

COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO, THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT, ALLEN COUNTY

State v. Finfrock

2026-Ohio-2240 · No. 1-25-58 · Decided June 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The Third District Court of Appeals of Ohio affirmed Joseph W. Finfrock’s sentence for failure to verify his address under Ohio’s sex-offender registration laws. The court held that Ohio law permits a prison term to run consecutively to an out-of-state prison term and that extradition expenses are costs of prosecution that the trial court must assess, although collection from an indigent defendant is limited. Both assignments of error were overruled.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Third Appellate District, Allen County
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mark C. Miller; William R. Zimmerman; Juergen A. Waldick
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Third Appellate District, Allen County
DECIDED	June 15, 2026
DOCKET	1-25-58
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Finfrock appealed his felony sentence from the Allen County Court of Common Pleas, challenging the imposition of a sentence consecutive to an out-of-state prison term and the assessment of prosecution and extradition costs.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under R.C. 2953.08(G)(2), appellate review of consecutive sentences is not for abuse of discretion. The appellate court may modify or vacate the sentence only if it clearly and convincingly finds that the record does not support the required findings under R.C. 2929.14(C) (4) or that the sentence is otherwise contrary to law. Failure to object to the assessment of prosecution costs waives all but plain error, requiring an obvious, outcome-determinative error affecting substantial rights.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Ohio Court of Appeals opinion
PARTIES	Joseph W. Finfrock v. State of Ohio

TOPICS

sentencing

appellate procedure

plain meaning rule

criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal law

sentencing

appellate procedure

statutory interpretation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court could impose Finfrock's Ohio prison term consecutively to a prison term imposed by Minnesota under R.C. 2929.41(B)(2).
2. Whether the trial court erred by assessing prosecution costs, including extradition costs, against Finfrock after finding him indigent.

HOLDINGS

1. R.C. 2929.41(B)(2) expressly authorizes an Ohio court to order an Ohio felony prison term to be served consecutively to a prison term imposed by another state or the United States. Because R.C. 2929.14(C) (4) concerns prison terms imposed under Ohio law, the appellate court's review of the consecutive sentence involving Minnesota was limited to whether the sentence was otherwise contrary to law under R.C. 2953.08(G)(2)(b). Finfrock failed to clearly and convincingly establish that his sentence was contrary to law.
2. A trial court is required under R.C. 2947.23(A)(1) to assess prosecution costs against every convicted defendant, including an indigent defendant. R.C. 2949.14 limits the clerk's ability to collect extradition and other costs from a nonindigent felony defendant but does not prohibit the court from assessing those costs. Extradition expenses are costs of prosecution because bringing the accused within the court's jurisdiction is necessary for the prosecution to proceed.
3. Because Finfrock did not object to the order assessing prosecution costs, review was limited to plain error. He did not establish an obvious, outcome-determinative error resulting in a sentence contrary to law.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The appellate court’s standard for review is not whether the sentencing court abused its discretion.” (¶ 6)

“R.C. 2949.14 does not govern a court’s ability to assess costs. It governs only a clerk’s ability to collect assessed costs from nonindigent defendants.” (¶ 16)

“Because bringing an indicted defendant before the court to answer to criminal charges is an absolute prerequisite for prosecution of the case, extradition expenses are fundamentally “costs of prosecution.”” (¶ 17)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

While on probation for a prior sexual-imposition conviction, Finfrock moved from Ohio to Minnesota in 2019 and failed to comply with Ohio sex-offender-registration requirements. An Allen County grand jury indicted him

in 2021, and he was later returned to Ohio from Minnesota in 2025 to face the charges. He pleaded guilty to one count, received a 12-month Ohio prison term consecutive to his Minnesota sentence, and was assessed prosecution and extradition costs.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

An Allen County grand jury indicted Finfrock in 2021 for failing to provide notice of a change of address and failing to verify his address under Ohio's sex-offender-registration statutes. After he was returned from Minnesota in 2025, he pleaded guilty to one count pursuant to a plea agreement under which the other count was dismissed. The trial court imposed a 12-month Ohio prison term consecutive to Finfrock's Minnesota prison term and assessed prosecution costs, including extradition costs. The appellate court overruled both assignments of error and affirmed, remanding only for execution of the judgment for costs.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The cause was remanded to the trial court solely for execution of the judgment for costs. The appellate clerk was directed to certify the judgment and opinion to the trial court as the mandate under App.R. 27.

