

**SUPREME COURT OF OHIO**

**COLUMBUS**

**ANNOUNCEMENT**

TUESDAY  
October 24, 2000

**MERIT DOCKET**

**00-1830. State ex rel. Ohio Heritage Dev. Co. v. Portage Cty. Bd. of Elections.**

In Prohibition. This cause originated in this court on the filing of a complaint for a writ of prohibition regarding an expedited election matter and was considered in a manner prescribed by law. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the writ of prohibition be, and hereby is, denied.

Moyer, C.J., Douglas, Resnick, F.E. Sweeney, Cook and Lundberg Stratton, JJ., concur.

Pfeifer, J., would deny the writ based on laches.

**00-1844. State ex rel. Streicher v. Ruhlman.**

In Prohibition. This cause originated in this court on the filing of a complaint for a writ of prohibition. Upon consideration of the city of Cincinnati's motion for stay of trial court proceedings or temporary restraining order,

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

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

Moyer, C.J., Resnick, Pfeifer, Cook and Lundberg Stratton, JJ., concur.

F.E. Sweeney, J., would only deny the motion.

Douglas, J., dissents and would grant an alternative writ.

### **MOTION DOCKET**

#### **00-977. Columbus Bar Assn. v. Bailey.**

This cause came on for further consideration upon respondent's motion for stay of enforcement of entry of October 13, 2000, pending filing of petition to the United States Supreme Court. Upon consideration thereof,

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

Resnick, J., would also impose sanctions.

Lundberg Stratton, J., would also assess sanctions.

#### **00-1829. State ex rel. Wehrung v. Dinkelacker.**

Hamilton App. No. C-000449. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Hamilton County. Upon consideration of appellant's revised motion for stay of proceedings in the trial court,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the revised motion for stay of proceedings in the trial court be, and hereby is, granted, to the extent that the stay applies to the actual trial only and not pretrial proceedings.

F.E. Sweeney, J., dissents.

### **RECONSIDERATION DOCKET**

#### **99-157. Cincinnati Bar Assn. v. Bailey.**

Reported at 90 Ohio St.3d 136, \_\_\_ N.E.2d \_\_\_. This cause came on for further consideration upon respondent's motion for reconsideration and motion for stay of enforcement of entry of October 13, 2000, pending filing of petition in the United States Supreme Court. Upon consideration thereof,

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