

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

COLUMBUS

ANNOUNCEMENT

TUESDAY
March 10, 1998

MOTION DOCKET

97-1142. Sutowski v. Eli Lilly & Co.
Certified State Law Question, No. 1:97CV1283. This cause came before the court on the certification of a state law question from the United States District for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division. Upon consideration of the requests by respondents, Dart Industries, Inc., and Eli Lilly & Company, for additional time to present oral argument, currently scheduled for April 7, 1998,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the requests for additional time to present oral argument be, and hereby are, granted, and the time for oral argument is extended to twenty minutes per side.

98-55. In re Petition for Annexation of 368.08 Acres of Land, More or Less, In Springfield Twp.
Ross App. No. 96 CA 2238. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal. Upon consideration of appellant's motion to stay the judgment of the Fourth Appellate District Court of Appeals, Ross County, Ohio, rendered on November 25, 1997,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion to stay the judgment of the Fourth Appellate District Court of Appeals, Ross County, Ohio, be, and hereby is, granted, pending final disposition by this court.

Douglas and Pfeifer, JJ., would deny the motion.

Lundberg Stratton, J., would dismiss the motion as untimely.

98-68. State ex rel. Nix v. Cleveland.
In Mandamus. This cause originated in this court on the filing of a complaint for a writ of mandamus. Upon consideration of respondents' motion for protective order and to quash,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion to quash be, and hereby is, granted.

F.E. Sweeney, Pfeifer and Lundberg Stratton, JJ., dissent.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the court that the motion for

protective order is denied for want of four votes on the following vote:

F.E. Sweeney, Pfeifer and Lundberg Stratton, JJ., would deny the motion for protective order.

Cook, J., would delay ruling on the motion for protective order until relators request an order compelling discovery.

Moyer, C.J., Douglas and Resnick, JJ., would grant the motion for protective order.

98-409. State v. Haendiges.

Lorain App. No. 96CA006558. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and claimed appeal of right. Upon consideration of appellant's motion for stay,

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

F.E. Sweeney, J., dissents.

98-431. State v. Bell.

Madison App. No. CA96-07-027. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and claimed appeal of right. Upon consideration of appellant's motion for stay,

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

Resnick, J., dissents.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

98-288. State ex rel. Simms v. Cuyahoga Cty. Dept. of Children & Family Serv.

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.