

The Supreme Court of Ohio

COLUMBUS

ANNOUNCEMENT

FRIDAY
March 1, 2002

MOTION DOCKET

99-1249. State v. Gross.

Muskingum App. No. CT96055. This cause is pending before the court as a death penalty appeal from the Court of Appeals for Muskingum County. Upon consideration of appellant's motion for leave to file information requested by the court during oral argument,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion be, and hereby is, denied.
Moyer, C.J., Resnick and Lundberg Stratton, JJ., dissent.

01-99. State v. Walls.

Butler App. No. CA99-10-174. This cause is pending before the court as an appeal from the Court of Appeals for Butler County. Upon consideration of appellee's motion to strike argument relating to Ex Post Facto Clause in reply briefs of appellant and *amicus* Ohio Public Defender,

IT IS ORDERED by the court that the motion to strike be, and hereby is, denied.

F.E. Sweeney, J., dissents.

02-255. Bankers Trust Co. v. Wagner.

Allen App. Nos. 1-01-100, 1-01-102, 1-01-103, 1-01-104, 1-01-105, 1-01-106, 1-01-107, 1-01-108, 1-01-109, 1-01-110, 1-01-111, 1-01-112, 1-01-113, 1-01-194, 1-01-95, 1-01-96, 1-01-97, 1-01-98 and 1-01-99. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal. Upon consideration of appellants' motion for stay of execution of foreclosure, without requirement of bond, pending outcome of appeal,

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

Moyer, C.J., Resnick and F.E. Sweeney, JJ., dissent.

02-256. Bankers Trust Co. v. Wagner.

Allen App. Nos. 1-01-17, 1-01-18, 1-01-19, 1-01-20, 1-01-21, 1-01-22, 1-01-23, 1-01-24, 1-01-25, 1-01-26, 1-01-28, 1-01-29, 1-01-30, 1-01-31, 1-01-32, 1-01-33, 1-01-34, 1-01-35, 1-01-36, 1-01-37, 1-01-38, 1-01-39 and 1-01-40. This cause is pending before the court as a discretionary appeal. Upon consideration of appellants' motion for stay of execution of foreclosure, without requirement of bond, pending outcome of appeal,

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

Moyer, C.J., Resnick and F.E. Sweeney, JJ., dissent.

DISCIPLINARY DOCKET

01-1994. Disciplinary Counsel v. Callaghan.

On June 1, 2001, this court suspended respondent, Thomas Matthew Callaghan, Attorney Registration No. 0021661, from the practice of law pursuant to Gov.Bar R. X(6)(B)(3) and Gov.Bar R. X(5)(A)(4). On November 8, 2001, movant filed a motion requesting the court to issue an order requiring respondent to appear and show cause why he should not be held in contempt for failing to obey the order entered June 1, 2001. On December 20, 2001, movant filed an amended motion for an order to appear and show cause. On January 18, 2002, this court entered an order requiring respondent to show cause by filing a written response why he should not be held in contempt for failing to obey this court's order of suspension. Respondent did not respond to the show cause order. Upon consideration thereof,

IT IS ORDERED by the court, *sua sponte*, that respondent appear in person before this court on March 12, 2002, at 8:45 a.m.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, *sua sponte*, that service shall be deemed made on respondent by sending this order, and all other orders in this case, by certified mail to the most recent address respondent has given to the Attorney Registration Office.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of this court issue certified copies of this order as provided for in Gov.Bar R. V(8)(D)(1).