



Stark County Law Library
110 Central Plaza South, Suite 401, Canton, OH 44702
www.starkcountyohio.gov/law-library



Ohio Fifth District Court of Appeals Case Summaries

Case Type	Case Caption	Case No(s)	Character of Proceeding	Judgment	Topics and Issues	Author	Date of Judgment Entry
Criminal	STATE VS. AMANDA REICHELDERFER	Case No. 24CA009	Appeal from the Holmes County Municipal Court, Case No. 22CRB115	Affirmed	Anders brief Amanda Reichelderfer, appealed the decision to revoke her probation and impose a 30-day jail sentence. Initially charged with theft under R.C. 2913.02(A)(1), a first-degree misdemeanor, Reichelderfer entered a no-contest plea in November 2022. Her sentence was suspended, and she was placed on one-year probation, with conditions including drug and alcohol counseling. Despite signing a probation agreement, she failed to attend required in-person appointments and tested positive for methamphetamines and amphetamines. The court issued a warrant after her failure to report and continued non-compliance. The trial court determined that Reichelderfer's repeated violations justified revoking her probation, and the decision was affirmed on appeal.	Hoffman, P.J.	3/17/2025
Criminal	STATE VS. RICHARD KILGORE	Case No. 24AP0002	Appeal from the Morgan County Clerk of Court, Case No. 2023-CRB-0212	Affirmed in part; Reversed in part	Manifest weight of the evidence; sufficiency of the evidence Kilgore appeals the decision convicting him of Domestic Violence and Resisting Arrest. He was accused of threatening his estranged wife through messages and revving his car while aligning it with her apartment. At trial, the court found sufficient evidence to support the Domestic Violence conviction, determining that Kilgore's actions caused his wife to fear imminent harm. However, Kilgore argued the trial court erred in convicting him of Resisting Arrest, asserting that the deputy did not intend to arrest him or communicate an arrest. The appellate court affirmed the Domestic Violence conviction, reversed the Resisting Arrest conviction, and remanded the case for further proceedings.	Baldwin, P.J.	3/14/2025
Criminal	STATE VS. MALLORY L. SCARBERRY	Case No. 24 CA 037	Appeal from the Fairfield County Municipal Court, Case No. TRD 24 03975	Reversed	Distracted driving exception for cell phone directly near the ear Scarberry appealed her conviction for distracted driving in Fairfield County, arguing that Ohio's distracted-driving law did not prohibit her actions. While using her vehicle's hands-free system, she switched to speakerphone and held her phone a few inches from her ear. A state trooper cited her, and she was later convicted in a bench trial. The appellate court agreed with her argument, ruling that the law did not apply to her conduct. As a result, her conviction was vacated.	Gormley, J.	3/17/2025
Criminal	STATE VS. JEREMY HAWKINS	Case No. 2024 CA 00083	Appeal from the Stark County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 2023CR2131	Affirmed	Suppression; search warrant Hawkins appealed the denial of his motion to suppress evidence obtained during a search of his home in Stark County, arguing that the search warrant was based on unreliable hearsay and lacked probable cause. Police obtained the warrant after a confidential source provided videos and information linking Hawkins to drug trafficking. The trial court found the warrant valid, and the appellate court upheld this decision, ruling that the affidavit established a sufficient nexus between Hawkins' home and the alleged crimes. As a result, the trial court's judgment was affirmed.	King, J.	3/17/2025
Criminal	STATE VS. CYNTHIA COOK	Case No. 24 CA 033	Appeal from the Fairfield County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 23 CR 360	Affirmed	Conditional term of incarceration not contrary to law; jail sentence properly reflected in document attached to sentencing entry; whether trial court advised defendant of all possible sanctions for violating community control not yet ripe The trial court sentenced Cook to 45 days in jail for felony trespassing and imposed a conditional 135-day sentence, which could be suspended if she complied with community-control requirements. Cook argued the conditional sentence was unlawful, but the court found no error. Her claim that the judge failed to advise her of all potential sanctions for a community-control violation was deemed not yet ripe for review. The trial court's judgment was affirmed.	Gormley, J.	3/19/2025
