

OHIO COURT OF APPEALS, NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

State v. Coleman

2026-Ohio-1701 · No. 2025CA0022-M · Decided May 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The Ohio Ninth District Court of Appeals affirmed Bareon Coleman's convictions for two counts of burglary and consecutive prison sentences. The court rejected challenges concerning suppression of jailhouse statements, authentication of cell-phone location data, interpretation of an interview recording, admission of surveillance video, and the manifest weight of the evidence.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Ohio Court of Appeals, Ninth Judicial District
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jill Flagg Lanzinger; Sutton, J.; Stevenson, J.
JURISDICTION	Ohio Court of Appeals, Ninth Judicial District, Medina County
DECIDED	May 11, 2026
DOCKET	2025CA0022-M
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Coleman appealed his jury convictions for two counts of burglary and the resulting consecutive prison sentences, challenging the denial of his motion to suppress, the admission of cell-phone and video evidence, the effectiveness of trial counsel, and the manifest weight of the evidence.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Suppression rulings present mixed questions of law and fact: factual findings are accepted if supported by competent, credible evidence, while the application of the law to those facts is reviewed de novo. Unpreserved evidentiary errors are reviewed only for plain error. Ineffective-assistance claims are governed by the Strickland deficient-performance and prejudice test. A manifest-weight challenge requires the appellate court to review the entire record and determine whether the factfinder clearly lost its way, with reversal reserved for the exceptional case.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Ohio Court of Appeals opinion
PARTIES	Bareon Coleman v. State of Ohio

TOPICS

criminal procedure

suppression of evidence

right to counsel

ineffective assistance

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal law

criminal procedure

evidence

constitutional law

appellate practice

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court violated Coleman's Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights by denying suppression of statements made to Detective Lubinsky after indictment and in the absence of retained counsel.
2. Whether the trial court erred by admitting Detective Lubinsky's testimony regarding cell-phone location data without proper authentication and in violation of the Confrontation Clause.
3. Whether trial counsel was ineffective for failing to object to Detective Lubinsky's interpretation of inaudible portions of Coleman's recorded interview.
4. Whether the trial court erred by admitting a video recording of exterior surveillance footage under Evid.R. 1002.
5. Whether Coleman's burglary convictions were against the manifest weight of the evidence.

HOLDINGS

1. The trial court properly denied suppression because Coleman was advised of and voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waived his Miranda right to counsel, and he never unequivocally requested that counsel be present.
2. The challenge failed because Coleman did not object to Detective Lubinsky's testimony at trial and did not argue plain error on appeal; the court would not construct a plain-error argument for him.
3. Coleman did not establish ineffective assistance because counsel's failure to object could have been a reasonable trial strategy, and an officer who heard the conversation may clarify inaudible portions of a recording.
4. The challenge to admission of the surveillance-footage video was forfeited because Coleman did not object at trial and did not present a plain-error argument on appeal.
5. Coleman's convictions were not against the manifest weight of the evidence because the jury did not clearly lose its way and this was not the exceptional case in which the evidence weighed heavily against conviction.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Accordingly, this Court grants deference to the trial court's findings of fact but conducts a de novo review of whether the trial court applied the appropriate legal standard to those facts." (¶ 18)

"A reversal on this basis is reserved for the exceptional case in which the evidence weighs heavily against the conviction." (¶ 36)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Coleman was accused of forcibly entering S.G.'s condominium on July 6 and July 7, 2024, while S.G. was out of town, and stealing designer merchandise and personal property. The State presented an interior security video on which S.G. identified Coleman, exterior surveillance footage, vehicle-camera evidence, cell-phone location data and call logs, and testimony from law-enforcement officers. After his indictment, Coleman spoke with Detective Lubinsky at the Medina County Jail after receiving and waiving Miranda rights; he denied involvement and claimed to have been at a local bar during the burglaries.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A Medina County grand jury indicted Coleman on two counts of burglary under R.C. 2911.12(A)(3). The trial court denied his motion to suppress statements made at the county jail, and a jury found him guilty on both counts. The trial court imposed consecutive sentences of 18 months and 30 months. The Ohio Court of Appeals overruled all five assignments of error and affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- State v. Burnside, 2003-Ohio-5372, ¶ 8
- State v. Mills, 62 Ohio St.3d 357, 366 (1992)
- State v. Fanning, 1 Ohio St.3d 19, 20 (1982)
- State v. McNamara, 124 Ohio App.3d 706, 710 (4th Dist. 1997)
- State v. Booth, 2003-Ohio-829, ¶ 12 (9th Dist.)
- State v. Huguley, 2017-Ohio-8300, ¶ 9 (9th Dist.)
- Davis v. United States, 512 U.S. 452, 459 (1994)
- State v. Taylor, 2024-Ohio-1752, ¶ 24
- Montejo v. Louisiana, 556 U.S. 778, 786 (2009)
- State v. Robertson, 2024-Ohio-2848, ¶ 54
- State v. Moorer, 2016-Ohio-7679, ¶ 11 (9th Dist.)
- State v. Singer, 2023-Ohio-2636, ¶ 26 (9th Dist.)
- State v. Gondor, 2006-Ohio-6679, ¶ 62
- Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 687 (1984)
- State v. Bradley, 42 Ohio St.3d 136 (1989), paragraph two of the syllabus
- State v. Sowell, 2016-Ohio-8025, ¶ 138
- State v. Carter, 2017-Ohio-8847, ¶ 27 (9th Dist.)
- State v. Coleman, 85 Ohio St.3d 129, 141 (1999)
- State v. Heineman, 2016-Ohio-3058, ¶ 67 (8th Dist.)

- State v. Warmus, 2011-Ohio-5827, ¶ 26 (8th Dist.)
- State v. Granakis, 2017-Ohio-8428, ¶ 29 (9th Dist.)
- State v. Miller, 2007-Ohio-370, ¶ 10 (9th Dist.)
- State v. Marshall, 2025-Ohio-2283, ¶ 31 (9th Dist.)
- State v. Yates, 2020-Ohio-6991, ¶ 24 (9th Dist.)
- State v. Perenkovich, 2025-Ohio-521, ¶ 38 (5th Dist.)
- State v. Gray, 2009-Ohio-3165, ¶ 7
- State v. Otten, 33 Ohio App.3d 339, 340 (9th Dist. 1986)
- State v. Croghan, 2019-Ohio-3970, ¶ 26
- State v. Harris, 2024-Ohio-196, ¶ 19
- State v. Petersen, 2025-Ohio-877, ¶ 32 (9th Dist.)
- State v. Calhoun, 2021-Ohio-1713, ¶ 25

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/ohio-court-of-appeals-ninth-judicial-district-medina-county-ohio-court-of-appeals-ninth-judicial-dis/2026/state-v-coleman-vej7rhk0>