

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

State v. Jones

2025-Ohio-5526 · No. No. 115113 · Decided December 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The Eighth District Court of Appeals of Ohio affirmed Lavelle Jones’s consecutive sentences for receiving stolen property and fraudulent actions concerning a vehicle identification number. The court held that the trial court made the required findings under Ohio Revised Code 2929.14(C)(4) and that the record supported those findings, particularly in light of Jones’s related federal convictions and parole status.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Eighth Appellate District, Cuyahoga County
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Eileen T. Gallagher, P.J.; Mary J. Boyle, J.; Anita Laster Mays, J.
JURISDICTION	Ohio Court of Appeals, Eighth Appellate District, Cuyahoga County
DECIDED	December 11, 2025
DOCKET	No. 115113
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Jones pleaded guilty to receiving stolen property and fraudulent action concerning a vehicle identification number and was sentenced to consecutive prison terms. He appealed, challenging whether the record clearly and convincingly supported the findings required for consecutive sentences.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under R.C. 2953.08(G)(2), the reviewing court determines whether it can clearly and convincingly find that the record does not support the trial court’s consecutive-sentence findings. The reviewing court must be able to ascertain evidence supporting those findings from the record.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion
PARTIES	Lavelle Jones v. State of Ohio

TOPICS

sentencing

criminal procedure

appellate procedure

standard of review

sentencing guidelines

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal law

criminal sentencing

Ohio appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court's findings that consecutive sentences were necessary to protect the public or punish Jones and were not disproportionate to the seriousness of his conduct were supported by the record.
2. Whether the trial court properly applied the statutory requirements governing consecutive sentences.

HOLDINGS

1. A trial court imposing consecutive sentences must make the findings required by R.C. 2929.14(C)(4) at the sentencing hearing and incorporate those findings into the sentencing entry.
2. The record did not clearly and convincingly fail to support the trial court's findings, so the consecutive sentences were lawful and were affirmed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Consecutive sentences are imposed because the Court believes it is necessary to protect the public from future crime and/or punish the offender and are not disproportionate to the seriousness of your conduct. Additionally, the Court finds the offender committed one or more of the offenses while awaiting trial or sentencing or was under sanction or was under parole or post-release control for a prior offense and that the defendant's history of criminal conduct demonstrates consecutive sentences are necessary to protect the public from future crime by the offender." (Tr. 17-18)

"From our review of the transcript, we cannot clearly and convincingly find that the record does not support the trial court's findings in support of its imposition of consecutive sentences." (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jones was charged with offenses arising from his participation in a scheme involving stolen vehicle parts and altered vehicle identification numbers. He committed the offenses while on federal parole for related convictions involving the sale or receipt of stolen vehicles and conspiracy to commit such acts. After pleading guilty to receiving stolen property and fraudulent action concerning a vehicle identification number, Jones received consecutive sentences of eighteen months and twelve months.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jones was indicted on two counts of receiving stolen property and five counts of fraudulent actions concerning a vehicle identification number. After pleading guilty to one count of each offense, the remaining charges were nolle. The Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas imposed consecutive sentences of eighteen months and twelve months. Jones appealed, and the Eighth District affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The case was remanded to the trial court only for execution of the affirmed sentence; the appellate court directed that a special mandate issue.

CASES CITED

- State v. Bonnell, 2014-Ohio-3177, ¶¶ 26, 29, 37
- State v. Edmonson, 86 Ohio St.3d 324, 326 (1999)
- State v. Smith, 2020-Ohio-3666, ¶ 19
- State v. Johnson, 2016-Ohio-1536, ¶ 7 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Wells, 2021-Ohio-2585, ¶ 71 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Sheline, 2019-Ohio-528, ¶ 176 (8th Dist.)