

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

State of Ohio

Court of Appeals No. WD-25-069

Appellee

Trial Court No. 2024 CR 0454

v.

Robert H. Cameron

DECISION AND JUDGMENT

Appellant

Decided: October 16, 2026

* * * * *

Paul A. Dobson, Wood County Prosecutor and
Kristofer A. Kristofferson, Assistant Prosecutor for appellee.

Neil S. McElroy for appellant

* * * * *

OSOWIK, P.J.

{¶ 1} Robert Cameron appeals the October 30, 2025, judgment of the Wood County Court of Common Pleas. We sua sponte place this matter on the accelerated calendar pursuant to App.R. 11.1(A), and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the

court. *See* S.Ct.R.Rep.Op.3.1; App.R. 11.1(E); 6th Dist.Loc.App.R. 12. For the following reasons, we affirm the judgment of the trial court.

{¶ 2} On November 21, 2024, Appellant, Robert Cameron was charged by the Wood County Grand Jury with a two-count indictment. Count One, Rape-F1, in violation of R.C. 2907.02(A)(1)(c), 2907.02(B) and Sexual Battery F-3, in violation of R.C. 2907.03(A)(2), 2907.03(B).

{¶ 3} On August 22, 2025, he entered a plea of guilty to the sexual battery charge and the rape charged was dismissed.

{¶ 4} On October 30, 2025, Cameron was sentenced to serve 60 months in prison and was designated as a Tier III sex offender. At the sentencing hearing, before imposing sentence, the trial court expressly considered the video footage of what happened, the amount of alcohol that may have been consumed by the victim and the intoxicated state of the victim. The court also considered the time and circumstances of the offense as well as the law-abiding life of the appellant. The court further considered the successful career and family life of appellant. Nevertheless, the court also considered the fact that appellant had ample opportunity to consider his decisions on the night of the offense.

{¶ 5} Appellant timely appealed and raises a single assignment of error for our review:

The trial court's sentence of 60 months was contrary to law as the trial court failed to adequately consider R.C. 2929.12 (E) as required by statute.

In support of his assignment, appellant argues that the trial court failed to adequately address the relevant factors regarding recidivism.

{¶ 6} We review sentencing challenges under R.C. 2953.08(G)(2). The statute allows us to increase, reduce, or otherwise modify a sentence or vacate the sentence and remand the matter for resentencing only if we clearly and convincingly find either (1) the record does not support the trial court's findings under specified Revised Code sections not at issue here, or (2) the sentence is otherwise contrary to law. R.C. 2953.08(G)(2)(a)-(b).

{¶ 7} However, since the Ohio Supreme Court decided *State v. Jones*, 2020-Ohio-6729, the law governing appellate review of a trial court's consideration of R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12 in imposing a sentence is clear: 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. *State v. Bowles*, 2021-Ohio-4401, ¶ 7 (6th Dist.), quoting *Jones* at ¶ 42.

{¶ 8} We have consistently held that we may summarily dispose of an assignment of error that is based only on the trial court's consideration of the factors in R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12. *See State v. Kynard*, 2026-Ohio-758, ¶ 10-12, *State v. Diaz*, 2026-Ohio-2506, ¶¶12-14, *State v. Coon*, 2025-Ohio-1849 ¶ 23 (6th Dist.), citing *State v. Eames*, 2024-Ohio-183 ¶ 10 (6th Dist.).

{¶ 9} This does not mean that a sentence cannot be “otherwise contrary to law” for other reasons. For example, the Supreme Court determined that a sentence was “contrary to law” because it was “improperly imposed based on impermissible considerations—i.e., considerations that fall outside those that are contained in R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12.”

5.

2929.11 and 2929.12.” *State v. Frohlich*, 2026-Ohio-3665, ¶ 8-17, citing *State v. Fowler*, 2022-Ohio-3499, ¶ 15 (6th Dist.). However, Cameron is not claiming that the trial court considered impermissible factors in its sentencing.

{¶ 10} Because appellant's assigned error involves the trial court's consideration of a factor that falls squarely within R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12, he has not alleged any error that is subject to review by this court. Accordingly, Cameron’s sole assignment of error is not well-taken.

{¶ 11} Therefore, the judgment of the Wood County Court of Common Pleas is affirmed. Cameron is ordered to pay the costs of this appeal pursuant to App.R. 24. A certified copy of this entry shall constitute the mandate pursuant to App.R. 27.

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.

Thomas J. Osowik, P.J.

JUDGE

Christine E. Mayle, J.

JUDGE

Myron C. Duhart, 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/.
