

The Supreme Court of Ohio

Annual Report

1998



THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

Annual Report
1998

Thomas J. Moyer
Chief Justice

Andrew Douglas
Alice Robie Resnick
Francis E. Sweeney
Paul E. Pfeifer
Deborah L. Cook
Evelyn Lundberg Stratton
Justices

**Supreme Court of Ohio
30 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0419
(614) 466-3456
(800) 826-9010**

Stephan W. Stover	Administrative Director
Keith T. Bartlett	Assistant Administrative Director
Diane Chesley-Lahm	Secretary, Commission on Continuing Legal Education
John Dilenschneider	Counsel to the Court
Richard A. Dove	Associate Director for Legal and Legislative Services
Harry Franken	Communications Director
Paul S. Fu	Law Librarian
Walter S. Kobalka	Reporter
John Meeks	Executive Director, Judicial College
James J. Mendel	Manager, Office of Court Technology and Services
Marcia J. Mengel	Clerk
Noreen L. S. Weisberg/	Fiscal Officer
James L. Porter	

Introduction

For the Supreme Court of Ohio, 1997 was a year marked by significant accomplishments and solid progress. Among the highlights:

- Creation of the Ohio Courts Futures Commission.
- Chief Justice Moyer's second State of the Judiciary address to a joint session of the Ohio General Assembly, including a call for jury reform. His themes included domestic violence prevention, family courts, legislative-judicial relations, and the future of Ohio's courts.
- National leadership in developing drug courts, including awards of nearly 10 percent of U.S. Department of Justice drug court grants, and a statewide drug court evaluation project.
- Funding by the General Assembly for an \$11.25 million program to enhance court and courthouse security statewide, and new security procedures at the Supreme Court.
- Adoption of *A Lawyer's Creed* and *A Lawyer's Aspirational Ideals* to promote professionalism among Ohio's lawyers, judges, and legal educators.
- Approval of revisions in the campaign finance rules for judicial elections.
- Hosting the national Conference of Chief Justices/Conference of State Court Administrators Annual Meeting in Cleveland.
- Doubling to \$50,000 the maximum award that may be made by the Clients' Security Fund to victims of attorney misconduct.
- Appointment of Jonathan E. Coughlan as the fifth Disciplinary Counsel.
- An increase in the attorney registration fee to provide enhanced support for lawyer discipline.
- Progress in moving the Supreme Court to the historic Ohio Departments Building.

- Consideration of 32 proposals to amend or adopt Supreme Court rules and the rules of practice and procedure for Ohio courts, including rules on civil, criminal, and juvenile, procedure and evidence.
- Continued progress in the Court's effort to secure state and federal grant funds to maximize the use of general revenue funds, administering more than \$2 million in federal and state grants for each of the past four years.

Key Issues and Events of 1997

Ohio Courts Futures Commission

In May, Chief Justice Moyer appointed the 52 members of the Ohio Courts Futures Commission, 30 advisory council members, and academic representatives from each of Ohio's nine law schools. The Commission began a multi-faceted review of the Ohio court system through five task forces: Access and Quality, Organization and Structure, Public Education and Awareness, Rules and Procedures, and Technology.

Commission members attempted to identify the key desired characteristics of the Ohio court system of the next century, gathered data, and reviewed the current operations of the judicial system.

Commission task forces will continue to develop strategies and recommendations. The Commission will have a public comment period in 1998, before drafting a final report in early 1999.

State of the Judiciary Address: Jury Reform

On February 12, Chief Justice Moyer's historic State of the Judiciary address represented only the second time in history that a Chief Justice had delivered a report to a joint session of the General Assembly. Chief Justice Moyer's first State of the Judiciary address was in 1990.

In his address, Chief Justice Moyer urged that all statutory exemptions from jury duty be removed and that jurors in state courts be paid at least \$40 a day for their services. "Juries are the essence of democracy in our courtrooms," Chief Justice Moyer told the members of the 122nd General Assembly. "The belief that citizens should be judged by a jury of their peers is held more strongly in our country than in any other." Chief Justice Moyer said he believed it was wrong to exempt certain occupations and professions and people over the age of 70 from jury duty. "They are the persons whose knowledge and experience would lend wisdom to a jury." Chief Justice Moyer said two-thirds of the states have eliminated statutory

exemptions from jury duty. He said he would ask a citizens commission to consider an expanded role for jurors, noting that juries in Arizona are permitted to question witnesses in trials.

Other themes included domestic violence prevention, family courts, legislative-judicial relations, and the future of Ohio's court system.

Ohio Conference on Substance Abuse and the Courts

The Supreme Court, in conjunction with the Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services, continued efforts to support drug courts. Ohio received more than 10 percent of the grants from the United States Department of Justice for drug court programs. The \$1,656,000 earmarked for Ohio will go to ten counties for programs to treat non-violent drug offenders and control their activities by means other than incarceration. "Ohio is demonstrating significant leadership in the development of drug courts," said Marilyn Roberts, Director of the U.S. Justice Department's Drug Court Program Office. "One of the most important reasons Ohio has been successful has been the interdisciplinary cooperation at the state and local level."

In addition, the Court began a new project to evaluate drug courts, funded in part through a grant from the Office of Criminal Justice Services. The project, to be undertaken by a research team from the University of Cincinnati, will produce data concerning recidivism rates and the costs to the criminal justice system, and work with each drug court jurisdiction to collect the data necessary to evaluate Ohio's drug courts.

The Court also provided technical assistance to one juvenile, one municipal, and six common pleas courts that are implementing or planning a drug court. Additionally, the Court assisted three drug court programs in obtaining grants from the Office of Criminal Justice Services. These grants support: 1) the Akron Municipal Court in developing a model municipal drug court program; 2) the Hamilton County Common Pleas Court in developing an automated data collection and evaluation process; and 3) the Butler County Common Pleas Court in creating a drug court.

The Ohio Conference on Substance Abuse and the Courts continued its multi-disciplinary effort to address substance-related issues as they affect the courts. The Planning Committee continued to foster communication and assist in developing working relationships between and among the courts, criminal justice agencies, education, health, and social service agencies, and developing specific plans and long-term strategies to address the impact of substance abuse on the courts.

Court Security Initiative

In 1993, Chief Justice Moyer, in announcing the Supreme Court/Ohio Judicial Conference Committee on Court Security, expressed concern that courtroom violence “threatens the very core of our judicial system,” and that “our courtrooms are places for the peaceful, reasoned, resolution of dispute. To ensure the safety of judges, witnesses, court workers, and attorneys ... our courtrooms must be safe and secure.” The Committee is chaired by Justice Evelyn Lundberg Stratton and Judge Michael Voris.

In 1995, the Court adopted statewide court security standards, requiring all courts to develop a court security policy and procedures plan, but not requiring specific steps due to concerns over county budgets.

In 1997, the Ohio General Assembly funded a two-year, \$11.25 million statewide court security initiative through the Ohio Judicial Conference. The budget includes: 1) \$1 million in the first year for a statewide assessment of the security of Ohio’s 269 courts, to provide a clear picture of the scope and nature of the potential security risks for the courts; 2) \$250,000 for training; and 3) \$10 million in the second year for block grants for court security equipment. The funds will be divided equally among Ohio’s courts. This funding is especially important since it demonstrates the state’s commitment to court security, even though the majority of the funds must be local.

“A Lawyer’s Creed” and “A Lawyer’s Aspirational Ideals”

In February, the Supreme Court issued *A Lawyer’s Creed and A Lawyer’s Aspirational Ideals*, which are suggested guidelines aimed at promoting civility in the legal profession. The Court issued the *Creed* and the *Ideals* at the request of bar leaders and the Commission on Professionalism. In issuing the *Creed* and the *Ideals*, the Court intended to encourage lawyers and judges to promote professionalism rather than to provide additional bases for lawyer discipline.

The *Creed* identifies the qualities and services that every lawyer should offer to clients, opposing parties and their counsel, courts and other tribunals, colleagues in the practice of law, the legal profession, the public and the justice system.

The *Aspirational Ideals* set goals for the attorney in meeting the obligations outlined in the *Creed*.

In a statement preceding the *Creed* and *Ideals*, the Supreme Court said it was concerned with trends that emphasize commercialism in the practice of law and de-emphasize the historical heritage that the practice is a learned profession to be conducted with dignity, integrity and honor as a high calling dedicated to the service of clients and the public good. The Court said these trends lead to an emphasis on

financial rewards, a diminishing of courtesy and civility among lawyers, a reduction in the respect for the judiciary, and a lessening of regard for others and commitment to the public good.

The *Creed* and the *Ideals* may be found in publications of the Rules for the Government of the Bar.

Judicial Campaign Conduct and Enforcement

The Supreme Court continued its national leadership in the area of judicial campaign reform by adopting a series of amendments to Canon 7 of the Code of Judicial Conduct and Rule II, Section 5 of the Rules for the Government of the Judiciary of Ohio, effective June 1, 1997. The latest revisions were approved by the Court following a review of 1996 judicial campaigns and comments from judges, judicial candidates, and the public.

Among the amendments approved by the Court were:

- revised limits on campaign contributions and expenditures, including separate primary and general election limitations for candidates with contested primaries and population-based spending limits for trial court candidates;
- clarified rules pertaining to advertising a candidate's political party affiliation, endorsement, and nomination; and the use of campaign funds to attend political fundraising events;
- continued refinement of the rules relating to consideration of judicial campaign grievances, including appointment of a panel to determine probable cause, allowing certain grievances to be referred to the Disciplinary Counsel for further review, and expanding the definition of "sanctions" for judicial campaign violations to include the assessment of reasonable attorney's fees incurred in prosecuting a grievance.

1997 Conference of Chief Justices/Conference of State Court Administrators Annual Meeting in Cleveland

The Supreme Court of Ohio hosted the national Conference of Chief Justices/Conference of State Court Administrators Annual Meeting in Cleveland in July. The meeting was attended by 43 of the 54 Chief Justices and 45 of the 54 state court administrators from across the nation, including the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands. Featured speakers included United States Attorney General Janet Reno, Ohio House Speaker Jo Ann Davidson, and R. David Thomas, founder of Wendy's International.

Clients' Security Fund Award

In October, the Supreme Court doubled to \$50,000 the maximum award that may be made by the Clients' Security Fund to victims of attorney misconduct.

"The purpose of the Fund is to protect those who have suffered because of improper action by attorneys. The increase will make it possible to provide more money for those who have suffered the greatest losses," said Chief Justice Moyer. The program is funded by practicing lawyers not tax dollars. "This is an effort by those in the legal profession to protect the public from those few attorneys who may be dishonest in their dealings with clients," the Chief Justice said.

Disciplinary Counsel (OMITTED WORD NEW)

In October, the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline, with the approval of the Supreme Court, appointed Jonathan E. Coughlan, an Assistant District Attorney in Erie County, New York, as the fifth Disciplinary Counsel. Coughlan is a 1978 graduate of Case Western Reserve Law School in Cleveland, and worked three years as an assistant public defender in Cuyahoga County. Coughlan had served ten years as an assistant district attorney in Erie County, New York. His most recent assignment was Chief of Special Investigations/Prosecution Bureau, where he was responsible for white collar and high profile cases.

Increase in the Attorney Registration Fee to Support Lawyer Discipline

In February, the Supreme Court announced a \$50 dollar per year increase in the registration fee paid by all attorneys. The attorney registration fee, paid every two years, was increased to \$125 per year, effective with the August 1997 registration.

Ohio's attorney registration fees were the lowest in the nation according to the *1996 State and Local Bar Association Membership Dues and Mandatory Fees Survey*, published by the American Bar Association. In the category "Ranking By Total Cost to Practice in State (Highest to Lowest)," the increase will rank Ohio 46th of 54 jurisdictions.

Approximately 75 percent of the increase will be directed to lawyer discipline, and most will go to reimburse local certified grievance committees.

The Attorney Registration Fund supports the agencies responsible for policing the legal profession in Ohio. These include: 1) the Office of Disciplinary Counsel, which investigates and prosecutes allegations of misconduct against lawyers and judges; 2) the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline, which hears cases of allegations of misconduct against lawyers and makes recommendations to the Supreme Court for final disciplinary action; and 3) the

Clients' Security Fund, which provides compensation to persons financially harmed by the misconduct of attorneys.

The Fund is also used to reimburse certified grievance committees of bar associations and unauthorized practice of law committees for some costs incurred in performing their obligations under the Rules for the Government of the Bar.

