

09-0994

ORIGINAL

Case No. _____

The Supreme Court of Ohio

State ex rel., Robert G. Watson,

Mansfield Correctional Inst.

No. 281-900

1150 North Main Street

Mansfield, Ohio 44901,

Relator,

vs.

Honorable Judge William B Hoffman, 5197

-and-

The Fifth District Court of Appeals,


320 County Office Bldg.

110 Central Plaza South

Canton, Ohio 44702-1411,

Respondent.

Complaint for Writ of Prohibition



The Supreme Court of Ohio

State ex rel., Robert G. Watson, :
Mansfield Correctional Inst. : Case No. _____
No. 281-900 :
1150 North Main Street :
Mansfield, Ohio 44901, :
 :
Relator, :
 :
vs. :
 : **Complaint for**
Honorable Judge William B Hoffman, : **Writ of Prohibition**
-and- :
The Fifth District Court of Appeals, :
320 County Office Bldg. :
110 Central Plaza South :
Canton, Ohio 44702-1411, :
 :
Respondent. :

Jurisdiction

1. This court has original jurisdiction pursuant to Ohio Constitution, Article IV, Section 2 (B)(1)(d) of the acts and omissions complained of.

Parties

2. Relator is currently imprisoned at the Mansfield Correctional Institution and can be located at the above listed location.
3. Respondent, William B. Hoffman, is a duly qualified and acting judge of the Fifth District Court of Appeals of Richland County, Ohio, which said court is also named as a Respondent herein.

Claim for Relief


4. The court or officer against whom the writ is sought is about to exercise judicial or quasi-judicial power, the exercise of that power is unauthorized by law, and that by denying a writ will result in injury for which no other adequate remedy exists in the ordinary course of law.
5. An appeal entitled Robert G. Watson (Plaintiff-Appellee) vs. State of Ohio (Defendant-Appellant) was filed in said court and is now pending as cause No. 08-CA-201. Relator is the Plaintiff-Appellee in said action.
6. The respondent court was and is wholly without jurisdiction of said action. Said lack of jurisdiction was duly called to the attention of the court and urged upon it by a Motion to Dismiss duly filed with said court, which the Relator without entering his appearance and appearing solely for the purpose of making objection to the jurisdiction of the court, asserted that the court lacked jurisdiction over the case and appeal due to the lack of a final appealable order given the specific circumstances which had occurred, and duly moved that the action be dismissed for want of jurisdiction. A copy of said Motion to Dismiss by Relator is hereto attached, marked Exhibit A respectively, and by this reference made a part hereof.
7. Nevertheless, the Respondent court, by and through Respondent judge William B. Hoffman, denied said Motion to Dismiss on January 12, 2009 and retained jurisdiction thereof. A copy of said denial is hereto attached, marked Exhibit B respectively, and by this reference made a part hereof.
8. The respondent court is without jurisdiction of said action for the following reasons: On May 7, 2008, Relator filed an action against the State of Ohio in the court of common pleas, County of Richland, challenging his reclassification under the Adam Walsh Act (Ohio's Senate Bill 110). Ultimately, on September 30, 2008, the Richland County Common Pleas entered a "Conditional Final Order" which stated in part:
 - “ 1. Conditional judgment is granted in favor of petitioner, and, unless a Party files a motion within twenty-one days after the date of this order to request a hearing to demonstrate that this petitioner's case is not resolved by the *Sigler* ruling, that judgment will be final.”A copy of said Conditional Final Judgment is hereto attached, marked Exhibit C respectively, and by this reference made a part hereof.
9. Relator, however, felt all issues had not been fully resolved, and, on October 20, 2008, being twenty (20) days after the courts "Conditional Final Order", timely filed his document entitled "*Petitioner's Request for a Hearing Pursuant to this Court's Ruling on September 30, 2008*".
10. Said above request for a hearing submitted by Relator in that case is still pending.

