

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

State ex rel. Holloway v. Saffold

2026-Ohio-1779 · No. 116122 · Decided May 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The Eighth District Court of Appeals of Ohio dismissed Case Holloway’s petition for a writ of mandamus seeking findings of fact concerning the denial of his motion to vacate a void judgment. The court held that Crim.R. 32(C) and Crim.R. 12(F) did not require the requested findings, that any alleged error was remediable by appeal, and that the requested relief had already been rendered moot because the trial court had ruled on the motion for findings of fact.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Eighth Appellate District, Cuyahoga County
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Lisa B. Forbes, Presiding Judge; Eileen T. Gallagher, Judge; Kathleen Ann Keough, Judge
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Eighth Appellate District, Cuyahoga County
DECIDED	May 12, 2026
DOCKET	116122
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Original mandamus action in which Holloway sought to compel a trial judge to issue findings of fact concerning the denial of his motion to vacate a void judgment. The respondent moved to dismiss under Civ.R. 12(B)(6), and Holloway filed a motion for summary judgment.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Civ.R. 12(B)(6) motion, the court presumes factual allegations to be true and draws all reasonable inferences in the relator's favor, dismissing when it appears beyond doubt that the relator can prove no set of facts entitling him to relief. Unsupported legal conclusions are not presumed true. A mandamus relator must establish a clear legal right, a clear legal duty, and the absence of an adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law by clear and convincing evidence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion
PARTIES	Case Holloway v. Jeffrey P. Saffold

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

appellate procedure

standard of review

post-conviction relief

criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Appellate procedure

Criminal procedure

Mandamus

Postconviction relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Holloway stated a claim for a writ of mandamus requiring the trial court to issue findings of fact concerning its denial of his motion to vacate a void judgment.
2. Whether Crim.R. 32(C) requires findings of fact for a trial court's ruling on a motion to vacate a void judgment.
3. Whether Crim.R. 12(F) requires findings of fact for the ruling on Holloway's motion to vacate a void judgment.
4. Whether Holloway had an adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law through appeal.
5. Whether the petition was moot because the trial court had already ruled on Holloway's motion for findings of fact.
6. Whether Holloway's motion for summary judgment should be denied as moot.

HOLDINGS

1. Holloway failed to state a claim for mandamus relief because he did not establish a clear legal right to findings of fact, a clear legal duty requiring the trial court to issue them, or the absence of an adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law.
2. Mandamus may compel a court to exercise its judgment or issue a ruling, but it generally may not dictate the decision the court must reach or correct alleged errors in the ruling.
3. The mandamus petition was moot because the trial court had already ruled on Holloway's motion for findings of fact before he filed the petition.
4. Holloway's motion for summary judgment was denied as moot.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A writ of mandamus may be used to compel a court to act, but it cannot generally be used to dictate the action the court takes.” (Opinion analysis, section II.A.2)

“Mandamus does not lie to correct errors and procedural irregularities in the course of a case” (Opinion analysis, section II.A.2)

