[Cite as *State v. George*, 2026-Ohio-4600.]

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

STATE OF OHIO	:	
	:	C.A. No. 30822
Appellant	:	
	:	Trial Court Case No. 2025 CR 03229
v.	:	
	:	(Criminal Appeal from Common Pleas
PATRICK GEORGE	:	Court)
	:	
Appellee	:	**FINAL JUDGMENT ENTRY & OPINION**
	:	

. . . . . .

Pursuant to the opinion of this court rendered on November 20, 2026, the judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

Costs to be paid as stated in App.R. 24.

Pursuant to Ohio App.R. 30(A), the clerk of the court of appeals shall immediately send a copy of the court's ruling to each party and note that action on the docket. Additionally, pursuant to App.R. 27, the clerk of the court of appeals shall send a certified copy of this judgment, which constitutes a mandate, to the clerk of the trial court and note the service on the appellate docket.

For the court,



CHRISTOPHER B. EPLEY, JUDGE

LEWIS, P.J., and HANSEMAN, J., concur.

OPINION
MONTGOMERY C.A. No. 30822

ANDREW T. FRENCH, Attorney for Appellant
JIMMIE CHRISTON, Attorney for Appellee

EPLEY, J.

{¶ 1} Pursuant to R.C. 2945.67(A), the State of Ohio appeals from the Montgomery County Common Pleas Court's judgment that dismissed counts of Patrick George's indictment that charged him with carrying a concealed weapon under R.C. 2923.12(A)(2) and improperly handling firearms in a motor vehicle under R.C. 2923.16(B). Based on our opinion in *State v. Matosky*, 2025-Ohio-5658 (2d Dist.), *appeal accepted*, *04/08/2026 Case Announcements*, 2026-Ohio-1248, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

I. Procedural History and Facts

{¶ 2} On December 24, 2025, a Montgomery County grand jury indicted George on one count of carrying a concealed weapon in violation of R.C. 2923.12(A)(2) and one count of improperly handling firearms in a motor vehicle under R.C. 2923.16(B), both felonies of the fourth degree. George was 18 years old at the time of the offense. A loaded firearm was located under George's car seat during a traffic stop. He pled not guilty to the charges.

{¶ 3} Later, on March 10, 2026, George made an oral motion to the trial court to dismiss both counts. The court granted the motion. A Decision, Order, and Entry Granting Defendant's Motion to Dismiss was filed the next day. The State appeals, raising two assignments of error.

II. Assignment of Error and Analysis

{¶ 1} The State's assignments of error state:

I. Ohio's restriction on the ability of eighteen-to-twenty-year-olds to carry concealed firearms is consistent with this Nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation and falls outside the Second Amendment's protection. The trial court erred in finding otherwise, notwithstanding prevailing precedent.

II. Ohio's improper-handling statute, which prohibits persons under the age of twenty-one from knowingly transporting or having a loaded firearm in a motor vehicle if a person in the vehicle can access the firearm without leaving the vehicle, is consistent with this Nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation and falls outside the Second Amendment's protection. The trial court erred in finding otherwise, notwithstanding prevailing precedent.

{¶ 2} The State's two assignments of error fit squarely within the Second District's precedent originally established in *State v. Matosky*, 2025-Ohio-5658 (2d Dist.). The key fact in this appeal – that George was not 21 years old at the time of his alleged offenses – is identical to the key fact in *Matosky*. Therefore, for the same reasons as we expressed in *Matosky*, we conclude that the concealed-carry statute, R.C. 2923.12(A)(2), and the improper-handling statute, 2923.16(B), are unconstitutional as applied to George.

III. Conclusion

{¶ 3} Having overruled the assignments of error, the judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

. . . . . .

LEWIS, P.J., and HANSEMAN, J., concur.