



for the

Second Quarter 2014

RECORD

NEWS FOR THE OHIO COURTS

OHIO COURTHOUSE NEWS

COURTHOUSE DOGS

Meet Camry! Camry recently joined Hon. Robert D. Fragale and Hon. Deborah A. Alspach at the Marion County Family Court as a facility dog. Camry was trained by Canine Companions for Independence in Delaware, Ohio. Camry will be used primarily to comfort individuals that are involved in court proceedings. Camry and handler Kathleen Clark will be in attendance at the Ohio Judicial Conference Annual Meeting on August 28, 2014 along with the two other Ohio Courthouse Dogs: Nanook (Green County) and Avery (Summit County Prosecutor's Office).



Ellen O'Neill Stephens, J.D. and Celeste Walsen, DVM, will present "Courthouse Dogs: Promoting Justice with Compassion" on August 28, 2014, and "Courthouse Dogs Facilitate the Fact Finding Process" on August 29, 2014, at the Ohio Judicial Conference Annual Meeting.



MONTGOMERY COUNTY OPENS WOMEN'S THERAPEUTIC DOCKET

Hon. Gregory F. Singer, Montgomery County Common Pleas, welcomed judges and distinguished guests to the inaugural ceremony of the Montgomery County Women's Therapeutic Docket on June 17, 2014.

Judge Singer said, women often enter the criminal justice system for much different reasons than men and that the Court will try to treat addiction, mental health, prostitution, sex trafficking and other gender-specific issues in order to reduce recidivism rates.

In This Issue...

Ohio Judicial Conference News.....	2
Order In The Court.....	3
Ohio Judicial Conference Website.....	8
2014 Judicial College Schedule.....	10

2014 Annual Meeting Reminder.....	2
Senate Bill 143.....	7
Evidence Suppression Checklist.....	9
Ohio Judicial Conference Staff.....	13

OHIO JUDICIAL CONFERENCE NEWS

Farewell Jennie I. Long, Program Specialist

Jennie Long, who has been with the Judicial Conference since November 2006 as our Program Specialist, has joined the staff of the Ohio Constitutional Modernization Commission.

We thank Jennie for her hard work during her tenure with the Judicial Conference, and wish her much success in her new endeavor.



Ohio Judicial Conference 2014 Annual Meeting

August 28 - 29
Hilton Columbus at Easton

Register Now!

ORDER IN THE COURT

THE JUDICIAL DUTY TO PREVENT VIOLENT AND IMPROPER BEHAVIOR IN THE COURTROOM

JUDGE DIANE V. GRENDALL
11TH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS

Violence, inappropriate behavior, and other unruly conduct occur in courtrooms in both Ohio and across the country. One example of this happened recently, during the sentencing of T.J. Lane, who was convicted in the Chardon High School shootings. At his sentencing hearing, Lane wore a white t-shirt with the word “killer” handwritten on the front in black marker.¹ Lane also directed an obscene gesture and profane language toward the victims’ families. Unfortunately, such reprehensible behavior is not entirely uncommon.

Judges are placed in the difficult position of having to defuse situations in which a defendant or other individual acts in such an inappropriate or disruptive manner. Judges are tasked with regulating activity that takes place in the courtroom and preserving the decorum of the court. This article will examine the occurrence of violent and improper courtroom behavior, the steps that can be taken by judges to respond to this conduct, and rules governing that response.

Violent and Inappropriate Behavior in Courtrooms

There have been many incidents involving outbursts and inappropriate behavior in Ohio courtrooms. Recently, according to the Akron Beacon Journal, a woman seeking a protection order against her former boyfriend was attacked by him in a Summit County Domestic Relations courtroom. The victim, who stated that she was in fear for her life, was left alone with the man after the magistrate stepped out of the room during the hearing. The former boyfriend took several swings at the victim before he was stopped by a deputy, who ran into the courtroom. The parties’ prior volatile relationship, and the woman’s need to seek a protection order, demonstrated the possibility of such a violent attack occurring.

