

COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO, SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT,
MONTGOMERY COUNTY

State v. Johnson

2026-Ohio-756 · No. C.A. No. 30496 · Decided March 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The Ohio Second District Court of Appeals dismissed Chadwick Johnson’s appeal from the revocation of his community control sanctions as moot. The court held that Johnson had completed the challenged jail term, and that reversal of the community-control violation finding would not provide the requested relief.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Second Appellate District, Montgomery County
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mary K. Huffman; Lewis, P.J.; Tucker, J.
JURISDICTION	Ohio Court of Appeals, Second Appellate District, Montgomery County
DECIDED	March 6, 2026
DOCKET	C.A. No. 30496
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Johnson appealed the judgment revoking his community control sanctions and imposing an aggregate 180-day jail term.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Chadwick Johnson v. State of Ohio

TOPICS

- mootness
- appellate procedure
- criminal procedure
- sentencing

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal procedure
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Johnson's appeal from the finding of a community-control violation and resulting jail sentence was moot because he had completed the sentence.
2. Whether the appellate court could grant relief by reversing the finding of a community-control violation after the challenged jail term had been served.

HOLDINGS

1. The appeal was moot because Johnson had completed the aggregate jail sentence imposed in the judgment, making it impossible for the court to grant the requested relief.
2. The appellate court's function under App.R. 12(A) is to affirm, reverse, or modify judgments, not findings; because the only challenged relief was the completed jail term, the court dismissed the appeal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A case becomes moot when something happens that makes it impossible for the court to grant the requested relief.” (§ 10)

“Our ‘function under App.R. 12(A) is to affirm, reverse or modify judgments, not findings.’” (§ 10)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Johnson pleaded guilty to two counts of violating a protection order and one count of criminal trespass. He was placed on community control with a modified no-contact order and related supervision conditions. After he was convicted in municipal court of aggravated menacing and domestic-violence threats, the trial court found that he violated community control and imposed an aggregate 180-day jail sentence. By the time of appellate review, Johnson had been released from jail after serving the sentences.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Johnson pleaded guilty to two protection-order violations and criminal trespass and was sentenced to community control sanctions. After municipal-court convictions for aggravated menacing and domestic-violence threats, the trial court found that he violated community control and imposed concurrent jail terms totaling 180 days, consecutive to the municipal-court sentence. While the appeal was pending, Johnson completed the sentences, and the appellate court dismissed the appeal as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- State v. Vaughan, 2023-Ohio-2330, ¶ 9 (2d Dist.)
- State ex rel. Ohio Democratic Party v. LaRose, 2020-Ohio-1253, ¶ 5

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

[Cite as State v. Johnson, 2026-Ohio-756.] IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT MONTGOMERY COUNTY STATE OF OHIO:: C.A. No. 30496 Appellee:: Trial Court Case No. 2024 CR 01793 v.: (Criminal Appeal from Common Pleas CHADWICK JOHNSON: Court) Appellant: FINAL JUDGMENT ENTRY &: OPINION Pursuant to the opinion of this court rendered on March 6, 2026, the appeal is dismissed.

Costs to be paid as stated in App.R. 24. Pursuant to Ohio App.R. 30(A), the clerk of the court of appeals shall immediately serve notice of this judgment upon all parties and make a note in the docket of the service. Additionally, pursuant to App.R. 27, the clerk of the court of appeals shall send a certified copy of this judgment, which constitutes a mandate, to the clerk of the trial court and note the service on the appellate docket.

For the court, MARY K. HUFFMAN, JUDGE LEWIS, P.J., and TUCKER, J., concur. OPINION MONTGOMERY C.A. No. 30496 AARON M. HERZIG and NATHAN R. COYNE, Attorneys for Appellant MICHAEL P. ALLEN, Attorney for Appellee HUFFMAN, J. {¶ 1} Chadwick Johnson appeals from a judgment entry revoking community control sanctions.

For the following reasons, this appeal is dismissed as moot. Facts and Procedural History {¶ 2} On August 28, 2024, Johnson was charged by way of a bill of information with two counts of violation of a protection order and one count of criminal trespass. He pled guilty to the offenses on September 11, 2024. Disposition occurred on May 8, 2025, and the court sentenced Johnson to community control sanctions for a period not to exceed five years.

A post-conviction no contact order was issued preventing contact with K.J., the subject of the protection order, who was Johnson's estranged wife and the mother of his children. {¶ 3} On October 15, 2024, Johnson filed a motion to modify conditions of the no contact order as outlined in a consent agreement between him and K.J. in the domestic relations court.

