

OHIO COURT OF APPEALS, SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

State v. Edwards

2025-Ohio-5774 · No. E-25-016 · Decided December 26, 2025

SUMMARY

The Sixth District Court of Appeals of Ohio affirmed Ernest Edwards’s 36-month prison sentence for third-degree-felony child endangering. The court held that the trial court could consider relevant uncharged conduct and that Edwards’s challenge to the trial court’s consideration of sentencing factors under R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12 was not subject to appellate review under the applicable standard.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Ohio Court of Appeals, Sixth Appellate District
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Gene A. Zmuda; Myron C. Duhart; Charles E. Sulek
JURISDICTION	Ohio Court of Appeals, Sixth Appellate District, Erie County
DECIDED	December 26, 2025
DOCKET	E-25-016
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Edwards pleaded guilty to third-degree-felony child endangering and appealed the trial court's imposition of a 36-month prison sentence, arguing that the maximum sentence was contrary to law because the court considered uncharged conduct and conduct by another person.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under R.C. 2953.08(G)(2), an appellate court may not independently reweigh the sentencing evidence or substitute its judgment for the trial court's judgment regarding the sentence that best complies with R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential accelerated-calendar judgment entry
PARTIES	Ernest Edwards v. State of Ohio

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal law
- criminal sentencing
- appellate practice

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court's 36-month sentence was contrary to law or an abuse of discretion because the court considered uncharged conduct and conduct by another person.
2. Whether the appellate court could independently reweigh sentencing evidence or review an alleged error based solely on the trial court's consideration of factors under R.C. 2929.11 and R.C. 2929.12.

HOLDINGS

1. A sentencing court may consider a defendant's unindicted acts so long as those acts are not the sole basis for the sentence.
2. An appellate court may not independently weigh the sentencing evidence or substitute its judgment for the trial court's judgment concerning the sentence that best complies with R.C. 2929.11 and R.C. 2929.12.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“R.C. 2953.08(G)(2) does not permit an “appellate court to independently weigh the evidence in the record and substitute its judgment for that of the trial court concerning the sentence that best reflects compliance with R.C. 2929.11 and 2929.12.”” (¶ 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A two-year-old child sustained second- and third-degree burns over nearly half of his body in October 2023 while in Edwards's care. Edwards was indicted for child endangering, pleaded guilty, and was found guilty. At sentencing, the trial court considered the victim's age and extensive injuries, Edwards's relationship with the victim, his failure to obtain help, his lack of remorse, and a recent incident involving inadequate supervision of another child in his care.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Edwards was indicted in the Erie County Court of Common Pleas, pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to 36 months in prison. He timely appealed from the April 11, 2025 judgment. The Sixth District placed the appeal on its accelerated calendar and affirmed, entering judgment for the State under App.R. 12(B).

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- State v. Griffin, 2021-Ohio-3137, ¶ 19 (6th Dist.)
- State v. Jones, State v. Jones, 2020-Ohio-6729, ¶ 42
- State v. Orzechowski, 2021-Ohio-985, ¶ 13 (6th Dist.)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/ohio-court-of-appeals-sixth-appellate-district-erie-county-ohio-court-of-appeals-sixth-appellate-dis/2025/state-v-edwards-bwt0qs40>