Criminal	STATE VS. LOREN SCHOOLEY	Case No. CT2024-0100	Appeal from the Muskingum County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. CR2024-0162	Affirmed	Anders brief no non-frivolous issues found Schooley was indicted on 13 counts of Pandering Obscenity Involving a Minor or Impaired Person and sentenced to an indefinite term of 8 to 12 years. He was also designated a Tier II sex offender, requiring registration every 180 days for 25 years. The court found that Schooley's guilty plea was made knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily, with full understanding of the charges and sentencing recommendations. The judge followed proper legal procedures, and the agreed-upon sentence was lawful and not subject to appeal. The sentence was determined to be in accordance with the law.	Popham, J.	3/19/2025

Case Type	Case Caption	Case No(s)	Character of Proceeding	Judgment	Topics and Issues	Author	Date of Judgment Entry
Criminal	STATE VS. TROY HOWARD	Case No. 2024 CA 0054	Appeal from the Richland County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 2023-CR-0288R	Affirmed	Calculation of post-release control time The appellant was convicted of escape and sentenced to one year in prison, with 1,164 days of post-release control. He argued he had only 455 days remaining but failed to account for time he was declared a violator at large. The trial court correctly calculated his post-release control time based on records from the Adult Parole Authority and a prior appellate decision. His claim that he was not properly notified about post-release control was rejected, as the issue before the court was solely the calculation of remaining time. The court's sentence was found to be lawful.	Montgomery, J.	3/19/2025
Criminal	STATE VS. KERRIS SOWERS	Case No. CT2024-0080	Appeal from the Muskingum County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. CR2024-0235	Affirmed	Sentencing Sowers appealed the judgment of the Muskingum County Court of Common Pleas convicting and sentencing her after pleading guilty to charges including domestic violence, attempted kidnapping, grand theft of a firearm, and tampering with evidence. The trial court sentenced her to an aggregate prison term of eight to eleven years, considering her prior burglary conviction and multiple jail incidents. Sowers argued that the sentence was excessive and failed to align with the purposes of felony sentencing under R.C. 2929.11 and R.C. 2929.12. The appellate court affirmed the trial court's decision, finding the sentence was within the statutory range, appropriately considered the sentencing factors, and was not disproportionate to the offenses committed.	Popham, J.	3/19/2025
Criminal	STATE VS. SAMUEL D. WILLIAMS	Case Nos. 2024CA00023 2024CA00024	Criminal appeal from the Fairfield Municipal Court, Case Nos. CRB2300685 & 23TRD03274	Affirmed	Criminal Williams appealed his convictions and sentence from the Fairfield County Municipal Court. He was convicted of failure to comply with an order or signal of a police officer, obstructing official business, failure to reinstate, driving on a judgment suspension, driving under suspension, and reckless operation. Williams argued that his identity and prior suspensions were not sufficiently proven and that there was insufficient evidence for the obstruction conviction. The appellate court affirmed the convictions, finding that the certified BMV records provided prima facie evidence of his identity and prior convictions. Additionally, Williams' refusal to comply with multiple police commands to exit his home constituted affirmative acts that obstructed law enforcement, supporting his obstruction conviction.	Smith, V.J.	3/19/2025
Criminal	STATE VS. MUREL PARKS	Case No. CT2024-0119	Appeal from the Muskingum County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. CR2024-0339	Affirmed	Felony sentencing; maximum sentence Parks appealed the decision convicting him of Failure to Comply with an Order or Signal of a Police Officer, causing a substantial risk of serious physical harm, and Aggravated Possession of Methamphetamine. After pleading guilty, Parks was sentenced to consecutive terms of 36 months and 12 months, with a forfeiture of his truck. Parks argued that the trial court had erred in imposing maximum sentences without specific findings that the offenses were among the worst forms or that he posed the greatest recidivism risk. The appellate court affirmed the trial court's decision, concluding that the sentences were within the statutory range, aligned with sentencing guidelines, and not based on impermissible considerations.	Popham, J.	3/18/2025
Criminal	STATE VS. BRYAN SKELLY	Case No. 24CA014	Appeal from the Holmes County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 23CR130	Affirmed	Anders Bryan Skelly filed an Ander's brief but failed to raise any issues to appeal. Skelly argued that he was intoxicated and therefore did not have the intention to steal Rice's trail bologna or his wallet. The appellate court found the appeal to be wholly frivolous under anders and affirmed the trial court's judgement.	Montgomery, J.	3/20/2025