11. The defendant, State of Ohio, in that case on November 20, 2008, filed a Notice of Appeal with Respondent court prematurely before any decision of Relator's timely request for a hearing pursuant to the lower court's conditional order which necessarily cancelled the September 30, 2008 "Conditional Final Order". A copy of the Richland County Common Pleas case docket (#2008CV993D) and the Fifth District Court of Appeals case docket (#2008CA0201) are hereto attached, marked Exhibits D & E respectively, and by this reference made a part hereof.
12. On May 19, 2009, Relator, again, duly called to the attention of the Respondent court its lack of jurisdiction by submitting a "*Motion to Strike Appellant's Brief*" in reaffirming Relator's position that the Respondent court lacks a final appealable order in said cause.
13. Relator has no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy other than by issuance of a writ of prohibition as herein prayed, Relator's right of appeal from said order of Respondent court being dependent on the court having subject matter jurisdiction given by a final appealable order entered in a case pursuant to the Ohio Constitution, and the Respondent court will, unless restrained and prohibited, continue to exercise control over the action, notwithstanding its lack of jurisdiction thereof.

WHEREFORE, Relator prays:

1. That an alternative writ of prohibition be issued restraining the Fifth District Court of Appeals, in and for the County of Richland, State of Ohio, its officers, judges, agents, and all persons acting by and through its orders, from proceeding further in said appeal as regards said cause and Relator until further order of this Court;
2. That said Respondent and court be directed and required to show cause before this Court why it should not be absolutely and forever restrained and prohibited from taking any further action or proceedings against or making any further orders affecting Relator herein in the above-described proceedings;
3. That such further relief to which Relator may be entitled be ordered and decreed.

Respectfully submitted,


Robert G. Watson, Relator

Instructions to the Clerk:

Please make the proper service upon the Respondent at the above captioned-listed address in accordance and as required by the Ohio Civil Rules and Ohio law.

The Supreme Court of Ohio

State ex rel., Robert G. Watson, :
Relator, : Case No.
vs. :
Honorable Judge William B. Hoffman, :
-and- : Affidavit of Verification and
The Fifth District Court of Appeals, : of prior civil action in accordance
Respondent. : with R.C. 2969.25

State of Ohio)
Richland County) SS:

I, Robert G. Watson, first being duly sworn according to law and competent to testify herein, deposes and states the following:

- 1. I have not filed any civil actions in the past five years.
2. That I am the Relator herein, and the Petitioner in Case No 2008CV993D, and the Petitioner-Appellee in Case No. 2008CA0201.
3. That all facts and statements submitted herein are true, correct, and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.
4. That the attached Exhibits are true, correct, and complete copies of the originals either drafted by Affiant or sent to him by the clerk of courts or counsel for the State of Ohio.

Further Affiant sayeth naught.

Robert G. Watson
Robert G. Watson

Sworn to and subscribed in my presence on this 27 day of May, 2009.

Mary K Miner
Notary Public



MARY K. MINER
NOTARY PUBLIC,
STATE OF OHIO
My Commission Expires
October 22, 2012

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO

Case No. 2008-CA-201

ROBERT G. WATSON,	:	
	:	
Petitioner-Appellee,	:	Richland County
	:	Common Pleas Case No.
-vs-	:	08-CV-993D
	:	
	:	
STATE OF OHIO	:	
	:	
Respondent-Appellant.	:	

MOTION TO DISMISS APPEAL

Now Comes Petitioner-Appellee, Robert G. Watson, pro se, and moves this Honorable Court for an order dismissing this appeal for failing to have a final appealable order to appeal from and for the reasons set forth in the Brief attached hereto and incorporated herein.

Respectfully submitted,


Robert G. Watson #281-900
Mansfield Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 788
Mansfield, OH
Petitioner-Appellee, pro se

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

A copy of the forgoing Motion to Dismiss Appeal was sent by ordinary U.S. mail, postage prepaid, to the Assistant Richland County Prosecutor, Frank Ardis, Jr., at 38 South Park Street, Second Floor, Mansfield, Ohio, 44902, on December 8th, 2008.



