

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

February 13, 2014

[Cite as *2/13/14 Case Announcements*, 2014-Ohio-485.]

MERIT DECISIONS WITH OPINIONS

2012-0187. In re Application of Columbus S. Power Co., Slip Opinion No. 2014-Ohio-462.

Public Utilities Commission, Nos. 08-917-EL-SSO and 08-918-EL-SSO. Orders affirmed.

O'Connor, C.J., and O'Donnell, Lanzinger, Kennedy, and French, JJ., concur.

Pfeifer and O'Neill, JJ., dissent.

2012-2136. State v. Taylor, Slip Opinion No. 2014-Ohio-460.

Summit App. No. 26279, 2012-Ohio-5403. Judgment reversed.

Pfeifer, Acting C.J., Harsha, O'Donnell, Lanzinger, Kennedy, and O'Neill, JJ., concur.

French, J., dissents.

William H. Harsha, J., of the Fourth Appellate District, sitting for O'Connor, C.J.

2013-0696. Smith v. Buchanan, Slip Opinion No. 2014-Ohio-459.

Noble App. No. 13-NO-399, 2013-Ohio-1746. Judgment affirmed.

O'Connor, C.J., and Pfeifer, O'Donnell, Lanzinger, Kennedy, French, and O'Neill, JJ., concur.

2013-1051. State ex rel. Harsh v. Oney, Slip Opinion No. 2014-Ohio-458.

Butler App. No. CA2013-05-0069. Judgment affirmed.

O'Connor, C.J., and Pfeifer, O'Donnell, Lanzinger, Kennedy, French, and O'Neill, JJ., concur.

MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

In re Howard.

On September 24, 2004, this court found Gregory T. Howard to be a vexatious litigator under S.Ct.Prac.R. 4.03(B). This court further ordered that Howard was prohibited from continuing or instituting legal proceedings in the court without obtaining leave. On February 5, 2014, and February 11, 2014, Howard presented a motion for leave to file a notice of appeal and related documents and a motion to file reasons for granting a notice of appeal of right.

It is ordered by the court that the motions are denied.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

2013-1583. State ex rel. Harsh v. Mohr.

Franklin App. No. 13AP-357. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Franklin County. The records of this court indicate that appellant has not filed a merit brief, due December 20, 2013, in compliance with the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court of Ohio and therefore has failed to prosecute this cause with the requisite diligence.

Upon consideration thereof, it is ordered by the court that this cause is dismissed.

Upon consideration of appellant's motion to hold case in abeyance, it is ordered by the court that the motion is denied.