

OHIO COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT, SHELBY
COUNTY

Chambers v. Chambers

2026-Ohio-1620 · No. 17-25-18 · Decided May 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The Ohio Third District Court of Appeals affirmed a domestic violence civil protection order issued in favor of Jamie Chambers against Matthew Chambers. The court held that competent, credible evidence supported the order, that the trial court properly declined to consider materials not introduced at the hearing, and that the appellant’s remaining arguments were either without merit or insufficiently developed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Ohio Court of Appeals, Third Appellate District, Shelby County
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John R. Willamowski; Mark C. Miller; Juergen A. Waldick
JURISDICTION	Ohio Court of Appeals, Third Appellate District, Shelby County
DECIDED	May 4, 2026
DOCKET	17-25-18
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Respondent appealed pro se from the Shelby County Court of Common Pleas, Domestic Relations Division, judgment adopting a magistrate's decision issuing a domestic violence civil protection order.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The issuance of a domestic violence civil protection order is reviewed under the manifest-weight-of-the-evidence standard. The order will not be reversed if some competent, credible evidence supports the trial court's decision. The appellant bears the burden of affirmatively demonstrating trial-court error. Issues concerning exhibits not proffered at the hearing are waived, and an appellate court may disregard an assignment of error that is not separately argued as required by App.R. 16(A).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Ohio Court of Appeals opinion
PARTIES	Matthew Chambers v. Jamie Chambers

TOPICS

domestic violence

family law procedure

standard of review

appellate procedure

evidence

PRACTICE AREAS

family law

domestic violence

appellate procedure

evidence

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the domestic violence civil protection order was against the manifest weight of the evidence or unsupported by sufficient evidence under R.C. 3113.31.
2. Whether the trial court erred or violated Matthew's due-process rights by refusing to consider documents and exhibits that he did not introduce at the full hearing.
3. Whether the evidence established domestic violence through menacing by stalking under R.C. 2903.211.
4. Whether the trial court denied Matthew a fair and impartial hearing by relying on testimony and alleged hearsay when Matthew did not separately argue the assignment of error in his brief.

HOLDINGS

1. The order was supported by some competent, credible evidence and was not against the manifest weight of the evidence. Jamie's testimony concerning repeated physical abuse, threats, the firearm, and post-separation contact, together with corroborating testimony, was sufficient to satisfy the preponderance-of-the-evidence burden under R.C. 3113.31.
2. The trial court did not err in refusing to consider the text messages and law-enforcement records because Matthew did not produce or offer them into evidence during the full hearing and did not prompt a ruling on their admissibility.
3. The trial court was not required to find a violation of R.C. 2903.211 because R.C. 3113.31(A)(1)(a)(ii) defines domestic violence through disjunctive alternatives. Domestic violence could be established by placing a person in fear of imminent serious physical harm by threat of force, without proving menacing by stalking. In any event, the evidence of repeated physical abuse independently established domestic violence under R.C. 3113.31(A)(1)(a)(i).
4. The court could disregard the fourth assignment of error because Matthew's brief contained no corresponding argument as required by App.R. 16(A)(7).

KEY QUOTATIONS

"When the respondent challenges the trial court's decision to issue a DVCPO, appellate courts determine whether the determination is against the manifest weight of the evidence." (¶ 9)

"These clauses are written in the disjunctive, such that a person may commit an act of domestic violence by the threat of force or by violating the menacing by stalking statute (R.C. 2903.211), which does not require a threat of force." (¶ 22)

"Thus, his challenge does not comply with the requirements of App.R. 16(A)." (¶ 26)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jamie and Matthew Chambers married in July 2022, had a child in December 2022, and separated on December 28, 2024. Jamie testified that Matthew had repeatedly physically abused her, threatened to kill her, used a gun to threaten her, and contacted and located her through multiple social-media accounts and in-person searches after their separation. A witness corroborated portions of Jamie's account, while Matthew denied some allegations and gave inconsistent testimony concerning the location of his firearm. The trial court found Jamie's testimony credible and issued a domestic violence civil protection order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jamie Chambers petitioned for a domestic violence civil protection order under R.C. 3113.31. After a full hearing, the magistrate issued an order effective through May 28, 2030. The trial court denied Matthew Chambers's motion to add evidence, overruled his objections, and adopted the magistrate's decision. The court of appeals overruled all four assignments of error and affirmed, remanding only for execution of the judgment for costs.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The cause was remanded only for execution of the judgment for costs, and the clerk was directed to certify the judgment and opinion to the trial court as the mandate under App.R. 27.

CASES CITED

- Clementz-McBeth v. Craft, 2012-Ohio-985, ¶ 12 (3d Dist.)
- J.M.P. v. J.R.P., 2026-Ohio-367, ¶ 12 (10th Dist.)
- Hasbrook v. Hasbrook, 2025-Ohio-418, ¶ 5 (3d Dist.)
- State v. Harrison, 2015-Ohio-1419, ¶ 18 (3d Dist.)
- Craft, 2012-Ohio-985, at ¶ 13 (3d Dist.)
- Baltes v. Baltes, 2012-Ohio-4890, ¶ 30 (11th Dist.)
- Wilson v. Wilson, 2023-Ohio-4243, ¶ 30 (12th Dist.)
- Felton v. Felton, 79 Ohio St. 3d 34, 44, fn. 9 (1997)
- Durastanti v. Durastanti, 2020-Ohio-4687, ¶¶ 17-18 (1st Dist.)
- Frisby v. Frisby, 2025-Ohio-5874, ¶ 20 (4th Dist.)
- M.S. v. Ives, 2025-Ohio-5312, ¶ 46 (5th Dist.)
- Bigler v. Haynes, 2025-Ohio-5105, ¶ 6 (3d Dist.)
- Jabr v. Columbus, 2023-Ohio-2781, ¶ 11 (10th Dist.)
- Aston v. Aston, 2018-Ohio-908, ¶ 9 (11th Dist.)
- Edelstein v. Edelstein, 2023-Ohio-2503, ¶ 21 (1st Dist.)

- Bullard v. Alley, 2014-Ohio-1016, ¶ 21 (4th Dist.)
- T.C. v. M.C., 2025-Ohio-2995, ¶ 31 (10th Dist.)
- Adams v. June, 2021-Ohio-168, ¶ 8 (3d Dist.)
- In re B.P., 2015-Ohio-48, ¶ 10 (9th Dist.)
- Pierce v. Workman, 2023-Ohio-2022, ¶ 19 (3d Dist.)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/ohio-court-of-appeals-third-appellate-district-shelby-county-ohio-court-of-appeals-third-appellate-d/2026/chambers-v-chambers-vraulru1>