OCG Bill Review — H.B. 260 (Courts: Statutes Superseded by Court Rules)

Ohio Common Ground · Research Center · ohiocommonground.com

Bill Review No. 005 · RL-2026-045 · 11/16/26 · Version 1.0

Bottom line: H.B. 260 amends 15 sections and repeals 21 sections of the Revised Code that cover the same ground as rules the Ohio Supreme Court has adopted under the 1968 Modern Courts Amendment. They cover grand juries, jury handling, pleas, evidence and court records. Under Article IV, Section 5(B) of the Ohio Constitution, laws that conflict with the Court's procedural rules already have "no further force or effect," provided the rules do not change substantive rights. The sponsors and the Supreme Court describe the bill as removing text the rules have overtaken. OCG confirmed that for the provisions it checked, grand jury size and the retention of conviction and probate records; others, such as the dead man's statute and payment for a sick juror's care, were not compared rule by rule. One example: Ohio statutes still call for a 15-member grand jury and 12 votes to indict, while Criminal Rule 6 sets nine members and seven votes, and the courts have held that the rule controls.[1]

The House passed H.B. 260 95–0 in October 2025. A week later the Senate passed its own version, S.B. 61, 31–0. Each bill then sat in the other chamber's Judiciary Committee. The two versions differ: the Senate's repeals or amends seven provisions the House left alone, including the statutory list of pleas, and adds one the House left out. H.B. 260 had its first Senate hearing on November 10, 2026, before a committee chaired by S.B. 61's sponsor. Every witness in either chamber supported the bill. Section 7 identifies four drafting questions.

Item	Detail
Bill	Am. H.B. 260, 136th General Assembly — "relative to courts and court procedures"
Sponsors	Reps. Mike Odioso (R-30th District) and Adam Mathews (R-56th District); 19 House cosponsors from both parties
House action	Introduced May 13, 2025; five Judiciary hearings; reported as amended and passed 95–0 on Oct 8, 2025
Senate action	Referred to Judiciary Oct 15, 2025; sponsor testimony Nov 10, 2026
Companion	S.B. 61 (Sens. Gavarone and Manning, R): passed the Senate 31–0 on Oct 15, 2025; three House Judiciary hearings (May–June 2026), no vote
Version reviewed	As Passed by the House, with LSC's analysis and LBO's fiscal note for that version, and the As Introduced text

[1] *State v. Pitts*, 2025-Ohio-3012 (5th Dist., Aug. 22, 2025), ¶¶ 13–15, citing *State v. Brown*, 38 Ohio St.3d 305 (1988), paragraph one of the syllabus, https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/rod/docs/pdf/5/2025/2025-Ohio-3012.pdf.

Item	Detail
Lame-duck flag	Yes. Either bill needs passage by the second chamber, and concurrence if amended, before the General Assembly ends.
Catalog no.	Bill Review No. 005 · RL-2026-045 · 11/16/26 · Version 1.0

1. What the bill does, in plain language

H.B. 260 does three things.

1. **Points court rule-making to the Supreme Court's rules.** Municipal court judges' local rules, including those of housing and environmental divisions, must follow the Rules of Superintendence. A guardian's signed guardianship-guide form is kept as those rules provide, not permanently in the court file. A tort defendant may claim that someone not sued shares fault "in accordance with" the Civil Rules, rather than "at any time before trial."
2. **Removes duties that duplicate court rules.** Municipal court defendants lose the statutory option to hold back a counterclaim for a separate suit; Civil Rule 13(A) generally requires a counterclaim arising from the same transaction to be raised in the same case. County court clerks no longer keep a separate permanent account of receipts and disbursements. The common pleas court no longer must name a grand juror as foreperson; Criminal Rule 6 lets it name any qualified elector. The clerk no longer reads the indictment aloud at arraignment unless waived.
3. **Repeals 21 sections outright.**[2]
   - **Court records:** municipal court case-file destruction rules; county court docket indexes; the 50-year retention of conviction records by municipal, county and common pleas clerks; the list of records probate courts must keep (including marriage, naturalization, birth and death records and the adoption index); probate record-keeping methods and public viewing equipment; and preservation and disposal of probate papers.
   - **Evidence:** the "dead man's statute" limiting a party's testimony against an estate or guardian, official reports as evidence, and the rule that civil evidence rules apply in criminal cases.
   - **Grand juries:** the 15-member composition and selection method, and the 12-juror concurrence to indict.
   - **Criminal procedure:** prosecution by information after waiver of indictment, form of pleas, payment for a sick juror's medical care from the judiciary fund, jury separation and sequestration (including in death-penalty cases), the admonition to separated jurors, and applications for depositions.

