Supreme Court of Ohio Clerk of Court - Filed December 01, 2014 - Case No. 2014-1905

Exhibit 10

Kenneth Taylor
(Paras. 117-122)

A review of the transcript and recording of the November 27, 2012 hearing demonstrates, contrary to the assertions in the Complaint, that it was Mr. Taylor who acted inappropriately in the presence of the Court. While he was a *pro se* litigant, he still is required to comport himself with respect and not be argumentative. On the contrary, Judge Stokes did not respond in a rude or condescending manner, but firmly explained to Mr. Taylor the reason that the matter was to be continued to December 14. Mr. Taylor had filed a Motion to which the City had a right to respond, and therefore, it was through his action that the continuance was necessary.

As Mr. Taylor departed the podium, he did mumble and audibly challenged the Court, which certainly justified the Court's admonishment and instruction to the bailiff present in the courtroom.

It should be noted that ultimately the Court did dismiss Mr. Taylor's case on January 9, 2013 after the police officer did not show up when the case had actually been set for trial. Also, the recording of the court proceeding which took place on December 14, 2012 well demonstrates the Court's patience with this *pro se* defendant. As this matter illustrates, taking some of Judge Stokes' comments out of context and isolating them from literally thousands of minutes of court proceedings is an unfair way in which to somehow argue that her demeanor is impatient, undignified or discourteous to the extent that it violates Judicial Rule 2.6. See Exhibit H and attachments.