While violent attacks sometimes occur in court, verbal outbursts can also be problematic. For example, during a recent sentencing hearing in a Youngstown courtroom, two defendants were disruptive and yelled at the judge. The judge warned one defendant to stop, while the other defendant continued to be disruptive and was removed by police.²

A study performed by the Center for Judicial and Executive Security, entitled “Disorder in the Court: Incidents of Courthouse Violence,” documented 238 incidents of courtroom-related security and violence issues that occurred across the country from 2005 to 2011. These incidents included assaults by defendants reacting to a verdict or a sentence, many being attacks on officers or attempts to escape. The study also included examples of defendants’ family members and victims fighting in the courtroom.

The United States Supreme Court has recognized the importance of preventing this type of conduct in the courtroom. “It is essential to the proper administration of criminal justice that dignity, order, and decorum be the hallmarks of all court proceedings in our country. The flagrant disregard in the courtroom of elementary standards of proper conduct should not and cannot be tolerated.” *Illinois v. Allen*, 397 U.S. 337, 343 (1970). The Ohio Rules of Superintendence, which apply to Ohio courts, also recognize that “[p]roper decorum in the court is necessary to the

1 . Rachel Dissell, *T.J. Lane Appeals Life Sentence Without Possibility of Parole*, Cleveland Plain Dealer, http://www.cleveland.com/metro/index.ssf/2013/04/tj_lane_appeals_life_sentence.html. This shirt was similar to the one he wore on the date of the shooting.

2 . Danielle Cotterman, *Courtroom Outburst During Sentencing of Two Youngstown Women*, <http://www.wfmj.com/story/19074221/courtroom-outburst-during-sentencing-of-two-youngstown-women>.

administration of the court's function." The Rules further provide that "conduct that interferes or tends to interfere with the proper administration of the court's business is prohibited." Sup.R. 54(A).

Handling Courtroom Disruptions

Given the dangers that violence and misbehavior in the courtroom present and the Supreme Court's mandate that such behavior must be prevented, it is important to consider the steps that can be taken to respond to this problem. Central in addressing these incidents are judges, who play an integral role in handling all issues that occur in the courtroom. The Ohio Supreme Court has held that "a trial judge possesses inherent power to control any proceeding before him" and "is obliged to insist upon the orderly conduct of the public business." *State ex rel. Dayton Newspapers, Inc. v. Phillips*, 46 Ohio St.2d 457, 488 (1976); *State v. Hensley*, 75 Ohio St. 255, 265 (1906). The Ohio Code of Judicial Conduct also mandates that a judge "shall require order and decorum in proceedings before the court." Rule 2.8(A).

While the judge has both the power and responsibility to control his courtroom, rules and case law create some restrictions, although the judge retains great discretion. In fact, there is no clear legal standard of how to control the courtroom in every scenario. The U.S. Supreme Court has held that "trial judges confronted with disruptive, contumacious, stubbornly defiant defendants must be given sufficient discretion to meet the circumstances of each case. No one formula for maintaining the appropriate courtroom atmosphere will be best in all situations." *Allen* at 343. A judge, "in enforcing orders directing proper and necessary **decorum** in the **courtroom**, while the court is in session, must see to it that the rules enforced are reasonable and necessary for that purpose." (Citation omitted.) *State v. Clifford*, 162 Ohio St. 370, 372 (1954).

A judge should first take preventative steps to prohibit courtroom misconduct. By implementing such procedures, many courtroom disruptions may be avoided entirely. First, law enforcement should be made aware of court rules and procedures for handling individuals present in the courtroom, especially criminal defendants. Specifically, they should be informed of expected courtroom attire, in order to ensure that inappropriate or offensive clothing is not worn. They should also be knowledgeable about the court's policy on the usage of restraints on defendants, including if they are necessary during all stages of the proceedings, when a jury is present, and when the defendant is potentially violent, an issue that will be further discussed.

