

STATE OF OHIO)
)ss:
COUNTY OF SUMMIT)

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

CITY OF HUDSON

C.A. No. 31678

Appellee

v.

ANTHONY RAVIDA

Appellant

APPEAL FROM JUDGMENT
ENTERED IN THE
STOW MUNICIPAL COURT
COUNTY OF SUMMIT, OHIO
CASE No. 2025CRB00783

DECISION AND JOURNAL ENTRY

Dated: September 2, 2026

MANNING, Judge.

{¶1} Defendant-Appellant, Anthony Ravida, appeals from the judgment of the Stow Municipal Court. This Court affirms.

I.

{¶2} Mr. Ravida built a fence on residential property he owns in Hudson (“the City”). Although he obtained a zoning permit from the City before building his fence, the fence he built did not comply with the conditions of the permit. The City notified Mr. Ravida of the discrepancy and ordered him to correct it. His refusal to do so led to him being charged with a violation of Section 1212.02(b)(9)/(10) of the Codified Ordinances of Hudson (“the Ordinance”). A jury convicted him, and this Court affirmed his conviction. *See City of Hudson v. Ravida*, 2026-Ohio-1947 (9th Dist.).

{¶3} The instant appeal arises from additional charges the City filed against Mr. Ravida when he maintained his refusal to remedy the issues with his fence. Mr. Ravida was charged with

ten separate violations of the Ordinance. The violations were charged as first-degree misdemeanors due to his having been previously convicted of violating the Ordinance in a two-year period.

{¶4} A jury found Mr. Ravida guilty on all counts. The trial court issued him an identical sentence on each count. The court sentenced him to a fine and jail time, the latter of which the court suspended based on Mr. Ravida obeying all laws for two years. The court stayed the imposition of his sentence for thirty days to verify his compliance with the City regarding his fence.

{¶5} Mr. Ravida now appeals from the court’s judgment. He raises two assignments of error for review.

II.

ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR I

RAVIDA’S CONVICTION RESTS ON INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE[.]

{¶6} In his first assignment of error, Mr. Ravida argues that his convictions are based on insufficient evidence. Because the record does not contain a transcript of the proceedings, this Court has no choice but to presume regularity and reject his assignment of error.

{¶7} “If the appellant intends to present an assignment of error on appeal that a finding or conclusion is unsupported by the evidence . . . , the appellant shall include in the record a transcript of proceedings that includes all evidence relevant to the findings or conclusion.” App.R. 9(B)(4). *See also* Loc.R. 9(A) (it is an appellant’s duty to arrange for timely transmission of any transcripts). “[W]hen an appellant challenges the . . . sufficiency of the evidence, but the transcript of proceedings is not part of the record, ‘this Court must presume regularity in the trial court’s

proceedings and accept its judgment.’” *State v. Sheppard*, 2020-Ohio-56, ¶ 4 (9th Dist.), quoting *Macedonia v. Ewing*, 2007-Ohio-2194, ¶ 8 (9th Dist.).

{¶8} The record reflects that Mr. Ravida filed a praecipe to request a transcript of his jury trial. On April 14, 2026, the court reporter filed an explanation for not filing a transcript. The court reporter indicated that she would not be preparing a transcript because “no audio files [were] given for the preparation of the transcript” Consistent with the court reporter’s explanation, no trial transcript was ever filed. The clerk of court’s notice of the filing of the record informed the parties that the record consisted of a transcript of the docket and journal entries filed.

{¶9} In its appellate brief, the State asked this Court to presume regularity based on the absence of a transcript. Mr. Ravida did not file a reply brief. Nor did he seek to remedy the omission of the transcript.

{¶10} It was Mr. Ravida’s burden to support his sufficiency argument with a transcript of the proceedings. *See* App.R. 9(B)(4); Loc.R. 9(A). Absent a trial transcript, this Court has no choice but to presume regularity and accept the trial court’s judgment. *Sheppard*, 2020-Ohio-56, at ¶ 4 (9th Dist.), quoting *Ewing*, 2007-Ohio-2194, at ¶ 8 (9th Dist.). Accordingly, Mr. Ravida’s first assignment of error is overruled.

ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR II

THE TRIAL COURT LACKED JURISDICTION TO MODIFY RAVIDA’S SENTENCE FOLLOWING HIS APPEAL.

{¶11} In his second assignment of error, Mr. Ravida argues the trial court erred when it modified his sentence in a journal entry it filed on October 14, 2025. For the following reasons, we decline to address his argument.

{¶12} “An appeal is initiated when the appellant files a notice of appeal.” *State v. Hamilton*, 2018-Ohio-2551, ¶ 10 (9th Dist.). The notice of appeal must “designate the judgment-

-or the order or the part of it--from which the appeal is taken” App.R. 3(D). The scope of an appeal is limited to issues arising from the judgment or order designated in the notice of appeal. *See E.E. v. A.K.*, 2023-Ohio-2999, ¶ 11-12 (9th Dist.); *State v. Gilcreast*, 2022-Ohio-3463, ¶ 8 (9th Dist.).

{¶13} Mr. Ravida filed his notice of appeal on October 2, 2025. The notice indicated that he was appealing from the trial court’s August 29, 2025 judgment entry. Mr. Ravida now seeks to challenge a judgment entry the trial court filed on October 14, 2025. That judgment entry is beyond the scope of this appeal, however, as it was issued after Mr. Ravida appealed. Mr. Ravida did not appeal from the October 14th entry. Because his argument in his second assignment of error exceeds the scope of the current appeal, we decline to address it. *See State v. Hamilton*, 2018-Ohio-2551, ¶ 10, 12 (9th Dist.).

III.

{¶14} Mr. Ravida’s first assignment of error is overruled. This Court declines to address his second assignment of error. The judgment of the Stow Municipal Court is affirmed. Further, all outstanding motions are denied.

Judgment affirmed.

There were reasonable grounds for this appeal.

We order that a special mandate issue out of this Court, directing the Stow Municipal Court, County of Summit, State of Ohio, to carry this judgment into execution. A certified copy of this journal entry shall constitute the mandate, pursuant to App.R. 27.

Immediately upon the filing hereof, this document shall constitute the journal entry of judgment, and it shall be file stamped by the Clerk of the Court of Appeals at which time the period for review shall begin to run. App.R. 22(C). The Clerk of the Court of Appeals is instructed to mail a notice of entry of this judgment to the parties and to make a notation of the mailing in the docket, pursuant to App.R. 30.

Costs taxed to Appellant.

NATHAN MANNING
FOR THE COURT

FLAGG LANZINGER, P. J.
STEVENSON, J.
CONCUR.

APPEARANCES:

ANDREW KARAS, Attorney at Law, for Appellant.

SARA J. FAGNILLI, Prosecuting Attorney, for Appellee.