

OHIO COURT OF APPEALS, TENTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

State ex rel. Barnette v. Chambers-Smith

2026-Ohio-1571 (10th Dist.) · No. 25AP-398 · Decided April 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The Ohio Tenth District Court of Appeals overruled Lorenza Barnette’s objections to a magistrate’s decision, granted the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction’s motion for summary judgment, and denied a writ of mandamus. The court held that Barnette’s October 26, 2011 sentencing entry imposing consecutive life sentences without parole remained operative after later post-release-control proceedings. The court concluded that the 2021 entry addressed only post-release control and did not alter the original prison sentences.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Ohio Court of Appeals, Tenth Appellate District
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Edelstein, J.; Beatty Blunt, J.; Mentel, J.
JURISDICTION	Ohio Court of Appeals, Tenth Appellate District
DECIDED	April 30, 2026
DOCKET	25AP-398
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Original mandamus action challenging ODRC's computation of relator's prison sentence. The court reviewed Barnette's objections to a magistrate's decision recommending summary judgment for the respondent and denial of the writ.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court independently reviewed the matters objected to under Civ.R. 53(D)(4)(d), determining whether the magistrate properly determined factual issues and appropriately applied the law. Summary judgment is proper when no genuine issue of material fact exists, the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law, and reasonable minds can reach only a conclusion adverse to the nonmoving party, with evidence construed most strongly in the nonmoving party's favor.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	Lorenza Barnette v. Annette Chambers-Smith, Director, Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction

TOPICS

remedies

post-conviction relief

summary judgment

appellate procedure

standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

Mandamus

Ohio criminal sentencing

Post-release control

Summary judgment

Appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Barnette established a clear legal right to a writ of mandamus compelling ODRC to alter its records to reflect that the June 28, 2021 judgment imposed no prison sentence.
2. Whether the 2020 Seventh District decision vacating the September 17, 2019 judgment also vacated the original October 26, 2011 sentencing entry.
3. Whether the June 28, 2021 judgment was a resentencing judgment that replaced the original sentences.
4. Whether respondent was entitled to summary judgment on the mandamus petition.

HOLDINGS

1. The 2020 appellate decision vacated only the improper September 17, 2019 post-release-control judgment; it did not vacate the October 26, 2011 judgment imposing the aggravated-murder, kidnapping, and arson sentences.
2. The June 28, 2021 judgment was not a sentencing or resentencing entry; it merely notified Barnette of post-release control for the kidnapping counts and did not eliminate or replace the prison sentences imposed in 2011.
3. Barnette failed to establish a clear legal right to correction of ODRC's records or a clear legal duty requiring respondent to make the requested correction; the writ was therefore properly denied.
4. Respondent was entitled to summary judgment because no genuine issue of material fact existed and respondent was entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“At most, the trial court was permitted by R.C. 2929.191 to conduct a hearing for the limited purpose of giving him proper notice of post-release control and imposing post-release control for the two kidnapping counts.” (¶ 10)

“Therefore, we overrule Mr. Barnette’s four objections to the magistrate’s decision, adopt the magistrate’s decision as our own, including findings of fact and conclusions of law, grant respondent’s motion for summary judgment, and deny Mr. Barnette’s petition for a writ of mandamus.” (¶ 14)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

In 2011, a jury found Lorenza Barnette guilty of two aggravated murders, two kidnappings, and arson, and the trial court imposed consecutive sentences including life imprisonment without parole for each aggravated-murder count. The trial court later conducted a hearing to impose mandatory post-release control on the

kidnapping counts, but the Seventh District held that the hearing had improperly been treated as resentencing and vacated the resulting 2019 judgment. On remand, the trial court conducted a limited post-release-control notification hearing in 2021; that entry did not alter the original prison sentences. Barnette nevertheless argued that the 2021 entry superseded the 2011 sentencing entry and required ODRC to treat him as serving no prison sentence.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Barnette was convicted and sentenced in 2011 to consecutive sentences, including life without parole for two aggravated-murder counts. After the trial court conducted a 2019 post-release-control hearing characterized as resentencing, the Seventh District reversed and vacated the resulting judgment and remanded for a limited post-release-control hearing. The trial court conducted that limited hearing and entered judgment on June 28, 2021. Barnette then filed this mandamus action seeking correction of ODRC records to reflect what he claimed was the sentence imposed in 2021. A magistrate recommended granting respondent's summary-judgment motion and denying the writ; the appellate court independently reviewed and adopted that decision.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

CASES CITED

- State v. Barnette, 2014-Ohio-5673 (7th Dist.)
- State v. Barnette, 2020-Ohio-6817 (7th Dist.)
- State v. Harper, State v. Harper, 2020-Ohio-2913
- State ex rel. Pressley v. Industrial Commission, 11 Ohio St.2d 141 (1967)
- Welsh-Huggins v. Jefferson County Prosecutor's Office, 2020-Ohio-5371
- State ex rel. Miller v. Ohio State Highway Patrol, 2013-Ohio-3720
- Starner v. Onda, 2023-Ohio-1955 (10th Dist.)
- Dresher v. Burt, 1996-Ohio-107
- Hinton v. Ohio Department of Youth Services, 2022-Ohio-4783 (10th Dist.)