

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.)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/ohio-court-of-appeals-sixth-appellate-district-wood-county-ohio-court-of-appeals-sixth-appellate-dis/2025/state-v-pringle-9a6e8oao>