CASES CITED

- State v. Glover, 2024-Ohio-5195, ¶ 40
- State v. Warren, 2018-Ohio-4757, ¶ 14 (1st Dist.)
- State v. West, 2022-Ohio-4069, ¶ 23 (3d Dist.)
- State v. Henslee, 2017-Ohio-5786, ¶ 13 (5th Dist.)
- State v. Noling, 2002-Ohio-7044, ¶ 62
- State v. Long, 53 Ohio St.2d 91 (1978), paragraph three of the syllabus
- State v. Beckwith, 2022-Ohio-2362 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Snowden, 2019-Ohio-3006 (2d Dist.)
- State v. White, 2004-Ohio-5989, ¶ 8
- State ex rel. Franklin Cty. Commrs. v. Guilbert, 77 Ohio St. 333, 338 (1907)
- City of Middleburg Hts. v. Quinones, 2008-Ohio-6811, ¶ 8
- State v. Ball, 2023-Ohio-4352, ¶ 10 (12th Dist.)

OPINION

State v. Finfrock

2026 Ohio 2240

PER CURIAM.

[Cite as State v. Finfrock, 2026-Ohio-2240.]

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT
ALLEN COUNTY
STATE OF OHIO,
CASE NO. 1-25-58
PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE,
v.

JOSEPH W. FINFROCK, OPINION AND
JUDGMENT ENTRY

DEFENDANT-APPELLANT. Appeal from Allen County Common Pleas Court Trial Court No. CR2021 0214 Judgment Affirmed Date of Decision: June 15, 2026 APPEARANCES: William T. Cramer for Appellant John R. Willamowski, Jr. for Appellee Case No. 1-25-58 MILLER, J. ¶1 Defendant-appellant, Joseph Finfrock (“Finfrock”), appeals the September 29, 2025 judgment of sentence against him in the Allen County Court of Common Pleas. For the reasons that follow, we affirm. Facts and Procedural History ¶2 This case originated on June 17, 2021, when an Allen County grand jury indicted Finfrock on two counts: Count One of failure to provide notice of change of address in violation of R.C. 2950.05(F)(1) and R.C. 2950.99(A)(1)(a)(iii), a felony of the fourth degree and Count Two of failure to verify his address in violation of R.C. 2950.06(F) and R.C. 2950.99(A)(1)(a)(iii), also a felony of the fourth degree. In 2019, while on probation for a prior sexual imposition conviction, Finfrock moved to Minnesota. In making this transition, he failed to comply with the mandates of Ohio’s sex offender registration law. Following his indictment in Allen County, a warrant was issued for his arrest. Although the warrant was not formally executed at that time, Minnesota authorities later notified Finfrock of the outstanding Allen County warrant during a routine traffic stop. Once notified of the outstanding warrant, Finfrock contacted Allen County law enforcement officials to resolve the matter. These discussions were left unresolved. ¶3 Minnesota authorities subsequently imprisoned Finfrock on an unrelated offense. In 2025, he was returned to Ohio to face the charges set forth in the 2021 -2- Case No. 1-25-58 indictment. Pursuant to a plea agreement, in September 2025, Finfrock pleaded guilty in exchange for the dismissal of Count One. At sentencing, the trial court noted Finfrock’s 48-year criminal history which included numerous felony offenses, including violent and sex offenses, across multiple jurisdictions. The trial court sentenced Finfrock to serve a 12-month prison term to be served consecutively to his Minnesota prison term. ¶4 Finfrock timely filed this appeal. He raises two assignments of error. First Assignment of Error The trial court violated R.C. 2929.14(C) and R.C. 2929.41(B)(2) by imposing sentence consecutively to a prison term from another state. ¶5 In his first assignment of error, Finfrock argues the trial court erred by imposing his prison sentence consecutively to his Minnesota sentence. He contends the record does not clearly and convincingly support the trial court’s findings under R.C. 2929.14(C). He further asserts the court abused its discretion by ordering consecutive service with an out-of-state

