

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

COLUMBUS

ANNOUNCEMENT

THURSDAY  
September 19, 1996

DISMISSALS, SUA SPONTE, NO SUBSTANTIAL  
CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION AND DISCRETIONARY  
APPEALS, IF APPLICABLE, NOT ALLOWED

96-1561. State v. Chinn.  
Montgomery County, No. 15009. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and a claimed appeal of right. Upon consideration of appellant's motion for stay of proceedings set for September 24, 1996, in the trial court,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion for stay be, and hereby is, denied.

Upon consideration of the jurisdictional memoranda filed in this case, the court denies leave to appeal and dismisses the appeal as not involving any substantial constitutional question.

MOTION DOCKET

88-1074. State v. Hutton.  
Cuyahoga County, No. 51704. Upon consideration of the motion filed by counsel for appellant to stay execution in the above-stayed cause pending the exhaustion of state post-conviction remedies, and it appearing from the exhibits to the motion that a petition for post-conviction relief has been filed by appellant with the Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Court,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that compliance with the mandate and execution of sentence be, and the same are hereby, stayed, pending the exhaustion of all proceedings for post-conviction relief before courts of this state.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that counsel for the appellant and for the appellee shall notify this court when all proceedings for post-conviction relief before courts of this state have been exhausted.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

94-2371. State ex rel. LTV Steel Co. v. Indus. Comm.  
Franklin County, No. 93APD10-1419. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Franklin County. Upon consideration of the joint application for dismissal,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the application for dismissal be, and hereby is, granted.

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that this cause be, and hereby is, dismissed.

96-1834. Davis v. Davis.

Montgomery County, No. CA 15628. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and as a claimed appeal of right. It appears from the records of this court that appellant has not filed a memorandum in support of jurisdiction, due September 16, 1996, in compliance with the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court and therefore has failed to prosecute this cause with the requisite diligence. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that this cause be, and hereby is, dismissed sua sponte.

96-1915. State ex rel. Lorain Journal Co. v. Lorain.

In Mandamus. This cause originated in this court on the filing of a complaint for a writ of mandamus. Upon consideration of relator's application for dismissal,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the application for dismissal be, and hereby is, granted.

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that this cause be, and hereby is, dismissed.