Criminal	STATE VS. GEORGE H. SWOGGER	Case No. 24CA00093	Appeal from the Court of Common Pleas of Stark County, Case No. 2024-CR-0370	Affirmed	Domestic-violence conviction was supported by sufficient evidence and not against the manifest weight of the evidence; defendant's day-before-trial request for new appointed counsel was properly denied Swogger appealed his conviction for domestic violence, arguing that the evidence was insufficient, the verdict was against the manifest weight of the evidence, and that the trial court erred in denying his request for substitute counsel. The appellate court rejected these claims, finding that J.H.'s testimony was sufficient to establish all elements of domestic violence. The court also determined that the jury did not lose its way in evaluating the evidence, as J.H.'s account was consistent with her injuries. Lastly, the court held that Swogger's request for new counsel on the eve of trial was untimely, and the trial court reasonably concluded that his attorney provided competent representation. The appellate court affirmed the conviction.	Gormley, J.	3/21/2025

Case Type	Case Caption	Case No(s)	Character of Proceeding	Judgment	Topics and Issues	Author	Date of Judgment Entry
Civil	FEED FAT COMPANY, LLC D/B/A/ ORIGO VS. CUSTOM AGRI SYSTEMS, INC.	Case No. 24-COA-031	Appeal from the Ashland County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 24-CIV-038	Reversed	Trial court review of arbitrtion award The trial court did not find that the arbitrator exceeded his authority or issued an irrational award. The trial court vacated the award solely because it believed the decision conflicted with the express terms of the Agreement. In doing so, the court improperly substituted its own interpretation of the Agreement for that of the arbitrator, failing to give judicial deference. The court found a conflict between Section 7 of the Contract and Section 7 of the Supplement, but such a conflict does not justify vacating the award under R.C. 2711.10(D). Additionally, the trial court erred in making findings on indemnification, as it was not within its authority to do so. The trial court should have adhered to the statutory grounds for vacating an arbitration award rather than reevaluating the arbitrator's decision.	Montgomery, J.	3/14/2025
Civil	MINERVA DAIRY, INC. VS. VILLAGE OF MINERVA, OHIO	Case No. 2024 CA 00097	Appeal from the Stark County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 2023CV00901	Affirmed	Administrative appeal The Village waived its right to raise several arguments on appeal by failing to file a brief on the R.C. 2506 issues. Even if considered, the trial court's decision was upheld as it found the Disconnection Order arbitrary, capricious, and lacking due process. Under R.C. 2506.04, a court can reverse an administrative decision on multiple grounds, and the trial court identified several valid reasons for doing so. The Village also argued that the Dairy had no due process rights beyond Ordinance 921.16, but the appellate court rejected this, citing Ohio law, which recognizes a protectable property interest in discharge permits. The Disconnection Order imposed significant fines, further implicating due process protections. Regarding the trial court's decision to vacate the Disconnection Order instead of holding a de novo hearing or remanding the case, the Village again failed to raise this argument earlier, waiving its right to assert it on appeal. The appellate court found no abuse of discretion in the trial court's actions. The Village challenged the trial court's granting of a de novo hearing and its decision not to hold one to correct due process deficiencies. The appellate court found that constitutional challenges entitle an appellant to a de novo review and that the trial court acted within precedent. Since no new evidence was introduced at the April 30th hearing and the trial court relied on briefs and the existing record, the appellate court upheld its decision to vacate the Disconnection Order.	Popham, J.	3/14/2025
Civil	THOMAS BELLAR VS. CLARY TRUCKING, ET AL.	Case Nos. 2024 CA 0055 2024 CA 0083	Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 2024 CV 00229	Affirmed	There was subject matter jurisdiction on first voluntary dismissal; two voluntary dismissals; savings stature inapplicable; Civ.R.60(B) motion properly denied Bellar appealed the trial court's decisions dismissing his refiled complaint and denying his motion for relief from judgment. After a motor vehicle accident caused by Whitley, an employee of Clary Trucking, Bellar had initially filed lawsuits in both Licking and Adams Counties. He voluntarily dismissed the Adams County case in 2020 and later dismissed the Licking County case in 2023. Upon refiled in 2024, the court dismissed the case, citing the expiration of the statute of limitations and the double-dismissal rule under Civ.R. 41(A)(1). Bellar's motion for relief was denied, with the court reasoning that his counsel should have been aware of the prior dismissal. The appellate court affirmed the trial court's rulings, rejecting Bellar's arguments that the Adams County dismissal was void and that he was entitled to relief due to surprise or excusable neglect.	King, J.	3/17/2025