Second, law enforcement should examine defendants and ensure they are in compliance with such rules before escorting them into the courtroom. This can play an important role in preventing judges from having to address these issues in open court and in stopping possible disruptions.

Finally, courtroom rules should be provided to parties prior to proceedings, which can be posted outside of the courtroom, and also made available on the court's website. This serves as a preventive measure, precluding problems or misunderstandings that may occur while the court is in session.

Steps must also be taken by judges to react to inappropriate and disruptive behavior if it does occur. While no specific procedure will be effective in every situation, it is instructive to have a set of guidelines to follow when courtroom problems arise. This is often the case when a criminal defendant is involved, since criminal trials are among the most likely to incite improper courtroom behavior. Before following these steps, however, the misconduct must be discovered. Attorneys and law enforcement can be required to inform the judge of disruptions or noncompliance with the rules. This will provide the judge support and may help catch violations that the judge may not observe, due to his other important responsibilities while presiding over court proceedings.

Once a defendant acts in an unruly or disruptive manner, the first step is to address the improper conduct directly with the defendant. Reassurances by the judge regarding the defendant's rights may prevent further outbursts,

if he is upset due to his lack of knowledge of the legal process and the justification for certain decisions or rulings.¹ As has been discovered in interviews with defendants who have carried out violence in the courtroom, they often “felt they were being treated unfairly and were not provided an opportunity to be heard during the court proceedings.”²

If a discussion does not provide resolution, the defendant must be warned that further inappropriate conduct will lead to negative consequences, with a specific explanation of the punishment that will follow, up to and including exclusion from the courtroom. It is important that this warning be given in order to preserve the defendant’s rights, although the judge must make it clear that improper conduct will not be tolerated. As was demonstrated in the Youngstown case above, a judge can and should give a stern warning regarding the inappropriate nature of a defendant’s conduct prior to his ultimate removal.

If the warning fails to end the disruptive conduct, the next step is to find the defendant in contempt of court, which would subject him to the risk of serving additional jail time. The Ohio Supreme Court has emphasized that one of the purposes of contempt “is to secure the dignity of the courts and the uninterrupted and unimpeded administration of justice.” *Windham Bank v. Tomaszczyk*, 27 Ohio St.2d 55, 58 (1971). Contempt provides an important tool for judges to enforce their power to regulate conduct that occurs in the courtroom. Without this power, individuals in the courtroom may feel free to act as they please, facing limited consequences. Similarly, a judge may also consider whether additional criminal charges against the defendant would act as a deterrent to further disruption, especially if threats are made or violence occurs.

One related example of a judge exercising his power to maintain decorum and protect victims occurred in Toledo. In that case, the defendant was originally sentenced to serve six years for Aggravated Burglary. According to Mark Reiter of the Toledo Blade, after the sentence was given, however, the defendant stated, “I should’ve killed [the victim].” The judge held another sentencing hearing and ordered the defendant to serve a nine-year prison term, noting that his statement indicated he was a greater risk to society than the judge had realized. In a subsequent appeal, *State v. Fought*, 6th Dist. No. L-10-1348, 2011-Ohio-4047, the appellate court upheld the resentencing, since the original sentence was pronounced in court but not journalized and was subject to being altered. While the trial court judge indicated that the second sentence was not a punishment for the outburst, it exemplified that a judge must be aware of a defendant’s behavior at all times and not allow poor behavior or outbursts to go unnoticed.

The third step that may be taken to address an unruly criminal defendant’s behavior involves physically restraining him to prevent his dangerous or disruptive conduct. Different methods of restraint may be used, including handcuffs or shackles. This allows the defendant to remain in the courtroom, thereby preserving his right to be present at the trial. The Supreme Court in *Allen* noted that a constitutionally permissible way to handle such behavior includes to “bind and gag” the defendant. *Id.* at 344. However, the *Allen* court also emphasized that “no person should be tried while shackled and gagged except as a last resort.” *Id.* at 344. The Ohio Supreme Court has also followed this principle, and found that restraint of a defendant during a trial should occur only in “unusual circumstances.” *State v. McKnight*, 107 Ohio St.3d 101, 2005-Ohio-6046, ¶ 219. These concerns are based on the necessity of protecting a defendant’s right to a fair trial and to prevent prejudice. It is important to emphasize that the judge’s right to control his courtroom must always be balanced with the parties’ rights, especially those of criminal defendants.

