

COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO, SEVENTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

State v. Adams

2026-Ohio-1128 · No. 25 MA 0080 · Decided March 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The Ohio Seventh District Court of Appeals affirmed Shane Thomas Adams's consecutive sentences for two second-degree felony robbery convictions. The court held that the trial court made the findings required by Ohio Revised Code section 2929.14(C)(4) and that the record supported those findings. The court rejected Adams's argument because appellate courts may not independently reweigh the evidence supporting felony sentencing findings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Seventh Appellate District
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Cheryl L. Waite, P.J.; Mark A. Hanni, J.; Katelyn Dickey, J.
JURISDICTION	Ohio Court of Appeals, Seventh Appellate District, Mahoning County
DECIDED	March 30, 2026
DOCKET	25 MA 0080
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant appealed the Mahoning County Court of Common Pleas' imposition of consecutive sentences following his guilty pleas to two second-degree felony robbery counts.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under R.C. 2953.08(G)(2), an appellate court may modify or vacate a felony sentence only if it clearly and convincingly finds that the record does not support the sentencing court's statutory findings or that the sentence is otherwise contrary to law. The appellate court may not independently weigh the evidence or substitute its judgment for the trial court's sentencing judgment.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Ohio Court of Appeals opinion
PARTIES	Shane Thomas Adams v. State of Ohio

TOPICS

- sentencing
- standard of review
- appellate procedure
- criminal procedure
- preservation of error

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal sentencing

Ohio appellate procedure

consecutive sentences

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the record clearly and convincingly failed to support the trial court's findings under R.C. 2929.14(C)(4) imposing consecutive sentences.
2. Whether the appellate court could independently reweigh the evidence concerning the seriousness of the harm and the course of conduct supporting consecutive sentences.

HOLDINGS

1. The record clearly and convincingly supported the trial court's findings required by R.C. 2929.14(C)(4), including that the offenses were part of a course of conduct and caused harm so great or unusual that a single prison term would not adequately reflect the seriousness of the conduct.
2. An appellate court may not conduct a freestanding inquiry into whether a felony sentence is appropriate or independently reweigh the evidence supporting consecutive-sentence findings.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In order to impose consecutive terms of imprisonment, a trial court is required to make the findings mandated by R.C. 2929.14(C)(4) at the sentencing hearing and incorporate its findings into its sentencing entry, but it has no obligation to state reasons to support its findings.” (¶13)

“We may not independently weigh the evidence and substitute our judgment for that of the trial court regarding the sentence.” (¶28)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Adams and a codefendant committed a series of robberies at businesses in Mahoning and Trumbull Counties, including two Mahoning County gas stations and a Trumbull County pizza shop. The perpetrators led police on a vehicle and foot chase before being arrested. The record indicated threats of physical harm, a suggestion that a gun was present, use of robbery proceeds to obtain crack cocaine, multiple victims and locations, and risks to law-enforcement officers during the attempted escape.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Adams was indicted in Mahoning County on two robbery counts arising from a multijurisdictional crime spree. He pleaded guilty under a Crim.R. 11 agreement, and the trial court imposed concurrent 3-to-4.5-year sentences on the two counts, to be served consecutively to his sentence in a related Trumbull County aggravated-robbery case. Adams appealed, arguing that the record did not support the trial court's findings under R.C. 2929.14(C)(4). The Seventh District affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- State v. Marcum, 2016-Ohio-1002
- State v. Glover, 2024-Ohio-5195
- State v. Gwynne, 2023-Ohio-3851
- Cross v. Ledford, 161 Ohio St. 469
- State v. Hornbuckle, 2022-Ohio-2025 (7th Dist.)
- State v. Bonnell, 2014-Ohio-3177
- State v. Williams, 2015-Ohio-4100 (7th Dist.)
- State v. Jones, State v. Jones, 2020-Ohio-6729
- State v. Spack, 2026-Ohio-135 (7th Dist.)
- State v. Alexander, 2025-Ohio-5215 (7th Dist.)
- State v. Talbert, 2025-Ohio-4922 (7th Dist.)
- State v. Hamilton, 2025-Ohio-4838 (7th Dist.)
- State v. Corlett, 2025-Ohio-2907 (7th Dist.)
- State v. Yu, 2025-Ohio-2377 (7th Dist.)
- State v. Rayle, 2025-Ohio-1912 (7th Dist.)
- State v. Bowser, 2010-Ohio-951 (2d Dist.)
- State v. Pyle, 2021-Ohio-1075 (6th Dist.)
- State v. Myers, 2005-Ohio-447 (2d Dist.)
- State v. McDaniel, 2005-Ohio-3581 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Williams, 2013-Ohio-2201 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Sparks, 2024-Ohio-2362 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Glenn, 2004-Ohio-2917 (11th Dist.)
- State v. Twiley, 2022-Ohio-4751 (7th Dist.)
- State v. Workman, 2017-Ohio-8638 (12th Dist.)