

OHIO COURT OF APPEALS, FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

State v. Largent

2026-Ohio-1689 · No. CT2025-0109 · Decided May 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The Ohio Court of Appeals for the Fifth Appellate District reversed and remanded Kendra Largent’s sentence for resentencing. The court held that 17 receiving-stolen-property convictions involving credit cards taken in a single wallet theft arose from the same animus and should have merged for sentencing under Ohio Revised Code section 2941.25.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Ohio Court of Appeals, Fifth Appellate District
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Craig R. Baldwin; Andrew J. King; William B. Hoffman
JURISDICTION	Ohio Court of Appeals, Fifth Appellate District, Muskingum County
DECIDED	May 8, 2026
DOCKET	CT2025-0109
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant appealed her sentence following a jury conviction on 17 counts of theft and 17 counts of receiving stolen property.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Appellate review of an allied-offense question is de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	Kendra Largent v. State of Ohio

TOPICS

- sentencing
- double jeopardy
- criminal procedure
- appellate procedure
- standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

- Criminal law
- Criminal procedure
- Sentencing

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the seventeen receiving-stolen-property convictions arose from the same conduct and animus and therefore were allied offenses that had to merge for sentencing under Ohio Revised Code section

2941.25.

2. Whether the trial court erred by imposing consecutive sentences on all seventeen receiving-stolen-property counts.

HOLDINGS

1. The seventeen receiving-stolen-property counts arose from the same animus because they all stemmed from the single act of taking the victim's wallet, and the record contained no evidence distinguishing one credit card or count from another. The counts therefore should have merged for sentencing.
2. An appellate court reviews an allied-offense question de novo.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“However, each of the 17 counts for which the appellant was being sentenced stemmed from the singular act of taking the victim’s wallet. There is no evidence that the appellant treated any of the credit cards differently, or that they were removed from the wallet, and we find nothing in the record that distinguishes count 18 from counts 19 - 34. Accordingly, we find that counts 18 – 34 each arose from the same animus, and should therefore all have merged for the purposes of sentencing.” (¶ 14)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Largent took a purse from a store containing a wallet with seventeen separate credit cards and a SNAP card. She was convicted of seventeen theft counts and seventeen receiving-stolen-property counts. At sentencing, the State elected sentencing on the receiving-stolen-property counts, and the trial court imposed the maximum twelve-month term on each count consecutively. The record did not show that Largent treated any credit card differently or removed any card from the wallet.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Largent was indicted in the Muskingum County Court of Common Pleas, proceeded to a jury trial, and was convicted on all 34 theft and receiving-stolen-property counts. The State conceded at sentencing that the theft counts merged with the receiving-stolen-property counts, but the trial court imposed consecutive 12-month terms on the 17 receiving-stolen-property counts, for an aggregate 24-month sentence. Largent appealed, and the State requested remand for resentencing.

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The Muskingum County Court of Common Pleas must resentence Largent consistent with the determination that counts 18 through 34 merge for sentencing.

CASES CITED

- State v. Miku, 2018-Ohio-1584, ¶ 70 (5th Dist.)
- State v. Williams, 2012-Ohio-5699, ¶ 12
- State v. Hughes, 2016-Ohio-880, ¶ 22 (5th Dist.)
- State v. Johnson, 2010-Ohio-6314, ¶¶ 48-51
- State v. Earley, 2015-Ohio-4615, ¶ 11
- State v. Ruff, 2015-Ohio-995, ¶ 31

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/ohio-court-of-appeals-fifth-appellate-district-muskingum-county-ohio-court-of-appeals-fifth-appellat/2026/state-v-largent-bhmfjju0>