The final step that may be taken is to exclude the defendant from the courtroom. Regarding removal of the defendant, the Ohio Supreme Court in *State ex rel. Dayton Newspapers, Inc. v. Phillips*, 46 Ohio St.2d 457, 497 (1976), has held that “[a] judge, in the exercise of his complete control of a criminal proceeding, may exclude those whose conduct is of a disturbing nature, or whose presence is likely to interfere with the administration of justice, and may

1 Sarah Podmaniczky, *Order in the Court: Decorum, Rambunctious Defendants, and the Right to be Present at Trial*, 14 U.Pa.J.Const.L. 1283, 1303 (2012).

2 John F. Muffler and Hon. James R. Brandlin, *Judicial Security: Implementing Sound Protective Intelligence Methods*, National Judicial College: Case In Point (2011).

also make such orders of exclusion as will protect public health, morals and safety; but within these limitations, it is his duty to afford both the state and the defendant a public trial in open court.”

Ohio Criminal Rule 43(B) provides that, “[w]here a defendant’s conduct in the courtroom is so disruptive that the hearing or trial cannot reasonably be conducted with the defendant’s continued physical presence, the hearing or trial may proceed in the defendant’s absence or by remote contemporaneous video, and judgment and sentence may be pronounced as if the defendant were present.” Given the defendant’s right to be present and participate in his trial, this should be reserved only for cases where the defendant is so disruptive that the trial cannot proceed.

Removal of a defendant during sentencing is less troublesome than during trial, since the jury has already rendered its verdict and will not be prejudiced against the defendant based on his absence from the courtroom. This does not mean, however, that the court is not still required to balance the importance of a defendant’s right to be present at sentencing against the necessity of controlling the courtroom.

In addition to the removal of a disorderly criminal defendant, courts may also exclude spectators who cause a courtroom disruption. In ejecting a spectator from the courtroom, the court has different considerations to take into account. There is no absolute right for a spectator to be present in the courtroom, but the court should balance “the requirement that the actions of the courts be open to public scrutiny and the need to have the trial proceed in an orderly manner.” *State v. Sowell*, 10th Dist. No. 06AP-443, 2008-Ohio-3285, ¶ 39. Ejection of a spectator may be ordered to protect the parties, witnesses, and victims, and to maintain courtroom security. Such an order should be made only to those who are disruptive, to allow free access to a public trial to the greatest extent possible.

In addition to these instructions for dealing with defendants and spectators, parties to other cases should also be required to act in compliance with court rules. Importantly, volatile parties should not be left alone without security officers to prevent situations like those discussed above. A judge should be especially cautious during divorce and custody proceedings or when a restraining order is in effect.

Finally, in addition to following these steps for responding to unruly defendants, spectators, and other parties, the court should also take measures to either prevent or prepare for future court-wide security challenges. The Ohio Supreme Court provides specific guidance to judges on how to address security concerns in courthouses across the state. Pursuant to the Supreme Court, the Office of Court Security can aid county and local courts in “conducting court security surveys,” provide training for court security personnel, and can provide assistance in coordinating for high-risk trials. All of these services potentially decrease the likelihood of an attack escalating into a dangerous situation.

The Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Court Security has also made recommendations as to minimum Court Security Standards, which the Ohio Supreme Court states “should be reviewed by each court.” These standards recommend that each court should appoint a court security committee to implement the necessary procedures. Standard Two states that “each court shall adopt a written security policy and procedures manual governing security of the court and the court facility to ensure consistent, appropriate, and adequate security procedures.” Such standards, like the ones outlined above, can help the court become aware of potential security threats and prepare the best possible response.