Robert G. Watson #281-900
Mansfield Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 788
Mansfield, OH
44901-0788
Petitioner-Appellee, pro se

BRIEF IN SUPPORT

On November 20, 2008, the State of Ohio, Respondent-Appellant, herein, filed a Notice of Appeal in Case No. 08-CV-993D. It is assigned Court of Appeals Case No. 2008-CA-201. A review of the Conditional Order attached to the Docketing Statement reveals that it is not a final appealable order for the following reasons:

1. On the Conditional Final Order (Filed on 9/30/08), Judge James DeWeese specifically stated on page one:

"1. Conditional judgement is granted in favor of petitioner, and, unless a party files a motion within twenty-one days after the date of this order to request a hearing to demonstrate that this petitioner's case is not resolved by the Sigler ruling, that judgement will be final." [emphasis added].

On October 20, 2008, Petitioner-Appellee, timely filed, "Petitioner's Request for a Hearing Pursuant to this Court's Ruling on September 30, 2008." This motion is still pending and therefore the judgment entry the state is attempting to appeal is not a final appealable order pursuant to R.C. §2905.02:

According to R.C. 2905.02:

"(A) As used in this section:

(B) An order is a final order that may be reviewed, affirmed, modified, or reversed, with or without retrial, when it is one of the following:

(1) An Order that affects a substantial right in an action that in effect determines the action and prevents a judgment;

(2) An order that affects a substantial right made in a special proceeding or upon a summary application in an action after judgment;

(3) An order that vacates or sets aside a judgment or grants a new trial;

(4) An order that grants or denies a provisional remedy and to which both of the following apply:

(a) The order in effect determines the action with respect to the provisional remedy and prevents a judgment in the action in favor of the appealing party with respect to the provisional remedy.

(b) The appealing party would not be afforded a meaningful or effective remedy by an appeal following final judgment as to all proceedings, issues, claims, and parties in the action.

(5) An order that determines that an action may or may not be mandated as a class action;***[.]"

Courts routinely dismiss appeals when a party mistakenly files a premature appeal. In *Meldrum v. Meldrum, et al.* (July 22, 2002), Lucas App.No.L-02-1204, 2002 WL 1782225, 2002-Ohio-3971, the Sixth District Court of Appeals held: "(¶ 8) 'Accordingly, we find the order denying a stay of proceeding is not a final appealable order under R.C. 2505.02(B)(4).

Therefore, we must also dismiss this appeal.'"

In **Community First Bank Trust v. Dafoe, et al.** (2006), 108 Ohio St.3d 472, 844 N.E.2d 825, 2006-Ohio-1503, the Ohio Supreme Court held: "(¶ 32) Accordingly, we hold that a court's order staying an action, including the claims against nonbankrupt parties, pending determination of the bankruptcy of another party, is not a final order subject to appeal under former R.C. 2505.02."

In **State v. Robinson** (Nov.10, 2008), Stark App.No. 2007-CA-00349, 2008 WL 4881120, 2008-Ohio-5885, this Court held a court lacks jurisdiction when there is a lack of a final appealable order. See, also, **Jefferson v. Stebler, III**, (Oct.20, 2008), Stark App.No. 2008-CA-00077, 2008 WL 4637052, 2008-Ohio-5434 (same).

Therefore, Petitioner-Appellee respectfully moves this Honorable Court for an order dismissing this appeal.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert G. Watson #281-900
Mansfield Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 788
Mansfield, OH
44901-0788
Petitioner Appellee, pro se

COURT OF APPEALS
RICHLAND COUNTY OHIO
FILED

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

2009 JAN 12 AM 9:16

LINDA H. FRARY
CLERK

ROBERT G. WATSON
Plaintiff-Appellee

CASE NO. 08-CA-201

-vs-

JUDGMENT ENTRY

STATE OF OHIO
Defendant-Appellant

This matter came before the Court upon Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal for lack of a final, appealable order. Appellant has not filed a response. The trial court issued an entry on September 30, 2008, which stated it would become a final order after 21 days. The entry appears to have become a final order on October 22, 2008. The notice of appeal was filed in this case on November 20, 2008, which is within 30 days of the date of the final entry, therefore, Appellant timely appealed the final order. Appellee's motion to dismiss is denied.

