

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

January 25, 2019

[Cite as *01/25/2019 Case Announcements*, 2019-Ohio-221.]

AFFIDAVITS OF DISQUALIFICATION

The chief justice has released the following judicial-disqualification opinions, which were previously issued as entries in response to affidavits of disqualification filed pursuant to R.C. 2701.03.

18-AP-132. In re Disqualification of Russo, Slip Opinion No. [2018-Ohio-5457](#) (decided Dec. 4, 2018).

18-AP-134. In re Disqualification of Hendon, Slip Opinion No. [2018-Ohio-5458](#) (decided Dec. 5, 2018).

18-AP-142. In re Disqualification of Blaine, Slip Opinion No. [2018-Ohio-5459](#) (decided Dec. 31, 2018).

MOTION AND PROCEDURAL RULINGS

[2018-1815. Lubrizol Advanced Materials, Inc. v. Natl. Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, PA.](#)

Certified Question of State Law, United States District Court, Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division, No. 1:17-CV-01782-DAP. On motions for admission pro hac vice of Rebecca E. Bennett, Ian A. Cooper, Joel M. Graczyk, and Jonathan T. Viner. Motions granted. Pursuant to Gov.Bar R. XII(4), counsel shall file a notice of permission to appear pro hac vice with the Office of Attorney Services within 30 days.

APPEALS NOT ACCEPTED FOR REVIEW

2018-1682. State v. Johnson.

Hamilton App. No. C-170371, 2018-Ohio-4131.

French, J., dissents.

DeWine and Stewart, JJ., dissent and would accept the appeal on proposition of law No. I.

Lisa L. Sadler, J., of the Tenth District Court of Appeals, sitting for Fischer, J.

DISCIPLINARY CASES

2018-1840. Cincinnati Bar Assn. v. Moore.

On certification of default. Rodger William Moore, Attorney Registration No. 0074144, last known business address in Alexandria, Kentucky, suspended from the practice of law for an interim period.

MISCELLANEOUS DISMISSALS

2018-0935. Clemente v. Washburn.

In Mandamus. On relator's application for dismissal. Application granted. Cause dismissed.

MISCELLANEOUS ORDERS

2019-0104. State ex rel. Federle v. Warren Cty. Bd. of Elections.

In Mandamus and Prohibition. This cause originated in this court on the filing of a complaint for writs of mandamus and prohibition involving an expedited election matter. On review of the complaint, it is evident that this case was filed more than 90 days prior to the next election and thus is not an expedited election case. However, the case shall still proceed pursuant to the schedule set forth in S.Ct.Prac.R. 12.08.