The Fund also supports the Supreme Court Board of Commissioners on the Unauthorized Practice of Law, Commission on Certification of Attorneys as Specialists, and Office of Attorney Registration. The increase provides supplemental funding for the Ohio Lawyers Assistance Program, Inc. and legal assistance.

Proposed Ohio Courts Building

In 1997, the Court approved a study of the feasibility of renovating the historic Ohio Departments Building for use by the Supreme Court and other judicial offices. The study focused on the current and future needs of the Court. Architects conducted a comprehensive space needs assessment of the Court and affiliated agencies, and analyzed the structural and engineering condition of the 64-year old Ohio Departments Building to determine whether it will meet the needs of the Court.

Prior to 1901, the Supreme Court was located in the State House. From 1901 to 1974, the Supreme Court and its Law Library, along with the Attorney General, were located in the State House Annex, then known as the "Judicial Annex." In 1974, the Court moved to the Rhodes State Office Tower along with a number of state agencies and offices. As the responsibilities and caseload of the Court have increased over the years, space has become inadequate, resulting in overcrowding and expansion into leased facilities.

The Ohio Departments Building, constructed between 1931 and 1933, is an outstanding example of the Art Deco period and was designed to be a key element in the Columbus riverfront civic center. A major contributing element to the overall significance of the building is its outstanding collection of artwork by early 20th century American artists and artisans.

Grants (NEW)

The Supreme Court administered \$2,160,884 in federal and state grant funds in 1997. During the last six years, the Court has aggressively sought grant funds to maximize the use of state general revenue funds and assist the Court in developing new and innovative programs. Sources of the grants have included the United States Department of Health and Human Services, the national State Justice Institute and the state Office of Criminal Justice Services, Department of Human

Services, Department of Public Safety, Commission on Dispute Resolution Conflict Management, and Ohio State Bar Foundation.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (NEW)

In 1998, the Supreme Court administered major grants from the United States Department of Health and Human Services to fund the Court Improvement Program (\$593,000) and the Family Court Feasibility Study (see page ---)

The Family Court Feasibility Study recommended a number of improvements in the processing of family-related court cases. In collaboration with the Ohio Department of Human Services, in 1998 the Court:

- 1) finalized a draft rewrite of the Revised Code to present a more organized family law section;
- 2) added a family law specialist to the Judicial College;
- 3) continued the development of a statewide juvenile record database, the Juvenile Data Network;
- 4) supported the expansion of CASA/GAL (Court Appointed Special Advocates/Guardians *Ad Litem*); and
- 5) requested proposals from local courts for volunteer family court pilot projects.

State Justice Institute

During 1997, the Supreme Court administered one grant from the national State Justice Institute totaling \$31,000 to design and implement processes for data collection on court-annexed custody and visitation mediation programs.

Office of Criminal Justice Services

In 1997, the Supreme Court administered \$530,182 in grants from the Office of Criminal Justice Services. Grants to the State Criminal Sentencing Commission for \$72,020 were used to study sentencing trends (see page 23). The Court received \$189,290 in grants for mediation evaluation and a \$64,744 grant for victim-offender mediation (see page 21).

The Court was awarded a \$108,189 grant for a statewide drug evaluation program. The Court also administered three special grants totaling \$34,239 to assist drug court programs in the Akron Municipal Court, Hamilton County Common Pleas Court, and Butler County Common Pleas Court (see pages 3, 25, and 26).

Department of Public Safety

The Supreme Court received a grant for \$38,400 from the Department of Public Safety for traffic related education (see page 18).

Commission on Dispute Resolution and Conflict Management

In 1997, the Supreme Court collaborated with the Commission on Dispute Resolution and Conflict Management to conduct and evaluate a pilot project for early intervention truancy mediation. Increased efforts in training, publications, and public awareness were also part of these joint efforts (see page 21).

Ohio State Bar Foundation

In 1997, the Supreme Court received a \$15,000 grant from the Ohio State Bar Foundation to support the Ohio Courts Futures Commission (see page 2).

Supreme Court Caseload Statistics (NEW)

A total of 2,728 cases were filed in the Supreme Court in 1998, including 186 original actions, 70 habeas corpus cases, 5 federal court certification of state law questions, 133 attorney disciplinary matters, 4 attorney admission cases, 9 other cases related to the practice of law, and appeals, as follows: 34 claimed appeals of right, 1,283 non-felony discretionary appeals, 531 felony discretionary appeals, 209 direct appeals, 84 certified conflicts, 45 appeals from the Board of Tax Appeals, 5 appeals from the Public Utilities Commission, 29 death penalty appeals, and 100 *Murhaman* appeals. For additional statistical information, see Appendices A through F.

Rules Amended or Adopted in 1997

The Supreme Court considered 32 proposals to amend or adopt Court rules and rules of practice and procedure for Ohio courts. The full text of proposed and final rule amendments are published in the *Ohio Official Reports Advance Sheets* and the *Ohio State Bar Association Report*. The publication and effective dates of adopted rules are listed in Appendix G.

Rules of Practice and Procedure (NEW)

The Supreme Court filed with the General Assembly proposed amendments to the Rules of Civil, Criminal, and Juvenile Procedure, and Rules of Evidence. Amendments that took effect July 1, 1998, addressed issues, including bifurcation of divorce actions, criminal warrants, bail, removal of a child from a school in an out-of-county foster placement situation, and codification of certain common law rules on impeachment.

Judicial Continuing Legal Education—Professionalism Component (NEW)

The Supreme Court amended the judicial continuing legal education rule to include a professionalism component in the two-hour ethics, professionalism, and substance abuse training requirement for judges. This amendment was proposed by the Supreme Court Commission on Professionalism and mirrors the rule adopted in 1997 for attorney continuing legal education. The judicial education change goes into effect on January 1, 1999.

Retirement, Removal, or Suspension of Judges without Pay (NEW)

In May, the Supreme Court adopted a rule to provide for the disqualification and immediate suspension from office without pay of judges who are indicted, who plead guilty or are convicted of felony charges, or who are suspended from the

practice of law. A judge is disqualified from serving as a judge if he or she is charged with a felony offense under state or federal law. If the judge is convicted or pleads guilty to the felony offense, the judge immediately is suspended from office without pay. A judge whose license to practice law is suspended by the Supreme Court for disciplinary violations immediately is suspended from office without pay during the term of the suspension.

The new rules went into effect on June 22.

Code of Judicial Conduct

Canons 1-6 of the Code of Judicial Conduct were substantially revised, effective May 1, 1997. The amendments, which consolidated Canons 1-6 into four canons, were the result of an extensive review of the 1990 revised ABA Model Code of Judicial Conduct by both the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline and the Ohio Judicial Conference.

Noteworthy amendments to the Code include provisions relative to financial activities permitted by active judges, *ex parte* communications, the responsibility of supervisory judges, and membership in organizations that practice insidious discrimination.

Continuing Legal Education

Effective January 1, 1998, the Supreme Court adopted amendments to Rule X of the Rules for the Government of the Bar, which concerns continuing legal education for Ohio lawyers. The amendments require lawyers to obtain 60 minutes of professionalism education, including *A Lawyer's Creed* and *A Lawyer's Aspirational Ideals*; 60 minutes of education on the Code of Professional Responsibility; and 30 minutes on substance abuse issues every two years. The Commission on Professionalism recommended the amendments.

Standard Domestic Violence Protection Order Forms

Effective January 1, 1998, the Supreme Court adopted Rules 10.01 and 10.02 of the Rules of Superintendence and standard civil and criminal domestic violence protection order forms and instructions. Rules 10.01 and 10.02 require courts to provide protection order forms and instructions upon request and to use protection order forms that are "substantially similar" to the standard forms. Rules 10.01 and 10.02 also require all civil and criminal protection orders issued in Ohio to include a standard cover sheet that warns of the potential penalties for violating the order. The Standard Forms Committee of the Domestic Violence Task Force developed Rules 10.01 and 10.02 and the standard forms and instructions.

Records Management and Retention

Effective October 1, 1997, the Supreme Court adopted Rules 26-26.05 of the Rules of Superintendence, which govern records management and retention in Ohio courts. Rules 26-26.05 set forth records retention schedules for the courts of appeals, common pleas, municipal, and county courts; establish guidelines for maintaining records using new technology; and create notification requirements for the destruction of historical records, exhibits, depositions, and transcripts. The Task Force on Records Management recommended Rules 26-26.05 in its September 1996 report.

Child Support Default; Interim Suspension from the Practice of Law

In March, the Supreme Court adopted a rule to provide for the immediate suspension from the practice of law of an attorney who is found in default on a child support order. Upon receiving notice that an attorney is in default under a child support order, the Supreme Court may suspend the attorney from the practice of law. The suspension remains in effect until the Court receives notice that the attorney is no longer in default or is obligated under a new or modified order to pay support and any arrearages. The amendment to Rule V, Section 5 of the Rules for the Government of the Bar was effective on April 21, 1997.

Standard Probate Forms

Effective October 1, 1997, the Supreme Court adopted amendments to standard probate form series 18, which is used in adoption proceedings.

Supreme Court Rules of Practice; Frivolous Actions; Sanctions

The Supreme Court amended its Rules of Practice relative to frivolous conduct in all actions filed with the Court. The new rule adopts a definition of frivolous conduct used in Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and sets forth the sanctions available to the Court, including expenses, attorney's fees, single or double costs, and any other sanction considered just. Under the rule, the Court may impose sanctions on a party, the party's attorney, or both. The amendment to Rule XIV, Section 5 of the Supreme Court Rules of Practice was effective April 28, 1997.

Supreme Court Activities

Off-Site Court (gave copy to Tom)

Since 1987, the Supreme Court has conducted court sessions in 34 counties throughout the state, primarily for the benefit of high school students. Approximately 16,200 high school students, as part of a total of 21,800 individuals, have attended the sessions. The education program includes meetings with editors and reporters from high school newspapers, briefings prior to and following oral arguments, and related course work. In 1997, the Court heard oral arguments in Athens and Muskingum Counties and at Cleveland-Marshall College of Law.

Court Education Activities (gave copy to Tom)

Students from primary and secondary schools, colleges, universities, and law schools from Ohio, the nation, and the world visit the Supreme Court of Ohio each year. In 1997, more than 280 groups and more than 13,800 individuals visited the Court.

The Supreme Court continued to support the Ohio Center for Law-Related Education, including the Mock Trial and Ohio Government in Action programs and other Center activities. The Court provides financial support and is represented on the board of trustees.

The Supreme Court again participated in the Youth in Government Model Supreme Court program.

Supreme Court Extern Program (NEW)

The Supreme Court continued its law student extern program with Capital University Law and Graduate Center, The Ohio State University College of Law, University of Toledo College of Law, University of Cincinnati College of Law, Ohio Northern University Pettit College of Law, University of Akron C. Blake McDowell Law Center, and University of Dayton School of Law. Seven of Ohio's nine law schools and a total of 59 students participated during 1998, serving all seven Justices and the offices of the Administrative Director, Counsel to the Court, and State Criminal Sentencing Commission. The Court also participated in the Columbus Bar Association Minority Clerkship Program for the sixth year.

Bench-Bar-Deans Conference

For the eleventh year, the Supreme Court participated in the Bench-Bar-Deans Conference, sponsored by the Ohio State Bar Association, to discuss legal education, admission to the practice of law, and other issues of common interest to the nine Ohio law schools, the bar, and the judiciary.

Continuing Legal Education Coalition

The Court continued its participation in the Continuing Legal Education Coalition with the Attorney General, Legislative Service Commission, and other state departments and agencies. The Coalition provides a curriculum of continuing legal education courses for government attorneys. In 1997, the Coalition presented 14 courses for a total of 41 credit hours.

International Programs

Ukraine-Ohio Rule of Law Program

In 1997, the Ukraine-Ohio Rule of Law Program continued to provide support and assistance to the Republic of Ukraine in developing its democratic institutions. At the request of the Ukraine Constitutional Court, an Ohio team consisting of the Chief Justice and Administrative Director of the Supreme Court, a retired court of appeals judge, and a court of appeals administrator was formed to provide technical assistance on court administration. A delegation from the Ukraine Constitutional Court will visit Ohio in 1998.

The Supreme Court of Ohio continued to support the Supreme Court of Ukraine and the Higher Arbitration Court of Ukraine in their efforts to establish an independent judicial system. Projects of the Rule of Law Program include commentary on draft legislation, support in establishing a judicial training institute for the Supreme Court of Ukraine, support for the Constitutional Court efforts described above, and, upon request, providing faculty for courses in substantive areas of law.

