

COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO, TENTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

State ex rel. Walker v. Bolin

2026-Ohio-1822 · No. 25AP-133 · Decided May 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The Ohio Tenth District Court of Appeals denied Anthony Walker’s petition for a writ of mandamus seeking correction of his jail-time credit and first Ohio Parole Board hearing date. The court adopted the magistrate’s decision, which concluded that the evidence showed Walker’s 2,053 days of credit had been applied and that he failed to establish a clear legal duty requiring further correction. Walker did not file objections to the magistrate’s decision.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Tenth Appellate District
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mentel, J.; Beatty Blunt, J.; Edelstein, J.
JURISDICTION	Ohio Court of Appeals, Tenth Appellate District
DECIDED	May 19, 2026
DOCKET	25AP-133
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Walker filed an original action seeking a writ of mandamus requiring the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's Bureau of Sentence Computation to apply jail-time credit to his prison-term calculation and alter the date of his first parole-board hearing. A magistrate recommended denial of the writ. Walker filed no objections, and the Court of Appeals adopted the magistrate's decision and denied the writ.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no timely objections to a magistrate's decision are filed, the appellate court may adopt the decision unless it finds an error of law or other defect evident on the face of the decision. To obtain mandamus, the relator must establish by clear and convincing evidence a clear legal right to the requested relief, a clear legal duty on the respondent to provide it, and the absence of an adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Ohio Court of Appeals opinion

PARTIES

Anthony Walker v. Jessica Bolin, in her official capacity as an employee of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's Bureau of Sentence Computation

TOPICS

writ of certiorari

appellate procedure

remedies

post-conviction relief

standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

Mandamus

Ohio appellate procedure

Prison sentence computation

Jail-time credit

Parole proceedings

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Walker established a clear legal right and Bolin had a clear legal duty to recalculate his prison term by applying 2,053 days of jail-time credit.
2. Whether Walker established a clear legal right and Bolin had a clear legal duty to alter the date of his first parole-board hearing.
3. Whether the magistrate's decision contained an error of law or facial defect preventing adoption when Walker filed no objections.

HOLDINGS

1. Because Walker filed no timely objections, the court could adopt the magistrate's decision unless it found an error of law or another defect evident on the face of the decision; the court found none.
2. Walker was not entitled to mandamus because he failed to establish that Bolin had a clear legal duty to alter the calculation of his prison term or the date of his first parole-board hearing.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"In order for a writ of mandamus to issue in this matter, Walker must establish by clear and convincing evidence (1) a clear legal right to the requested relief, (2) a clear legal duty on the part of Bolin to provide it, and (3) the lack of an adequate remedy in the ordinary course of the law." (§ 27)

"Contrary to Walker's claims, the evidence submitted by Bolin reflects that Walker's credit has been applied to the calculation of his sentence and parole hearing date." (§ 30)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Walker was serving consecutive sentences arising from multiple Cuyahoga County criminal cases. The relevant sentencing entries resulted in a total sentence of 48 years to life, and the Bureau of Sentence Computation documented 2,053 days of credit applied to his sentence and parole-hearing calculation. Walker nevertheless claimed that the credit had not been properly applied and that his first parole hearing should occur around April 2029, while the Bureau's evidence showed the hearing was scheduled for February 2034.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Walker filed his mandamus complaint on January 15, 2025. The respondent's motion to dismiss was denied, after which the respondent submitted evidence and amended evidence; Walker submitted no evidence or rebuttal evidence. The magistrate recommended denial on March 5, 2026, and the appellate court adopted that decision because Walker filed no objections and the court found no error of law or facial defect.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

CASES CITED

- State ex rel. Wyse v. Ohio Pub. Emp. Retirement Sys., 2024-Ohio-314, ¶ 2 (10th Dist.)
- State ex rel. Alleyne v. Indus. Comm., 2004-Ohio-4223 (10th Dist.)
- State ex rel. Russell v. Klatt, 2020-Ohio-875, ¶ 7
- State ex rel. Blachere v. Tyack, 2023-Ohio-781, ¶ 13 (10th Dist.)
- State ex rel. Gil-Llamas v. Hardin, 2021-Ohio-1508, ¶ 19
- State ex rel. Ware v. Crawford, 2022-Ohio-295, ¶ 14
- State ex rel. Miller v. Ohio State Hwy. Patrol, 2013-Ohio-3720, ¶ 14