

COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO

**EIGHTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA**

STATE EX REL. VALEMAR D. BLADE, :

Relator, :

No. 116491

v. :

JUDGE PETER J. CORRIGAN, :

Respondent. :

JOURNAL ENTRY AND OPINION

JUDGMENT: COMPLAINT DISMISSED

DATED: August 17, 2026

Writs of Prohibition and Mandamus
Motion No. 596413
Order No. 597960

Appearances:

Valemar Blade, *pro se*.

Michael C. O'Malley, Cuyahoga County Prosecuting
Attorney, and Bridget E. Dever, Assistant Prosecuting
Attorney, *for respondent*.

DEENA R. CALABRESE, J.:

{¶ 1} Valemar D. Blade, the relator, has filed a complaint for a writ of prohibition and a writ of mandamus. Blade essentially argues that his convictions for aggravated menacing, discharge of a firearm on or near prohibited premises, and

having weapons while under disability, in *State v. Blade*, Cuyahoga C.P. No. CR-22-667895-A, are void based upon defects in the indictment and grand jury proceedings, lack of probable cause, and fraud or misconduct by law enforcement and the prosecution. Blade alleges that he is entitled to a writ of prohibition because the defects in the indictment and fraud upon the court divested Judge Peter J. Corrigan, the respondent, of the necessary jurisdiction to preside over the trial that resulted in his conviction for the offenses of discharge of a firearm on or near a prohibited premises (R.C. 2923.162(A)(3)), having weapons while under disability (R.C. 2923.13(A)(2)), and aggravated menacing (R.C. 2903.21)). Blade also requests a writ of mandamus that requires Judge Corrigan to vacate the conviction and sentence journalized in CR-22-667895. Judge Corrigan has filed a motion to dismiss that is granted because Blade has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

I. Complaint for Prohibition

{¶ 2} In order for this court to issue a writ of prohibition, Blade must demonstrate that (1) Judge Corrigan is about to exercise judicial power; (2) the exercise of such power by Judge Corrigan is unauthorized by law; and (3) Blade possesses no other adequate remedy in the ordinary course of the law. *State ex rel. Largent v. Fisher*, 43 Ohio St.3d 160, 161 (1989); *Collegiate Communities, LLC v. Kilbane*, 2020-Ohio-926, ¶ 6 (8th Dist.). Prohibition does not lie unless it is clear that a court possesses no jurisdiction over the cause that it is attempting to adjudicate or the court is about to exceed its jurisdiction. *State ex rel. Ellis v.*

McCabe, 138 Ohio St. 417, 420 (1941); *State ex rel. Thomas v. McGinty*, 2019-Ohio-5129, ¶ 13 (8th Dist.).

{¶ 3} A writ of prohibition may not be employed to prevent an erroneous judgment, serve the purpose of an appeal, or correct mistakes of a lower court in deciding questions within its jurisdiction. *State ex rel. Sparto v. Juvenile Court of Darke Cty.*, 153 Ohio St. 64, 65 (1950); *A.S. v. Gold*, 2020-Ohio-4309, ¶ 5 (8th Dist.). Prohibition should be employed with great caution and will not issue in doubtful cases. *State ex rel. Merion v. Tuscarawas Cty. Court of Common Pleas*, 137 Ohio St. 273, 277 (1940); *State ex rel. Lang v. Turner*, 2019-Ohio-3520, ¶ 5 (8th Dist.). Absent a patent and unambiguous lack of jurisdiction, a court possessing general subject-matter jurisdiction of an action possesses the necessary authority to determine its own jurisdiction. A party challenging the court's jurisdiction has an adequate remedy at law through an appeal from the court's holding that it possesses jurisdiction. *State ex rel. Cleveland v. Russo*, 2019-Ohio-1595, ¶ 8; *State ex rel. Rootstown Local School Dist. Bd. of Edn. v. Portage Cty. Court of Common Pleas*, 78 Ohio St.3d 489, 419 (1967). It must also be noted that this court has discretion in issuing a writ of prohibition. *State ex rel. Gilligan v. Hoddinott*, 36 Ohio St.2d 127, 132 (1973); *V.R.T. v. Celebrezze*, 2019-Ohio-2339, ¶ 5 (8th Dist.).

{¶ 4} Herein, Judge Corrigan clearly possesses general subject-matter jurisdiction over *State v. Blade*, Cuyahoga C.P. No. CR-22-667895. Pursuant to the Ohio Const., art. IV, § 4(B), a court of common pleas is a court of general jurisdiction, with subject-matter jurisdiction that extends to all matters of law and in equity that

are not denied it. *Ohio High School Athletic Assn. v. Ruehlman*, 2019-Ohio-2845, ¶ 7. In addition, R.C. 2931.03 provides that a court of common pleas possesses original jurisdiction of all crimes and offenses.

{¶ 5} The Ohio Supreme Court has addressed the confusion often surrounding the term “jurisdiction.” The term “jurisdiction” can be used with regard to the concepts of jurisdiction over the subject matter, jurisdiction over the person, and jurisdiction over a particular case. *Bank of Am., N.A. v. Kuchta*, 2014-Ohio-4275, ¶ 18. Prohibition is solely concerned with a court’s subject-matter jurisdiction, that is “the power of a court to entertain and adjudicate a particular class of cases.” *Id.* at ¶ 19. A court’s subject-matter jurisdiction is determined without regard to the rights of any individual party. *Corder v. Ohio Edison Co.*, 2020-Ohio-5220, ¶ 14.

{¶ 6} It must also be noted that prohibition may not be employed to challenge the propriety of a defendant’s conviction. *State ex rel. Jackson v. Callahan*, 86 Ohio St.3d 73, 74 (1999). Moreover, Blade possesses or possessed an adequate remedy in the ordinary course of the law to challenge procedural irregularities in his underlying criminal case. *State ex rel. Turner v. Corrigan*, 2015-Ohio-980, ¶ 26 (8th Dist.). Blade is not entitled to a writ of prohibition.

II. Complaint for Mandamus

{¶ 7} Herein, Blade essentially has challenged the validity of his indictment. Extraordinary relief is not available to attack the validity or sufficiency of a charging instrument; Blade possessed an adequate remedy through a direct appeal by which to raise his current arguments in support of his request for a writ of mandamus. *See*

State ex rel. Elko v. Suster, 2006-Ohio-4248, ¶ 3. The manner by which an accused is charged is procedural rather than jurisdictional. *State ex rel. Mitchell v. Pittman*, 2022-Ohio-2542, ¶ 13. Consequently, Blade cannot obtain a writ of mandamus to compel Judge Corrigan to vacate his convictions for the offenses of discharge of a firearm on or near a prohibited premises, having weapons while under disability, and aggravated menacing. *State ex rel. Nelson v. Griffin*, 2004-Ohio-4754, ¶ 6.

III. Conclusion

{¶ 8} Accordingly, we grant Judge Corrigan’s motion to dismiss. Costs to Blade. The court directs the clerk of courts to serve all parties with notice of this judgment and the date of entry upon the journal as required by Civ.R. 58(B).

{¶ 9} Complaint for writs of prohibition and mandamus dismissed.

DEENA R. CALABRESE, JUDGE

MICHAEL JOHN RYAN, P.J., and
EILEEN A. GALLAGHER, J., CONCUR