In 1997, the Supreme Court hosted delegations from Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Rwanda, and Spain.

Ohio-Shanghai Judiciary Program

The Ohio-Shanghai Judiciary Program continued the relationship among the Shanghai High People's Court, Supreme Court of Ohio, and Capital University Law and Graduate Center, in conjunction with The Ohio State University College of Law. The primary purpose is to advise Chinese court officials on developing a commercial court system to keep pace with China's booming economy.

A delegation from Shanghai visited the Supreme Court in 1993, and an exchange visit from the Supreme Court and Capital University Law and Graduate Center followed in 1994. In 1997, a delegation from the Shanghai High People's Court conducted legal education seminars on doing business in China in Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Columbus.

Supreme Court Standing Boards, Commissions, and Committees

Committee on the Appointment of Counsel for Indigent Defendants in Capital Cases (NEW)

Chair: Judge Everett Burton; Secretary: Nan P. Cairney

The Committee was established in 1988 under former Rule 65 of the Rules of Superintendence for Courts of Common Pleas to develop procedures to administer the continuing legal education requirements and experience standards for the appointment of counsel for indigent defendants in capital cases. Effective July 1, 1997, Rule 65 was renumbered to Rule 20 of the Rules of Superintendence for the Courts of Ohio. The revised rules combined the existing Rules of Superintendence for Courts of Appeals, Rules of Superintendence for Courts of Common Pleas, and Rules of Superintendence for Municipal and County Courts and are now known as the Rules of Superintendence for the Courts of Ohio.

Rule 20 provides a vehicle for quality representation of indigent defendants charged with a crime for which the death penalty could be imposed. The Committee grants certification to attorneys who meet Rule 20 qualifications, maintains a statewide attorney certification list, approves death penalty training seminars for continuing education credit required by the rule, and periodically reviews and recommends amendments to Rule 20.

In 1998, the Committee approved four continuing legal education seminars to fulfill the specialized training requirements of Rule 20, certified approximately 65 applicants who met the requirements of the rule, decertified 88 attorneys who did not satisfy the two year continuing education standard required by the rule, and distributed two updated lists of certified counsel to common pleas and appellate court judges. As of December 1998, approximately 434 attorneys were certified to accept appointment as counsel for indigent defendants in capital cases.

Board of Bar Examiners (NEW)

Chair: Thomas G. Pletz; Secretary: Marcia J. Mengel

The Board of Bar Examiners was created by Rule I, Section 4 of the Rules for the Government of the Bar. It is responsible for examination of applicants for admission to the practice of law pursuant to the Court's constitutional authority to regulate admission to the bar.

A total of ___ applicants took the bar examination in February 1998, with ___ (___ percent) passing, and _____ applicants took the July 1998 bar examination, with ___ (___ percent) passing.

In the spring of 1998, the Board recommended amendments to Gov. Bar R. I and to the Rules of the Ohio Board of Bar Examiners to adopt the Multistate Bar Examination as a component of the Ohio Bar Examination. The Supreme Court published the Board's proposed amendments on July 27, 1998, and invited public comment. The amendments are pending.

Commission on Certification of Attorneys as Specialists (NEW)

Chair: David E. Pontius; Secretary: Diane Chesley-Lahm

The Commission on Certification of Attorneys as Specialists was created in 1993 when the Supreme Court adopted Rule XIV of the Rules for the Government of the Bar, to develop a mechanism under which attorneys with special expertise in a field of law may become certified as specialists, and to recommend guidelines for attorneys certified as specialists to communicate their specialization to the public.

The Commission studied the standards and regulations adopted by the American Bar Association and states that have specialization programs. The recommended standards and regulations, which established procedures for certifying agencies seeking accreditation, were submitted to the Court early in 1995. The standards were approved by the Court and became final in November 1995. Ohio attorneys may achieve certification by meeting practice requirements and passing tests administered by accredited certifying agencies.

During 1998, the Commission recommended two additional designated specialty areas, which brings the total approved by the Court to 13. A speaker's kit containing information about the Commission was developed and used. In May and October of 1997, the National Board of Trial Advocacy was accredited by the Commission to certify Ohio attorneys in the areas of Civil Law Trial Advocacy and Criminal Law Trial Advocacy, respectively. In September of 1997, the Ohio State Bar Association was accredited to certify Ohio attorneys in the area of Workers' Compensation Law. The Commission is currently reviewing for possible accreditation the National Academy for Elder Law program of Elder Law certification and the Ohio State Bar Association program of Federal Taxation certification.

Board of Commissioners on Character and Fitness (NEW)

Chair: Ernest A. Eynon II; Secretary: Marcia J. Mengel

The Board of Commissioners on Character and Fitness was established under Rule I, Section 10 of the Rules for the Government of the Bar. The Board oversees investigation of the character, fitness, and moral qualifications of applicants for admission to the practice of law in Ohio.

_____ new character and fitness cases were filed with the Board in 1998; ___ of these were appeals from admissions committee determinations, and ___ were *sua sponte* investigations. In October, the Board conducted a CLE seminar for

members of local bar association admissions committees. Over ___ admissions committee members attended the seminar.

Board of Commissioners of the Clients' Security Fund (NEW)

Chair: David P. Kamp; Administrator: Janet Green Marbley

Pursuant to Rule VIII of the Supreme Court Rules for the Government of the Bar, the Clients' Security Fund compensates individuals who have lost money or property as a result of the dishonest conduct of an attorney. Since its establishment in 1985, the Clients' Security Fund has awarded close to \$4 million to 678 former law clients. In 1998, the Board of Commissioners awarded \$312,675 to 72 claimants. One of the claimants received a \$25,000 award, and three of the claimants received the new maximum award amount of \$50,000 pursuant to a 1997 Rule VIII amendment.

Beginning in 1997 and continuing throughout much of 1998, the Clients' Security Fund received funds resulting from fines imposed as sanctions against attorneys appearing before Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Court Judge Kathleen A. Sutula. During 1998, the Fund deposited a total of \$1,975 received as a result of orders issued by Judge Sutula. Effective August 19, 1998, rule VIII was amended to acknowledge the receipt of such funds in pursuance of the fund's objectives.

Commission on Continuing Legal Education (NEW)

Chair: James Caruso; Secretary: Diane Chesley-Lahm

In 1988, the Supreme Court adopted Rule X of the Rules for the Government of the Bar to require all attorneys in Ohio to complete continuing legal education "to maintain and improve the quality of legal services in Ohio." Rule X requires each of the approximately 40,000 active lawyers in Ohio to complete 24 hours of continuing legal education every two years, including instruction in ethics and substance abuse. The Commission administers Rule X.

In 1998, pursuant to 1993 amendments to Rule X that transferred to the Commission the administration and enforcement of continuing education for judges, the Commission mailed 460 final reporting transcripts to judges with last names beginning with the letters M-Z.

A total of 20,007 attorneys and 458 judges with last names beginning with the letters A-L were required to report completion of at least 24 hours (40 hours for judges) of approved continuing legal education, including two hours of ethics and substance abuse instruction, during the preceding two years. By March 31, 1998, 88 percent were in full compliance with the Rule. For the year, the Commission had an excellent 96.8 percent compliance rate.

The Supreme Court issued 480 sanction orders during 1998 against attorneys with last names beginning with M-Z, the group required to report in 1997. In addition, the Commission held hearings on notices of non-compliance, processed 8,500 applications for accreditation of continuing legal education activities more than 4,000 sponsors, and considered appeals from the Secretary's denial of accreditation. Interim progress reports and final reporting transcripts were mailed to 17,512 attorneys and judges with last names beginning with M-Z who were required to report for the fifth time by January 31, 1999.

In 1993, Rule X was amended to allow late compliance with the educational requirements contingent upon payment of a late compliance fee; 420 attorneys and judges paid the late compliance fee in 1998.

The Commission continued consideration of mandatory "bridge the gap" education for new admittees to the bar and expects to make recommendations to the Court during 1999. Mandatory professionalism education for all attorneys became effective January 1, 1998.

Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline (NEW)
Chair: Linde H. Webb; Secretary: Jonathan W. Marshall

The Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline was established by Rule V of the Rules for the Government of the Bar and is charged with administering, interpreting, and enforcing Rule V, which deals with lawyer and judge discipline for ethical misconduct. The Board also serves under state law as the ethics commission for the filing of over 1,500 financial disclosure statements required of Ohio judges, judicial candidates, and magistrates.

In 1998, the Board received 103 formal complaints filed by Disciplinary Counsel and certified grievance committees. The Board conducted 83 disciplinary hearings and certified 98 matters to the Supreme Court, disposing of a total of 127 cases altogether. The Board also conducted hearings on petitions for reinstatement and petitions to revoke probation.

The Board continued to evaluate the recommendations submitted by the Ohio State Bar Association based on its statewide study of the disciplinary system and advise the Supreme Court on amendments to Gov. Bar Rule V. The Board assisted the certified grievance committees in documenting requests for reimbursement of all disciplinary-related expenses and met with Ohio's new Disciplinary Counsel to review respective duties.

The Board also: 1) received 54 requests for advisory opinions and issued twelve opinions on ethical questions arising under the Code of Professional Responsibility, Code of Judicial Conduct, Rules for the Government of the Bar, Rules for the Government of the Judiciary, and Ohio Ethics Law; 2) for the seventh

year, provided partial reimbursement to local certified grievance committees for ongoing grievance and discipline expenses; 3) sponsored and assisted in two statewide training seminars for members of certified grievance committees; 4) taught four courses on campaign law and ethics required of Ohio judicial candidates under Canon 7; and 5) presented 33 continuing legal education programs for judges, lawyers, and law students.

Office of Disciplinary Counsel (NEW)

Disciplinary Counsel: Jonathan E. Coughlan

The Office of Disciplinary Counsel is responsible for the investigation and prosecution of matters involving the professional responsibilities of Ohio attorneys and judges. During 1998, the Office received 3,078* complaints, compared to 2,961 filed in 1997. These original complaints, together with appeals and unauthorized practice matters, totaled 3,443* matters in 1998, compared to 3,346* in 1997.

After intake and investigation, 2,508* complaints were dismissed. Formal action before the Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline was taken in ___* cases for a total of ___* active Board cases.

On August 17, 1998, Arnie J. Schropp joined our office as an investigator. Arnie's background of 27 years with the Ohio Highway Patrol will definitely be an asset to our office.

(* Note: Totals will be revised to include all matters through December 31, 1998.)

Judicial College Board of Trustees

Chair: Judge James A. Brogan; Executive Director: John Meeks

The Judicial College was established in 1976 to provide continuing legal education for Ohio judges and court personnel. In September 1982, the College was made a division of the Ohio Judicial Conference. In July 1989, the College became part of the Supreme Court. The College provides educational programs for judges, magistrates, acting judges, and non-judicial court personnel.

In 1997, the Judicial College presented 61 days of courses to more than 2,900 attendees. These courses included a faculty development program and a leadership institute, which provided the College with an additional faculty for its courses.

The College also provided five teleconferences in 1997, a number that will increase in the future. The teleconferences, which are now available at an average of 13 sites across the state, presented information to magistrates and judges on ethics, substance abuse, and substantive and procedural law.

The Department of Public Safety again provided grant funds to the Judicial College in 1996 for traffic-related education. These funds enabled the College to present three DUI evidence courses for judges, three felony DUI courses for judges, and two traffic law courses for acting judges.

Commission on Professionalism

Chair: Dick Ison; Secretary: Michelle Hall

The Commission on Professionalism was created by Rule XV of the Rules for the Government of the Bar in 1992. Rule XV charges the Commission with monitoring and coordinating professionalism efforts in Ohio courts, bar associations, law schools, and other entities; promoting activities that enhance professionalism; developing educational materials concerning professionalism; assisting in the development of law school curricula and continuing education programs that emphasize professionalism; and making recommendations to the Supreme Court, judicial organizations, and bar associations on methods to enhance professionalism.

During 1997, on the recommendation of the Commission, the Supreme Court issued the *Statement on Professionalism, A Lawyer's Creed, and A Lawyer's Aspirational Ideals*, and adopted amendments to Rule X of the Rules for the Government of the Bar to require 60 minutes of continuing legal education in the area of professionalism every two years beginning January 1, 1998. The Commission recommended an amendment to Rule IV of the Rules for the Government of the Judiciary that would mandate professionalism education for judges.

