

[Cite as *Capitol Indemn. Corp. v. Weatherseal Roofing & Renovations, Inc.*, 2003-Ohio-4732.]

**\*\*\*Please see original opinion at *Capitol Indemn. Corp. v. Weatherseal Roofing & Renovations, Inc.*, 2003-Ohio-3982.\*\*\***

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO  
SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT  
LUCAS COUNTY

Capitol Indemnity Corp.

Court of Appeals No. L-02-1174

Appellant

Trial Court No. CI-01-4045

v.

Weatherseal Roofing &  
Renovations, Inc., d/b/a O  
Seagate Roofing, et al.

**DECISION AND JUDGMENT ENTRY**

Decided: August 28, 2003

Appellees

\* \* \* \* \*

{¶1} On July 25, 2003, this court issued its decision and judgment entry in the above-referenced case. Appellant has filed a motion requesting that we clarify or correct our judgment. Appellee has requested an extension of time to file its response motion. Upon a review of the decision and judgment entry, the court hereby issues this correction and notice of errata and orders that the judgment entry be revised as follows.

{¶2} The second full paragraph of page 12 of the judgment entry is stricken and replaced with the following paragraph:

{¶3} “Therefore, we find appellant’s first assignment of error well taken and appellant’s second assignment of error not well-taken. We hold that the trial court erred in

granting summary judgment in this case because material questions of fact exist.”

{¶4} Appellant’s motion is granted and appellee’s motion is denied. It is so ordered.

Peter M. Handwork, P. J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
JUDGE

Richard W. Knepper, J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
JUDGE

Mark L. Pietrykowski, J.  
CONCUR.

\_\_\_\_\_  
JUDGE