

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

Goodykoontz v. Moore

2026-Ohio-938 · No. 115755 · Decided March 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The Eighth District Court of Appeals dismissed David Goodykoontz’s procedendo action against Judge Lauren C. Moore as moot. The trial court had ruled on all four underlying motions involving motions for new trial and petitions for postconviction relief.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Eighth Appellate District, Cuyahoga County
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Eileen A. Gallagher; Michelle J. Sheehan; Mary J. Boyle
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Eighth Appellate District, Cuyahoga County
DECIDED	March 18, 2026
DOCKET	115755
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Original action in procedendo seeking to compel a trial judge to rule on motions for leave to file a motion for new trial and petitions for postconviction relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Ohio Court of Appeals opinion
PARTIES	David Goodykoontz, Relator v. Judge Lauren C. Moore, Respondent

TOPICS

- mootness
- appellate procedure
- post-conviction relief
- motion for new trial
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- appellate procedure
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the procedendo action was moot after the respondent judge entered rulings on all four matters for which the relator sought compelled action.

HOLDINGS

- 1. A procedendo action seeking to compel rulings is moot when the respondent judge has ruled on all of the matters identified in the action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The four journal entries establish that the trial court has proceeded to judgment on the four outstanding matters and that this procedendo action is moot.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Goodykoontz had filed motions for leave to file a late motion for new trial and petitions for postconviction relief in two underlying criminal cases. The trial judge entered journal entries denying two of the matters on November 19, 2025, and denying the remaining two matters on February 5, 2026. Because the trial court had ruled on all four matters, no unresolved duty remained for a procedendo writ to enforce.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Goodykoontz filed a procedendo action seeking rulings on four matters pending in two underlying criminal cases. The respondent judge successively filed motions to dismiss based on mootness after entering rulings on the matters. After the final two rulings resolved all four outstanding matters, the Court of Appeals dismissed the procedendo action as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

OPINION

Goodykoontz v. Moore
2026 Ohio 938
PER CURIAM.
[Cite as Goodykoontz v. Moore, 2026-Ohio-938.]
COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO
EIGHTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA
DAVID GOODYKOONTZ, : Relator, : No. 115755 v. : JUDGE LAUREN C. MOORE, :
Respondent. :
JOURNAL ENTRY AND OPINION
JUDGMENT: WRIT DISMISSED
DATED: March 18, 2026 Writ of Procedendo Motion No. 592150 Order No. 593014 Appearances:
David Goodykoontz, pro se. Michael C. O’Malley, Cuyahoga County Prosecuting Attorney, and
Regina A. Russo, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for respondent. EILEEN A. GALLAGHER, J.:

On October 21, 2025 the relator, David Goodykoontz, commenced this procedendo action against the respondent, Judge Lauren Moore, to compel the judge to rule on motions for leave to file a motion for new trial and postconviction- relief petitions that he filed in the two underlying cases, State v. Goodykoontz, Cuyahoga C.P. Nos. CR-19-641800-A and CR-20-647818-A. On November 21, 2025 the respondent judge moved to dismiss the writ action on the grounds of mootness. Attached to the motion were copies of two certified journal entries: (1) a November 19, 2025 entry denying the motion for leave to file a late motion for new trial and (2) a November 19, 2025 entry denying the petition for postconviction relief. Recognizing that this motion to dismiss resolved two of the four outstanding matters, this court granted the motion to dismiss, in part, and denied it, in part. On February 5, 2026 the respondent judge filed a renewed motion to dismiss on the grounds of mootness. Attached to the motion were copies of the following certified journal entries: (1) the November 19, 2025 journal entry denying the motion for leave to file late motion for new trial in case No. CR-19-641800, (2) the November 19, 2025 journal entry denying the petition for postconviction relief in case No. CR-20-647818, (3) a February 5, 2026 journal entry denying the petition for postconviction relief in case No. CR-19-641800 and (4) a February 5, 2026 journal entry denying the motion for new trial in case No. CR-20-647818. The relator has not filed a brief in opposition. The four journal entries establish that the trial court has proceeded to judgment on the four outstanding matters and that this procedendo action is moot. Accordingly, this court grants the respondent judge's motion to dismiss and dismisses this procedendo action. Relator to pay costs; costs waived. This court directs the clerk of courts to serve all parties notice of the judgment and its date of entry upon the journal as required by Civ.R. 58(B). Writ dismissed.

EILEEN A. GALLAGHER, JUDGE
MICHELLE J. SHEEHAN, A.J., and
MARY J. BOYLE, J., CONCUR