Judges play a critical role in maintaining order and decorum in the courtroom. To prevent defendants and other parties from acting in a violent and disruptive manner, judges are responsible for maintaining control of the courtroom by enforcing the rules and laws regulating this process, as well as employing other potential solutions as needed to be effective. The failure to do so can result in dangerous consequences, including potential physical and emotional harm to individuals in the courtroom.

SENATE BILL 143

MARTA MUDRI - DEPUTY LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL
THE OHIO JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

The Governor signed Senate Bill 143 on June 20, 2014 in the historical Ceremonial Office in the Statehouse. The Office is virtually unchanged from the time that Abraham Lincoln saw it in 1861, when he sat at the desk across from then-Governor of Ohio William Dennison, Jr., to discuss the impending Civil War and was informed that he been elected President of the United States.

Present at the signing on June 20 were: Governor John Kasich, Senator Bill Seitz, the bill's co-sponsor; Senator John Eklund, the Chairman of the Senate Criminal Justice Committee; Representative Margaret Conditt, the author of the Prison Nursery Program provision of the bill; Ohio Judicial Conference staff and various other stakeholders.

Senate Bill 143 is an expansive bill that will generally revise criminal and traffic law across several topics, including:

- Authorizing municipal corporations to establish Community Alternative Sentencing Centers
- Removing the judicial veto over transitional control in cases where the aggregate sentence is longer than two years and adopting the same penalty for commission of a felony on transitional control as on post-release control
- Allowing the sealing of a single traffic conviction if it is in connection with criminal non-convictions that could otherwise be sealed
- Removing the cap of 40 hours per month for and giving the court discretion in setting the amount of credit for community service ordered for failure to pay a cost judgment
- Requiring the court, if ordering an HIV test, to ensure the test is administered within 48 hours after the indictment, information, or complaint is presented; allowing the court, if it reasonably believes that another person had contact with the accused and could have contracted HIV, to inform that person that the test was performed
- Authorizing a court that receives a petition for a Certificate of Qualification for Employment to direct the clerk of the court to process and record all required notices
- Removing the requirement that warning notices are mailed to an offender before a court can notify the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to block the registration or transfer of registration of motor vehicles of a criminal defendant who fails to appear in court or to pay fines or costs when due
- Requiring the court to demand proof of financial responsibility for persons driving under suspension; allowing the court to order restitution if a person fails to provide such proof
- Allowing a court to order an alleged or adjudicated delinquent child who is at least 18 but younger than 21 to an adult detention facility; allowing a court to commit a child to the Department of Youth Services (DYS) for a violation of supervised release for a period of time determined by the court (at least 90 days)

The bill will become effective on September 19, 2014. More information about this and other recently enacted bills is available in Enactment News on the OJC website.

VISIT THE OHIO JUDICIAL CONFERENCE WEBSITE

WWW.OHIOJUDGES.ORG

CONTACT JEFF JABLONKA AT THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE FOR LOGIN ASSISTANCE

JEFF.JABLONKA@SC.OHIO.GOV

OHIO JUDICIAL CONFERENCE



HOME

ABOUT US

RESOURCES

LEGISLATIVE

COMMITTEES

DIRECTORY

WELCOME

WEEKLY FYI:



NATIONAL NEWS:

- Renting Judges for Secret Rulings
- Supreme Court rules in favor of broad protections for whistleblowers
- Feds to end roadside breath testing without permission
- New Jersey moves to shut down Tesla sales despite protests



STATE NEWS:

- Too Many Requests for Public Records Rejected, Officials Say
- Keeping Courthouse Safe is Important Job
- Ohio Judicial Conference Legislation Status Sheet
- Jumping the Retirement Hurdle (Seminar)

Citizens Guide Brochure Series

The Ohio Judicial Conference has created a series of brochures to help judges inform the public about Ohio's judicial system. The series consists of eight tri-fold brochures with general information regarding aspects of the judicial system as well as one 25-page guide to small claims court.