sentence under R.C. 2929.41(B)(2). For the reasons that follow, we disagree. Standard of Review {¶6} R.C. 2953.08(G)(2) “provides the sole basis for an appellate court’s review of consecutive sentences.” *State v. Glover*, 2024-Ohio-5195, ¶ 40. R.C. 2953.08(G)(2) states in relevant part: -3- Case No. 1-25-58 The court hearing an appeal [of a sentence that includes consecutive sentences] shall review the record, including the findings underlying the sentence or modification given by the sentencing court. The appellate court may increase, reduce, or otherwise modify a sentence that is appealed under this section or may vacate the sentence and remand the matter to the sentencing court for resentencing. The appellate court’s standard for review is not whether the sentencing court abused its discretion. The appellate court may take any action authorized by this division if it clearly and convincingly finds either of the following: (a) That the record does not support the sentencing court’s findings under division . . . (C)(4) of section 2929.14 . . . (b) That the sentence is otherwise contrary to law. {¶7} Thus, reviews of challenges under both R.C. 2929.14(C) and R.C. 2929.41(B)(2) are reviewed under a clear and convincing standard.1 Accordingly, we may sustain Finfrock’s challenges only if we clearly and convincingly find the record fails to support the trial court’s R.C. 2929.14(C)(4) findings or his sentence is otherwise contrary to law under R.C. 2929.41(B)(2). Analysis R.C. 2929.14(C)(4) states: If multiple prison terms are imposed on an offender for convictions of multiple offenses, the court may require the offender to serve the prison terms consecutively if the court finds that the consecutive service is necessary to protect the public from future crime or to punish the offender and that consecutive sentences are not disproportionate to the seriousness of the offender’s conduct and to the danger the offender poses to the public, and if the court also finds any of the following: 1 Finfrock incorrectly asserts challenges under R.C. 2929.41(B)(2) are reviewed for abuse of discretion. -4- Case No. 1-25-58 (a) The offender committed one or more of the multiple offenses while the offender was awaiting trial or sentencing, was under a sanction imposed pursuant to section 2929.16, 2929.17, or 2929.18 of the Revised Code, or was under post-release control for a prior offense. (b) At least two of the multiple offenses were committed as part of one or more courses of conduct, and the harm caused by two or more of the multiple offenses so committed was so great or unusual that no single prison term for any of the offenses committed as part of any of the courses of conduct adequately reflects the seriousness of the offender’s conduct. (c) The offender’s history of criminal conduct demonstrates that consecutive sentences are necessary to protect the public from future crime by the offender. {¶8} Crucially, “[a]s defined in R.C. 2929.01, [a] ‘prison term’ . . . include[s] only sanctions imposed under the Ohio Revised Code, which necessarily limits the scope of ‘prison term’ . . . to those sanctions imposed by Ohio courts.” *State v. Warren*, 2018-Ohio- 4757, ¶ 14 (1st Dist.). Accordingly, a R.C. 2953.08(G)(2)(a) analysis of the R.C. 2929.14(C)(4) factors is inapplicable to the facts of this case where the issue is imposing a consecutive sentence to an out-of-state prison term. Therefore, our analysis is limited to R.C. 2953.08(G)(2)(b) and whether the sentence imposed is otherwise contrary to law. {¶9} While R.C. 2929.14(C)(4) is limited to prison terms imposed under the Ohio Revised Code, R.C. 2929.41(B)

(2) explicitly gives trial courts authority to impose a prison term consecutively with an out-of-state prison term. R.C. 2929.41(B)(2) states: If a court of this state imposes a prison term upon the offender for the commission of a felony and a court of another state or the United States also has imposed a prison term upon the offender for the commission of a felony, the court of this state may order that the offender serve the prison term it -5- Case No. 1-25-58 imposes consecutively to any prison term imposed upon the offender by the court of another state or the United States. {¶10} In support of his notion that the trial court erred in imposing his sentence consecutively with the Minnesota sentence, Finfrock suggests “he is aging out of criminality and no longer a danger to the public,” and “his conduct in this case did not justify additional prison time insofar as he attempted to notify the sheriff when he moved to Minnesota and properly registered himself in Minnesota.” (Appellant’s Brief at 5). Finfrock offers no authority for the proposition that either assertion demonstrates his sentence is contrary to law. Accordingly, we find Finfrock has failed to clearly and convincingly establish that the imposition of consecutive sentences under R.C. 2929.41(B)(2) is contrary to law. {¶11} Finfrock’s first assignment of error is overruled.

Second Assignment of Error The trial court violated R.C. 2929.14 by imposing the costs of prosecution, including extradition costs, after finding appellant to be indigent. {¶12} In his second assignment of error, Finfrock contends the trial court erred by imposing the costs of prosecution, including the extradition costs. Specifically, he argues the trial court violated R.C. 2949.14 which limits the clerk of courts to collect costs only from nonindigent persons convicted of a felony. -6- Case No. 1-25-58 Standard of Review {¶13} Finfrock failed to object to the trial court’s order that he pay the costs of prosecution. “The failure to object to a trial court’s order to pay the costs of prosecution . . . waives all but plain error on review.” *State v. West*, 2022-Ohio-4069, ¶ 23 (3d Dist.). “To recognize plain error, we must find obvious error affecting such substantial rights that the error was outcome-determinative.” *State v. Henslee*, 2017-Ohio-5786, ¶ 13 (5th Dist.), citing *State v. Noling*, 2002-Ohio-7044, ¶ 62. “In the context of sentencing, outcome- determinative means an error that resulted in a sentence which is contrary to law.” *Id.* “Notice of plain error . . . is to be taken with the utmost caution, under exceptional circumstances and only to prevent a manifest miscarriage of justice.” *State v. Long*, 53 Ohio St.2d 91 (1978), paragraph three of the syllabus. Analysis {¶14} R.C. 2947.23(A)(1) states “[i]n all criminal cases, including violations of ordinances, the judge or magistrate shall include in the sentence the costs of prosecution . . . and render a judgment against the defendant for such costs.” (Emphasis added.) R.C. 2949.14 states the following: Upon conviction of a nonindigent person for a felony, the clerk of the court of common pleas shall make and certify under the clerk’s hand and seal of the court, a complete itemized bill of the costs made in such prosecution, including the sum paid by the board of county commissioners, certified by the county auditor, for the arrest and return of the person on the requisition of the governor, or on the request of the governor to the president of the United States, or on the return of the fugitive by a -7- Case No. 1-25-58 designated agent pursuant to a waiver of extradition except in cases of parole violation. The clerk shall attempt to collect the costs from the