“Crim.R. 32(C) sets forth the essential elements for a judgment of conviction. It does not require findings of facts for other rulings and journal entries in criminal cases.” (Opinion analysis, section II.A.2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Holloway was convicted of multiple offenses arising from large-scale liquor thefts at Giant Eagle stores. After the appellate court partly reversed his convictions and remanded for resentencing, the trial court resentenced him and later denied his motion to vacate the judgment concerning two counts. The trial court also denied Holloway's subsequent request for findings of fact. Holloway then sought mandamus relief requiring the trial judge to issue findings of fact under Crim.R. 32(C) and Crim.R. 12(F).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Holloway was convicted in the Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas, appealed, and obtained a partial reversal and remand for resentencing. After resentencing, he filed a motion to vacate a void judgment, which the trial court denied with an explanation. The trial court also denied Holloway's later motion for findings of fact before he filed this mandamus petition. The Court of Appeals granted the respondent's motion to dismiss and denied Holloway's summary-judgment motion as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- State ex rel. Fischer Asset Mgt., LLC v. Scott, 2023-Ohio-3891, ¶ 3 (8th Dist.)
- Patterson v. Cuyahoga Cty. Common Pleas Court, 2019-Ohio-110, ¶ 2 (8th Dist.)
- Cornelison v. Russo, 2018-Ohio-3574, ¶ 8 (8th Dist.)
- State ex rel. Everhart v. McIntosh, 2007-Ohio-4798, ¶ 8
- Manning v. Gallagher, 2025-Ohio-2781, ¶ 2 (8th Dist.)
- Beverly v. Cuyahoga Cty. Mun. Court, 2025-Ohio-2457, ¶ 16 (8th Dist.)
- State ex rel. Nelson v. Russo, 89 Ohio St. 3d 227, 228 (2000)
- State v. Holloway, 2024-Ohio-3189, ¶¶ 1-3, 14, 73-74 (8th Dist.)
- State ex rel. Holloway v. Saffold, 2025-Ohio-1936, ¶¶ 2, 12 (8th Dist.)
- State ex rel. Roush v. Hickson, 2024-Ohio-4741, ¶ 8
- State ex rel. A.N. v. Cuyahoga Cty. Prosecutor's Office, 2021-Ohio-2071, ¶ 8
- State ex rel. Martre v. Reed, 2020-Ohio-4777, ¶ 12
- State ex rel. Tobias v. Fuerst, 2022-Ohio-3556, ¶ 5 (8th Dist.)
- State ex rel. Schwarzmer v. Mazzone, 2025-Ohio-1246, ¶ 10
- State ex rel. Duncan v. Chambers-Smith, 2025-Ohio-978, ¶ 10
- Wesley v. Cuyahoga Cty. Court of Common Pleas, 2020-Ohio-4921, ¶ 10 (8th Dist.)
- State ex rel. Collins v. Kilbane, 2023-Ohio-1577, ¶ 5 (8th Dist.)
- State ex rel. Scott v. Gall, 2020-Ohio-929, ¶ 7 (8th Dist.)
- State ex rel. S.Y.C. v. Floyd, 2024-Ohio-1387, ¶ 15
- State ex rel. Austin v. Fuerst, 2020-Ohio-928, ¶ 12 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Minter, 2015-Ohio-23, ¶ 5 (8th Dist.)

- State ex rel. Jefferson v. Russo, 2008-Ohio-135, ¶ 3 (8th Dist.)
- Hicks v. Russo, 2025-Ohio-2077, ¶ 10 (8th Dist.)
- State ex rel. Penland v. Dinkelacker, 2020-Ohio-3774, ¶¶ 3, 29

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

[Cite as State ex rel. Holloway v. Saffold, 2026-Ohio-1779.] COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO EIGHTH APPELLATE DISTRICT COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA STATE EX REL. CASE HOLLOWAY,; Relator,; No. 116122 v.; JEFFREY P. SAFFOLD,; Respondent,; JOURNAL ENTRY AND OPINION JUDGMENT: PETITION DISMISSED DATED: May 12, 2026 Writ of Mandamus Motion Nos. 593328 and 593469 Order No. 595182 Appearances: Case Holloway, pro se.

Michael C. O'Malley, Cuyahoga County Prosecuting Attorney, and Jake A. Elliott, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for respondent. LISA B. FORBES, P.J.: Relator Case Holloway, pro se, seeks a writ of mandamus ordering respondent Judge Jeffrey P. Saffold (the “trial court” or “respondent”) to issue findings of fact related to the trial court’s denial of Holloway’s motion to vacate void judgment.

Because, for the reasons that follow, it appears beyond doubt Holloway cannot prevail on his mandamus claim, we dismiss his petition. I. Factual and Procedural Background On February 10, 2026, Holloway filed the instant petition for a writ of mandamus. Holloway seeks an order compelling respondent to issue findings of fact in response to his “motion for findings of fact in support of plaintiff’s denial of defendant’s motion to vacate void judgment filed on October 24, 2024” (“motion for findings of fact”).

Holloway asserts that he had a “clear legal right for relief for respondent to issue a finding of fact based on entitling the relator to a [sic] appellate review of the findings of fact... requested,” that respondent has “a clear legal duty” to issue findings of fact under Crim.R. 32(C), and that respondent has a “clear legal duty to perform a final appealable order.” Holloway does not identify the underlying criminal case in which he seeks relief in his petition, but, based on a review of the Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Court docket, his petition appears to relate to State v. Holloway, Cuyahoga C.P.