Civil	GREG SPEARS VS. ROBERT BOTELLO JR.	Case No. 2024 CA 0053	Appeal from the Richland County Court of Common Pleas (Domestic Relations Division), Case No. 2021 SUP 0520	Affirmed	Direct and indirect contempt; issues not addressed in trial court's judgment cannot be addressed on appeal Botello appealed his contempt finding for failing to pay child support in Richland County, arguing procedural errors and raising unrelated issues. He had agreed to the contempt finding and purge conditions at the hearing, where he waived his right to counsel. On appeal, he challenged the service of notice, paternity, visitation, and driving privileges. The appellate court found the contempt order valid and properly served, ruling that his additional arguments were outside the scope of review. As a result, the trial court's judgment was affirmed.	Gormley, J.	3/17/2025
Civil	LICKING HEIGHTS LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION VS. LICKING COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION, ET AL.	Case No. 2024 CA 00064	Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 24 CV 00762	Affirmed	Right to appeal under R.C. 2506.01 As addressed in Olentangy Local School Dist. Bd. of Education v. Delaware Cty. Bd. of Revision, 2024-Ohio-1564 (5th Dist.). the Court of Appeals found that the language in R.C. Ch. 5717 was not ambiguous, and the right to an appeal is solely with the property owner. Furthermore, the appellate court held that a board of education is statutorily prohibited from appealing a decision of the board of revision to either the Board of Tax Appeals or the common pleas court. For those reasons, the appellate court found that the trial court did not err in dismissing the BOR's decision.	Gormley, J.	3/19/2025

Case Type	Case Caption	Case No(s)	Character of Proceeding	Judgment	Topics and Issues	Author	Date of Judgment Entry
Civil	GRANVILLE EXEMPTED VILLAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION VS. LICKING COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION, ET AL.	Case No. 2024 CA 00065	Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 24 CV 00744	Affirmed	Right to appeal under R.C. 2506.01 As addressed in Olentangy Local School Dist. Bd. of Education v. Delaware Cty. Bd. of Revision, 2024-Ohio-1564 (5th Dist.). the Court of Appeals found that the language in R.C. Ch. 5717 was not ambiguous, and the right to an appeal is solely with the property owner. Furthermore, the appellate court held that a board of education is statutorily prohibited from appealing a decision of the board of revision to either the Board of Tax Appeals or the common pleas court. For those reasons, the appellate court found that the trial court did not err in dismissing the BOR's decision.	Gormley, J.	3/19/2025
Civil	LICKING HEIGHTS LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION VS LICKING COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION, ET AL.	Case No. 2024 CA 00070	Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 24 CV 00770	Affirmed	Right to appeal under R.C. 2506.01 As addressed in Olentangy Local School Dist. Bd. of Education v. Delaware Cty. Bd. of Revision, 2024-Ohio-1564 (5th Dist.). the Court of Appeals found that the language in R.C. Ch. 5717 was not ambiguous, and the right to an appeal is solely with the property owner. Furthermore, the appellate court held that a board of education is statutorily prohibited from appealing a decision of the board of revision to either the Board of Tax Appeals or the common pleas court. For those reasons, the appellate court found that the trial court did not err in dismissing the BOR's decision.	Gormley, J.	3/19/2025
Civil	LICKING HEIGHTS LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION VS. LICKING COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION, ET AL.	Case No. 2024 CA 00074	Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 24 CV 00764	Affirmed	Right to appeal under R.C. 2506.01 As addressed in Olentangy Local School Dist. Bd. of Education v. Delaware Cty. Bd. of Revision, 2024-Ohio-1564 (5th Dist.). the Court of Appeals found that the language in R.C. Ch. 5717 was not ambiguous, and the right to an appeal is solely with the property owner. Furthermore, the appellate court held that a board of education is statutorily prohibited from appealing a decision of the board of revision to either the Board of Tax Appeals or the common pleas court. For those reasons, the appellate court found that the trial court did not err in dismissing the BOR's decision.	Gormley, J.	3/19/2025