Rules Advisory Committee (NEW)

Chair: Richard Walinski; Secretary: Keith T. Bartlett

The Rules Advisory Committee was established by Rule XII of the Rules for the Government of the Bar and is responsible for reviewing proposed new rules and amendments to the rules of practice and procedure for the courts of Ohio. In 1998, the Rules Advisory Committee continued to review proposed new rules and rule amendments submitted to the Court by bar associations, attorney and judge associations, and other interested parties. The Committee's annual recommendations were submitted to the Court, published twice for public comment, and filed with the General Assembly. Substantive amendments to the Rules of Criminal, Civil, and Juvenile Procedure and Rules of Evidence, took effect on July 1, 1998.

The Committee also reviewed proposals that were submitted to the Court for initial consideration in September. The proposed amendments approved by the Court for filing with the General Assembly in January 1999 will, unless modified by the Court or disapproved by the General Assembly, take effect on July 1, 1999.

Traffic Rules Review Commission (NEW)

Chair: Judge Frederick Hany II; Secretary: Richard A. Dove

The Traffic Rules Review Commission met in December and approved two rule amendments for consideration by the Supreme Court in 1999. The first proposed amendment is a temporary provision that would facilitate the development and implementation of an automated traffic citation currently being tested in Licking and Pickaway Counties. The temporary provision would allow the officer who issues an automated citation to sign the ticket by means of a password-protected facsimile signature. The second amendment would allow a court, through its violations bureau, to establish an electronic system, such as telephone or Internet, to accept guilty pleas, trial waivers, and payments of fines and costs.

Board of Commissioners on the Unauthorized Practice of Law

Chair: D John Travis; Secretary: Susan B. Christoff

The Board of Commissioners on the Unauthorized Practice of Law was established by Rule VII of the Rules for the Government of the Bar of Ohio. Rule VII was promulgated pursuant to the Court's constitutional authority to regulate the practice of law and all matters related to it [Article IV, Section 2(B)(1)(g) of the Ohio Constitution].

Four complaints alleging the unauthorized practice of law were filed with the Board in 1997. The Board conducted three hearings in 1997 relating to cases filed in 1996. The Board also filed three final reports with the Supreme Court.

The Board considered and approved applications for reimbursement of expenses, received requests for advisory opinions, referred matters for investigation to either Disciplinary Counsel or a bar association's unauthorized practice of law committee, and responded to public inquiries regarding the unauthorized practice of law.

Supreme Court Committee for Lawyer Referral and Information Services (NEW)

Secretary: Michelle Hall

The Committee for Lawyer Referral and Information Services began work in 1998. Appointed pursuant to the Rules for the Government of the Bar of Ohio, the Committee is charged with overseeing lawyer referral and information services in operation in Ohio and ensuring compliance by those services with the applicable Disciplinary Rules and regulatory provisions.

The Committee conducted three meetings in 1998, and, by the end of the year had developed initial regulations for consideration by the Supreme Court.

These regulations provide minimum requirements for operation of a lawyer referral service and mandate the submission of an annual report by each service. The Committee also recommended an amendment to DR 2-103 that would preclude an attorney from having an ownership interest in a referral service from which that attorney receives referrals. The regulations and rule amendment were scheduled for consideration by the Supreme Court in early 1999.

Supreme Court Special Committees

Bench-Bar Planning Committee (NEW)

Chairs: Judge Ann Marie Tracy and David E. Griffiths; Staff Liaison: Richard A. Dove

The Bench-Bar Planning Committee, chaired by Judge James Green and attorney Lawrence R. Springer, was appointed to plan the seventh statewide Bench-Bar Conference on March 18-19, 1999. The Planning Committee agreed to have the work of the Ohio Courts Futures Commission discussed at the Conference. Refinement of discussion topics continued into 1999 as the Futures Commission finalized concepts for public review and discussion.

Standard Forms Committee (NEW)

The Standard Forms Committee is an *ad hoc* committee arising from the 1996 recommendations of the Domestic Violence Task Force. The Committee is chaired by Judge Mike Brigner and includes several other former members of the Task Force. In 1997, the Committee developed, and the Supreme Court adopted, eleven standard civil and criminal protection order forms for use in domestic violence cases. These forms, which include protection order petitions and instructions designed for use by pro se victims of domestic violence, were mandated for use beginning on January 1, 1998.

In 1998, the Committee reviewed the domestic violence forms and recommended changes based on recently enacted legislation and experience in using the forms in 1998. The Committee also developed and recommended for adoption new stalking protection order forms to reflect the General Assembly's enactment of H.B. 302, effective July 29, 1998. These forms were published for comment in December, and the Committee will reconvene early in 1999 to review comments and approve final forms for consideration by the Supreme Court.

Task Force on Family Law and Children (NEW)

The General Assembly enacted Senate Bill 112 to create the Task Force on Family Law and Children. The Task Force was charged with reviewing existing laws

relative to the allocation of parental rights and responsibilities in divorce, dissolution, and legal separation actions and recommending changes to “create a more civilized and constructive process for the parenting of children whose parents do not reside together.”

Chief Justice Moyer appointed eight members to the Task Force and selected attorney Rosemary Rubin from Canton as chair of the Task Force. An organizational meeting of the Task Force is scheduled for January 1999.

Advisory Committee on Court Technology (NEW)

In 1988, Chief Justice Moyer appointed the Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Court Technology and charged the Committee with the preparation of a comprehensive plan for the application of technology in the courts, including computers, telecommunications, and other media. In 1998, the Committee continued to provide support to the Court and the Office of Court Technology and Services in identifying and considering technology issues for the present and future. The Court Technology and Service group conducted a statewide Court Technology survey in April 1998 which identified at that time 92% of the trial Courts in Ohio were automated. In addition, the Court Technology and Service staff completed over 22 technical assistance engagements and are currently assisting 21 trial and appellate courts.

Ohio Courts Futures Commission

Chairs: Judge Robert M. Duncan and Susan Lajoie Eagan;

Project Director: Laralyn M. Sasaki

The activities of the Commission are outlined on page 2.

Committee on Dispute Resolution (NEW)

Chair: Robert W. Rack, Jr.; Staff Liaison: C. Eileen Pruett

The Supreme Court Committee on Dispute Resolution (SCCDR) continued to work closely with trial courts and researchers in 1998. This work focused on the tasks of developing and refining best practices for court-connected mediation programs.

The 12-site Mediation Institutionalization project entered its second year. This project provides staff mediators to serve 27 courts, covering 14 counties. The following were highlights of first year activity:

- The project provided basic and advanced mediation training to 59 mediators.
- The project provided training to a total of 104 mediators and lawyers on the role of attorneys in mediation. This training was presented in Cincinnati, Columbus, and Cleveland.
- A planning group is developing a training curriculum on domestic violence for mediators and other involved professionals. Once completed, the training will be given to the mediators in the project to enable them to screen cases for domestic abuse and assist the parties in getting the services most appropriate for their needs.
- Staff assisted the trial courts in identifying issues regarding case selection, staffing, and continued funding.

Early intervention truancy programs and model projects for multi-party mediation of abuse dependency and neglect cases continued to demonstrate significant benefits for participating juvenile courts. Evaluation of these projects began and will continue into 1999. New grant funding for the development of juvenile mediation programs in three southeastern Ohio counties was received.

The three-year pilot project to provide in-house civil mediation in three common pleas courts ended in December 1998. Each of the participating common pleas courts in Clinton, Montgomery and Stark Counties have established funding to continue services beyond the grant period. A fourth year of grant funding will enable staff to conclude data collection and analysis and to develop an implementation manual for the victim offender mediation component of the project.

The Office of Dispute Resolution represented Ohio in a five state study to develop cost benefit analyses of court connected mediation models. An initial symposium on this project brought supreme court and trial court staff as well as judges from 10 states to Columbus in November.

Chief Justice Moyer was recognized for his contributions to the development of programming for families in Ohio's domestic relations and juvenile courts when he received the Irwin Cantor Award from the Association of Family and Conciliation Courts (AFCC) at its annual meeting in May. The Office of Dispute Resolution Programs was also recognized at a regional AFCC meeting in Orlando in October. Staff coordinated two workshops and participated in the opening plenary to discuss policy implications of an expanding continuum of court services for families. SCCDR member Professor Nancy Rogers received the Ohio State Bar Foundation's Ritter Award for outstanding service to the legal profession in recognition of her work in dispute resolution.

Staff assisted in the development of a pilot mediation project at the Supreme Court, the presentation of several Judicial College courses and continued to develop implementation manuals for both common pleas general division mediation programs and juvenile court mediation programs. Additionally, a brochure highlighting the benefits of court-connected programs was developed with the efforts of staff, the Committee and the consultant.

Commission on Racial Fairness

Chair: Judge Ronald B. Adrine

In June 1993, the Supreme Court and the Ohio State Bar Association created the Commission on Racial Fairness. The Commission's objective is to conduct a thorough examination of the justice system and legal profession to determine whether racial bias exists, and if bias is found to exist, to develop recommendations for change. The Commission established six subcommittees responsible for collecting and assessing data pertaining to specific areas of the judicial system and legal profession: 1) perception and participant treatment in the justice system; 2) criminal defendants in the justice system; 3) adjudication of civil matters; 4) employment and appointment practices; 5) judicial selection; and 6) education and cultural diversity.

In 1997, the Commission reviewed the subcommittee reports and began preparation of its final report, to be submitted to the Court in 1998.

Committee to Review the Rules of Superintendence

Chair: Judge John W. McCormac; Staff Liaison: Richard A. Dove

The Committee to Review the Rules of Superintendence reconvened in March to consider public comments on the Revised Rules of Superintendence that were published in late 1996. Based on the public comments, the Committee recommended minor revisions to the proposed rules including:

- allowing the majority of judges of a court or division to vacate or modify the actions of the administrative judge;
- permitting the Chief Justice to assign retired, part-time municipal and county court judges to active duty;
- revising the method by which certain criminal and traffic cases are numbered and reported to the Supreme Court Statistical Reporting Section;
- adopting new time guideline and statistical report form for death penalty post-conviction relief actions;
- a new preface to the Rules.

In April, the Supreme Court approved the revised Rules of Superintendence based on the Committee's recommendations. With the exception of the revisions to statistical reporting rules, which were made effective on January 1, 1998, the revised rules were made effective on July 1, 1997. The new rules were distributed to judges, clerks, and court administrators in the late Spring.

Effective October 1, 1997, the Rules of Superintendence applicable to the probate division of the court of common pleas were amended. These amendments and commentary were proposed by the Rules and Forms Committee of the Probate Judges Association.

Committee on Court Security

Chairs: Justice Evelyn Lundberg Stratton and Judge Michael J. Voris

The activities of the Committee are outlined on pages 3 and 4.

Supreme Court Statutory Commission

State Criminal Sentencing Commission (NEW)

Chair: Chief Justice Thomas J. Moyer; Executive Director: David J. Diroll

During 1998, the Sentencing Commission (called the "Sentencing Council" in statute) completed its misdemeanor sentencing proposals. A three volume report was submitted to the General Assembly in December. The report contained recommendations on misdemeanor sentencing generally, drunken driving, vehicular homicides and manslaughters, driver's license suspensions, the distribution of fine and cost revenue, mayor's courts, domestic violence, and other topics. It followed a four-year study.

Meanwhile, the Commission's Juvenile Committee, chaired by Butler County Common Pleas Judge H. J. Bressler, considered concepts that are wholly new to juvenile sentencing in Ohio. The Committee reached tentative agreement on a structure that would "blend" juvenile and adult dispositions for some of the worst juvenile offenders. The group also favors extending juvenile jurisdiction to age 25 for certain serious offenders, while lowering the minimum age for commitment to a State (Department of Youth Services) facility from 12 to 10 years. These proposals will be refined for submission to the General Assembly late in 1999.

The Commission continued to monitor its felony proposals (enacted in 1996 as S.B. 2), while providing training as needed. Research efforts included a meta-analysis of "what works" in criminal sanctions, to be presented early in 1999.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR
Stephan W. Stover, Administrative Director

Legal and Legislative Services - Richard A. Dove (NEW)

Governmental Relations (NEW)

The General Assembly had an abbreviated schedule during the second year of the 122nd General Assembly. The Supreme Court staff continued to serve as an important resource to members and staff of the General Assembly and assisted in the consideration and enactment of key legislation. Staff also met regularly with representatives of the Ohio judicial associations and the Ohio State Bar Association to ensure a coordination of efforts on legislation affecting Ohio's courts.