MOTION DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

William B. Johnson
JUDGE

EXHIBIT
B

Pras

RECEIVED

OCT 20 2008

RICHLAND COUNTY
CLERK OF COURTS

2008 SEP 30 PM 12:29

RICHLAND COUNTY
CLERK OF COURTS

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO

Robert Watson,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	Case No. 08 CV 0993'D
)	
v.)	
)	CONDITIONAL FINAL ORDER
State of Ohio,)	ON PETITION TO CONTEST
)	APPLICATION OF THE ADAM
Respondent,)	WALSH ACT

The petitioner has brought this case before the court in order to contest his reclassification under the Adam Walsh Act (Ohio's Senate Bill 10). On August 11, 2008, this court issued a decision in the case of *William Sigler v. State of Ohio*, Case Number 07 CV 1863, which concerned constitutional challenges to the Adam Walsh Act. In *Sigler*, this court held that the Adam Walsh Act was an unconstitutional violation of the ex post facto clause in the U.S. Constitution (Article I, Section 10) and of the prohibition on retroactive laws in the Ohio Constitution (Article II, Section 28).

This court finds that the holding in *Sigler* applies in this case to bar application of the Adam Walsh Act to petitioner, because the petitioner has previously been sentenced and classified under the law in existence when he was sentenced.

Judgment Entry:

It is therefore ordered:

1. Conditional judgment is granted in favor of the petitioner, and, unless a party files a motion within twenty-one days after the date of this order to request a hearing to demonstrate a reason that this petitioner's case is not resolved by the *Sigler* ruling, that judgment will be final.



Journalized on the court's
docket on 10-2-08

[Handwritten Signature]
Deputy Clerk

2. If no such motion is filed in this case, this case shall be closed, costs shall be taxed to the respondent, and the petitioner shall continue to comply with all registration and reporting requirements that applied to his prior to the effective date of the Adam Walsh Act.

3. Petitioner's renewed request to obtain briefing schedule to submit new case law is deemed a moot issue and motion is dismissed.

4. The clerk shall serve copies of this order on the following individuals, telling them the date it was entered on the court's journal:


Robert Watson

Richland County Prosecutor's Office

Ohio Attorney General's Office

Richland County Sheriff

Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation



Judge James DeWeese



2008 CV 0993

WATSON, ROBERT G VS STATE OF OHIO

(JD)

Search Criteria

Docket Entry Begin Date SortDescending
 Images All Dockets End Date
 Participant
 Display Option Exclude Non Display Dockets

Search Results

Docket Date	Referenc e	Description	Amt Owed/ Amt Dism/Credit	Amount Due
2/19/2009		POSTAGE FEE---ROBERT WATSON #281-900 (REQUESTING DOCKET SHEET PER LETTER)	1.00	1.00
2/17/2009		POSTAGE FEE---ROBERT WATSON #281-900 (DOCKET SHEET)	1.00	1.00
12/29/2008		AR STATEMENT SENT STATE OF OHIO was sent notice for \$ 248.00 Printed on 12/29/2008 13:39:07.	10.00	10.00
11/25/2008		COPY OF ENTRY SCANNED ON 12-02-08 ISSD TO B C I	1.00	1.00
11/25/2008		COPY OF ENTRY SCANNED ON 12-02-08 ISSD TO RICH. CO. SHERIFF	1.00	1.00
11/25/2008		COPY OF ENTRY SCANNED ON 12-02-08 ISSD TO OHIO ATTY GENERALS OFFICE	1.00	1.00
11/25/2008		COPY OF ENTRY SCANNED ON 12-02-08 ISSD TO RICH. CO. PROS. OFFICE	1.00	1.00
11/25/2008		COPY OF ENTRY SCANNED ON 12-02-08 ISSD TO ROBERT WATSON	1.00	1.00
11/25/2008	21	ORDER FILED. ORDERED: THE DEF. MOTION TO STAY JUDGMENT IS HEREBY OVERRULED. SCANNED 12-02-08 BNS	2.00	2.00
11/20/2008	20	DOCKETING STATEMENT FILED. REG CAL/JOURNAL ENTRIES ONLY FILED. Attorney: ARDIS JR, FRANK (14746)	5.00	5.00
11/20/2008	19	NOTICE OF APPEAL TO COURT OF APPEALS JE 9-30-08 FILED. 08CV993D Attorney: ARDIS JR, FRANK (14746)	2.00	2.00
11/20/2008	18	COURT OF APPEALS DOCKETING STATEMENT REG/CAL. W/OUT TRANS. REQUIRED Attorney: ARDIS JR, FRANK (14746)	5.00	5.00
11/20/2008	17	NOTICE OF APPEAL TO COURT OF APPEALS 08-CV-993 Attorney: ARDIS JR, FRANK (14746)	2.00	
10/20/2008	16	REQUEST FOR HEARING FILED BY PLTF. Attorney: PRO SE ()	2.00	
10/20/2008	15	MOTION TO STAY JUDGMENT FILED BY THE STATE		