The remaining amendments update cross-references to the repealed sections, among them R.C. 1901.021 and 2939.03. LBO expects a minimal fiscal effect, mainly the cost of updating court publications.[3]

2. Provision by provision

The Supreme Court's testimony pairs each section with the rule it says covers it.[4] Those rule numbers were current in 2025. The Rules of Superintendence have since been renumbered; the records-retention rules,

---

[2] Ohio Legislative Service Commission, *Bill Analysis: H.B. 260, As Passed by the House*, 136th General Assembly, November 6, 2025, https://www.legislature.ohio.gov/download?key=26533.

[3] Ohio Legislative Service Commission, Legislative Budget Office, *Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement: H.B. 260, As Passed by the House*, October 8, 2025, https://www.legislature.ohio.gov/download?key=26062.

[4] Richard Schuster, Chief Legal Officer, Supreme Court of Ohio, proponent testimony on H.B. 260, House Judiciary Committee, June 18, 2025.

formerly Sup.R. 26 to 26.05, are now Sup.R. 11.28 to 11.33.[5] OCG compared the records-retention provisions with the current rules (section 3). It did not compare the text of every other rule with the statute it would replace.

Statute (R.C.)	What it does now	H.B. 260	Rule cited by the Supreme Court
1901.14 (and cross-reference in 1901.021)	Municipal judges adopt local rules	Rules must follow the Rules of Superintendence	Sup.R. 5
1901.16	Powers of multi-judge municipal courts	Repealed	Sup.R. 4.02
1901.41, 1907.21, 1907.231, 2101.12–.141, 2111.011, 2301.141	Case-file destruction, dockets and indexes, 50-year conviction records, probate records	Repealed or redirected to the Rules of Superintendence	Sup.R. 26
1901.22(F)	Defendant may hold back a counterclaim	Removed	Civ.R. 13(A)
1907.20(C)	County clerk's separate account of receipts	Removed	Sup.R. 26
2307.23(C)	Nonparty-fault defense raised any time before trial	Raised per the Civil Rules	Civ.R. 15
2317.03, 2317.02(F)	Dead man's statute	Repealed	Evid.R. 601, 804
2317.42	Official reports as evidence	Repealed	Evid.R. 803
2939.02, 2939.20	15-member grand jury; 12 votes to indict	Repealed	Crim.R. 6 (nine members; seven votes)
2939.06 (and cross-reference in 2939.03)	Court appoints a grand juror as foreperson	Removed	Crim.R. 6(C)
2941.021	Waiver of indictment; prosecution by information	Repealed	Crim.R. 7
2943.02	Clerk reads indictment at arraignment	Removed	Crim.R. 10
2943.04	Form of pleas	Repealed	Crim.R. 11
2945.30, .31, .33, .34	Sick jurors, jury separation and sequestration, admonition	Repealed (2945.32 is not affected)	Crim.R. 24
2945.41	Civil evidence rules apply in criminal cases	Repealed	Evid.R. 101
2945.50	Depositions in criminal cases	Repealed; related sections now cite the Criminal Rules	Crim.R. 15

3. Context

The constitutional basis. The Modern Courts Amendment (1968) gave the Supreme Court power to adopt rules of practice and procedure and rules of superintendence. Article IV, Section 5(B) provides that procedural rules may not "abridge, enlarge, or modify any substantive right," that they are filed with the General Assembly, which may disapprove them, and that conflicting laws then have "no further force or effect." The sponsors, the Supreme Court and the Ohio State Bar Association all describe H.B. 260 as removing statutes that this process has already overtaken.

