

[Until this opinion appears in the Ohio Official Reports advance sheets, it may be cited as *State ex rel. Galloway v. Lucas Cty. Court of Common Pleas*, Slip Opinion No. 2011-Ohio-5259.]

NOTICE

This slip opinion is subject to formal revision before it is published in an advance sheet of the Ohio Official Reports. Readers are requested to promptly notify the Reporter of Decisions, Supreme Court of Ohio, 65 South Front Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215, of any typographical or other formal errors in the opinion, in order that corrections may be made before the opinion is published.

SLIP OPINION NO. 2011-OHIO-5259

**THE STATE EX REL. GALLOWAY, APPELLANT, v. LUCAS COUNTY COURT OF
COMMON PLEAS ET AL., APPELLEES.**

**[Until this opinion appears in the Ohio Official Reports advance sheets, it
may be cited as *State ex rel. Galloway v. Lucas Cty. Court of Common Pleas*,
Slip Opinion No. 2011-Ohio-5259.]**

*Criminal procedure—Judgment entries in compliance with Crim.R. 32(C)—Writs
of mandamus and procedendo denied.*

(No. 2011-0871—Submitted October 5, 2011—Decided October 18, 2011.)

APPEAL from the Court of Appeals for Lucas County,
No. L-10-1132, 2011-Ohio-1876.

Per Curiam.

{¶ 1} We affirm the judgment of the court of appeals denying the request of appellant, Carlos G. Galloway Jr., for writs of mandamus and procedendo to compel appellees, Lucas County Court of Common Pleas and Judge Denise Ann Dartt, to issue judgments in his criminal cases that comply with Crim.R. 32(C) and constitute final, appealable orders.

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

{¶ 2} The sentencing entries in Galloway’s criminal cases fully complied with Crim.R. 32(C) by including the jury verdicts upon which the convictions are based, the sentence, and the signature of the judge and being entered on the journal by the clerk of court. See *State ex rel. Peterson v. Durkin*, 129 Ohio St.3d 213, 2011-Ohio-2639, 951 N.E.2d 381, ¶ 1.

{¶ 3} Moreover, insofar as Galloway claims that one of his sentencing entries did not properly reflect the jury’s verdict, he raises mere error and he had an adequate remedy by appeal to raise the issue. See generally *Manns v. Gansheimer*, 117 Ohio St.3d 251, 2008-Ohio-851, 883 N.E.2d 431, ¶ 6 (“sentencing errors are not jurisdictional and are not remediable * * * by extraordinary writ”); *State ex rel. Jelinek v. Schneider*, 127 Ohio St.3d 332, 2010-Ohio-5986, 939 N.E.2d 847, ¶ 13 (neither mandamus nor procedendo will issue if the relator has an adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law).

{¶ 4} Finally, any error regarding the imposition of court costs can be challenged by appeal. *State ex rel. Whittenberger v. Clarke* (2000), 89 Ohio St.3d 207, 208, 729 N.E.2d 756.

{¶ 5} Therefore, the court of appeals properly denied Galloway’s request for extraordinary relief in mandamus and procedendo, and we affirm that judgment.

Judgment affirmed.

O’CONNOR, C.J., and PFEIFER, LUNDBERG STRATTON, O’DONNELL, LANZINGER, CUPP, and MCGEE BROWN, JJ., concur.

Carlos G. Galloway Jr., pro se.

Julia R. Bates, Lucas County Prosecuting Attorney, and John A. Borell, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for appellees.