EXHIBIT
D

Date	Page	Description	Cost	Balance
		OF OHIO. Attorney SCHOLKA-GARTNER, KIRSTEN L (77792)	3.00	3.00
10/2/2008		ST. SENT TO OHIO ATTY. GENERAL FOR COSTS DUE \$248.00		
10/2/2008		COPY OF ENTRY SCANNED ON 10-2-08 ISS'D TO RICHLAND CO. SHERIFF	1.00	1.00
10/2/2008		COPY OF ENTRY SCANNED ON 10-2-08 ISS'D TO B C I	1.00	1.00
10/2/2008		COPY OF ENTRY SCANNED ON 10-2-08 ISS'D TO OHIO ATTY. GENERAL'S OFFICE	1.00	1.00
10/2/2008		COPY OF ENTRY SCANNED ON 10-2-08 ISS'D TO RICHLAND CO. PROSECUTOR	1.00	1.00
10/2/2008		COPY OF ENTRY SCANNED ON 10-2-08 ISS'D TO PETITIONER / ROBERT WATSON	1.00	1.00
9/30/2008	14	ENTRY FILED. ORDERED: CONDITIONAL JUDGMENT IS GRANTED IN FAVOR OF THE PETITIONER, AND, UNLESS A PARTY FILES A MOTION WITHIN 21 DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF THIS ORDER TO REQUEST A HEARING TO DEMONSTRATE A REASON THAT THIS PETITIONER'S CASE IS NOT RESOLVED BY THE SIGLER RULING, THAT JUDGMENT WILL BE FINAL. IF NO SUCH MOTION IS FILED IN THIS CASE, THIS CASE SHALL BE CLOSED, COSTS SHALL BE TAXED TO THE RESPONDENT AND THE PETITIONER SHALL CONTINUE TO COMPLY WITH ALL REGISTRATION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS THAT APPLIED TO HIS PRIOR TO THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE ADAM WALSH ACT. SCANNED 10-2-08 WKM	4.00	4.00
9/29/2008		POSTAGE, NO CHARGE MAILED COPY OF DOCKET ROBERT G WATSON #A281-900		
9/26/2008		EVENT RESULTED AS: The following event: NON-ORAL HRG ON DEFENDANT'S MOT FOR SUMMARY JDGMT scheduled for 08/06/2008 at 5:00 pm has been resulted as follows: Result: JUDGMENT GRANTED Judge: DEWEESE, JAMES Location: # 1 (419) 774-5567		
9/5/2008	13	PETITIONERS RENEWED MOTION/REQUEST TO OBTAIN BRIEFING SCHEDULE TO SUBMIT NEW CASE LAW FILED. Attorney: PRO SE ()	26.00	26.00
8/27/2008		POSTAGE FEE ROBERT G WATSON #281900	1.00	1.00
8/25/2008	12	ENTRY FILED. ORDERED: THAT THE PETITIONERS REQUEST FOR LEAVE OF THE COURT TO BRIEF THE ISSUES IS HEREBY OVERRULED. scanned 9/4/08 lcb	2.00	2.00
8/18/2008		REQUEST FOR COPY FILED AND MAILED PETITIONER'S AMMENDED REPLY CONTRA RESPONDENCE REPLY TO PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT 3 STAMPED ENVELOPES ADDED TO FILE		
8/8/2008	11	PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR LEAVE OF COURT TO BRIEF THE ISSUES FILED. Attorney: PRO SE ()	1.00	1.00
8/6/2008	10	PETITIONERS AMENDED REPLY CONTRA RESPONDENTS REPLY TO PETITIONERS MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT FILED.	18.00	18.00

