

COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO, TWELFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT,
WARREN COUNTY

State v. Hagens

2026-Ohio-2360 (12th Dist. 2026) · No. CA2026-01-006 · Decided June 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The Twelfth District Court of Appeals affirmed the denial of Tyler James Hagens's postconviction motions arising from his guilty plea to rape and pandering sexually oriented matter involving a minor. The court held that the motion to reconsider was a nullity and that the successive postconviction petition satisfied none of the statutory requirements for review. The court also declared Hagens a vexatious litigator and restricted further proceedings in the Twelfth District without leave of court.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Twelfth Appellate District, Warren County
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Melena S. Siebert, J.; Robert A. Hendrickson, P.J.; Mike Powell, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Twelfth District, Warren County
DECIDED	June 22, 2026
DOCKET	CA2026-01-006
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Hagens appealed the Warren County Court of Common Pleas's denial of a motion to reconsider his first postconviction petition and denial of a motion to vacate his conviction and sentence, which the trial court construed as a successive postconviction petition. The court of appeals affirmed and sua sponte declared Hagens a vexatious litigator subject to filing restrictions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The opinion applies the legal rules governing jurisdiction over motions for reconsideration and successive postconviction petitions, reviews the trial court's legal conclusions concerning res judicata and the law-of-the-case doctrine, and reviews the record to determine whether the appeal was frivolous and whether vexatious-litigator restrictions were warranted.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published and precedential decision of the Ohio Court of Appeals, Twelfth Appellate District

TOPICS

post-conviction relief

successive petitions

appellate procedure

criminal procedure

remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

Criminal procedure

Postconviction relief

Appellate procedure

Vexatious litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court had jurisdiction to rule on Hagens's motion to reconsider the denial of his first postconviction petition.
2. Whether the law-of-the-case doctrine and res judicata barred Hagens's renewed challenge to the timeliness and merits of his first postconviction petition.
3. Whether the trial court properly construed Hagens's motion to vacate as a petition for postconviction relief.
4. Whether Hagens's motion to vacate satisfied the statutory prerequisites for an untimely or successive postconviction petition.
5. Whether Hagens's repeated appeals and postconviction filings warranted declaring him a vexatious litigator and restricting his ability to file in the Twelfth District.

HOLDINGS

1. A motion to reconsider a final judgment is a nullity because Ohio's rules provide no mechanism for such a motion; consequently, the trial court lacked jurisdiction to rule on Hagens's motion to reconsider, and the appellate court lacked jurisdiction to review that ruling.
2. The law-of-the-case doctrine barred Hagens from relitigating the untimeliness of his postconviction petition because he did not establish extraordinary circumstances warranting departure from the prior appellate ruling.
3. Res judicata barred Hagens from raising claims in postconviction proceedings that were raised or could have been raised at trial or on direct appeal, and postconviction relief does not provide a second opportunity to litigate a conviction.
4. A post-direct-appeal motion seeking to vacate a conviction or sentence on the ground that constitutional rights were violated is properly treated as a petition for postconviction relief, regardless of the motion's label.
5. The trial court properly dismissed Hagens's motion as an untimely successive postconviction petition because he did not show that he was unavoidably prevented from discovering the facts supporting his claim or that he invoked a newly recognized retroactive federal or state right, and he could not show that no reasonable factfinder would have found him guilty.

6. Hagens's persistent and frivolous appeals and postconviction filings were not reasonably grounded in fact or law and warranted declaring him a vexatious litigator and prohibiting further proceedings in the Twelfth District without leave of court.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"[T]here is no rule that allows a party to move a trial court for reconsideration of a final judgment." (¶ 11)

"This doctrine precludes a convicted defendant "from raising and litigating in any proceeding, except an appeal from that judgment, any defense or any claimed lack of due process that was raised or could have been raised at trial or on direct appeal."" (¶ 13)

"[W]ith the exception of an appeal, a petition for postconviction relief is 'the exclusive remedy by which a person may bring a collateral challenge to the validity of a conviction or sentence in a criminal case.'" (¶ 18)

"These efforts have not been reasonably well-grounded in fact or warranted by existing law and were prosecuted merely to delay the finality of his conviction and sentence." (¶ 27)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hagens pleaded guilty to one count of forcible rape of a child under thirteen and eight counts of pandering sexually oriented matter involving a minor in exchange for dismissal of other counts and a jointly recommended sentence. After dismissing his direct appeal, he filed multiple motions and petitions challenging his plea, conviction, and sentence, including claims concerning ineffective assistance, allegedly undisclosed exculpatory evidence, and the effect of the conviction on probation in another county. His latest motion sought to vacate the sentence as void, asserting that the trial court failed to advise him about the effect of his plea and conviction on his other probation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hagens pleaded guilty to forcible rape of a child under thirteen and eight counts of pandering sexually oriented matter involving a minor and received a jointly recommended sentence of life with parole eligibility after twenty-five years. His delayed direct appeal was dismissed with prejudice at his request. The trial court denied a later motion to withdraw his plea and a first postconviction petition, and the Twelfth District affirmed those rulings in prior appeals. The trial court then denied Hagens's motion to reconsider and construed his motion to vacate as an untimely successive postconviction petition; the Twelfth District affirmed and imposed vexatious-litigator restrictions.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The court ordered that its opinion and judgment entry serve as the mandate to the Warren County Court of Common Pleas for execution. Hagens was prohibited from continuing or instituting proceedings in the Twelfth

District Court of Appeals without first obtaining leave of court.

CASES CITED

- Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738 (1967)
- State v. Hagens, 2025-Ohio-4989 (12th Dist.)
- State v. Hagens, 2025-Ohio-3114, ¶¶ 12, 14 (12th Dist.)
- State v. Vanelli, 2003-Ohio-2717, ¶ 8 (9th Dist.)
- State v. Leach, 2005-Ohio-2370, ¶ 6 (12th Dist.)
- Nolan v. Nolan, 11 Ohio St.3d 1, syllabus (1984)
- State v. Hall, 2024-Ohio-1235, ¶ 39 (12th Dist.)
- State v. Boles, 2017-Ohio-786, ¶ 19 (12th Dist.)
- State v. Parker, State v. Parker, 2019-Ohio-3848, ¶ 33
- State v. Reynolds, 79 Ohio St.3d 158, 160 (1997)
- State v. McKelton, 2016-Ohio-3216, ¶¶ 7-8 (12th Dist.)
- State v. Henderson, 2020-Ohio-4784
- Rathert v. Kempker, 2011-Ohio-1873, ¶ 12 (12th Dist.)
- Hausser & Taylor, LLP v. Accelerated Systems Integration, Inc., 2005-Ohio-1017, ¶ 10 (8th Dist.)