

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

State of Ohio

Court of Appeals No. WD-26-011

Appellee

Trial Court No. 2024CR0207

v.

Kedesha James

DECISION AND JUDGMENT

Appellant

Decided: October 2, 2026

* * * * *

Paul A. Dobson, Prosecuting Attorney, and
Kristofer A. Kristofferson, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for appellee.

Benjamin M. Asebrook, for appellant.

* * * * *

DUHART, J.

{¶ 1} Appellant, Kedesha James, appeals from the judgment of the Wood County Court of Common Pleas convicting her, following a guilty plea, of the offense of counterfeiting. For the reasons that follow, the trial court’s judgment is affirmed.

Background and Facts

{¶ 2} James was charged in a two-count indictment for counterfeiting, both felonies of the fourth degree. She ultimately pled guilty to a single count of counterfeiting, a violation of R.C. 2913.30 (B)(2) and (C), a felony of the fourth degree. James was sentenced to serve 18 months in prison.

Assignment of Error

{¶ 3} On appeal, Jones asserts the following assignment of error:

- I. The trial court erred when imposing incarceration [sic] instead of community control.

Law and Analysis

{¶ 4} In her sole assignment of error, James, citing only R.C. 2929.11, argues that it was improper for the trial court to impose a prison sentence. Specifically, she alleges that the trial court did not adequately consider her mental health treatment when weighing the sentencing factors and imposing a prison sentence.

The law governing appellate review of a trial court's consideration of R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12 in imposing sentence is clear. As we have repeatedly noted, ‘R.C. 2953.08(G)(2) does not permit an “appellate court to independently weigh the evidence in the record and substitute its judgment for that of the trial court concerning the sentence that best reflects compliance with R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12.”’ See *State v. Bowles*, 2021-Ohio-4401, ¶ 7 (6th Dist.), quoting *State v. Jones*, 2020-Ohio-6729, ¶ 42; see also *State v. Johnson*, 2021-Ohio-2139, ¶ 14 (6th Dist.), citing *State v. Orzechowski*, 2021-Ohio-985, ¶10 (6th Dist.); *State v. Woodmore*, 2021-Ohio-1677, ¶ 17 (6th Dist.); *State v. Buck*, 2021-Ohio-1073, ¶7 (6th Dist.); *State v. White*, 2021-Ohio-987, ¶10 (6th Dist.). Such challenges based on a trial court's consideration of R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12, moreover, may be summarily denied. *Bowles* at ¶ 8, citing *State v. Toles*, 2021-Ohio-3531, ¶ 1.

State v. Cathan, 2022-Ohio-228, ¶ 2 (6th Dist.).

{¶ 5} Accordingly, based on the authority of *Jones* and *Toles*, we find the present challenge is “subject to summary resolution as a matter of law.” *Bowles* at ¶ 9, citing *Toles* at ¶ 11. James’s assignment of error is found not well-taken.

Conclusion

{¶ 6} The judgment of the Wood County Court of Common Pleas is affirmed. Appellant is ordered to pay the costs of appeal pursuant to App.R. 24.

Judgment affirmed.

A certified copy of this entry shall constitute the mandate pursuant to App.R. 27. *See also* 6th Dist.Loc.App.R. 4.

Gene A. Zmuda, J

JUDGE

Myron C. Duhart, J

JUDGE

Charles Sulek, J

CONCUR.

JUDGE

This decision is subject to further editing by the Supreme Court of Ohio’s Reporter of Decisions. Parties interested in viewing the final reported version are advised to visit the Ohio Supreme Court’s web site at:
<http://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/ROD/docs/>.