

OHIO COURT OF APPEALS, NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

State v. Davis

2026-Ohio-540 · No. 31442 · Decided February 18, 2026

---

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

[Cite as State v. Davis, 2026-Ohio-540.] STATE OF OHIO ) IN THE COURT OF APPEALS )ss:  
NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COUNTY OF SUMMIT ) CITY OF AKRON C.A. No. 31442  
Appellee v. APPEAL FROM JUDGMENT ENTERED IN THE NASHEEMIA DAVIS AKRON  
MUNICIPAL COURT COUNTY OF SUMMIT, OHIO Appellant CASE No. 24 CRB 06233  
DECISION AND JOURNAL ENTRY Dated: February 18, 2026 HENSAL, Judge Presiding. {¶1}  
Nasheemia Davis appeals a journal entry of the Akron Municipal Court that found her guilty of  
contempt of court.

For the following reasons, this Court reverses. I. {¶2} In January 2025, Ms. Davis pleaded guilty  
to resisting arrest. The municipal court sentenced her to 90 days in jail but gave her credit for 3  
days and suspended the remainder of the days. It also fined her \$100 and ordered her to obey all  
laws for one year. A month later, the court issued a complaint, alleging that Ms. Davis had failed  
to comply with the terms of her probation and failed to comply with GPS monitoring.

Following a hearing, the court found Ms. Davis in contempt and ordered her to spend 30 days at  
the community alternative sentencing center. Ms. Davis has appealed, assigning two errors. This  
Court will address her second assignment of error first because it is dispositive. 2 II.  
ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR II THE RECORD CONTAINS INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO  
SUSTAIN DAVIS’S CONVICTION FOR INDIRECT CRIMINAL CONTEMPT. {¶3} In her  
second assignment of error, Ms. Davis argues that her conviction for contempt is not supported by  
sufficient evidence.

Specifically, she argues that there is no valid court order in this case that she both knew about and  
violated intentionally. The State agrees that the evidence submitted to the municipal court did not  
have to do with this case and did not establish that Ms. Davis violated any of the sentencing  
conditions imposed by the municipal court in this case. Upon review of the record, we agree that it  
does not show that Ms. Davis was ordered to comply with GPS monitoring in this case or that she  
violated any laws within one year of her sentencing.

Ms. Davis’s second assignment of error is sustained. Considering this determination, Ms. Davis’s  
first assignment of error is moot, and this Court declines to address it for that reason. App.R.  
12(A)(1)(c). III. {¶4} Ms. Davis’s second assignment of error is sustained.

The judgment of the Akron Municipal Court is reversed, and this matter is remanded for the municipal court to enter a judgment of acquittal on the contempt charge. Judgment reversed and cause remanded. There were reasonable grounds for this appeal. 3 We order that a special mandate issue out of this Court, directing the Court of Common Pleas, County of Summit, State of Ohio, to carry this judgment into execution.

A certified copy of this journal entry shall constitute the mandate, pursuant to App.R. 27. Immediately upon the filing hereof, this document shall constitute the journal entry of judgment, and it shall be file stamped by the Clerk of the Court of Appeals at which time the period for review shall begin to run. App.R. 22(C).

The Clerk of the Court of Appeals is instructed to mail a notice of entry of this judgment to the parties and to make a notation of the mailing in the docket, pursuant to App.R. 30. Costs taxed to Appellee. JENNIFER HENSAL FOR THE COURT SUTTON, J. STEVENSON, J. CONCUR.  
APPEARANCES: JOSEPH SHELL, Attorney at Law, for Appellant. DEBORAH S. MATZ, Director of Law, and BRIAN D. BREMER and KIRSTEN L. SMITH, Assistant Directors of Law, for Appellee.