

[Cite as *In re M.R.*, 2017-Ohio-4133.]

STATE OF OHIO, JEFFERSON COUNTY  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
SEVENTH DISTRICT

IN RE: M.R.

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

CASE NO. 14 JE 0035

OPINION  
AND  
JUDGMENT ENTRY

CHARACTER OF PROCEEDINGS: Motion for Reconsideration

JUDGMENT: Motion denied.

APPEARANCES:

For State of Ohio-Appellee

Attorney Michael Dewine  
Ohio Attorney General  
Attorney Stephen E. Maher  
Special Assistant Prosecutor  
150 East Gay Street, 16th Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3400

For Minor Child-Appellant

Attorney Brook M. Burns  
250 East Broad Street, Suite 1400  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

JUDGES:

Hon. Mary DeGenaro  
Hon. Gene Donofrio  
Hon. Carol Ann Robb

Dated: June 5, 2017

[Cite as *In re M.R.*, 2017-Ohio-4133.]  
PER CURIAM.

{¶1} Minor child-Appellant, M.R., et al., filed an application for reconsideration of *In re M.R.*, 7th Dist. No. 14 JE 0035, 2016-Ohio-8545.

{¶2} "The test generally applied upon the filing of a motion for reconsideration in the court of appeals is whether the motion calls to the attention of the court an obvious error in its decision, or raises an issue for consideration that was either not considered at all or was not fully considered by the court when it should have been." *Columbus v. Hodge*, 37 Ohio App.3d 68, 523 N.E.2d 515 (1987), paragraph one of the syllabus.

{¶3} The purpose of reconsideration is not to reargue one's appeal based on dissatisfaction with the logic used and conclusions reached by an appellate court. *Victory White Metal Co. v. N.P. Motel Syst. Inc.*, 7th Dist. No. 04 MA 0245, 2005-Ohio-3828, ¶ 2. "An application for reconsideration may not be filed simply on the basis that a party disagrees with the prior appellate court decision." *Hampton v. Ahmed*, 7th Dist. No. 02 BE 0066, 2005-Ohio-1766, ¶ 16 (internal citation omitted).

{¶4} In support of reconsideration, M.R. alleges the exact same argument he made in the direct appeal, namely, that his classification was void because the juvenile court did not comply with the timing requirements of R.C. 2152.83(A). M.R. does not call to the attention of this Court an obvious error, but merely a disagreement with the decision reached by the Court.

{¶5} M.R.'s arguments regarding his interpretation of R.C. 2152.83 were fully considered by this Court prior to ruling on the matter. The motion for reconsideration does not call to the attention of this Court an obvious error. Accordingly, M.R.'s motion for reconsideration is denied.

DeGenaro, J., concurs.

Donofrio, J., concurs.

Robb, P. J., concurs.