

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

COLUMBUS

ANNOUNCEMENT

**FRIDAY
MAY 7, 1999**

MOTION DOCKET

98-1686. Ezawa v. Yasuda Fire & Marine Ins. Co. of Am.

Franklin App. No. 97APE10-1343. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal. On August 14, 1998, appellants filed a notice that a motion to certify a conflict was pending in the court of appeals and, pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(A), this court stayed consideration of the jurisdictional memoranda filed in this appeal. Whereas appellants have neither notified this court that the court of appeals determined that a conflict does not exist as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(B), nor filed a copy of the court of appeals' order certifying the existence of a conflict as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(C),

IT IS ORDERED by the court, *sua sponte*, that appellants show cause within ten days of the date of this entry why this court should not proceed to consider the jurisdictional memoranda in this appeal pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(6).

98-1991. State v. Martin.

Summit App. No. 18607. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and claimed appeal of right. On September 28, 1998, appellant filed a notice that a motion to certify a conflict was pending in the court of appeals and, pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(A), this court stayed consideration of the jurisdictional memoranda filed in this appeal. Whereas appellant has neither notified this court that the court of appeals determined that a conflict does not exist as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(B), nor filed a copy of the court of appeals' order certifying the existence of a conflict as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(C),

IT IS ORDERED by the court, *sua sponte*, that appellant show cause within ten days of the date of this entry why this court should not proceed to consider the jurisdictional memoranda in this appeal pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(6).

98-2577. Hubbard v. Canton City School Dist. Bd. of Edn.

Stark App. No. 1998CA00089. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal. On December 7, 1998, appellants filed a notice that a motion to certify a conflict was pending in the court of appeals and, pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(A), this court stayed consideration of the jurisdictional memoranda filed in this appeal. Whereas appellants have neither notified this court that the court of appeals determined that a conflict does not exist as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(B), nor filed a copy of the court of appeals' order certifying the existence of a conflict as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(C),

IT IS ORDERED by the court, *sua sponte*, that appellants show cause within ten days of the date of this entry why this court should not proceed to consider the jurisdictional memoranda in this appeal pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(6).

99-347. Greenwalt v. Am. Std., Inc.

Columbiana App. No. 98CO13. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal. On February 12, 1999, appellant filed a notice that a motion to certify a conflict was pending in the court of appeals and, pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(A), this court stayed consideration of the jurisdictional memoranda filed in this appeal. Whereas appellant has neither notified this court that the court of appeals determined that a conflict does not exist as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(B), nor filed a copy of the court of appeals' order certifying the existence of a conflict as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(C),

IT IS ORDERED by the court, *sua sponte*, that appellant show cause within ten days of the date of this entry why this court should not proceed to consider the jurisdictional memoranda in this appeal pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(6).

99-450. Christe v. GMS Mgt. Co., Inc.

Summit App. No. 18992. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal and claimed appeal of right. On March 8, 1999, appellant filed a notice that a motion to certify a conflict was pending in the court of appeals and, pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(A), this court stayed consideration of the jurisdictional memoranda filed in this appeal. Whereas appellant has neither notified this court that the court of appeals determined that a conflict does not exist as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(B), nor filed a copy of the court of appeals' order certifying the existence of a conflict as provided by S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(4)(C),

IT IS ORDERED by the court, *sua sponte*, that appellant show cause within ten days of the date of this entry why this court should not proceed to consider the jurisdictional memoranda in this appeal pursuant to S.Ct.Prac.R. IV(6).

DISCIPLINARY DOCKET

99-604. Cleveland Bar Assn. v. Szczepinski.

On March 31, 1999, movant filed a motion for an order to show cause why respondent should not be held in contempt of an order of the Board of Commissioners on the Unauthorized Practice of Law. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion be, and is hereby, granted, to the extent that respondent show cause by filing a written response with the Clerk of this court, on or before twenty days from the date of this order, why respondent should not be punished for contempt.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, *sua sponte*, that all documents filed with this court in this case shall meet the filing requirements set forth in the Rules of Practice of the Supreme Court of Ohio, including requirements as to form, number, and timeliness of filings.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

99-249. Taylor v. Mitchell.

Richland App. No. 98CA113. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Richland County. It appears from the records of this court that appellant has not filed a merit brief, due May 3, 1999, 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*.