person convicted. (Emphasis added.) {¶15} Finfrock points to State v. Beckwith, 2022-Ohio-2362 (8th Dist.), and State v. Snowden, 2019-Ohio-3006 (2d Dist.), for the proposition that extradition costs can only be imposed upon and collected from nonindigent defendants pursuant to R.C. 2949.14 and the trial court was, therefore, required to conduct an analysis of his ability to pay the extradition costs. However, Snowden did not find that trial courts are barred from imposing extradition costs, but merely determined that the defendant there failed to prove his indigency. Snowden at ¶ 94-95. By contrast, the court in Beckwith held that extradition costs are excluded from general prosecution costs, reasoning that because R.C. 2949.14 limits the collection of extradition costs to nonindigent defendants, those expenses cannot be broadly categorized as part of the standard costs of prosecution. Beckwith at ¶ 29. {¶16} The Supreme Court of Ohio has directly addressed the intersection between R.C. 2947.23 and R.C. 2949.14, holding: R.C. 2949.14 does not govern a court's ability to assess costs. It governs only a clerk's ability to collect assessed costs from nonindigent defendants. Moreover, R.C. 2947.23 does not prohibit a court from assessing costs against an indigent defendant; rather it requires a court to assess costs against all convicted defendants. (Emphasis in original.) State v. White, 2004-Ohio-5989, ¶ 8. Therefore, since a trial court is not prohibited from imposing costs of prosecution against an indigent defendant, and, in fact, is required to do so, the only remaining question is whether extradition costs are -8- Case No. 1-25-58 included in the definition of "costs of prosecution." The Supreme Court of Ohio has addressed the definition of "costs of prosecution" as follows: The phrase "costs of prosecution" has not been statutorily defined. However, this court clarified the term "costs" in State ex rel. Franklin Cty. Commrs. v. Guilbert, 77 Ohio St. 333, 338 (1907). "Costs, in the sense the word is generally used in this state, may be defined as being the statutory fees to which officers, witnesses, jurors, and others are entitled for their services in an action or prosecution, and which the statutes authorize to be taxed and included in the judgment or sentence." City of Middleburg Hts. v. Quinones, 2008-Ohio-6811, ¶ 8. Pursuant to the Supreme Court's definition in Quinones, we agree with the Twelfth District's reasoning that extradition costs are prosecution costs, because "extradition costs are directly related to a criminal prosecution in that the prosecution cannot proceed unless the accused is brought within the trial court's jurisdiction." State v. Ball, 2023-Ohio-4352, ¶ 10 (12th Dist.). We further note that R.C. 2949.14 includes costs "for the arrest and return of the person" as costs of prosecution to be collected by the clerk of courts. {¶17} Consequently, Finfrock's reliance on Beckwith and Snowden is misplaced. Under the controlling precedent of the Supreme Court of Ohio, R.C. 2949.14 restricts only the clerk's ability to collect costs, not the trial court's statutory obligation under R.C. 2947.23 to assess them. Because bringing an indicted defendant before the court to answer to criminal charges is an absolute prerequisite for prosecution of the case, extradition expenses are fundamentally "costs of prosecution." Because the trial court is required to assess these costs against all defendants, its judgment imposing extradition costs is affirmed. -9- Case No. 1-25-58 {¶18} Finfrock's second assignment of error is overruled. Conclusion {¶19} Having found no error prejudicial to the

Appellant herein in the particulars assigned and argued in the assignments of error, we affirm the judgment of the Allen County Court of Common Pleas. Judgment Affirmed ZIMMERMAN, P.J. and WALDICK, J., concur. -10- Case No. 1-25-58

JUDGMENT ENTRY

For the reasons stated in the opinion of this Court, the assignments of error are overruled and it is the judgment and order of this Court that the judgment of the trial court is affirmed with costs assessed to Appellant for which judgment is hereby rendered. The cause is hereby remanded to the trial court for execution of the judgment for costs. It is further ordered that the Clerk of this Court certify a copy of this Court's judgment entry and opinion to the trial court as the mandate prescribed by App.R. 27; and serve a copy of this Court's judgment entry and opinion on each party to the proceedings and note the date of service in the docket. See App.R. 30. Mark C. Miller, Judge William R. Zimmerman, Judge Juergen A. Waldick, Judge DATED: /jlm -11-