The General Assembly enacted and Governor Voinovich signed S.B. 69, which eliminated statutory exemptions from jury service and allowed counties to increase juror compensation. This legislation was proposed by Chief Justice Moyer in his 1997 State of the Judiciary address and was sponsored by State Senator Bruce Johnson.

Working with the Ohio Judicial Conference, the Supreme Court sponsored the first judicial branch orientation for newly elected members of the General Assembly. Approximately twenty members-elect and staff attended the November 30 orientation and heard presentations from Chief Justice Moyer and representatives of judicial associations.

New judicial positions (NEW)

Court staff also reviewed and recommended to the General Assembly several proposals for new judicial positions. Beginning in 1989 and at the request of the General Assembly, the Court has reviewed new judgeship proposals using a series of objective criteria designed to measure relative need. Nearly fifty proposals have been evaluated by the Court staff in the nine years since the criteria were developed.

In 1998, the Supreme Court recommended and the General Assembly approved legislation creating new judgeships in the common pleas courts for Lorain (H.B. 444), Marion (H.B. 444), and Lake (H.B. 602) Counties and fulltime judgeships in the South Euclid and Washington Court House Municipal Courts.

Judicial campaign conduct (NEW)

Staff presented at five training seminars relative to the judicial campaign rules contained in Canon 7 of the Code of Judicial Conduct. Since 1995, more than one thousand judicial candidates, campaign committee members, and others have attended these Court-sponsored seminars.

Staff continued to work with the Attorney General's office to defend court challenges to the campaign contribution and spending limits contained in the judicial campaign rules, served as secretary to four judicial commissions appointed to review judicial campaign grievances filed with the Supreme Court, and responded to inquiries from judicial candidates, campaign workers, and others regarding application of Canon 7.

Affidavits of disqualification (NEW)

One hundred fifty-one affidavits of disqualification were filed with and considered by the Chief Justice in 1998. These affidavits were decided an average of _____ days from the date they were filed to the date on which the Chief Justice issued a written ruling on the affidavit.

_____ affidavit of disqualification entries issued by the Chief Justice in 1998 were selected for publication in the Ohio Official Reports. When published, these entries will supplement the 107 entries published prior to 1998.

Drug courts (NEW)

The Supreme Court staff continued to assist local courts with the development of drug courts. By year end, seventeen drug courts were in operation in Ohio.

Drug courts provide intensive supervised treatment options for persons accused of drug and drug-related offenses. The goal of drug court programs is to assist offenders with their drug abuse habit with a goal preventing future criminal misconduct. Several drug court models currently are in use in Ohio, including courts that concentrate their efforts on juvenile offenders.

In conjunction with research staff at the University of Cincinnati, the Court continued its effort to evaluate drug court programs in twelve courts throughout Ohio. The research staff developed a data base to compile information regarding drug court participants and provided that data base to each of the twelve courts. By year end, data was being collected in each of these sites, and expansion of the research project to all operating drug courts was contemplated for 1999.

In July, the Supreme Court was awarded a federal grant to assist in the expansion of Ohio's drug court efforts. The \$187,000 grant will allow for expansion of the drug court evaluation project, provide additional training opportunities for courts seeking to establish drug courts, and allow the Supreme Court to contract with a coordinator to oversee drug court expansion and operation in Ohio.

In addition to the grant received by the Supreme Court grant, the federal government awarded grant funds to a number of Ohio courts to facilitate drug court planning and establishment. The following courts received federal drug court grants of the type and amounts listed: Belmont County Juvenile Court (\$161,000 Implementation Grant); Butler County Court of Common Pleas (\$236,000 Enhancement Grant); Clermont County Juvenile Court (\$14,000 Planning Grant); Erie County Court of Common Pleas (\$298,000 Enhancement Grant); Mahoning County Court of Common Pleas (\$384,000 Implementation Grant); Richland County Common Pleas Court/Mansfield Municipal Court (\$415,000 Implementation Grant); Stark County Court of Common Pleas (\$373,000 Implementation Grant); Trumbull County Court of Common Pleas (\$14,000 Planning Grant).

The Implementation Grant awarded jointly to the Richland County Common Pleas Court and the Mansfield Municipal Court will be used to plan develop and implement a Mid-Ohio multi-jurisdictional drug court program. The Mid-Ohio Drug Court Program will be the first in the State of Ohio to include a six-county region involving both the common pleas and municipal courts. The six counties participating in this project are Richland, Ashland, Crawford, Morrow, Knox, and Huron. The Mid-Ohio Drug Court will allow for the development of a collaborative approach among the six counties to implement a drug court diversion option for non-violent offenders within their court systems. It is anticipated that this program will serve approximately 200 offenders, reduce delay in case processing by forty percent, and reduce the use of county jails by thirty percent.

Assignment of Judges - Doug Stephens (NEW)

Chief Justice Moyer made 2,573 assignments of judges to trial and appellate courts in 1998. This included assignments of retired judges as well as sitting judges.

Assignments are made on specific cases as well as for period of time. A judge may request an assignment for a case that may appear to present a conflict of interest from that judge or may request an assignment to preside over a docket during times of absence and need.

Statistical Reporting Section - Doug Stephens (NEW)

The Statistical Reporting Section received and analyzed court statistical reports, published the annual *Ohio Courts Summary*, provided individual report form training to court employees, briefed new judges on their reporting requirements, held regional review sessions in Fremont, Kent, Lebanon, and Columbus and responded to numerous inquiries.

Family Court Feasibility Study - Doug Stephens (NEW)

Based on the findings from the Family Court Feasibility Study, as recommended by the Governor's Task Force on the Investigation and Prosecution of Child Abuse and Child Sexual Abuse Cases, through an interbranch agreement with the Department of Human Services the Court in 1998: 1) has added a family law education specialist; 2) drafted a family code; 3) is establishing a juvenile court statistics database; 4) supported the continuation of the Ohio CASA/GAL Association and 5) will be developing pilot courts to test family court concepts.

Juvenile Data Network - Doug Stephens (NEW)

The Court continued its efforts to implement a pilot Juvenile Data Network. In cooperation with the Juvenile and Family Court Judges Association and through a grant from the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, the network continued the collection of demographic and case-related data from six juvenile courts. In 1998, more than 100,000 records were maintained in a central repository. Moving from the pilot phase to the permanent establishment of a resident statewide database at the Supreme Court is the next step.

LAW LIBRARY

Paul S. Fu, Librarian

Law Library Planning (NEW)

In the past year, in addition to its regular services, programs, and activities, the library concentrated on the planning of the new law library building. The library supplied to the building architects data and information on the overall space requirements, including shelf space, special collections space, patron study space, and staff work space. The library made projections on the number of library staff members, and number and kinds of workstations needed for the new law library. The library critiqued the schematic design submitted by the architects and made suggestions and changes. As a result, the preliminary planning and designing phase of the new library is now complete. The new law library will occupy the top six floors of the Ohio Departments Building.

Collection and Services (NEW)

The Supreme Court of Ohio Law Library provides professional law library service to the Justices and staff of the Supreme Court, General Assembly, administrative agencies, members of the bar, general public, and out-of-state patrons. The law library has a carefully selected and well-maintained collection of over 400,000 equivalent volumes. It contains a comprehensive collection of federal, Ohio, and other states laws, and a core collection of international and foreign law.

The library's most notable collections are its' Ohio materials, general treatises and practice books, legal periodicals, and audio-visual materials.

Library Information Technology (NEW)

The law library strives to make the most advanced library information technologies available to its patrons.

The Supreme Court of Ohio Law Library CD-ROM network system has been in full operation for more than three years. There are 40 workstations linking the Justices' chambers, Court offices, and four public workstations on the network system. The system has greatly improved research speed and efficiency. In the past three years, more than 4,000 government agency, private attorneys, and members of the general public have used the four public CD-ROM workstations in the law library.

Since 1992, the law library has been using a totally integrated on-line library system, NOTIS, which covers all areas of library operations. The on-line public catalog, SCROLL, can be accessed by lawyers and judges from anywhere in Ohio.

In May 1998, the Supreme Court of Ohio Law Library web page made its debut on the Internet. It has provided useful information to the general public and has generated many reference questions via E-mail. The library is currently in the process of designing software to allow direct access to the library's NOTIS on-line catalog (SCROLL) on the Internet.

Activities and Statistics (NEW)

In 1998, a total of 18,137 patrons visited the law library, including personnel from more than 60 state agencies. The law library added 8,285 printed volumes, 35,303 pieces of microfiche, and 248 rolls of microfilm to the collection. In addition, the library staff responded to 14,858 reference questions.

CLERK'S OFFICE

Marcia J. Mengel, Clerk

Clerk's Office

During 1997, the Clerk's Office processed 2,730 new cases and scheduled 180 cases for oral argument (159 for full Court hearing, and 21 tax cases for hearing by a master commissioner). The Clerk's Office also processed 719 continuing legal education enforcement matters filed with the Court pursuant to Rule X of the Rules for the Government of the Bar.

Admissions Office

In 1997, the Admissions Office processed more than 4,000 admission applications, including 1,956 law student registrations, 1,951 bar examination applications, 89 applications for admission without examination, and 9 applications (7 new and 2 renewals) for temporary certification under Rule IX of the Rules for the Government of the Bar. The Admissions Office also issued 463 legal intern certificates and 1,912 certificates of good standing.

The Admissions Office administered two bar examinations and two admissions ceremonies in 1997. During the February bar examination, 442 applicants were tested, and in May the Office conducted an admissions ceremony at the Ohio Theatre for the 358 successful applicants who had met all criteria for admission. At the July examination, 1,278 applicants were tested, and a November admissions ceremony was held for the 966 successful applicants who qualified for admission.

Attorney Registration Office

Pursuant to Rule VI of the Rules for the Government of the Bar, attorneys admitted to practice in Ohio are required to register with the Supreme Court on a biennial basis. The 1997-1999 attorney registration biennium began on September 1, 1997.

During the year, more than 45,000 attorneys registered for the 1997-1999 biennium as follows: 35,970 attorneys registered for active status; 6,768 registered as inactive; and 2,195 attorneys registered for retired status, a status for attorneys age 65 and over who no longer practice law. In addition, 220 attorneys who are admitted to practice in other states, but not in Ohio, registered for corporate status in Ohio.

REPORTER'S OFFICE (NEW)

Walter S. Kobalka, Reporter

In 1998, the Reporter's Office published 378 full Supreme Court opinions, 261 abbreviated entries, and 74 miscellaneous orders, for a total of 813 edited Supreme Court works. Also, 679 court of appeals opinions and 90 trial court opinions were published in the *Ohio Official Reports*. Plans are being made to bring out one or two special Advance Sheets in 1999 in order to publish court of appeals opinions on a more current basis.

The Reporter's Office published a total of 9,126 pages in the *Ohio Official Reports*. Of these 9,126 pages, Supreme Court opinions, announcements, rules, and notices accounted for 3,243 pages in the Advance Sheets or 35.34 percent of

the 1998 total. Court of appeals opinions took 5,319 pages in the Advance Sheets or 58.28 percent, while trial court opinions took 564 pages or 6.18 percent.

The Reporter's Office, in cooperation with the Office of Court Technology and Services, continued the electronic transmission to the official publisher of opinions, announcements, and notices. Also in cooperation with the Office of Court Technology and Services, the Reporter's Office continues to transmit the court's opinions, announcements, and final versions of court rules to the court's website so that the public can have access to this information within hours of its release. The court's Web page can be found at <<http://www.sconet.ohio.gov>> In addition, the Office of Court Technology and Services has added a "search engine" to the court's Web page. A newly created index for searching rule amendments and opinions will be available for public use in early 1999.

As noted last year, the court's excellence in reporting opinions will be continued, since the court and West Publishing Company agreed to extend the contract to publish the Ohio Official Reports for another five years, through June 30, 2001.

OFFICE OF COURT TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES
James J. Mendel, Manager

Supreme Court of Ohio Network (SCONet) (NEW)

During 1998, the Office of Court Technology completed significant upgrades to the Supreme Court network to improve access by staff and to make desktop hardware and software year 2000 compliant. We continued to upgrade our web site with more information about offices, court activities, and programs. It is now possible to download forms from various offices and view the rules for government of the bar. The web site now offers easier electronic communications for comments, questions, and recommendations.

Ohio Appellate Strategic Information System (OASIS) (NEW)

The Office continued to work with court of appeals judges, administrators, and staff to support and enhance the OASIS case management software package for the five district courts of appeals. During 1998, the enhancements included upgrading the applications software to a windows version. The new application software was installed in three (3) appellate districts for evaluation and testing. The remaining two appellate districts are upgrading their networks to accommodate the new software.

