

OHIO COURT OF APPEALS, SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT, WOOD COUNTY

State v. Pringle

2025-Ohio-5305 · No. WD-25-017 · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The Sixth District Court of Appeals of Ohio affirmed Jack Pringle’s convictions and sentences for two counts of menacing by stalking and one count of violating a protection order. The court held that it could not review the appellant’s arguments concerning the trial court’s consideration of Ohio Revised Code sections 2929.11 and 2929.12, and that those provisions do not apply to appellate review of consecutive sentences.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Ohio Court of Appeals, Sixth Appellate District, Wood County
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Gene A. Zmuda; Thomas J. Osowik; Charles E. Sulek
JURISDICTION	Ohio Court of Appeals, Sixth Appellate District, Wood County
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	WD-25-017
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant appealed his convictions and sentence from the Wood County Court of Common Pleas, arguing that the trial court failed to comply with Ohio Revised Code §§ 2929.11 and 2929.12 and improperly imposed consecutive sentences.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court held that appellate review of alleged error in the trial court's consideration of R.C. 2929.11 and R.C. 2929.12 is prohibited as a matter of law; those provisions also do not apply to appellate review of consecutive sentences.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published, but issued as an accelerated-calendar judgment entry that the court stated is not an opinion of the court.
PARTIES	Jack Pringle v. State of Ohio

TOPICS

- sentencing
- sentencing guidelines
- appellate procedure
- standard of review
- criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal law

criminal sentencing

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the appellate court could review Pringle's claim that the trial court failed to comply with the principles and purposes of sentencing under R.C. 2929.11 and the seriousness and recidivism factors under R.C. 2929.12.
2. Whether R.C. 2929.11 and R.C. 2929.12 provide a basis for appellate review of the trial court's imposition of consecutive sentences.

HOLDINGS

1. An appellate court may not review, as a matter of law, whether a trial court erred in considering R.C. 2929.11 and R.C. 2929.12 when imposing a sentence.
2. R.C. 2929.11 and R.C. 2929.12 do not apply to appellate review of consecutive sentences.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"We cannot review appellant's arguments concerning R.C. 2929.11 and R.C. 2929.12." (¶ 4)

"Moreover, R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12 do not apply to appellate review of consecutive sentences." (¶ 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jack Pringle was convicted of two counts of menacing by stalking under R.C. 2903.211(A)(1) and (B)(2)(a), and one count of violating a protection order under R.C. 2919.27(A)(1) and (B)(3)(c). He received two consecutive 16-month prison terms for the menacing-by-stalking convictions, consecutive to a prison term imposed in another case, and a concurrent 12-month term for violating the protection order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 4, 2025, the Wood County Court of Common Pleas convicted Jack Pringle of two counts of menacing by stalking and one count of violating a protection order. The court imposed consecutive prison terms for the two menacing-by-stalking counts and a concurrent prison term for the protection-order count. Pringle timely appealed, and the Sixth District placed the matter on its accelerated calendar and affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- State v. Jones, State v. Jones, 2020-Ohio-6729
- State v. Bowles, 2021-Ohio-4401, ¶ 9 (6th Dist.)
- State v. Toles, 2021-Ohio-3531

- State v. Strang, 2022-Ohio-3857, ¶ 16 (6th Dist.)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

[Cite as State v. Pringle, 2025-Ohio-5305.] IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT WOOD COUNTY State of Ohio Court of Appeals No. WD-25-017 Appellee Trial Court No. 24 CR 445 v. Jack Pringle DECISION AND JUDGMENT Appellant Decided: November 25, 2025 ***** Paul Dobson, Wood County Prosecuting Attorney, and David Harold, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for appellee.

Dan Weiss, for appellant. ***** ZMUDA, J. {¶ 1} We sua sponte place this matter on the accelerated calendar pursuant to App.R. 11.1(A), and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court. See S.Ct.R.Rep.Op.3.1; App.R. 11.1(E); 6th Dist.Loc.App.R. 12.

Having reviewed the record, we find appellant’s single assignment of error not well-taken as a matter of law. {¶ 2} On April 4, 2025, the Wood County Court of Common Pleas convicted appellant Jack Pringle of two counts of menacing by stalking, in violation of R.C. 2903.211(A)(1) and (B)(2)(a) (counts 1 and 2); and one count of violating a protection order, in violation of R.C.

2919.27(A)(1) and (B)(3)(c) (count 3). For counts 1 and 2, appellant was sentenced to two 16-month prison terms, one for each count, to be served consecutively with each and other and consecutively with a prison term imposed in another case.

For count 3, appellant was sentenced to a 12-month prison term to be served concurrently with appellant’s other prison terms. {¶ 3} Appellant timely appealed and asserts the following error for our review: The trial court failed to comply with the principles and purposes of R.C. 2929.11 and R.C. 2929.12 and appellant’s sentence should be vacated. He argues that the trial court erred by imposing a sentence that “did not advance the principles and purposes of R.C.

2929.11 and did not appropriately apply and weigh the seriousness and recidivism factors as outlined in R.C. 2929.12, and the court erred when it sentenced [a]ppellant to consecutive sentences.” {¶ 4} We cannot review appellant’s arguments concerning R.C. 2929.11 and R.C. 2929.12.

For nearly five years, we have abided by the Ohio Supreme Court’s holding in State v. Jones, 2020-Ohio-6729, that we are prohibited, as a matter of law, from reviewing whether a trial court erred in its consideration of the R.C. 2929.11 and R.C. 2929.12 when it imposed sentence. State v. Bowles, 2021-Ohio-4401, ¶ 9 (6th Dist.), citing State v. Toles, 2021-Ohio-3531 (appeals based solely on a trial court’s alleged error 2. in considering R.C.

2929.11 and 2929.12 are “subject to summary resolution as a matter of law”). Appellant’s assigned error falls squarely within this prohibition. Moreover, R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12 do not apply to

appellate review of consecutive sentences. State v. Strang, 2022-Ohio-3857, ¶ 16 (6th Dist.).

We find appellant's assignment of error not well-taken. Pursuant to App.R. 12(B), we affirm the April 4, 2025 judgment of the Wood County Court of Common Pleas. {¶ 5} Appellant is ordered to pay the costs of this appeal pursuant to App.R. 24. Judgment affirmed. A certified copy of this entry shall constitute the mandate pursuant to App.R. 27. See also 6th Dist.Loc.App.R.

4. Thomas J. Osowik, J. JUDGE Gene A. Zmuda, J. JUDGE Charles E. Sulek, P.J. CONCUR. JUDGE This decision is subject to further editing by the Supreme Court of Ohio's Reporter of Decisions. Parties interested in viewing the final reported version are advised to visit the Ohio Supreme Court's web site at: <http://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/ROD/docs/>. 3.