The grand jury example. In August 2025, a defendant in Muskingum County argued his indictment was invalid because his grand jury had nine members, not the 15 R.C. 2939.02 requires, and seven jurors signed, not the 12

[5] Supreme Court of Ohio, *Rules of Superintendence for the Courts of Ohio*, Sup.R. 11.31(D)(7), 11.32(E)(1), (2), (7) and 11.33(E)(2), (4), (5) (formerly Sup.R. 26 to 26.05; retention amendments effective April 1, 2025), https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/docs/LegalResources/Rules/superintendence/Superintendence.pdf.

of R.C. 2939.20. The Fifth District Court of Appeals rejected the argument on the merits, citing the Supreme Court's 1988 holding in *State v. Brown* that the number of grand jurors "does not affect a substantive right" and that the statutes are superseded where they conflict with Criminal Rule 6. It also held his arguments barred by res judicata, and noted that his appellate brief did not press the grand jury point.[6] The sections stay in the Code until repealed.

Records retention under the current rules. The records duties the bill removes from statute are covered by the Rules of Superintendence. Documents admissible to prove a prior conviction must be kept 50 years after final judgment in common pleas, municipal and county courts (25 years for most misdemeanor traffic files), as the repealed statutes require. Probate adoption records, birth and death registrations and marriage license records must be kept permanently.[7] The Supreme Court last amended these rules effective April 1, 2025. OCG did not compare the probate public-access and viewing-equipment duties in R.C. 2101.121 with the rules.

How the two versions diverged.

- **Both chambers dropped** the introduced bills' repeal of R.C. 2939.11 and 2939.19 (grand jury reporting and testimony) and the amendment to R.C. 109.04. Sen. Gavarone told the House Judiciary Committee the Senate removed the grand jury provisions because they "were considered substantiative [*sic*] changes rather than procedural."[8] The House record reviewed does not explain its committee changes.
- **The House alone dropped** seven items that S.B. 61 still contains, four repeals and three conforming amendments:
  - repeal of R.C. 2317.40, the business-records rule of evidence;
  - repeal of 2943.03, the list of pleas: guilty, not guilty, former conviction or acquittal, once in jeopardy, and not guilty by reason of insanity, with the conclusive presumption of sanity for a defendant who does not plead insanity;
  - repeal of 2945.12, trial in the defendant's absence;
  - repeal of 2945.45, criminal subpoenas;
  - conforming changes to 2317.41, 2317.422 and 2941.61.
- **The Senate alone added** removal of the municipal court clerk's separate account of receipts and disbursements (R.C. 1901.31(F)).[9]

When	Event
Nov 10, 2026	H.B. 260: Senate Judiciary sponsor testimony
Jun 3, 2026	S.B. 61: House Judiciary 3rd hearing; no vote
May 13 and 20, 2026	S.B. 61: House Judiciary 1st and 2nd hearings
Oct 15, 2025	S.B. 61 reported 7–0 and passed the Senate 31–0; H.B. 260 referred to Senate Judiciary
Oct 8, 2025	H.B. 260 reported as amended and passed the House 95–0, the same day
Sep 24 and Oct 1, 2025	H.B. 260: House Judiciary 3rd and 4th hearings; no witnesses
Jun 11 and 18, 2025	H.B. 260: House Judiciary sponsor and proponent hearings
May 13, 2025	H.B. 260 introduced

[6] *State v. Pitts*, 2025-Ohio-3012 (5th Dist., Aug. 22, 2025), ¶¶ 13–15, citing *State v. Brown*, 38 Ohio St.3d 305 (1988), paragraph one of the syllabus, https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/rod/docs/pdf/5/2025/2025-Ohio-3012.pdf.

[7] Supreme Court of Ohio, *Rules of Superintendence for the Courts of Ohio*, Sup.R. 11.31(D)(7), 11.32(E)(1), (2), (7) and 11.33(E)(2), (4), (5) (formerly Sup.R. 26 to 26.05; retention amendments effective April 1, 2025), https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/docs/LegalResources/Rules/superintendence/Superintendence.pdf.

[8] Sen. Theresa Gavarone, sponsor testimony on S.B. 61, House Judiciary Committee, May 13, 2026.

[9] Ohio Legislative Service Commission, *Bill Analysis: S.B. 61, As Passed by the Senate*, 136th General Assembly; *Sub. S.B. 61, As Passed by the Senate*, https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_136/legislation/sb61/02_PS/html/; *H.B. 260, As Introduced*, https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_136/legislation/hb260/00_IN/pdf/.

When	Event
Jan 28, 2025	S.B. 61 introduced

4. Who is for and against, and why

No opponent testified in either chamber. Every witness filed as a sponsor or proponent except the Ohio Judicial Conference, an interested party whose statement supports S.B. 61.

