v. Davis*, 2d Dist. Montgomery No. 28923, 2021-Ohio-1833, ¶ 18, citing *State v. Payne*, 114 Ohio St.3d 502, 2007-Ohio-4642, 873 N.E.2d 306, ¶ 16.

{¶ 13} Upon review, we find that the discharge summary was not the only evidence presented at Wade’s revocation hearing, as the State presented testimony from Wade’s probation officer, Ryan Addison. Addison testified that he became Wade’s probation officer after Wade entered the MonDay Program, and that Wade was required to complete the MonDay Program as a condition of his community control sanctions. Addison also testified that Wade was not compliant in the MonDay Program and was terminated from the program unsuccessfully. Addison further testified that prior to Wade’s unsuccessful termination, he, Wade, and Wade’s MonDay clinician attended two interventions during which they discussed Wade’s behavior.

{¶ 14} Addison testified that during the first intervention, they discussed Wade’s “overall noncompliance [as] far as [Wade] being defiant, argumentative, utilizing grievances as a way to get attention, threatening suicide when [Wade] didn’t get his way, [and] constantly complaining of his medical state with his \* \* \* bowels \* \* \* because he

wasn't able to use the restroom." Hearing Trans. (Dec. 22, 2020), p. 28. Addison testified that they also discussed Wade's complaints of wrist pain and noted that "[i]t was later found that \* \* \* [Wade could] be seen on video doing pushups without any type of issue [.]" *Id.*

**{¶ 15}** Addison additionally testified that the second intervention "took place because [of Wade's] unwillingness to change his behavior and his unwillingness to work on himself and work on the things that got him there such as \* \* \* his addiction to \* \* \* alcohol and not fully engaging in the program." *Id.* at 29. Addison testified that Wade was "pretty upset" during both interventions and that Wade was acting like a victim by blaming and accusing others. *Id.* Addison also testified that Wade's behavior did not change from the first to the second intervention.

**{¶ 16}** With regard to the discharge summary, Addison testified that, per protocol, he received the discharge summary, which outlined the reasoning for Wade's unsuccessful discharge. Most significantly, Addison testified that his testimony regarding Wade's performance was outlined in the discharge summary. This indicated (and the actual discharge summary confirmed) that Wade's discharge from the program was based, at least in part, on the issues that Addison testified about at the revocation hearing.

**{¶ 17}** Because Addison's testimony touched on the reasons for Wade's unsuccessful discharge, we find that Addison's testimony, standing alone, would have been sufficient for the trial court to revoke Wade's community control sanctions. Although the record indicates that the trial court relied solely on the discharge summary when revoking Wade's community control, even without the discharge summary, the trial



court could have revoked Wade's community control based on Addison's testimony. Therefore, Wade has not established plain error with regard to the trial court's relying solely on the discharge summary, as the outcome of the revocation proceeding would not have been different had the discharge summary not been admitted into evidence. See generally *State v. Pullen-Morrow*, 2d Dist. Montgomery No. 24862, 2012-Ohio-3605, ¶¶ 24-25 (finding no plain error where the result of a revocation hearing would not have been different even if the discharge summary/testimony regarding the contents of the discharge summary had been excluded).

{¶ 18} Wade's first assignment of error is overruled.

### **Second Assignment of Error**

{¶ 19} Under his second assignment of error, Wade contends that the trial court's decision to revoke his community control sanctions was an abuse of discretion. Specifically, Wade argues that the trial court's decision to revoke his community control was unreasonable in light of the testimony he provided at the revocation hearing. We disagree with Wade's claim.

{¶ 20} "The right to continue on community control depends upon compliance with the conditions of community control and is a matter within the sound discretion of the trial court." *State v. Eastman*, 2d Dist. Clark No. 2020-CA-5, 2021-Ohio-392, ¶ 13, citing *State v. Lewis*, 2d Dist. Montgomery No. 23505, 2010-Ohio-3652, ¶ 11. "Accordingly, we review the trial court's revocation of community control for an abuse of discretion." *Id.*, citing *State v. Morgan*, 2d Dist. Montgomery No. 26132, 2014-Ohio-5071, ¶ 11. "A trial court abuses its discretion when it makes a decision that is unreasonable,

unconscionable, or arbitrary.” (Citation omitted.) *State v. Darmond*, 135 Ohio St.3d 343, 2013-Ohio-966, 986 N.E.2d 971, ¶ 34. “An abuse of discretion most often involves an unreasonable decision that is not supported by a sound reasoning process.” *State v. Pate*, 2021-Ohio-1838, \_\_\_ N.E.3d \_\_\_, ¶ 36 (2d Dist.), citing *AAAA Ents., Inc. v. River Place Community Urban Redevelopment Corp.*, 50 Ohio St.3d 157, 161, 553 N.E.2d 597 (1990).

**{¶ 21}** As previously noted, Wade claims that the trial court’s decision revoking his community control sanctions was unreasonable in light of his testimony at the revocation hearing. Specifically, Wade testified that his performance in the MonDay Program was affected by physical injuries that he sustained from being beaten in jail by fellow inmates prior to entering the program. Wade testified that his ribs were broken and that one of his ribs punctured his intestines. Wade testified that the puncture resulted in a blood clot that led to a prolonged bowel obstruction, which required him to be on laxatives for an extended period of time. According to Wade, his bowel condition caused him embarrassment and pain on a daily basis.

**{¶ 22}** In addition to his physical condition, Wade testified that he suffered from mental issues such as paranoia and delusions, which caused him to feel as if MonDay staff members were trying to get him kicked out of the program. Wade also testified that he had been diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder. According to Wade, his physical and mental ailments were the source of his negative personal interactions with MonDay staff and were the cause of the several grievances he filed while in the program. Wade testified that he otherwise completed all the required tasks in the program and that he never willfully violated the conditions of his community control sanctions.

**{¶ 23}** It was, however, within the province of the trial court to determine what weight, if any, to give to Wade's testimony. Simply because Wade disagrees with the trial court's resolution of the factual disputes in this case does not indicate that the trial court's decision revoking his community control was an abuse of discretion. Therefore, because the evidence established that Wade was required to complete the MonDay Program as a condition of his community control sanctions and that Wade was unsuccessfully discharged from the MonDay Program due to his noncompliant behavior, the trial court's decision revoking Wade's community control for failing to complete the MonDay Program was not unreasonable and thus not an abuse of discretion.

**{¶ 24}** Wade's second assignment of error is overruled.

### **Conclusion**

**{¶ 25}** Having overruled both assignments of error raised by Wade, the judgments of the trial court are affirmed.

.....

DONOVAN, J. and HALL, J., concur.

Copies sent to:

Mathias H. Heck, Jr.  
J. Joshua Rizzo  
Michael J. Scarpelli  
Hon. Mary Lynn Wiseman