

OPINIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

\*\*\*\* SUBJECT TO FURTHER EDITING \*\*\*\*

The full texts of the opinions of the Supreme Court of Ohio are being transmitted electronically beginning May 27, 1992, pursuant to a pilot project implemented by Chief Justice Thomas J. Moyer.

Please call any errors to the attention of the Reporter's Office of the Supreme Court of Ohio. Attention: Walter S. Kobalka, Reporter, or Deborah J. Barrett, Administrative Assistant. Tel.: (614) 466-4961; in Ohio 1-800-826-9010. Your comments on this pilot project are also welcome.

NOTE: Corrections may be made by the Supreme Court to the full texts of the opinions after they have been released electronically to the public. The reader is therefore advised to check the bound volumes of Ohio St.3d published by West Publishing Company for the final versions of these opinions. The advance sheets to Ohio St.3d will also contain the volume and page numbers where the opinions will be found in the bound volumes of the Ohio Official Reports.

The State of Ohio, Appellee, v. Tyler, Appellant.  
[Cite as State v. Tyler (1994), Ohio St. 3d .]  
Appellate procedure -- Application for reopening appeal from judgment and conviction based on claim of ineffective assistance of appellate counsel -- Application denied when issues raised are res judicata.

(No. 94-1636 -- Submitted November 1, 1994 -- Decided December 30, 1994.)

Appeal from the Court of Appeals for Cuyahoga County, No. 51696.

Appellant, Arthur Tyler, was convicted of aggravated murder with felony-murder and firearm specifications, and aggravated robbery, and was sentenced to death. The court of appeals affirmed the convictions. This court affirmed the appellate court. State v. Tyler (1990), 50 Ohio St. 3d 24, 553 N.E. 2d 576. He subsequently filed an application for delayed reconsideration in the court of appeals, it seems on or about June 30, 1993, pursuant to State v. Murnahan (1992), 63 Ohio St. 3d 60, 584 N.E. 2d 1204, arguing that his appellate counsel at the court of appeals was ineffective by failing to raise one hundred twenty-one additional assignments of error. The court of appeals denied the application, holding that the issues were res judicata because appellant, who filed his own supplemental brief at the court of appeals, could have raised the issues there, since he raised others, and because he had new counsel on direct appeal to this court who could have raised the issues there. Appellant now appeals that decision.

Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Cuyahoga County Prosecuting Attorney, and Karen L. Johnson, for appellee.

David H. Bodiker, Ohio Public Defender, Pamela Prude-Smithers and Randall L. Porter, Assistant State Public Defenders, for appellant.

Per Curiam. The decision of the court of appeals is

affirmed for the reasons stated in its opinion.

Judgment accordingly.

Moyer, C.J., A.W. Sweeney, Douglas, Resnick, F.E. Sweeney  
and Pfeifer, JJ., concur.

Wright, J., dissents.