No. CR-22-673380-C.1 1 This background is based on our review of the publicly available, online docket in the underlying criminal case. See State ex rel. Fischer Asset Mgt., LLC v. Scott, 2023-Ohio- 3891, ¶ 3, fn. 1 (8th Dist.) (observing, in original action, that “[t]his court is permitted to take judicial notice of court filings that are readily accessible from the internet”); Patterson v. Cuyahoga Cty.

Common Pleas Court, 2019-Ohio-110, ¶ 2, fn. 1 (8th Dist.) (setting forth procedural history relevant to mandamus action based on review of “publicly available dockets”), citing *Cornelison v. Russo*, 2018-Ohio-3574, ¶ 8, fn. 2 (8th Dist.), citing *State ex rel. Everhart v. McIntosh*, 2007-Ohio-4798, ¶ 8; see also *Manning v. Gallagher*, 2025- Ohio-2781, ¶ 2, fn. 1 (8th Dist.).

Judicial notice may be taken in writ actions without converting a motion to dismiss into a motion for summary judgment. *Beverly v. Cuyahoga* In that case, a jury found Holloway guilty of multiple counts arising out of a series of large-scale liquor thefts at Giant Eagle stores in Northeast Ohio. Holloway appealed his convictions.

On August 22, 2024, this court affirmed the trial court’s judgment in part, reversed in part, and remanded the case to the trial court for resentencing, finding that certain counts should have merged for sentencing. *State v. Holloway*, 2024-Ohio-3189, ¶ 1-3, 14, 73-74 (8th Dist.). Prior to his resentencing, Holloway filed, pro se, a “motion to vacate void judgment; contrary to law,” in which he argued that the trial court’s judgment with respect to Counts 1 and 2 (engaging in a pattern of corrupt activity and civil conspiracy) was “supported by plain allied offense error that violates the Double Jeopardy Clause,” lacked sufficient evidence, and was, therefore, “void” and “contrary to law” (“motion to vacate void judgment”).

On November 14, 2024, the trial court resentenced Holloway. Holloway did not appeal his resentencing. On April 21, 2025, the trial court denied his motion to vacate void judgment, explaining the basis for its ruling as follows: On October 20, 2023, defendant filed an appeal of his convictions in Case Number CR-22-673380-C in *State v. Holloway*, 8th Dist. Cuyahoga App.

No. 113296, 2024-Ohio-3189, 250 N.E.3d 777 (“Holloway”). On August 22, 2024, the Eighth District Court of Appeals in *Holloway* remanded Case Number CR-22-673380-C for resentencing. *Id.*, ¶ 74. *Cty. Mun. Court*, 2025-Ohio-2457, ¶ 16 (8th Dist.); see also *State ex rel. Nelson v. Russo*, 89 Ohio St.3d 227, 228 (2000).

On November 14, 2024, the trial court resentenced defendant in Case Number CR-22-673380-C as mandated by the Eighth District Court of Appeals in *Holloway*. (See attached entry). For the foregoing reasons defendant’s motion to vacate void judgement filed on October 24, 2024, is denied.[2] Holloway did not appeal the denial of his motion to vacate void judgment.

On September 8, 2025, Holloway filed his motion for findings of fact, requesting that the trial court issue “essential findings of fact” related to the denial of his motion to vacate void judgment “in accordance with Crim.R. 12(F).” On September 10, 2025 — five months before Holloway filed his petition — the trial court denied his motion for findings of fact.

On March 13, 2026, respondent filed a motion to dismiss relator’s petition pursuant to Civ.R. 12(B)(6) and Loc.App.R. 45 on the grounds that it fails to state a claim upon which relief in mandamus can be granted. Respondent contends that relator’s petition should be dismissed

because (1) relator is not entitled to findings of fact related to his motion to vacate void judgment; (2) the trial court already provided a rationale for its ruling in its journal entry denying the 2 Holloway filed a prior petition for a writ of mandamus in which he requested that respondent be ordered to “grant” his motion to vacate void judgment.

