

1 The State of Ohio, Appellee, v. Goines, Appellant.

2 [Cite as *State v. Goines* (1996), \_\_\_\_\_ Ohio St.3d \_\_\_\_\_.]

3 *Appellate procedure -- Application for reopening appeal from*  
4 *judgment and conviction based on claim of ineffective*  
5 *assistance of appellate counsel -- Application denied when*  
6 *applicant fails to establish ineffective assistance of counsel on*  
7 *the record presented.*

8 (No. 95-1325--Submitted October 24, 1995--Decided January 31,

9 1996.)

10 Appeal from the Court of Appeals for Franklin County, No. 95APA02-

11 204.

12 Appellant, Larry D. Goines, was convicted by a jury of two counts of

13 robbery, and sentenced accordingly. The court of appeals affirmed his

14 convictions and sentence. *State v. Goines* (Sept. 23, 1993), Franklin App.

15 No. 93AP-654, unreported.

16 Appellant then filed with the court of appeals a motion for a delayed

17 appeal or, in the alternative, motion for delayed reconsideration. The appeals

18 court treated this as an application to reopen pursuant to App.R. 26(B),

19 because, *inter alia*, the appellant had argued that his appellate counsel was

1 ineffective. The court of appeals denied the application, finding that  
2 appellant had failed to establish ineffective assistance of counsel on the  
3 record presented. This appeal followed.

4 *Larry D. Goines, pro se.*

5 *Stephen M. Miller, for appellee.*

6 *Per Curiam.* We affirm the decision of the court of appeals for the  
7 following reasons. Like the court of appeals, we disregard appellant's  
8 propositions of law that are not related to the claim of ineffective assistance  
9 of appellate counsel.

10 Appellant's fourth proposition of law asserts ineffective assistance of  
11 appellate counsel. The gist of the claim seems to be that appellate counsel  
12 was ineffective for not arguing that trial counsel was ineffective because he  
13 did not vigorously attack two eyewitnesses' identifications of appellant as the  
14 robber and attempt to establish appellant's brother as the robber. Like the  
15 court of appeals, we hold that appellant's record fails to establish that trial  
16 counsel was ineffective, and, therefore, appellant has failed to demonstrate  
17 that the genuine issue required by App.R. 26(B)(5) exists.

18 Accordingly, the judgment of the court of appeals is affirmed.

1

*Judgment affirmed.*

2

MOYER, C.J., DOUGLAS, WRIGHT, RESNICK, F.E. SWEENEY, PFEIFER and

3

COOK, JJ., concur.

4