

The Supreme Court of Ohio

CASE ANNOUNCEMENTS

September 28, 2009

[Cite as *09/28/2009 Case Announcements*, 2009-Ohio-5033.]

SLIP OPINIONS REPLACED BY OHIO OFFICIAL REPORTS VERSIONS AS OF SEPTEMBER 28, 2009

The official versions of the opinions listed below, which were previously released as slip opinions, have been published in the September 28, 2009 Ohio Official Reports advance sheet. These opinions should now be cited using the Ohio Official Reports citation format.

2008-0331. State v. Harrison, 122 Ohio St.3d 512, 2009-Ohio-3547.

2008-0975. Toledo v. State, 122 Ohio St.3d 542, 2009-Ohio-4117.

2008-1240. Cleveland v. State, 122 Ohio St.3d 543, 2009-Ohio-4118.

2008-1252. Dayton v. State, 122 Ohio St.3d 544, 2009-Ohio-4119.

2008-1396 and 2008-1489. W. Broad Chiropractic v. Am. Family Ins., 122 Ohio St.3d 497, 2009-Ohio-3506.

2008-1836. Am. Fedn. of State, Cty., & Mun. Emps., Local #74 v. Warren, 122 Ohio St.3d 545, 2009-Ohio-4120.

2008-2220. State ex rel. Ford Motor Co., Sharonville Transm. Plant v. Johnson, 122 Ohio St.3d 540, 2009-Ohio-4049.

2008-2438. Disciplinary Counsel v. Brenner, 122 Ohio St.3d 523, 2009-Ohio-3602.

2009-0090 and 2009-0318. In re M.M., 122 Ohio St.3d 541, 2009-Ohio-4048.

2009-0100. State ex rel. Meridia Health Sys. v. Indus. Comm., 122 Ohio St.3d 542, 2009-Ohio-4047.

2009-0159. State ex rel. Hall v. State Emp. Relations Bd., 122 Ohio St.3d 528, 2009-Ohio-3603.

2009-0511. In re Application of Grachanin, 122 Ohio St.3d 537, 2009-Ohio-3605.

MERIT DECISIONS WITH OPINIONS

2009-1573. State ex rel. Miller Diversified Holdings, L.L.C. v. Wood Cty. Bd. of Elections, Slip Opinion No. 2009-Ohio-4980.

In Prohibition. Writ granted in part and denied in part.

Moyer, C.J., and Pfeifer, O'Connor, O'Donnell, Lanzinger, and Cupp, JJ., concur.

Lundberg Stratton, J., dissents and would deny the writ in its entirety.

DISCIPLINARY CASES

2008-2154. In re Ritson.

This matter came on for further consideration upon the filing on September 9, 2009, by respondent, Douglas John Ritson, of a motion to purge contempt. Upon consideration thereof,

It is ordered by this court that the motion is granted and that respondent is purged of contempt in this matter.