

COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO, EIGHTH APPELLATE DISTRICT,
CUYAHOGA COUNTY

State v. Conley

2025-Ohio-5525 · No. No. 115106 · Decided December 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The Eighth District Court of Appeals of Ohio affirmed Tyler Conley’s aggregate 24-month prison sentence following his guilty pleas to failure to comply, breaking and entering, and attempted theft. The court held that consecutive sentencing was mandated by Ohio Revised Code § 2921.331(D), which requires a prison term for felony failure to comply to be served consecutively to any other prison term, so the trial court was not required to make findings under § 2929.14(C)(4).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Eighth Appellate District, Cuyahoga County
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Deena R. Calabrese; Michelle J. Sheehan; Lisa B. Forbes
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Eighth Appellate District, Cuyahoga County
DECIDED	December 11, 2025
DOCKET	No. 115106
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Tyler Conley appealed from his convictions and aggregate 24-month prison sentence after pleading guilty to fourth-degree felony failure to comply, fifth-degree felony breaking and entering, and amended fifth-degree felony attempted theft. He challenged the consecutive nature of the sentences, arguing that the trial court failed to make the findings required by R.C. 2929.14(C)(4) and that the record did not support consecutive sentencing.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under R.C. 2953.08(G)(2), an appellate court may modify or vacate a sentence only if it is clearly and convincingly contrary to law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published and precedential Ohio appellate opinion
PARTIES	Tyler Conley v. State of Ohio

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

Ohio criminal law

criminal sentencing

appellate review

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court was required to make the consecutive-sentence findings under R.C. 2929.14(C)(4) before ordering the prison term for fourth-degree failure to comply consecutive to other prison terms.
2. Whether the consecutive sentence was clearly and convincingly contrary to law under R.C. 2953.08(G)(2), including whether the mandate applied to sentences imposed in separate cases.

HOLDINGS

1. A trial court need not make the findings required by R.C. 2929.14(C)(4) when it imposes a prison term for a violation of R.C. 2921.331(B), because R.C. 2921.331(D) mandates that term be served consecutively to any other prison term.
2. The consecutive-sentence mandate in R.C. 2921.331(D) applies to any other prison term, including a prison term imposed in a different criminal case.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In this context, “a trial court has no discretion in the decision to impose a consecutive sentence for a violation of R.C. 2921.331(B).”” (¶ 18)

“Instead, R.C. 2921.331(D) “imposes a mandatory consecutive sentence for violations of R.C. 2921.331(B).”” (¶ 19)

“a court is required to impose consecutive sentences without regard to the dictates of R.C. 2929.14(C)(4).” (¶ 21)

“the trial court need not make these findings when consecutive sentences are required as a matter of law.” (¶ 26)

“The consecutive sentence mandate in R.C. 2921.331(D) extends to any other term of imprisonment, no matter if the sentence is being imposed on the same or different case.” (¶ 29)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The first case arose from a break-in at a Parma motorcycle dealership and the theft of a Honda motorcycle; evidence included security footage of Conley's truck and a phone search revealing photographs of the motorcycle and a downloaded operating manual. The second case arose when Conley fled from police while riding a motorcycle, crashed, and was arrested carrying Oxycodone. After guilty pleas, the trial court imposed an 18-month prison term for fourth-degree failure to comply and concurrent six-month terms for breaking and entering and attempted theft, ordering the former consecutive to the latter pursuant to law.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Conley entered guilty pleas in two Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Court cases. The trial court sentenced him to 18 months for failure to comply and concurrent six-month terms for breaking and entering and attempted theft, with the 18-month term consecutive to the concurrent six-month terms. The Eighth District affirmed, concluding that R.C. 2921.331(D) mandated the consecutive sentence and therefore the R.C. 2929.14(C)(4) findings were unnecessary.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The case was remanded to the trial court for execution of sentence; the court directed that a special mandate issue, and bail pending appeal was terminated.

CASES CITED

- State v. Foster, 2013-Ohio-2199 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Parker, 2018-Ohio-579, ¶ 40, 43-44 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Brown, 2019-Ohio-3773, ¶ 25 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Banks, 2003-Ohio-1530, ¶ 19 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Hanshaw, 2024-Ohio-253, ¶ 18-23 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Lopez, 2024-Ohio-4584, ¶ 26 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Back, 2014-Ohio-1656, ¶ 9-12 (2d Dist.)
- State v. Perry, 2015-Ohio-1542, ¶ 11 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Spicer, 2010-Ohio-61, ¶ 19 (8th Dist.)