

COURT OF APPEALS
LICKING COUNTY, OHIO
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

RICHARD WHITTINGTON	:	JUDGES:
	:	Hon. William B. Hoffman, P.J.
	:	Hon. Sheila G. Farmer, J.
Plaintiff-Appellant	:	Hon. John F. Boggins, J.
	:	
-vs-	:	
	:	Case No. 02CA78
LICKING COUNTY SHERIFF	:	
	:	
Defendant-Appellee	:	<u>OPINION</u>

CHARACTER OF PROCEEDING: Appeal from the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, Case No. 88S17053

JUDGMENT: Dismissed

DATE OF JUDGMENT ENTRY: September 30, 2002

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff-Appellant

For Defendant-Appellee

RICHARD WHITTINGTON
P.O. Box 87
Newark, Ohio 43058-0087

BRENT W. SHENK
ASSISTANT PROSECUTOR
20 South Second Street
Newark, Ohio 43055

Hoffman, P.J.

{¶1} Plaintiff-appellant Richard Whittington appeals the July 24, 2002 Judgment

Entry of the Licking County Court of Common Pleas, which dismissed his complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. Defendant-appellee is the Licking County Sheriff.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

{¶2} This case comes to us on the accelerated calendar. App. R. 11.1, which governs accelerated calendar cases, provides, in pertinent part: “(E) Determination and judgment on appeal. The appeal will be determined as provided by App. R. 11.1. It shall be sufficient compliance with App. R. 12(A) for the statement of the reason for the court’s decision as to each error to be in brief and conclusionary form. The decision may be by judgment entry in which case it will not be published in any form.”

{¶3} This appeal shall be considered in accordance with the aforementioned rule.

{¶4} Appellant prosecutes this appeal to us pro se. Unfortunately, appellant’s presentation of his arguments are disjointed, extremely difficult to follow, and do not conform with the requirements of App. R. 16. Because appellant’s brief is non-compliant in almost every respect, we dismiss his appeal pursuant to App. R. 18(C).

By: Hoffman, P.J.

Farmer, J. and

Boggins, J. concur

topic: brief, non conforming