In that petition, Holloway contended that there was “no other way” to get the remedy he sought because his sufficiency-of-the-evidence challenge was “denied/dismissed on appeal” and that he “can’t appeal [his] motion [sic] to vacate void judgment” because “respondent did not issue finding of fact or conclusion of law for said judgment.” This court denied Holloway’s petition, in part, because Holloway had already received all the relief he could have received on his mandamus claim once respondent ruled on his motion to vacate void judgment and it was, therefore, moot.

State ex rel. Holloway v. Saffold, 2025-Ohio-1936, ¶ 2, 12 (8th Dist.). motion to vacate void judgment; and (3) the trial court complied with Crim.R. 32(C) when it resentenced Holloway on November 14, 2024. Holloway filed a timely opposition to respondent’s motion to dismiss in which he argued that was entitled to an order compelling respondent “to issue a judgment complying with Crim.R.

32(C)” in regard to his motion to vacate void judgment. On March 17, 2026, Holloway also filed a motion for summary judgment. Holloway did not point to any evidence of the type specified in Civ.R. 56(C) in support of his motion but merely cited the standard for summary judgment and argued that since “[r]espondent has not filed any motion briefing a genuine issue that exists to any material fact of relator’s writ of mandamus,” “viewing the evidence most strongly in favor of the respondent,” Holloway was entitled to summary judgment as a matter of law.

II. Law and Analysis A. Respondent’s Motion to Dismiss 1. Standard for Dismissal under Civ.R. 12(B)(6) Dismissal of a mandamus action under Civ.R. 12(B)(6) for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted ““is appropriate if, after presuming all factual allegations in the complaint to be true and drawing all reasonable inferences in the relator’s favor, it appears beyond doubt that [Holloway] can prove no set of facts entitling him to a writ of mandamus.”” State ex rel.

Roush v. Hickson, 2024- Ohio-4741, ¶ 8, quoting State ex rel. A.N. v. Cuyahoga Cty. Prosecutor’s Office, 2021-Ohio-2071, ¶ 8. “[U]nsupported legal conclusions, even when cast as factual assertions, are not presumed true for purposes of a motion to dismiss.”” State ex rel. Roush at ¶ 8, quoting State ex rel. Martre v. Reed, 2020-Ohio-4777, ¶ 12. 2. Standard for a Writ of Mandamus A writ of mandamus is “a writ, issued in the name of the state to an inferior tribunal, a corporation, board, or person, commanding the performance of an act which the law specifically enjoins as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station.” R.C.

2731.01. It is “an extraordinary remedy that is to be exercised with caution and only when the right is clear.” *State ex rel. Tobias v. Fuerst*, 2022-Ohio- 3556, ¶ 5 (8th Dist.). To be entitled to mandamus relief, the relator must establish by clear and convincing evidence that (1) he or she has a clear legal right to the requested relief, (2) the respondent has a clear legal duty to provide that relief, and (3) the lack of an adequate remedy in the ordinary course of the law.

State ex rel. Schwarzmer v. Mazzone, 2025-Ohio-1246, ¶ 10; *State ex rel. Duncan v. Chambers-Smith*, 2025-Ohio-978, ¶ 10. A writ of mandamus may be used to compel a court to act, but it cannot generally be used to dictate the action the court takes. See R.C. 2731.03 (“The writ of mandamus may require an inferior tribunal to exercise its judgment, or proceed to the discharge of any of its functions, but it cannot control judicial discretion.”).

Thus, although a writ of mandamus may be used to require a judge to issue a ruling on a particular matter, it cannot be used to control what decision is issued. *Wesley v. Cuyahoga Cty. Court of Common Pleas*, 2020-Ohio-4921, ¶ 10 (8th Dist.). “[M]andamus does not lie to correct errors and procedural irregularities in the course of a case” and “cannot be used as a substitute for an appeal.” *State ex rel.*

Collins v. Kilbane, 2023-Ohio-1577, ¶ 5 (8th Dist.), quoting *State ex rel. Scott v. Gall*, 2020-Ohio-929, ¶ 7 (8th Dist.). Further, a writ of mandamus will not compel the performance of a duty that has already been performed. *State ex rel. S.Y.C. v. Floyd*, 2024-Ohio-1387, ¶ 15.

In his petition, Holloway contends that he has a clear legal right to findings of fact with respect to the denial of his motion to vacate void judgment and that respondent has a clear legal duty to issue them, pursuant to Crim.R. 32(C). Crim.R. 32(C) addresses the requirements for a judgment of conviction. It states: A judgment of conviction shall set forth the fact of conviction and the sentence.

