

[Cite as *Mickey v. No Named Defendants*, 2015-Ohio-4013.]

STATE OF OHIO)
)ss:
COUNTY OF MEDINA)

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

AUDREY MICKEY

Appellant

v.

NO NAMED DEFENDANTS

And

MEDINA PROSECUTOR’S OFFICE

Appellees

C.A. No. 14CA0062-M

APPEAL FROM JUDGMENT
ENTERED IN THE
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
COUNTY OF MEDINA, OHIO
CASE No. 2014 05 CA 0009

DECISION AND JOURNAL ENTRY

Dated: September 30, 2015

MOORE, Judge.

{¶1} Plaintiff, Audrey Mickey, appeals from the judgment of the Medina County Probate Court. This Court affirms.

I.

{¶2} In 2014, Ms. Mickey filed three sets of documents with the trial court, the first entitled “Relief[,]” and the second and third both entitled “Judicial Notice Mandatory[.]” Ms. Mickey set forth her name and address in the captions of these filings together with “In the Matter of the Private Home of[]Daniel Edward [Mickey] Private [P]arty Deceased[.]” Ms. Mickey named no defendants.

{¶3} On July 14, 2016, the trial court issued an order stating that “upon its own review and motion [the court] finds that the items submitted to the court in their entirety must be

stricken pursuant to Ohio Civil Rule 12(F), inasmuch as the claims are insufficient to constitute Pleadings and or a complaint under the Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure R. 7 et seq., in that the court cannot construe any of the items submitted in a fashion as to do substantial justice.” The trial court ordered the filings stricken, and dismissed the matter. Ms. Mickey timely appealed from the trial court’s order.

II.

{¶4} In her brief, Ms. Mickey raises five assignments of error, which we decline to reproduce here. We note that Ms. Mickey has appeared pro se in the trial court and on appeal. With regard to pro se litigants, this Court has held:

[P]ro se litigants should be granted reasonable leeway such that their motions and pleadings should be liberally construed so as to decide the issues on the merits, as opposed to technicalities. However, a pro se litigant is presumed to have knowledge of the law and correct legal procedures so that [s]he remains subject to the same rules and procedures to which represented litigants are bound. [Sh]e is not given greater rights than represented parties, and must bear the consequences of h[er] mistakes. This Court, therefore, must hold [pro se appellants] to the same standard as any represented party.

State v. Taylor, 9th Dist. Lorain No. 14CA010549, 2014-Ohio-5738, ¶ 5, quoting *Sherlock v. Myers*, 9th Dist. Summit No. 22071, 2014-Ohio-5178, ¶ 3.

{¶5} After review of her brief and the record, this Court is unable to decipher the nature of Ms. Mickey’s attempted action in the trial court or her challenge to the trial court’s dismissal. We can determine only that Ms. Mickey seems to have attempted to challenge a tax bill assessed on her family’s real property. Aside from this, her challenges set forth in her filings below, and in her arguments on appeal, are indecipherable. *See Cardone v. Cardone*, 9th Dist. Summit No. 18349, 1998 WL 224934, *8 (May 6, 1998) (disregarding inadequately argued assignments of error); *see also* App.R. 12(A)(2) and 16(A)(7)

{¶6} Accordingly, Ms. Mickey’s assignments of error are overruled.

III.

{¶7} Ms. Mickey's assignments of error are overruled. The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

Judgment affirmed.

There were reasonable grounds for this appeal.

We order that a special mandate issue out of this Court, directing the Court of Common Pleas, County of Medina, State of Ohio, to carry this judgment into execution. A certified copy of this journal entry shall constitute the mandate, pursuant to App.R. 27.

Immediately upon the filing hereof, this document shall constitute the journal entry of judgment, and it shall be file stamped by the Clerk of the Court of Appeals at which time the period for review shall begin to run. App.R. 22(C). The Clerk of the Court of Appeals is instructed to mail a notice of entry of this judgment to the parties and to make a notation of the mailing in the docket, pursuant to App.R. 30.

Costs taxed to Appellant.

CARLA MOORE
FOR THE COURT

CARR, P. J.
SCHAFER, J.
CONCUR.

APPEARANCES:

AUDREY MICKEY, pro se, Appellant.

DEAN HOLMAN, Prosecuting Attorney, and BRIAN M. RICHTER, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for Appellees.