Print



MEMBER LOGIN

User Name:

Password:

Log In

[Forgot Password?](#)



LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS



PUBLICATIONS



DIRECTORY



OTHER LINKS



CONTACT US



FAQS

DISCLAIMER | PRIVACY STATEMENT | COPYRIGHT 2012 OHIO JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

OVI EVIDENCE SUPPRESSION CHECKLIST FOR MUNICIPAL/COUNTY JUDGES

HON. K.J. MONTGOMERY
SHAKER HEIGHTS MUNICIPAL COURT

The majority of motions to suppress filed in municipal/county courts challenge the admissibility of evidence gathered by police in the investigation of O.V.I. cases. Such a motion will allege that a defendant was subjected to an unreasonable search and that the evidence gathered pursuant to that search should be suppressed. From the evidence presented at the suppression hearing, the court determines if the motion or some part of it should be granted or denied.

An O.V.I. case typically has three stages of detention and each stage may be challenged in the suppression motion. The first stage is the probable cause required for a law enforcement officer to stop a vehicle or to become engaged with the driver of a vehicle. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administrative DWI Detection & Standardized Field Sobriety Testing Participant Guide (the “NHTSA Manual”) calls this stage the “vehicle in motion” and “stopping sequence.”

The second stage expands the scope of the investigation by the officer and occurs when the officer has “personal contact” with the driver. During this time, the officer claims to develop a reasonable suspicion that the driver’s ability to operate a motor vehicle may be impaired. The driver may be asked to perform preliminary tests like reciting the alphabet. The NHTSA Manual calls this second stage the “personal contact” and “exit sequence.”

Finally, the officer conducts what NHTSA calls “pre-arrest screening.” These are the standard field sobriety tests. The trained officer instructs, demonstrates and observes the driver perform these tests watching for specific “clues.” If the officer conducts the tests in substantial compliance with the NHTSA procedures, the officer’s testimony about the test results will be admissible at trial. Without substantial compliance, the results are inadmissible.

All three stages of detention are outlined in the NHTSA Manual. Conduct that suggests a reason to stop a vehicle are set forth. More guidelines recommend observations that may be made during personal contact with the driver suggesting impairment. Finally, specific procedures and clues are in the manual’s discussion of standardized field sobriety tests. The data is lengthy and detailed.

In order to recall the various observations that might occur during the three stages of detention, I created a “checklist” for each stage of detention. As evidence is heard from the law enforcement officer or observed by video, factors the judge finds existed are “checked off” on the check list document. A fresh document is used for every suppression hearing. Post-hearing, the exact justifications for each stage are contained on the document. This has helped me to determine whether from the totality of the circumstances there was reason for the law enforcement officer to further detain a driver and to ultimately arrest that person for an O.V.I. offence. Helpful references to case law and the NHTSA Manual are included in the Checklist.

The check list is available at <http://ohiojudges.org/Resources/tools-and-bench-aids>

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO JUDICIAL COLLEGE COURSE SCHEDULE

(for Judges, Magistrates, Acting Judges, Court Personnel, Judicial Candidates)

Columbus

July 2014

9	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (1 - 4:30 p.m.)	Guardians ad Litem	Ohio University Inn - Athens
9 - 11	Wed - Fri	Court Management Program (CMP) 2017 Level II: Essential Components	CMP 2017 Class	Embassy Suites Dublin - Columbus
10	Thu	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (8:30 - noon)	Guardians ad Litem	Ohio University Inn - Athens
14 - 16	Mon - Wed	Association of Municipal & County Judges of Ohio (AMCJO) Summer Conference	Judges*	Sawmill Creek - Huron
16	Wed	Leadership Series (1 of 2)	Court Personnel	Quest Conference Center - Columbus
17	Thu	Leadership Series (2 of 2)	Court Personnel	Quest Conference Center - Columbus
29	Tue	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (1 - 4:30 p.m.)	Guardians ad Litem	Holiday Inn Boardman - Youngstown
30	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (8:30 - noon)	Guardians ad Litem	Holiday Inn Boardman - Youngstown