Civil	LICKING HEIGHTS LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION VS. LICKING COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION, ET AL.	Case No. 2024 CA 00074	Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 24 CV 00764	Affirmed	Right to appeal under R.C. 2506.01 As addressed in Olentangy Local School Dist. Bd. of Education v. Delaware Cty. Bd. of Revision, 2024-Ohio-1564 (5th Dist.). the Court of Appeals found that the language in R.C. Ch. 5717 was not ambiguous, and the right to an appeal is solely with the property owner. Furthermore, the appellate court held that a board of education is statutorily prohibited from appealing a decision of the board of revision to either the Board of Tax Appeals or the common pleas court. For those reasons, the appellate court found that the trial court did not err in dismissing the BOR's decision.	Gormley, J.	3/19/2025
Civil	HEATH CITY SCHOOL BOARD OF EDUCATION VS. LICKING COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION, ET AL.	Case No. 2024 CA 00067	Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 24 CV 00743	Affirmed	Right to appeal under R.C. 2506.01 As addressed in Olentangy Local School Dist. Bd. of Education v. Delaware Cty. Bd. of Revision, 2024-Ohio-1564 (5th Dist.). the Court of Appeals found that the language in R.C. Ch. 5717 was not ambiguous, and the right to an appeal is solely with the property owner. Furthermore, the appellate court held that a board of education is statutorily prohibited from appealing a decision of the board of revision to either the Board of Tax Appeals or the common pleas court. For those reasons, the appellate court found that the trial court did not err in dismissing the BOR's decision.	Baldwin, P.J.	3/19/2025
Civil	LICKING HEIGHTS LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION VS. LICKING COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION, ET AL.	Case No. 2024 CA 0068	Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 24 CV 00774	Affirmed	Right to appeal under R.C. 2506.01 As addressed in Olentangy Local School Dist. Bd. of Education v. Delaware Cty. Bd. of Revision, 2024-Ohio-1564 (5th Dist.). the Court of Appeals found that the language in R.C. Ch. 5717 was not ambiguous, and the right to an appeal is solely with the property owner. Furthermore, the appellate court held that a board of education is statutorily prohibited from appealing a decision of the board of revision to either the Board of Tax Appeals or the common pleas court. For those reasons, the appellate court found that the trial court did not err in dismissing the BOR's decision.	Baldwin, P.J.	3/19/2025
Civil	LICKING HEIGHTS LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION VS. LICKING COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION, ET AL.	Case No. 2024 CA 0071	Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 24 CV 00768	Affirmed	Right to appeal under R.C. 2506.01 As addressed in Olentangy Local School Dist. Bd. of Education v. Delaware Cty. Bd. of Revision, 2024-Ohio-1564 (5th Dist.). the Court of Appeals found that the language in R.C. Ch. 5717 was not ambiguous, and the right to an appeal is solely with the property owner. Furthermore, the appellate court held that a board of education is statutorily prohibited from appealing a decision of the board of revision to either the Board of Tax Appeals or the common pleas court. For those reasons, the appellate court found that the trial court did not err in dismissing the BOR's decision.	Baldwin, P.J.	3/19/2025

Case Type	Case Caption	Case No(s)	Character of Proceeding	Judgment	Topics and Issues	Author	Date of Judgment Entry
Civil	LICKING HEIGHTS LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION VS. LICKING COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION, ET AL.	Case No. 2024 CA 0075	Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 24 CV 00765	Affirmed	Right to appeal under R.C. 2506.01 As addressed in Olentangy Local School Dist. Bd. of Education v. Delaware Cty. Bd. of Revision, 2024-Ohio-1564 (5th Dist.). the Court of Appeals found that the language in R.C. Ch. 5717 was not ambiguous, and the right to an appeal is solely with the property owner. Furthermore, the appellate court held that a board of education is statutorily prohibited from appealing a decision of the board of revision to either the Board of Tax Appeals or the common pleas court. For those reasons, the appellate court found that the trial court did not err in dismissing the BOR's decision.	Baldwin, P.J.	3/19/2025