Technical Assistance (NEW)

The Office continues to provide direct technical assistance to trial and appellate courts in the installation of new technologies and the computer acquisition process, including dealing with vendors, negotiating with funding authorities, developing and releasing requests for proposal, evaluating proposals, and awarding contracts. In 1998, the Office provided technical assistance to 43 courts and completed work with 22 courts in 17 counties.

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE (NEW) **Harry Franken, Communications Director**

The Public Information Office provides a link between the public and the Court. It also supplies information and copies of opinions to attorneys and parties involved in Supreme Court cases. Actions of the Court are sent to the State House newsroom, mailed to several news outlets, faxed to others, and are available on the counter in the Public Information Office.

During 1998, the office released 738 opinions. The number released in the previous year had been 330. The large increase represented efforts by the Court to clear up a number of Workers' Compensation cases that were pending. The Public Information Office also issued summaries for 183 of the opinions and prepared short summaries for all cases that were argued in an effort to help the news media determine whether or not they wanted to cover those arguments. The office responded to 2,560 telephone requests for information, sent out 3,098 faxes, and issued 42 press releases. Six Bar Leadership Memos were prepared for publication by the Ohio State Bar Association.

The office prepared notices and press releases and assisted local news media in two visits of the Court outside Franklin County. One was held in Tiffin in Seneca County and one in Celina in Mercer County. These included working with editors of high school newspapers and yearbooks.

Educational programs were conducted for students of The Ohio State University School of Journalism and Communications taking the course on covering public offices. These included a visit and tour of the Court and covering one of the cases argued.

The office distributed court photographs upon request.

Press releases and opinions were also issued for the Court of Claims, Disciplinary Counsel, Board of Commissioners on Grievances and Discipline, and the Clients' Security Fund. News media and the public were notified of the time and location for hearings of attorneys facing disciplinary charges.

The office prepared clippings each week of news of interest about the Court and the judicial system. The office subscribes to nine daily newspapers published in Ohio, two (*New York Times* and *USA Today*) published outside the state, and three newspapers distributed free in Columbus. We also receive clips from the Ohio News Bureau, Inc.

FISCAL OFFICE

Noreen L. S. Weisberg, Fiscal Officer

The Fiscal Office administered combined annual budgets of approximately \$90 million for the Judiciary, including the Supreme Court. The Fiscal Office also provided fiscal and administrative management support for the Supreme Court, courts of appeals, trial courts, and affiliated entities from multiple funding sources and accounts. Other services of the Office included employee benefits and compensation; budgeting, purchasing, accounting, compliance review, and payment processing for the Supreme Court and Judiciary funds, accounts, grants, and inventories. In addition, the Office provided administrative technical assistance and support services to the offices of the Supreme Court, the Justices, and their staffs.

The Fiscal Office payroll unit prepared 128 biweekly and monthly payrolls; coordinated benefits, payroll tax withholdings, mandatory and voluntary deductions, payments, and adjustments for more than 1,300 judges and court personnel, including the Ohio Judicial Conference. The Fiscal Office also collected the counties' share of payments made to retired judges assigned by the Chief Justice, as required by law. The accounting unit made quarterly reimbursements to counties for the state's share of compensation to locally appointed municipal court judges. The Fiscal Office reviewed, approved, made, distributed, and accounted for over 30,000 reimbursements and payments to judges; staff, commission, committee and board members; counties, contractors; suppliers, and service providers. The Fiscal Office monitored, accounted for, and reported on grants awarded to, and on grants and subsidies awarded by, the Supreme Court.

Statutorily required increases and changes in state compensation and supplements for statewide judicial and specified court officials were made January 1 and July 1, 1997 and January 1, 1998. Starting July 1, 1997, all part-time municipal court judges and county court judges received a state share supplement to compensation paid locally. As a result, 76 judgeships were added to the monthly payroll.

MASTER COMMISSIONERS (NEW)
John J. Dilenschneider, Counsel to the Court

The Master Commissioners continued to provide research support for the Supreme Court, primarily in capital cases, appeals from the Public Utilities Commission and the Board of Tax Appeals, disciplinary cases, original actions filed in the Court, and direct appeals originating in the courts of appeals.

COURT OF CLAIMS (NEW)
Miles Durfey, Clerk

The Court of Claims has exclusive, original jurisdiction over all civil actions filed against the State of Ohio. The Court also determines all matters pertaining to an application for an award of reparations filed under the Ohio Victims of Crime Act.

Civil actions in the Court of Claims are determined in one of two ways: actions against the state for \$2,500 or less are determined administratively by the Clerk or Deputy Clerk (administrative determinations); and actions for more than \$2,500 are heard and determined by a judge of the Court and are referred to as judicial determinations.

A judge of the Court may review a civil action that has been determined administratively and enter judgment and may also hear and determine an appeal taken from an order issued by a panel of commissioners in a victims case. In either event, the judgment cannot be the subject of further appeal.

Court of Claims Case Management (NEW)

	<u>Comparative Data</u>	
	1997	1998
<u>Civil</u>		
Administrative Determinations:		
Pending Cases January 1	265	189
Filed	716	636
Terminated	792	713
Pending Cases December 31	189	112
Judicial Determinations:		
Pending Cases January 1	486	490
Filed	540	458
Terminated	536	502
Pending Cases December 31	490	446

Victims of Crime

Single Commissioner: (Initial Determination)		
Pending Cases January 1	3,756	5055*
New Filings	4,664	4125
Supplemental Filings	323	397
Referrals/Remands	647	743
Total Filings	5,634	5265
Terminated	6,150	7537
Pending Cases December 31	3,240*	2783

	<u>Comparative Data</u>	
	1996	1997
Panel of Commissioners: (First Appeal)		
Pending Cases January 1	250	211
Objections Filed	601	658
Terminated	640	659
Pending Cases December 31	211	210
Judicial Appeals: (Final Appeal)		
Pending Cases January 1	49	13
Appeals Filed	109	131
Terminated	145	116
Pending Cases December 31	13	28

* The difference between these two numbers is a result of the cumulative errors that have occurred over the years by the inadvertent exclusion of some remanded cases from pending caseload figures. The 5,055 number now fairly represents the number of cases that were pending on January 1, 1998.

CASES FILED (NEW)

JURISDICTIONAL APPEALS	<u>1998</u>
Claimed Appeals of Right	34
Discretionary Appeals (Non-felony)	1,283
Discretionary Appeals (Felony)	531
MERIT DOCKET	
Original Actions	186
Habeas Corpus Cases	70
Direct Appeals	209
Certified Conflicts	84
Appeals from Board of Tax Appeals	45
Appeals from Public Utilities Commission	5
Appeals from Power Siting Board	0
Death Penalty Cases*	29
Certified Questions of State Law	5
<i>Murnahan</i> Appeals	100
Appeals of Election Contest under R.C. 3515.15	0
Appeals under R.C. 4121.25	0
PRACTICE OF LAW CASES	
Disciplinary Cases**	133
Admissions Cases**	4
Other Practice of Law Cases**	9
<hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: auto; margin-right: 0;"/>	
TOTAL	2,728

* *Included in this category are 16 cases involving appeals from the courts of common pleas in which the death penalty was imposed for an offense committed on or after January 1, 1995. The remaining 13 cases involve appeals from the courts of appeals for offenses committed prior to January 1, 1995.*

** *See Appendix E for breakdown of cases relating to the practice of law that were filed in 1998.*

APPENDIX A

FINAL DISPOSITIONS* (NEW)

JURISDICTIONAL APPEALS (JURISDICTION DECLINED, LEAVE TO APPEAL DENIED AND/OR APPEAL DISMISSED) 1998

Claimed Appeals of Right	34
Discretionary Appeals (Non-felony)**	1,090
Discretionary Appeals (Felony)**	<u>362</u>

TOTAL 1,486

MERIT DOCKET

Original Actions	211
Habeas Corpus Cases	76
Direct Appeals	366
Certified Conflicts	84
Appeals from Board of Tax Appeals	36
Appeals from Public Utilities Commission	13
Appeals from Power Siting Board	1
Death Penalty Cases	17
Merit Cases Pursuant to Allowance***	177
Certified Questions of State Law	3
<i>Murnahan</i> Appeals	101
Appeals of Election Contest under R.C. 3515.15	0
Appeals under R.C. 4121.25	<u>0</u>

TOTAL 1,085

* See Appendix F for final dispositions of cases relating to the practice of law.

** This category includes cases involving discretionary appeals and claimed appeals of right.

*** This category includes all discretionary appeals and claimed appeals of right that were allowed by the Court, and heard and disposed of on the merits.

APPENDIX B

**DISCRETIONARY APPEALS AND CLAIMED APPEALS OF RIGHT
ALLOWED (NEW)**

	<u>1998</u>
Claimed Appeals of Right	3
Discretionary Appeals (Non-felony)*	136
Discretionary Appeals (Felony)*	<u>37</u>
TOTAL	176

* *This category includes cases involving discretionary appeals and claimed appeals of right.*

APPENDIX C

CASES PENDING (NEW)

CASE TYPE	PENDING AS OF 01/01/99
Discretionary Appeals and Claimed Appeals of Right*	564**
Original Actions	37
Habeas Corpus Cases	5
Direct Appeals	168
Certified Conflicts	33
Appeals from Board of Tax Appeals	43
Appeals from Public Utilities Commission	10
Death Penalty Cases***	44
Certified Questions of State Law	8
<i>Murnahan</i> Appeals	14
Appeal of Elections Contest under R.C. 3515.15	0
TOTAL	926

* *This category includes discretionary appeals and claimed appeals of right that were awaiting Court review on the first of the year. It also includes discretionary appeals and claimed appeals of right that had been allowed by the Court and were pending on the merits on the first of the year.*

** *110 of these cases had been allowed by the Court and were pending on the merits as of January 1, 1999. The remainder were pending as jurisdictional appeals.*

*** *Included in this category are 25 cases involving appeals from the courts of commonpleas in which the death penalty was imposed for an offense committed on or after January 1, 1995. One of the cases in which the death penalty was imposed for an offense committed on or after January 1, 1995, also has a companion cases appealed from the courts of appeals. The remaining 18 cases involve appeals from the courts of appeals for offenses committed prior to January 1, 1995.*

APPENDIX D

**CASES RELATING TO THE PRACTICE OF LAW (NEW)
CASES FILED
1998**

DISCIPLINARY CASES

Regular disciplinary cases	92
Mental illness suspension cases	1
Automatic suspensions for felony convictions	13
Automatic suspensions for child support noncompliance	1
Resignations	11
Reciprocal discipline cases	5
Disciplinary cases involving judges	2
Judicial campaign cases filed pursuant to Gov. Jud. R. II, Sec. 5	4
Judicial cases filed pursuant to Gov. Jud. R. III	0
Miscellaneous disciplinary matters	<u>4</u>
TOTAL	133

ADMISSIONS CASES

Character and fitness cases	4
Miscellaneous admissions matters	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	4

OTHER PRACTICE OF LAW CASES¹

Cases relating to the unauthorized practice of law	4
Other cases relating to the practice of law	<u>5</u>
TOTAL	9

¹ "Other practice of law cases" includes cases that were filed pursuant to the Supreme Court's exclusive constitutional authority over matters relating to the practice of law and that are not considered either disciplinary cases or admissions cases.