Affected parties were not contacted for comment before this release. Positions reflect the public record as of November 16, 2026. Responses received later will be added in a revised version.

On the record

Witness	Bill and committee	Position	Stated reasons
Reps. Odioso (R) and Mathews (R), sponsors	H.B. 260: House Judiciary (Jun 11, 2025); Senate Judiciary (Nov 10, 2026)	Sponsor	Conflicts between statutes and court rules "cause confusion for practitioners/parties"; the bill streamlines the Code and "better defines the constitutional separation of powers." The Senate testimony notes the unanimous House votes.
Supreme Court of Ohio (Richard Schuster, Chief Legal Officer; John VanNorman)	H.B. 260: House Judiciary (Jun 18, 2025). S.B. 61: Senate Judiciary (Mar 12, 2025) and House Judiciary (May 20, 2026)	Proponent	Explains the rule-making and disapproval process; lists the rule that corresponds to each section. Testifies on behalf of the Chief Justice and Justices.
Ohio State Bar Association (Mary Amos Augsburger)	Both bills, both chambers	Proponent	The conflicts "lead to unnecessary conflicts that must be resolved by courts"; the bill brings legal clarity.
Sens. Gavarone (R) and Manning (R), S.B. 61 sponsors	S.B. 61: Senate Judiciary (Feb 12, 2025); House Judiciary (May 13, 2026)	Sponsor	Statutes that predate the Modern Courts Amendment set procedure "that should be left for the courts to decide." The Senate removed the grand jury reporting and testimony provisions as substantive.
Ohio Judicial Conference (Paul Pfeifer)	S.B. 61: Senate Judiciary (Oct 1, 2025)	Interested party	"A fair and practical approach" that does not negatively affect judges and courts.

Affected interests with no public position found

Interest	Provision affecting them
Criminal defendants and the defense bar; Office of the Ohio Public Defender	Grand jury, plea, arraignment, jury and deposition statutes repealed
County prosecutors	Same; waiver of indictment and prosecution by information
Clerks of courts; probate judges	Record-keeping, retention and disposal duties move to the Rules of Superintendence
Boards of county commissioners	Statutory duty to furnish probate record books and materials at county expense repealed with R.C. 2101.12
Ohio Department of Health	Probate courts' birth and death record kept "in the form and manner" the Director designates, repealed with R.C. 2101.12

Interest	Provision affecting them
Estates, heirs and guardians	Dead man's statute repealed

5. Pros and cons by lens

These are the arguments each camp would likely make, not documented positions and not OCG positions.

	Conservative lens	Liberal lens
Pros	Respects separation of powers and the 1968 constitutional design. Cleans out obsolete law. LBO expects minimal fiscal effect.	Clearer law for courts and litigants. Removes traps such as dead statutes that invite litigation. Uniform statewide procedure.
Cons	Moves policy such as records retention and juror care from elected legislators to court rules written by judges. The legislature gives up its own text even where the line between procedure and substance is debatable.	Protections for the accused that sit in statute, such as the 15-member grand jury or written plea formalities, would exist only in rules the Court can change. Public-access duties for probate records leave the Code.
Likely split	Separation-of-powers purists vs. legislative-prerogative conservatives	Court-efficiency reformers vs. defense-rights and open-records advocates

Common ground in the record: every vote on either bill has been unanimous, with members of both parties voting yes. **Points either lens could raise:** whether every repealed provision is purely procedural, and why the two chambers' versions differ.

6. Process record

Metric	H.B. 260
Hearings	House Judiciary: 5 (Jun 11, Jun 18, Sep 24, Oct 1, Oct 8, 2025). Senate Judiciary: sponsor testimony Nov 10, 2026
Testimony	Sponsors plus 2 proponents (Supreme Court, Ohio State Bar Association); 0 opponents. S.B. 61 adds the Ohio Judicial Conference as an interested party
Committee to floor	Reported and passed the same day, Oct 8, 2025
House committee vote	13–0 (Oct 8, 2025), per the legislature's votes page.[10] No member-by-member breakdown is posted; the minutes record only that the bill was reported "with sufficient votes."[11]
House floor vote	95–0 (Oct 8, 2025), with members of both parties voting yes[12]
Time in Senate	About 13 months from referral (Oct 15, 2025) to first Senate hearing (Nov 10, 2026)
Companion	S.B. 61: Senate Judiciary reported 7–0 and Senate passed 31–0, both Oct 15, 2025. House Judiciary: three hearings, last on Jun 3, 2026; no vote
Committee leadership	S.B. 61's 2025 Senate testimony was addressed to Chair Manning, a sponsor. H.B. 260's 2026 Senate testimony is addressed to Chair Gavarone, the other S.B. 61 sponsor.
Fiscal note	Minimal fiscal effect; possible minimal costs to update court documentation and publications[13]