Multiple judgments of conviction may be addressed in one judgment entry. If the defendant is found not guilty or for any other reason is entitled to be discharged, the court shall render judgment accordingly. The judge shall sign the judgment and the clerk shall enter it on the journal. A judgment is effective only when entered on the journal by the clerk. Crim.R.

32(C) sets forth the essential elements for a judgment of conviction. It does not require findings of facts for other rulings and journal entries in criminal cases. Nor does Crim.R. 12(F), referenced in relator’s motion for findings of fact, require the trial court to issue findings of fact with respect to relator’s motion to vacate void judgment. Crim.R. 12 addresses “Pleadings and Motions Before Trial.” Crim.R.

12(F) states, in relevant part, “Where factual issues are involved in determining a motion, the court shall state its essential findings on the record.” Relator’s motion was not a pretrial motion, and there were no “factual issues” involved in the trial court’s ruling. Further, to the extent that this

court's ruling on appeal and the trial court's subsequent resentencing could be considered "factual issues," they were clearly identified in the trial court's journal entry explaining the basis for its denial of the motion to vacate void judgment.

Thus, Holloway has provided no authority that the trial court had a clear legal duty to provide findings of facts in support of its denial of relator's motion to vacate void judgment. And even if the trial court had such a duty, the allegations of Holloway's petition do not establish that he lacked an adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law. Error in ruling on a motion is generally remedied through appeal, not an extraordinary writ.

See, e.g., *State ex rel. Austin v. Fuerst*, 2020-Ohio-928, ¶ 12 (8th Dist.); see also *State v. Minter*, 2015-Ohio-23, ¶ 5 (8th Dist.) (Writ for mandamus denied where relator provided no authority that trial court had duty to issue findings of fact and conclusions of law in denying motion to vacate a void judgment.), citing *State ex rel. Jefferson v. Russo*, 2008-Ohio-135, ¶ 3 (8th Dist.) ("Generally, findings of fact and conclusions of law are not required for ruling on a motion other than an authentic postconviction relief petition under R.C.

2953.21.... [A]n appeal is an adequate remedy... for failing to provide findings of fact and conclusions of law for rulings on motions."3 3 Even if Holloway's motion to vacate void judgment were to be construed as a petition for postconviction relief and even if the trial court's entry denying his motion to vacate void judgment were deemed to include insufficient findings of fact, this would not provide a basis for mandamus relief.

See *State ex rel. Penland v. Dinkelacker*, 2020-Ohio- 3774, ¶ 3, 29 ("[A] trial court's failure to issue findings of fact and conclusions of law with A review of the docket in the underlying case shows that the trial court had already ruled on Holloway's motion for findings of fact before he filed his petition. Holloway has, therefore, already received all of the relief to which he could be entitled through his mandamus claim.

See, e.g., *Hicks v. Russo*, 2025-Ohio-2077, ¶ 10 (8th Dist.) (where respondent had already ruled on relator's motions when she filed her petition, relator has already received all the relief she could have received through her mandamus claim, rendering her petition moot), citing *State ex rel. S.Y.C.*, 2024-Ohio-1387, at ¶ 15-16.

After presuming the truth of all the material factual allegations of Holloway's petition and drawing all reasonable inferences in his favor, it appears beyond doubt that Holloway cannot prevail on his mandamus claim.

The allegations of Holloway's petition do not state a claim for mandamus relief. Accordingly, we grant respondent's motion to dismiss. B. Relator's Motion for Summary Judgment Based on our resolution of respondent's motion to dismiss, relator's motion for summary judgment, which does not meet the requirements of Civ.R. 56(C), is denied as moot. respect to a judgment denying

postconviction relief is an error that may be corrected through an appeal, not a defect depriving the appellate court of jurisdiction over the appeal.”).

Costs assessed against relator; costs waived. The clerk is directed to serve on all parties notice of this judgment and its date of entry upon the journal. Civ.R. 58(B). Petition dismissed.

LISA B. FORBES, PRESIDING JUDGE EILEEN T. GALLAGHER, J., and KATHLEEN ANN KEOUGH, J., CONCUR