APPENDIX E

**CASES RELATING TO THE PRACTICE OF LAW (NEW)
FINAL DISPOSITIONS
1997**

DISCIPLINARY CASES

Public reprimands	14
Definite suspensions ¹	21
Definite suspensions with probation ²	12
Mental illness suspensions	0
Suspensions pending compliance	1
Indefinite suspensions	19
Disbarments	16
Automatic suspensions for felony convictions	13
Automatic suspension cases dismissed as moot	0
Automatic suspension cases where Court imposed no disciplinary sanction	0
Automatic suspensions for child support noncompliance	2
Resignations	10
Reciprocal discipline imposed	9
Reciprocal discipline cases dismissed	0
Disciplinary cases involving judges	2
Judicial cases under Gov. Jud. R. III where Court imposed sanction	0
Judicial campaign cases where Court imposed sanction	0
Judicial campaign cases where five-judge commission imposed sanction	0
Disciplinary cases dismissed by the Court	4
Miscellaneous disciplinary matters	<u>3</u>
TOTAL	126

ADMISSIONS CASES

Character and fitness cases	6
Miscellaneous admissions matters	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	6

OTHER PRACTICE OF LAW CASES

Cases relating to the unauthorized practice of law	3
Other cases relating to the practice of law	<u>2</u>
TOTAL	5

APPENDIX F

- ¹ *This category includes suspensions for a definite period of time as well as suspensions that are completely or partially stayed, with or without conditions.*
- ² *This category includes cases where respondent was ordered to be monitored and/or placed on probation for all or part of the suspension, or where respondent was ordered to serve a period of probation following completion of a period of suspension.*
- ³ *One case was dismissed on the merits; one case was dismissed because it was filed erroneously; and two cases were dismissed because the respondents died.*

1998 RULE AMENDMENTS (NEW)

1. **Gov. Bar R. V, Section 4(D) and 11(C) and (D) -- Disciplinary Investigation Procedures (Keith Bartlett)**
 - a. Approved for publication: January 9, 1996
 - b. Published for comment: February 12, 1996
 - c. Final adoption by Conference:
 - d. Final publication:
 - e. Effective date:

2. **Civ. R. 3, 53, 75, and 86; Crim. R. 4, 11, 12, 32, 32.1, 32.2, 32.3, 46, and 59; Juv. R. 2, 4, 10, 11, 15, 16, 29, 39, 40, and 47; Evid. R. 607, 613, 616, 706, 806, and 1102 -- Rules Advisory Committee Recommendations (Keith Bartlett)**
 - a. Approved for publication: August 26, 1997
 - b. Published for comment: October 6, 1997
 - c. Final adoption by Conference: December 2, 1997; January 13, 1998
 - d. Filed with General Assembly: January 15, 1998
 - e. Published for comment: February 23, 1998
 - f. Final adoption by Conference: April 20, 1998
 - g. Revisions filed with the General Assembly: April 30, 1998
 - h. Final publication: August 24, 1998
 - i. Effective date: July 1, 1998

3. **Code of Professional Responsibility DR 2-101 -- Solicitation (Keith Bartlett)**
 - a. Approved for publication: August 26, 1997
 - b. Published for comment: October 6, 1997
 - c. Final adoption by Conference:
 - d. Final publication:
 - e. Effective date:

APPENDIX G

4. **Sup. R. 44 -- Acceptance of Garnishment Forms**
 - a. Approved for publication: August 26, 1997
 - b. Published for comment: September 29, 1997
 - c. Considered but not adopted: January 20, 1998

5. **Gov. Jud. R. IV -- Continuing Legal Education Professionalism (Rick Dove)**
 - a. Approved for publication: May 6, 1997; May 12, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: June 9, 1997; June 8, 1998
 - c. Final adoption by Conference: October 27, 1998
 - d. Final publication: November 23, 1998
 - e. Effective date: January 1, 1999

6. **Rule XIX, Section 4, Supreme Court Rules of Practice -- Transmission of Record in Death Penalty Cases (Marcia Mengel)**
 - a. Approved for publication: December 2, 1997
 - b. Published for comment: January 12, 1998
 - c. Final adoption by Conference: April 8, 1998
 - d. Final publication: May 11, 1998
 - e. Effective date: June 1, 1998

7. **Specialization Designation -- Business, Commercial , and Industrial Real Property Law & Residential Property Law (Diane Chesley-Lahm)**
 - a. Approved for publication: October 24, 1997
 - b. Published for comment: December 8, 1997
 - c. Final adoption by Conference: February 3, 1998
 - d. Final publication: March 9, 1998
 - e. Effective date: February 3, 1998

8. **Sup. R 10 and Form 10-A -- Protection Orders**
 - a. Approved for publication: December 9, 1997
 - b. Published for comment: January 12, 1998
 - c. Final adoption by Conference: March 24, 1998
 - d. Final publication: April 27, 1998
 - e. Effective date: March 24, 1998

9. **Gov. Bar R. I(9) -- Admission Without Examination (Marcia Mengel)**
 - a. Approved for publication: February 3, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: March 23, 1998
 - c. Final adoption by Conference: May 26, 1998
 - d. Final publication: July 20, 1998
 - e. Effective date: August 3, 1998

10. **Gov. Jud. R. III -- Retirement, Removal, or Suspension of Judges Without Pay (Rick Dove)**
 - a. Approved for publication: March 3, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: March 30, 1998
 - c. Final adoption by Conference: May 26, 1998
 - d. Final publication: June 22, 1998
 - e. Effective date: June 22, 1998

11. **Gov. Bar R. VIII(2)(D)(1) -- Clients' Security Fund Audit**
 - a. Final adoption by Conference: March 3, 1998
 - b. Final publication: April 13, 1998
 - c. Effective date: April 13, 1998

12. **Gov. Bar R. V, Section 3(D)(2) -- Certified Grievance Committees Reimbursement for Expenses (Keith Bartlett)**
 - a. Final adoption by Conference: January 20, 1998
 - b. Final publication: March 23, 1998
 - c. Effective date: January 20, 1998

13. **Sup. R. 9 -- Court Security (Steve Stover)**
 - a. Approved for publication: March 24, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: April 13, 1998; April 20, 1998
 - c. Final adoption by Conference: May 12, 1998
 - d. Final publication: June 8, 1998
 - e. Effective date: May 12, 1998

14. **Rule VI, Section 1(B)(1) Rules of Practice --Briefs in Merit Appeals (Marcia Mengel)**
 - a. Approved for publication: April 20, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: June 15, 1998
 - c. Final adoption by Conference: September 15, 1998
 - d. Final publication: October 19, 1998
 - e. Effective date: October 19, 1998

15. **Gov. Bar R. X, Section 3 -- Acting Judges (Rick Dove)**
 - a. Approved for publication: May 26, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: June 22, 1998
 - c. Final adoption by Conference: September 28, 1998
 - d. Final publication: November 2, 1998
 - e. Effective date: November 1, 1998

16. **Probate Forms 6.1, 9.0, 9.1, 9.2, 10.0, 10.1, 10.2, 12.0, 12.1, 14.0, 22.0, and 22.2**
 - a. Approved for publication: May 12, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: June 22, 1998
 - c. Final adoption by Conference: August 19, 1998
 - d. Final publication: September 28, 1998
 - e. Effective date: October 1, 1998

17. **Gov Bar R. V, Sections 8 and 11 – Resignation from the Practice of Law (Marcia Mengel)**
 - a. Approved for publication: May 26, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: July 6, 1998
 - c. Final adoption by Conference: September 28, 1998
 - d. Final publication: November 2, 1998
 - e. Effective date: November 2, 1998

18. **Gov. Bar R. I, Sections 3, 4, 5, and 7 -- Ohio Bar Examination(Marcia Mengel)**
 - a. Approved for publication: June 9, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: July 27, 1998 (Comment Deadline: August 26, 1998)
 - c. Final adoption by Conference:
 - d. Final publication:
 - e. Effective date:

19. **Gov. Bar R. VIII, Section 1 – Establishment of Fund (Janet Green-Marbley)**
 - a. Final adoption by Conference: August 19, 1998
 - b. Final publication: September 21, 1998
 - c. Effective date: August 19, 1998

20. **Gov. Bar R. V -- Bell Commission Amendments (Rick Dove)**
 - a. Approved for publication: August 19, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: September 21, 1998 (Comment deadline: November 23, 1998)
 - c. Final adoption by Conference:
 - d. Final publication:
 - e. Effective date:

21. **Civ. R. 24, 33, 56, and 86; Evid. R. 101 and 1102 -- Rules Advisory Committee Recommendations (Keith Bartlett)**
 - a. Approved for publication: October 12, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: November 2, 1998 (Comment Deadline: December 2, 1998)
 - c. Adopted by Conference: December 15, 1998
 - d. Filed with General Assembly:
 - e. Published for comment:
 - f. Revisions adopted by Conference:
 - g. Revisions filed with the General Assembly:
 - h. Final publication:

- 22. Sup. R. 10, 10.03 and Forms - Stalking Protection Order Forms (Melissa Knopp)**
- a. Approved for publication: November 10, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: December 14, 1998 (Comment Deadline: January 14, 1999)
 - c. Final adoption by Conference:
 - d. Final publication:
 - e. Effective date:
- 23. Sup. Forms 10.01-A to 10.01-J and 10.02-A - Revised Domestic Violence Protection Order Forms (Melissa Knopp)**
- a. Approved for publication: November 10, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: December 7, 1998 (Comment Deadline: January 7, 1999)
 - c. Final adoption by Conference:
 - d. Final publication:
 - e. Effective date:
- 24. Sup. R. 80, 81 and Forms - Standard Domestic Relations Forms (Melissa Knopp)**
- a. Approved for publication: November 10, 1998
 - b. Published for comment: December 7, 1998 (Comment Deadline: February 7, 1999)
 - c. Final adoption by Conference:
 - d. Final publication:
 - e. Effective date:

**SUPREME COURT OF OHIO
BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AND COMMITTEES
1997**

Permanent Boards, Commissions, Committees & Offices

BOARD OF BAR EXAMINERS

Thomas G. Pletz, Chair	Keith McNamara
William G. Batchelder, III	Michael P. Morrison
Mark C. Bissinger	Robert M. Morrow
Michael M. Briley	Jonathan E. Rosenbaum
Kim Wilson Burke	George A. Sadd
Fritz Byers	Kenneth F. Seibel
James F. DeLeone	Beatrice K. Sowald
Lawrence R., Elleman	Timothy J. Ucker
Robert F. Howarth, Jr.	Catherine M. Vernon
Julie Jones	John W. Waddy, Jr.
Samuel Kaplan	John W. Zeiger
Patricia G. Lyden	

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS ON CHARACTER AND FITNESS

Ernest A. Eynon, II, Chair	Michael B. Michelson
Judge Nancy D. Hammond	Frederick L. Oremus
Judge Sara E. Lioi	Jerry O. Pitts
Judge David Tobin	D. Michael Reny
Thomas L. Adgate	Suzanne K. Richards
Robert N. Farquhar	Joseph H. Weiss, Jr.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE CLIENTS' SECURITY FUND (NEW)

E. James Hople, Chair	Ann L. Clark
Laneta Goings, Vice-Chair	Jerome Phillips
Benjamin F. Barrett, Sr.	Natalie Y. Wester
John J. Chester, Jr.	

**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS ON GRIEVANCES AND DISCIPLINE
OF THE SUPREME COURT**

Robin G. Weaver, Chair	Judge John P. Petzold
David T. Evans, Vice-Chair	Judge Leo M. Spellacy
Judge Robert H. Gorman	Justice A. William Sweeney
Judge W. Scott Gwin	Judge Mary Grace Trimboli
Judge Nelfred G. Kimerline	Judge James R. Williams

Judge Sara E. Lioi
Michael R. Barrett
Stanley C. Bender
John W. Berger
Charles E. Brown
Raymond G. Esch
Sgt. George Gerken
Elaine B. Greaves
William Martin Greene
Carol Hallbauer
J. Thomas Henretta

Richard C. Alkire
Ellen Hobbs Hirshman
Jonathan Hollingsworth
Nancy D. Moore
Peggy A. Murray
Martin J. O'Connell
Dale K. Perdue
William E. Rathman
Larry L. Seward
Joseph T. Svete
Linde Hurst Webb

**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS ON THE UNAUTHORIZED
PRACTICE OF LAW**

D John Travis, Chair
Jack R. Baker
Peter J. Comodeca
Ryan H. Fisher

Paul D. Frankel
J. Jeffrey McNealey
Frederick L. Ransier, III

COMMISSION ON CERTIFICATION OF ATTORNEYS AS SPECIALISTS

Timothy J. Boone, Chair
Professor Glen A. Weissenberger,
Vice-Chair
Judge Carolyn Friedland
Judge Frederick D. Pepple
Frank E. Bazler
Stanley C. Bender
Mark C. Bissinger
Professor James Durham

Lawrence R. Elleman
Howard Friedman
Douglas N. Godshall
Michael S. Harshman
Paul E. Hoeffel
Michael E. Murman
David E. Pontius
Professor Albert T. Quick
Timothy F. Scanlon

COMMISSION ON CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION

David Deutsch, Chair
James Caruso, Vice-Chair
Judge John Bessey
Judge Patricia A. Cleary
Judge John J. Donnelly
Judge Thomas Grady
Judge Henry Shaw
Stephen Buchenroth
John H. Burlew
Gust Callas
Richard Cory
Jeffrey Heintz