Civil	HEATH CITY SCHOOL BOARD OF EDUCATION VS. LICKING COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION, ET AL.	Case No. 2024 CA 00066	Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 2024 CV00745	Affirmed	Right to appeal under R.C. 2506.01 As addressed in Olentangy Local School Dist. Bd. of Education v. Delaware Cty. Bd. of Revision, 2024-Ohio-1564 (5th Dist.). the Court of Appeals found that the language in R.C. Ch. 5717 was not ambiguous, and the right to an appeal is solely with the property owner. Furthermore, the appellate court held that a board of education is statutorily prohibited from appealing a decision of the board of revision to either the Board of Tax Appeals or the common pleas court. For those reasons, the appellate court found that the trial court did not err in dismissing the BOR's decision.	King, J.	3/19/2025
Civil	LICKING HEIGHTS LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION VS. LICKING COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION, ET AL.	Case No. 2024 CA 00073	Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 2024 CV00763	Affirmed	Right to appeal under R.C. 2506.01 As addressed in Olentangy Local School Dist. Bd. of Education v. Delaware Cty. Bd. of Revision, 2024-Ohio-1564 (5th Dist.). the Court of Appeals found that the language in R.C. Ch. 5717 was not ambiguous, and the right to an appeal is solely with the property owner. Furthermore, the appellate court held that a board of education is statutorily prohibited from appealing a decision of the board of revision to either the Board of Tax Appeals or the common pleas court. For those reasons, the appellate court found that the trial court did not err in dismissing the BOR's decision.	King, J.	3/19/2025
Civil	LICKING HEIGHTS LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION VS. LICKING COUNTY BOARD OF REVISION, ET AL.	Case No. 2024 CA 00072	Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 2024 CV00766	Affirmed	Right to appeal under R.C. 2506.01 As addressed in Olentangy Local School Dist. Bd. of Education v. Delaware Cty. Bd. of Revision, 2024-Ohio-1564 (5th Dist.). the Court of Appeals found that the language in R.C. Ch. 5717 was not ambiguous, and the right to an appeal is solely with the property owner. Furthermore, the appellate court held that a board of education is statutorily prohibited from appealing a decision of the board of revision to either the Board of Tax Appeals or the common pleas court. For those reasons, the appellate court found that the trial court did not err in dismissing the BOR's decision.	King, J.	3/19/2025
Probate	IN THE MATTER OF: THE GUARDIANSHIP OF ELIZABETH BURSON	Case No. 2024 CA 00039	Appeal from the Fairfield County Court of Common Pleas, Probate Division, Case No. PG00068376	Dismissed	Motion to reconsideration/guardianship Burson appealed the decision overruling his motion for reconsideration. His appeal was untimely, as he failed to file a notice of appeal within 30 days of the original judgment entry as required by Appellate Rule 4(A). The motion for reconsideration did not extend the appeal deadline. Since Burson filed his appeal late, the court determined it lacked jurisdiction to review the case and dismissed the appeal.	Popham, J.	3/17/2025
Domestic Relations	ELIZABETH TROMLER VS. LASZLO TROMLER	Case No. 2024 CA 0027	Appeal from the Richland County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 2023 CPO 0461	Affirmed	Civil Protection Order Tromler appealed the trial court's decision to grant E. Tromler a five-year Domestic Violence Civil Protection Order. He argued that the trial court should have dismissed the petition for improper venue, erred in limiting his cross-examination to three hours, and improperly issued the protection order due to insufficient evidence of imminent danger. The appellate court found no abuse of discretion, ruling that the trial court acted reasonably and within its authority. The evidence supported the appellee's fear for her safety, given the appellant's history of violence. As a result, the appeal was denied.	Baldwin, J.	3/18/2025
Domestic Relations	LEAH BRODBECK VS. BRETT BRODBECK				Failure to object to magistrate decision forfeit right to appeal; valuation of business; division of marital property 404 not found?		

Case Type	Case Caption	Case No(s)	Character of Proceeding	Judgment	Topics and Issues	Author	Date of Judgment Entry
-----------	--------------	------------	-------------------------	----------	-------------------	--------	------------------------

Case Type	Case Caption	Case No(s)	Character of Proceeding	Judgment	Topics and Issues	Author	Date of Judgment Entry
-----------	--------------	------------	-------------------------	----------	-------------------	--------	------------------------