[10] Ohio General Assembly, "House Bill 260: Votes," accessed November 16, 2026, https://www.legislature.ohio.gov/legislation/136/hb260/votes; "Senate Bill 61: Votes," https://www.legislature.ohio.gov/legislation/136/sb61/votes.

[11] Ohio House Judiciary Committee, minutes, October 8, 2025.

[12] Ohio General Assembly, "House Bill 260: Votes," accessed November 16, 2026, https://www.legislature.ohio.gov/legislation/136/hb260/votes; "Senate Bill 61: Votes," https://www.legislature.ohio.gov/legislation/136/sb61/votes.

[13] Ohio Legislative Service Commission, Legislative Budget Office, *Fiscal Note & Local Impact Statement: H.B. 260, As Passed by the House*, October 8, 2025, https://www.legislature.ohio.gov/download?key=26062.

Metric	H.B. 260
Lame-duck or omnibus	Lame duck: yes. Omnibus: no; one subject, many sections
Comment requests	None sent before release (2026 lame-duck reviews; see section 4)

7. Drafting issues and implementation risks

Sections 3 and 7 reflect OCG's reading of the bill text and current law. They have not been reviewed by an attorney and are not legal advice.

The text raises four drafting questions. None is rated High. An issue describes what the text does or leaves open, not anyone's intent.

#	Issue (R.C.)	Type	What the text does	Interests affected	Severity
1	**Two different versions.** H.B. 260 and S.B. 61	Textual	The bills share a purpose but not a text. The House version keeps seven items the Senate version repeals or amends (four repeals, three conforming amendments), including the statutory list of pleas with its conclusive presumption of sanity (2943.03) and trial in a defendant's absence (2945.12); the Senate version also removes a municipal clerk duty (1901.31(F)). Neither record explains the House committee's removals. Which list becomes law depends on which bill moves.	Courts; defendants; clerks	Medium
2	**Superintendence rules and the legislative check.** 1901.41, 1907.21, 1907.231, 2101.12–.141, 2301.141	Legal question	The records duties move to the Rules of Superintendence, which the Court adopts under Article IV, Section 5(A)(1). The current rules keep the 50-year conviction-record and permanent probate-record retention periods (section 3). What changes is who can alter them. The disapproval process the sponsors and the Supreme Court describe applies to the Rules of Practice and Procedure under Section 5(B); Section 5(A)(1) provides no comparable legislative check, and the Court amended the retention rules in 2025 on its own authority. The probate public-access duties (2101.121) and the county commissioners' duty (2101.12) were not compared.	Clerks; prosecutors; public; county commissioners	Medium

#	Issue (R.C.)	Type	What the text does	Interests affected	Severity
3	**Procedure or substance.** 2317.03, 2945.30, 2101.12	Legal question	Court rules may not "abridge, enlarge, or modify any substantive right." The bill rests on the premise that each repealed section is procedural. The courts have settled that point for grand jury size. The dead man's statute, a rule of witness competency, raises the question whether the Rules of Evidence cover the same ground or only the same subject. Two other provisions are about money and duties rather than procedure: payment for a sick juror's medical care from the judiciary fund, and the county commissioners' duty to furnish probate record materials. Repealing them does not by itself say who pays. Both chambers dropped two grand jury provisions as substantive, which shows the line is drawn case by case.	Litigants; estates; counties	Low–Medium
4	**LSC summary lists a repeal the bill does not make.** Analysis, As Passed by the House, summary of repeals	Textual (document)	The summary of LSC's analysis lists, among outright repeals, the requirement that a misdemeanor judgment be pronounced as if the defendant were present and that felony cases be continued until the accused appears. That is R.C. 2945.12, which the House removed; the passed text does not repeal it and the detailed analysis does not discuss it.	Legislators; public	Low

Type: *Textual* = confirmed in the bill's text or official documents. *Implementation* = depends on rules or practice not yet written. *Legal question* = depends on how a court would apply other law. **Severity:** *High* = a demonstrated conflict affecting public property, statutory rights or public money at scale. *Medium* = fraud, accountability, liability or coordination exposure the text leaves open. *Low* = administrative.