8/6/2008	9	Attorney: PRO SE () PETITION MOTION TO AMEND FILED. Attorney: PRO SE ()	3.00	3.00
7/30/2008	8	PETITIONERS REPLY CONTRA RESPONDENTS REPLY TO PETITIONERS MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT FILED. Attorney: PRO SE ()	12.00	12.00
7/25/2008		POSTAGE FEE - ROBERT G WATSON	1.00	1.00
7/25/2008		POSTAGE FEE - STATE OF OHIO RICHLAND COUNTY PROSECUTOR	1.00	1.00
7/25/2008		HEARING SCHEDULED: Event: NON-ORAL HRG ON DEFENDANT'S MOT FOR SUMMARY JDGMT Date: 08/06/2008 Time: 5:00 pm Judge: DEWEESE, JAMES Location: # 1 (419) 774-5567		
7/14/2008	7	Result: JUDGMENT GRANTED PETITIONERS MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME Attorney: PRO SE ()	1.00	1.00
7/7/2008		POSTAGE FEE ROBERT G WATSON (COPY OF COMPLETE FILE TO DATE)	1.00	1.00
6/16/2008		POSTAGE FEE ROBERT WATSON # 281900	1.00	1.00
6/13/2008	6	JUDGMENT ENTRY OVERRULING DEFENDANT'S REQUEST FOR COURT APPOINTED COUNSEL FILED. scanned 6/27/08 lcb	2.00	2.00
6/6/2008	5	RESPONDANT'S REPLY TO PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT. Attorney: ARDIS JR, FRANK (14746)	4.00	4.00
6/4/2008	4	MOTION FOR SUMMARY JDGMT FILED BY Attorney: PRO SE ()	14.00	14.00
5/20/2008		SENT TIME STAMPED COPY OF MOTION TO ROBERT WATSON		
5/15/2008	3	MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL Attorney: PRO SE ()	9.00	9.00
5/7/2008		COPY OF PETITION/MOTION ISSUED TO PROSECUTOR VIA CLERK OF COURT MAILBOX		
5/7/2008	2	AFFIDAVIT OF INDIGENCY	2.00	2.00
5/7/2008	1	PETITION TO CONTEST RECLASSIFICATION Attorney: PRO SE ()	6.00	6.00
5/7/2008		CLERKS FEES	25.00	25.00
5/7/2008		COURT TRAINING FEES 088.5088.401300	30.00	30.00
5/7/2008		APPROPRIATE DISPUTE RESOL	40.00	40.00

5/7/2008	COURT'S COMPUTER FEE	3.00	3.00
5/7/2008	CLERK'S COMPUTER FEE-GEN DIV	10.00	10.00
5/7/2008	HOUSE BILL FEE	26.00	26.00

*CRTR5925

Summary

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Judge</u>
2008 CA 0201	OPEN	
<u>In The Matter Of</u>		<u>Action</u>
WATSON, ROBERT G VS STATE OF OHIO		2E-CIVIL APPEAL COMMON PLEAS
<u>Party</u>		<u>Attorneys</u>
WATSON, ROBERT G	PLNTF	PRO SE
STATE OF OHIO	DFNDT	ARDIS JR, FRANK
<u>Opened</u>	<u>Disposed</u>	<u>Case Type</u>
11/20/2008	UNDISPOSED	COURT OF APPEALS
<u>Comments:</u>		