He sought limited communication with K.J. by means of the "Our Family Wizard" application to facilitate parenting time. On November 4, 2024, the court issued a notice of hearing regarding modification of terms and conditions of community control supervision, noting that the State of Michigan, where Johnson resided, denied interstate compact supervision. {¶ 4} At the subsequent hearing on November 12, 2024, the court granted Johnson's request to use "Our Family Wizard" to communicate with K.J. regarding issues of visitation 2 with the children.

The court imposed monitored time supervision consistent with the interstate rules and regulations for interstate supervision of offenders, with Johnson additionally consenting to continued counseling for anger management, to a substance abuse assessment and completion of any recommendations therefrom, and to report in person to probation when in Ohio for court proceedings or visitation.

The court advised Johnson that a violation of the restrictions to which he agreed could result in a revocation of his community control sanctions, and that a failure to abide by the no-contact order as modified, with the exception of court hearings, could result in criminal charges. A modification of community control sanctions was issued on November 20, 2024. {¶ 5} On December 17, 2024, a notice of community control sanctions revocation hearing and order was issued, stating that Johnson was arrested by the Centerville Police Department for domestic violence and menacing on December 15, 2024.

An amended notice of revocation was filed against Johnson on March 5, 2025, based on his arrest. It stated that on March 3, 2025, Johnson was charged with three counts of aggravated menacing and three counts of domestic violence threats in Dayton Municipal Court. It alleged that Johnson violated Rule 1, which required him to obey local, state, and federal laws and to immediately contact his probation officer if arrested or contacted by law enforcement, and Sanction 2, which required full compliance with the no contact order while also only using the “Our Family Wizard” application for purposes of visitation and custody. {¶ 6} After multiple continuances, a revocation hearing occurred on May 8, 2025.

At the start thereof, the court indicated it had been advised that after a trial in Dayton Municipal Court, Johnson was convicted of three counts of aggravated menacing and one count of domestic violence threats. Counsel for Johnson conceded that the convictions established that Johnson violated his monitored time supervision.

The court indicated that it reviewed 3 victim impact statements from K.J. and the children. The court imposed jail terms of 180 days for each protection order violation and 30 days for criminal trespass, to be served concurrently with each other for an aggregate term of 180 days.

The court ordered the sentence to be served consecutively to the term imposed in municipal court. Johnson received 122 days of jail time credit. {¶ 7} Johnson timely appealed from the trial court’s judgment. During the pendency of the appeal, this court overruled motions filed by Johnson to consolidate the instant appeal with his appeal from the municipal court case and to stay briefing of this appeal pending resolution of the municipal court matter.

Assignment of Error and Analysis {¶ 8} Johnson asserts one assignment of error. He argues that the court erred “by finding a community control violation.” Johnson’s argument is based solely on his belief that his conviction in municipal court, which served as the basis for his revocation, will be reversed. {¶ 9} Even if his municipal court conviction were reversed, simple arithmetic establishes that Johnson has been released from jail after the expiration of his aggregate sentence of 180 days in this matter and his sentence in Dayton Municipal Court.

Johnson’s companion appeal before us reflects that on April 14, 2025, he was sentenced to 180 days on one count of aggravated menacing, with credit for 123 days and 57 days to be served at

the jail; 180 days on a second count of aggravated menacing, with credit for 64 days and 116 days suspended; and 30 days for domestic violence threats, with credit for 64 days.

He was also sentenced to two years of non-reporting community control. Here he received 122 days of jail time credit towards his 180 aggregate jail term, leaving 58 days to serve upon 4 the completion of the sentence in his municipal court case. Put differently, Johnson was released from jail in August 2025. {¶ 10} ““A case becomes moot when something happens that makes it impossible for the court to grant the requested relief.”” *State v. Vaughan*, 2023-Ohio-2330, ¶ 9 (2d Dist.), quoting *State ex rel.*

Ohio Democratic Party v. LaRose, 2020-Ohio-1253, ¶ 5. Johnson asks us to reverse the finding that he violated community control. Our “function under App.R. 12(A) is to affirm, reverse or modify judgments, not findings.” *Id.* Counsel for Johnson admitted the violation, and the only aspect of the judgment on appeal at issue was the imposition of a jail term, which has been served.

Under these circumstances, Johnson’s appeal is moot, and it is dismissed. LEWIS, P.J., and TUCKER, J., concur. 5