August 2014

6	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Pre Service Course (6 of 9)	Guardians ad Litem	Quest Conference Center - Columbus
14	Thu	Judicial Candidates Seminar (1:30 - 3:30 p.m.)	Judicial Candidates	Thomas J. Moyer Ohio Judicial Center - Columbus
15	Fri	2014 Probate Course	Judges & Magistrates	Columbus
15	Fri	Delinquency Course (1 - 3:45 p.m.)	Judges & Magistrates	Video Teleconference
20	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (1 - 4:30 p.m.)	Guardians ad Litem	Quest Conference Center - Columbus

Judicial College Schedule Continued on Next Page...

WANT TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE NEXT EDITION OF FOR THE RECORD?

OJC ALWAYS NEEDS TIMELY AND RELEVANT ARTICLES TO PUBLISH.

CONTACT [JEFF JABLONKA](mailto:JEFF.JABLONKA@SC.OHIO.GOV) AT THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

JEFF.JABLONKA@SC.OHIO.GOV

August 2014

21	Thu	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (8:30 - noon)	Guardians ad Litem	Quest Conference Center - Columbus
22	Fri	Computer Lab	Judges & Magistrates	Thomas J. Moyer Ohio Judicial Center - Columbus
27	Wed	Ohio Courts of Appeals Judges Association (OCAJA) Fall Conference	Judges*	Hilton Easton - Columbus
28 - 29	Thu - Fri	Ohio Judicial Conference Annual Meeting	Judges*	Hilton Easton - Columbus
29	Fri	Court Reporter Course	Court Personnel	Columbus

September 2014

9	Tue	Guardian ad Litem Pre Service Course (7 of 9)	Guardians ad Litem	Holiday Inn Strongsville - Cleveland
10 - 12	Wed - Fri	Court Management Program (CMP) 2014 Scarlet Class: Purposes	CMP Class of 2014 A	Thomas J. Moyer Ohio Judicial Center - Columbus
12	Fri	Abuse, Neglect & Dependency (1 - 3:45 p.m.)	Judges & Magistrates	Video Teleconference
12	Fri	Criminal Procedure By the Numbers: Part II	Judges & Magistrates	Embassy Suites Airport - Columbus
17	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (1 - 4:30 p.m.)	Guardians ad Litem	Holiday Inn Fairborn - Dayton
17 - 19	Wed - Fri	Court Management Program (CMP) 2016 Class: Caseflow	CMP 2016 Class	Embassy Suites Airport - Columbus
18	Thu	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (8:30 - noon)	Guardians ad Litem	Holiday Inn Fairborn - Dayton
19	Fri	Acting Judge Course (2 of 4)	Acting Judges	Holiday Inn Fairborn - Dayton
23	Tue	Leadership Series (1 of 2)	Court Personnel	Quest Conference Center - Columbus
24	Wed	Leadership Series (2 of 2)	Court Personnel	Quest Conference Center - Columbus

October 2014

1 - 3	Wed - Fri	Ohio Association of Magistrates (OAM) Fall Conference	Magistrates*	Crowne Plaza North - Columbus
7	Tue	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (1 - 4:30 p.m.)	Guardians ad Litem	Holiday Inn French Quarter - Toledo
8	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (8:30 - noon)	Guardians ad Litem	Holiday Inn French Quarter - Toledo
8	Wed	Verbal Defensive Tactics (2 of 2)	Probation Officers	Crowne Plaza North - Columbus
8 - 10	Wed - Fri	Court Management Program (CMP) 2014 Gray Class: HR	CMP Class of 2014 B	Thomas J. Moyer Ohio Judicial Center - Columbus
9	Thu	Basic Defensive Tactics (2 of 2)	Probation Officers	Ohio State Highway Patrol Academy - Columbus
9	Thu	U.S. Constitutional Law	Judges & Magistrates	Cleveland
10	Fri	Advanced Defensive Tactics (2 of 2)	Probation Officers	Ohio State Highway Patrol Academy - Columbus