No.	Date of Pleadings Filed, Journal Book-Page-Nbr	Orders and Decrees Ref Nbr	Amount Owed/ Amount Dismissed	Balance Due
1	01/14/09 COPY ISSUED TO	PRO SE	0.00	0.00
2	01/14/09 COPY ISSUED TO RICHLAND CO	PROSECUTOR	0.00	0.00
3	01/14/09 ENTRY FILED. ORDERED: COURT SUA SPONTE STAYS ALL FURTHER BRIEFING & MOTION FILINGS UNTIL FURTHER ORDER OF THE COURT. SCANNED 01/16/09 CSC	9	2.00	2.00
4	01/12/09 COPY ISSUED TO ROBERT WATSON		0.00	0.00
5	01/12/09 COPY ISSUED TO RICHLAND CO	PROSECUTOR	0.00	0.00
6	01/12/09 ENTRY FILED. ORDERED: APPELLEES MOTION TO DISMISS IS DENIED. scanned by dkk	8	2.00	2.00
7	01/08/09 COPY ISSUED TO ROBERT WATSON		0.00	0.00
8	01/08/09 COPY ISSUED TO RICHLAND CO	PROSECUTOR	0.00	0.00
9	01/08/09 ENTRY FILED. ORDERED: APPELLEE SHALL HAVE UNTIL 1/20/09 TO FILE ITS BRIEF scanned by dkk	7	2.00	2.00
10	12/31/08 COPY MAILED TO ROBERT WATSON		1.00	1.00
11	12/31/08 COPY ISSUED TO RICHLAND CO	PROSECUTOR	0.00	0.00
12	12/31/08 COURT OF APPEALS ENTRY FILED ORDERED APPELLANT'S MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE IS DENIED. scanned by dkk		2.00	2.00



No.	Date of	Pleadings Filed, Orders and Decrees Journal Book-Page-Nbr	Ref Nbr	Amount Owed/ Amount Dismissed	Balance Due
13	12/31/08	COPY OF MOTION WITH ENTRY MAILED TO COURT OF APPEALS		0.00	0.00
14	12/31/08	MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE APPELLANT BRIEF Attorney: PSCHOLKA-GARTNER, KIRSTEN L (77792)	6	2.00	2.00
15	12/10/08	COPY MAILED TO COURT OF APPEALS		0.00	0.00
16	12/10/08	MOTION TO DISMISS APPEAL FILED. Attorney: PRO SE ()	5	6.00	6.00
17	12/01/08	COPY ISSUED TO RICHLAND CO PROSECUTOR		0.00	0.00
18	12/01/08	COPY ISSUED TO ROBERT WATSON		0.00	0.00
19	12/01/08	COPY MAILED TO COURT OF APPEALS		0.00	0.00
20	12/01/08	TRANSCRIPT DOCKET & ALL ORIGINAL PAPERS - WITHOUT TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS Sent on: 12/01/2008 12:10:26	4	5.00	5.00
21	11/24/08	COPY MAILED TO COURT OF APPEALS		0.00	0.00
22	11/24/08	MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE APPEAL FILED. Attorney: ARDIS JR, FRANK (14746)	3	1.00	1.00
23	11/20/08	COPY MAILED TO COURT OF APPEALS		0.00	0.00
24	11/20/08	COPY ISSUED TO PRO SE		0.00	0.00
25	11/20/08	COPY ISSUED TO RICHLAND CO PROSECUTOR		0.00	0.00
26	11/20/08	DOCKETING STATEMENT FILED. REG CAL/JOURNAL ENTRIES ONLY FILED. scanned by dkk Attorney: ARDIS JR, FRANK (14746)	2	5.00	5.00
27	11/20/08	NOTICE OF APPEAL TO COURT OF APPEALS JE 9-30-08 FILED. 08 CV 993D scanned by dkk Attorney: ARDIS JR, FRANK (14746)	1	2.00	2.00
28	11/20/08	COURT'S COMPUTER FEE		3.00	3.00
29	11/20/08	CLERK'S COMPUTER FEE-GEN DIV		10.00	10.00