8. Open questions

1. **Why did the House committee keep the plea, trial-in-absence, subpoena and business-records statutes that the Senate repeals?** No amendment explanation was found in the House record.
2. **Which bill will move?** S.B. 61 has waited in House Judiciary since June 2026; H.B. 260 had its first Senate hearing November 10.
3. **Do the Rules of Superintendence require the probate public-access measures in R.C. 2101.121,** such as viewing equipment and indexes, and who furnishes probate record materials once the commissioners' duty in R.C. 2101.12 is repealed? Retention periods match (section 3).
4. **What would govern payment for a sick juror's medical care** once R.C. 2945.30's judiciary-fund provision is repealed? The record reviewed does not say.
5. **Do Evidence Rules 601 and 804(B)(5) give the same protection as the dead man's statute,** as the Supreme Court's testimony indicates, or only govern the same subject?
6. **Will the LSC analysis be corrected** to remove the R.C. 2945.12 entry from its list of repeals?

About this review

What this is. OCG Bill Reviews are Research Center publications. They describe what a bill does, who has taken a position on it, and how it has moved through the General Assembly. Ohio Common Ground does not endorse or oppose legislation, candidates or parties. Nothing in this review is a recommendation to vote for or against this bill.

Version and date. This review covers Am. H.B. 260 As Passed by the House, as of November 16, 2026. Bills change through substitutes and amendments, so a later version may differ. Updates are posted at ohiocommonground.com.

Sources. Figures and statements of law come from primary government sources: bill text, analyses from LSC's Office of Research and Drafting, Legislative Budget Office fiscal notes, committee records, minutes and votes, and court decisions. Statements in testimony are reported as the witness's statement. A figure that cannot be traced to a primary source is left out.

Method. Each review follows the OCG Legislative Review Standard:

1. Plain-language summary and provision-by-provision comparison against current law.
2. Context: earlier versions, related bills, recent law and litigation.
3. Positions on the record, from committee testimony and public statements. Interests affected by a provision are listed separately; being affected is not treated as support or opposition.
4. Lens analysis: the arguments conservative and liberal observers would likely make. These are hypothetical, attributed arguments, not documented positions and not OCG positions.
5. Process record: measurable facts about hearings, testimony, timing and sponsorship.
6. Drafting issues: places where the text is ambiguous, incomplete or leaves discretion unchecked, each tied to a section of the Revised Code and labeled by type. An issue describes what the text does or leaves open, not anyone's intent.
7. Open questions the public record does not yet answer.

Not legal advice. This review is not legal advice. Anyone with a legal question should contact the responsible court or an attorney.

Corrections. Report errors through ohiocommonground.com. Corrections made before release are logged in the working draft. Substantive changes after release are issued as a new version.

Sources

Primary

- Am. H.B. 260, As Passed by the House; As Reported by House Judiciary; As Introduced
- LSC Bill Analysis, As Passed by the House; LBO Fiscal Note, As Passed by the House
- H.B. 260 committee activity, status and votes; House Judiciary minutes, Oct 8, 2025
- Sub. S.B. 61, As Passed by the Senate; LSC Bill Analysis and LBO Fiscal Note, As Passed by the Senate; S.B. 61 committee activity and votes
- Written testimony on both bills: Reps. Odioso and Mathews; Sens. Gavarone and Manning; Supreme Court of Ohio (Schuster, VanNorman); Ohio State Bar Association (Augsburger); Ohio Judicial Conference (Pfeifer)
- S.B. 61 testimony: Gavarone and Manning, Senate; VanNorman, Senate; Pfeifer, Senate; Gavarone, House; Schuster, House
- Rules of Superintendence for the Courts of Ohio
- *State v. Pitts*, 2025-Ohio-3012 (5th Dist.); Ohio Const. art. IV, § 5

Revision history

Version	Date	Change
1.0	11/16/26	Initial release.