Henry Hentemann
Stephen Hubbard
James Huggins
Annrita Johnson
Michael Kadens
Robert McGeough
Herbert McTaggart
James Roberts
Barbara Terzian
Thomas J. Tucker
Donald White

**COMMITTEE ON THE APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
FOR INDIGENT DEFENDANTS IN CAPITAL CASES**

Judge Everett Burton, Chair
Joann Jolstad
William F. Kluge

Charles H. Knight
Harry R. Reinhart

LEGAL RIGHTS SERVICE COMMISSION

Timothy J. McCormack, Chairman

COMMISSION ON PROFESSIONALISM

Richard G. Ison, Chair
John S. Stith, Vice-Chair
Judge David Johnson
Judge Lynett M. McGough
Judge Patrick McGrath
Judge Richard J. McMonagle
Judge C. Ashley Pike

Jonathan D. Adams
Jeffrey Helmick
Max Kravitz
William C. Mann
Terry McKee
Ralph Russo
Robert Solomon

OHIO PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION

(Supreme Court Appointees)

Paul Cassidy
George Gernot, III

C. Lyonel Jones
Timothy Young

RULES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Richard S. Walinski, Chair
Judge Mike Fain, Vice-Chair
Judge Peggy Bryant
Judge Phil W. Campbell
Judge William Finnegan
Judge Patricia A. Gaughan
Judge David Lewandowski
Judge Frederick E. Mong
Judge Jack Puffenberger
Donald C. Brey

Louis A. Jacobs
Gerald Messerman
Barbara Norton
Frank A. Ray
Elizabeth Reilly
Niki Z. Schwartz
Percy Squire
Mary Jane Trapp
Gregory A. White

TRAFFIC RULES REVIEW COMMISSION

Judge Frederick Hany, II, Chair
Judge Margaret Clark
Judge James J. Fais
Judge Francis X. Gorman
Judge Thomas J. Osowik

Judge Richard M. Rogers
Paul M. Herbert
Carol Johnson
Kerry A. Lynch
Edward R. Wead

COMMITTEE FOR LAWYER REFERRAL AND INFORMATION SERVICES

Michael A. Bonfiglio
Robert Gluck

Marian Smithberger
William L. Stehle

Special Boards, Commissions and Committees

BENCH-BAR PLANNING COMMITTEE

Judge Ann Marie Tracy, Co-Chair
David E. Griffiths, Co-Chair
Judge Sheila Farmer
Judge James E. Green

Judge John D. Schmitt
Heather Sowald
Terry M. Donnellon

COMMITTEE ON DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Robert W. Rack, Jr., Chair
Judge Fred Daniel, Jr.
Judge James L. DeWeese
Judge James A. Ray
Judge William C. Todia
Judge Howard S. Zwelling
Magistrate Kathleen Graham
Magistrate Harold D. Paddock
John M. Alton
Michael Casto
William L. Clark

Diana Cyganovich
David A. Doyle
Dianne Goss
Dean James M. Klein
Walter W. Kocher
Herbert Palkovitz
Robert Parsons
Dean Nancy Rogers
Dean Joseph P. Tomain
Thomas Weeks

COMMISSION ON RACIAL FAIRNESS

Judge Ronald B. Adrine, Chair
Chief Justice Moyer, Vice Chair
Judge Carl Character
Judge Charles J. Doneghy
Judge Nathaniel Jones
Judge Melba D. Marsh
Judge Gustalo Nunez

Daniel W. Hammer
Daniel J. Hoffheimer
Ken Irwin
City Attorney Janet Jackson
Co. Prosecutor Stephanie Tubbs Jones
Pastor Morris Lee
Alex H. Mark

Judge Donald L. Ramsey
Judge William H. Wolff, Jr.
Magistrate William G. Hutcheson
Thomas Bonasera
James C. Cissell
Edward Coaxam, Jr.
Sherry L. Eckman
Rita Fernandez
Jesse Goodring

Chief Patrick Oliver
Pamela Roberts
Romey Saunders
Richard T. Schisler
Thomas Wang
Robin G. Weaver
Dean Gregory Williams
City Councilwoman Les Wright

COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE RULES OF SUPERINTENDENCE

Judge John W. McCormac, Chair
Judge John R. Adkins
Judge Lawrence A. Belskis
Judge Ralph Berry
Judge Donald R. Ford
Judge Lee W. McClelland
Judge James S. Rapp
Judge Russell A. Steiner
Judge Anthony Valen

Suzanna K. Blevins
William L. Danko
Judy Gano
Bennett Manning
Dorcas Miller
Janet Miller
Thomas W. Palmer
Barbara Porzio

COURT PERSONNEL EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMITTEE

Michael Casto
Ken Dale
Sherry Eckman
Diane Hatcher
Jane Held
Bertha Miley Kalil
Anne McBrayer
Barb Pagnard

Dan Pompa
Bill Saus
Judy Snodgrass
Tony Tedeschi
Dottie Tuttle
Connie Villelli
Donna Wermer

**OHIO CONFERENCE ON SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND THE COURTS
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Mary Bower
Pat Bridgman
Sandra Cannon
Kristin Gilbert
Michelle Hall
Beverly Hawkins
Linda Janes
Craig Jaquith
Barbara Kaminski

Mike Lee
Michael Link
Anne G. McNealey
Fritz Rauschenberg
Tracy Robinson
Stephan W. Stover
Michael Stringer
Carol Upchurch

**STANDARD FORMS COMMITTEE OF THE
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE TASK FORCE**

Judge V. Michael Brigner
Judge Jack Rosen
Robin Bozian
Nancy Neylon

Alexandria Ruden
Michael F. Sheils
Michael Smalz

FAMILY CODE TASK FORCE (NEW)

Judge David Basinski
Judge Douglas Jenkins
Judge Phil Rose
Judge Russ Steiner
Magistrate Mike Bernstein
Magistrate William Reddington

Bob Frankart
Lew George
Bill Kurtz
Mike Ring
Craig Tame

FAMILY COURT FEASIBILITY STUDY - REVIEW COMMITTEE (NEW)

Judge John W. Gallagher
Judge James Green
Judge James W. Kirsch
Judge Judith Nicely
Judge Tom Nurre
Judge Donald L. Ramsey
Judge Don Reader

Frank D. Aquila
Jerry Collamore
Susan Ignelzi
Keith Kaufman
Barbara Norton
R. Larry Schneider

**OHIO COURTS FUTURES COMMISSION
TASK FORCE MEMBERS**

Judge Robert M. Duncan, Co-Chair
Susan Lajoie Eagan, Co-Chair
Justice Deborah Cook
Judge John P. Bessey
Judge Melissa Byers-Emmerling
*Judge R. Scott Krichbaum
Judge Judith Ann Lanzinger
*Judge Lee W. McClelland
Judge Jeff Payton
Judge James S. Rapp
Judge James A. Ray
Judge Leslie Spillane
Judge Ann Marie Tracey
Judge William H. Wolff, Jr.
Senator Nancy Chiles Dix
Representative James Mason

*Professor Charles Hallinan
*Matt Hensley
Robert D. Horowitz
Thomas S. Hodson
*Sandra Huth
Professor Ralph Izard
*Barbara Janis
*Robert H. Jeffrey
*Jeff Johnson
Jonathan J. Johnson
*Professor Peter Joy
Simon Karas
F. Dale Kasperek, Jr.
*Professor Robin M. Kennedy
*Todd Kleismit
*Doug Knight

Donna Alvarado
Professor Linda Ammons
*Dee Bardes
*Teri Barton
*Professor Susan J. Becker
*Professor William C. Becker
Mary M. Bower
*Christina Brueggeman
John Bryant
*Carol Caruso
*Dianne Coder
Professor Gary Coombs
Laurel Dinallo
*Professor Mike Distelhorst
*Charles A. Dozer
Paul M. Dutton
*Frank Elmer
*Professor Bruce French
Jeff Fruit
William Gaskill
Professor G. Kathleen Grant
*Samuel Gresham, Jr.
*Nancy Grigsby
*Reverend John Putka
William Randle
*Michael Rankin
David G. Rummel
*Professor Nancy H. Rogers
*Professor Richard Saphire
William J. Schlageter
*Michele Schoeppe
Jan Scotland
*Lisa Severtis
*Thomas Shields
*Professor Mike Solimine

* Advisory Council

*Alicia L. Koch
*Cathleen Kreiner
*Matt Kridler
Sandy Lewallen
*Jessica Shimberg Lind
*Mike Link
Larry Long
*Karla Lortz
Tracy Mahoney
*Karen Mason
Tim C. Mazur
Terry McCoy
*E. Winther McCroom
Albert A. Mills
*Mary Ming
Julie Mogavero
*Stephanie Mott
Kathleen Murphy
*Andrew Owen
Dennis M. Parish
*Dean Richard Perna
Richard Pogue
Samuel Porter
Susan Steinman
Linda L. Thompson
Keith A. Throckmorton
*Brad Tillson
Dean Joseph P. Tomain
*Professor Gregory Travaglio
James Underwood
*Lori Urogdy-Eiler
*Yeura Rommel Venters
David Ward
Paul Wu

JUDICIAL COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Judge James A. Brogan, Chair
Judge Judith Ann Lanzinger,
Vice Chair
Judge Yvette McGee Brown
Judge H.F. Inderlied
Judge Stephen D. Michael

Judge Reginald J. Routson
Judge Leslie Spillane
Judge Thomas A. Swift
Judge Thomas A. Weaver
Magistrate J. Michael Bernstein

OHIO LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOUNDATION

Thomas V. Chema, President
Robert M. Clyde, Executive Director
Judge Nathaniel R. Jones
Judge Teresa L. Liston
Judge John D. Schmitt
Judge James R. Sherck
Judge Jose A. Villanueva
Judge William H. Wolff, Jr.
State Rep. Thomas M. Roberts
John Alge
Stanley H. Aronoff
Francis J. Conte
James Draper
Gloria Eyerly
Bill Faith

John F. Hayward
Raymond C. Headen
C. Richard Hubbard
James J. Johnson
William Klatt
Joseph L. Mas
James J. McMonagle
Denis J. Murphy
Frederick L. Oremus
Edmund G. Peper
Richard W. Pogue
Samuel H. Porter
Greta Russell
Kurtis A. Tunnell
David C. Weiner

OHIO VICTIMS OF CRIME COMPENSATION PROGRAM ADVISORY COUNCIL

Rick Grochowski, Chair
Attorney General Betty Montgomery
Judge Richard Carey
Judge Frederick Pepple
Senator Rhine L. McLin
Jeannette Adkins
Chief Thomas Bartlett
Larry Blum
Reverend Timothy J. Clarke
Reverend Otis Gordon
Domingo S. Herraiz
Karin Ho
Judith Ann Ingram

Sheriff Simon L. Leis, Jr.
Hank Lytle
Kate McGuckin
Jennifer Metcalf
Sharon Naragon
Officer Glen Osburn
William M. Owens
Anthony Pizza
Debra Seltzer
Jack Somerville
Reverend George Stewart
Mary Yost

**SUPREME COURT/JUDICIAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON COURT
SECURITY**

Justice Evelyn J. Lundberg Stratton, Co-Chair	G. Matthew Hensley
Judge Michael J. Voris, Co-Chair	Gerald Latanich
Judge Judith A. Christley	Steve Martin
Judge Denise A. Dartt	Major Ken Morckel
Judge Deborah Gaines	Jim Ray
Judge Thomas K. Jenkins	Howard Shearer
Judge Michael A. Rumer	Stephan W. Stover
Magistrate Jackie Owen	Commissioner Dorothy Teater
Thomas Brandt	Mike Toman
Neil F. Freund	Peter Weinberger
Janet Raup Gross	Lewis E. Williams

Statutory Commissions

**COMMISSION ON DISPUTE RESOLUTION AND
CONFLICT MANAGEMENT**

(Supreme Court Appointees)

Justice Deborah L. Cook, Chair	Kurtis A. Tunnell
Hope Taft	William K. Weisenberg

STATE CRIMINAL SENTENCING COMMISSION (NEW)

(Supreme Court Appointees)

Chief Justice Thomas J. Moyer, Chair and <i>ex officio</i> member	Judge John T. Patton
Judge H.J. Bressler	Judge Jeff Payton
Judge Burt W. Griffin	Judge C. Fenning Pierce
Judge Sylvia Sieve Hendon	Judge Reginald Routson
Judge Alice O. McCollum	Judge John D. Schmitt
	Judge Stephanie Wyler