October 2014

10	Fri	Judicial Conduct Seminar	Judges	Cleveland
17	Fri	Acting Judge Course (3 of 4)	Acting Judges	Holiday Inn Strongsville - Cleveland
17	Fri	Juvenile Traffic (1 - 3:45 p.m.)	Judges & Magistrates	Video Teleconference
22	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Pre Service Course (8 of 9)	Guardians ad Litem	Holiday Inn Boardman - Youngstown
24	Fri	Municipal/Common Pleas Course (1 - 3:45 p.m.)	Judges & Magistrates	Video Teleconference
28	Tue	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (1 - 4:30 p.m.)	Guardians ad Litem	Holiday Inn Strongsville - Cleveland

November 2014

7	Fri	Paternity, Custody & Child Support (1 - 3:45 p.m.)	Judges & Magistrates	Video Teleconference
13	Thu	Acting Judge Course (4 of 4)	Acting Judges	Columbus
14	Fri	Evidence	Judges & Magistrates	Embassy Suites Dublin - Columbus
18	Tue	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (1 - 4:30 p.m.)	Guardians ad Litem	Embassy Suites Blue Ash - Cincinnati
18 - 19	Tue - Wed	Court Executive Team Seminar Part II	Judges & Court Personnel	Embassy Suites Airport - Columbus
19	Wed	2014 Probate Course (1 - 3:45 p.m.)	Judges & Magistrates	Video Teleconference
19	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (8:30 - noon)	Guardians ad Litem	Embassy Suites Blue Ash - Cincinnati

December 2014

2	Tue	Guardian ad Litem Pre Service Course (9 of 9)	Guardians ad Litem	Quest Conference Center - Columbus
2	Tue	Ohio Association of Domestic Relation Judges (OADRJ) Winter Seminar	Judges*	Embassy Suites Dublin - Columbus
3 - 5	Wed - Fri	Ohio Common Pleas Judges Association (OCPJA) Winter Meeting	Judges*	Embassy Suites Dublin - Columbus
4 - 5	Thu - Fri	Ohio Association of Juvenile Court Judges (OAJCJ) Winter Meeting	Judges*	Columbus
5	Fri	Magistrate Ethics (1 - 3:45 p.m.)	Magistrates	Video Teleconference
8 - 12	Mon - Fri	New Judges Orientation Part I	New Judges	Embassy Suites Dublin - Columbus
16	Tue	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (1 - 4:30 p.m.)	Guardians ad Litem	Quest Conference Center - Columbus
17	Wed	Guardian ad Litem Continuing Education Course (8:30 - noon)	Guardians ad Litem	Quest Conference Center - Columbus

PLEASE NOTE:

To view the Judicial College homepage for course calendars and additional information, please visit www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/Boards/judCollege/default.aspx.

To register for a Judicial College course or to view a course announcement, please visit our online registration site at www.judicialeducation.ohio.gov

Ohio Judicial Conference Staff

Executive Director

Hon. Mark R. Schweikert, Retired
Mark.Schweikert@sc.ohio.gov

614-387-9750

Project Specialist

Jeff Jablonka
Jeff.Jablonka@sc.ohio.gov

614-387-9753

Legislative Counsel

Louis Tobin, Esq.
Louis.Tobin@sc.ohio.gov

614-387-9765

Program Specialist

Vacant

Judicial Services Counsel

Vacant

Deputy Legislative Counsel

Marta Mudri, Esq.
Marta.Mudri@sc.ohio.gov

614-387-9764

Administrative Assistant

Trina Bennington
Trina.Bennington@sc.ohio.gov

614-387-9761

Deputy Legislative Counsel

John Ryan, Esq.
John.Ryan@sc.ohio.gov

614-387-9765

Legislative Services Assistant

Alyssa Guthrie
Alyssa.Guthrie@sc.ohio.gov

614-387-9756

Fiscal Officer

Jayma Umbstaetter
Jayma.Umbstaetter@sc.ohio.gov

614-387-9757

