# Appellate Court Decisions –week of 12/22/25

*Note: This is not a comprehensive list of every case released this week.*

## First Appellate District of Ohio

***State v. Underwood*, C-250223 & C-250224**

***Anders*; plea negotiations**

**Full Decision: (No web cite as of yet).**

**After appointed counsel advised the COA "that, after thoroughly reviewing the record, she has found no nonfrivolous issues for appeal and that the record fails to reveal any arguable assignments of error that would warrant reversal," the COA "cannot hold that [appellant's] appeals are wholly frivolous . . . Following our review of the record, we hold that it contains a legal point arguable on its merits—specifically, whether the plea bargain ultimately accepted by [appellant] was rendered involuntary by the trial court's involvement in the plea-bargaining process and its modification of [appellant's] bond after he refused to accept the initial plea deal.**

**Having found that the record contains a legal point arguable on its merits, [COA] cannot reach the merits of the appeals without the assistance of counsel to argue the issue for [appellant] and without a response from the State. [COA], therefore, grant[s] counsel's motion to withdraw and appoint[s] new counsel as set forth in the entry accompanying this opinion."**

## Second Appellate District of Ohio

***Nothing to report.***

## Third Appellate District of Ohio

***Nothing to report.***

## Fourth Appellate District of Ohio

***Nothing to report.***

## Fifth Appellate District of Ohio

***Nothing to report.***

## Sixth Appellate District of Ohio

***Nothing to report.***

## Seventh Appellate District of Ohio

***Nothing to report.***

## Eighth Appellate District of Ohio

***Nothing to report.***

## Ninth Appellate District of Ohio

***Nothing to report.***

## Tenth Appellate District of Ohio

***Nothing to report.***

## Eleventh Appellate District of Ohio

***Nothing to report.***

## Twelfth Appellate District of Ohio

***Nothing to report.***

## Supreme Court of Ohio

***Z.J. v. R.M.*, 2025-Ohio-5662**

**Civil stalking protection order**

**Full Decision:**
**https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/rod/docs/pdf/0/2025/2025-Ohio-5559.pdf**

***Menacing by stalking—R.C. 2903.211—Civil stalking protection order—R.C. 2903.214—A petitioner's belief that an offender will cause him mental distress is grounds for showing a violation of the menacing-by-stalking statute to obtain a civil stalking protection order.***

**In this certified-conflict case from the Fifth District Court of Appeals, both**

**that court and the trial court concluded that the menacing-by-stalking statute required the petitioner seeking the protection order to believe only that the offender would cause him mental distress. But the Fifth District acknowledged that its interpretation of the statute placed its decision in conflict with decisions from other courts of appeals.**

**We now resolve this conflict by holding that a petitioner's belief that an offender will cause him mental distress is grounds for showing a violation of the menacing-by-stalking statute to obtain a civil stalking protection order. We therefore affirm the Fifth District's judgment.**

## Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals

***Nothing to report.***

## Supreme Court of the United States

***Nothing to report.***