

[Until this opinion appears in the Ohio Official Reports advance sheets, it may be cited as *State ex rel. Hudson v. Sutula*, Slip Opinion No. 2012-Ohio-554.]

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. 2012-OHIO-554**

**THE STATE EX REL. HUDSON, APPELLANT, v. SUTULA, JUDGE, ET AL.,  
APPELLEES.**

**[Until this opinion appears in the Ohio Official Reports advance sheets,  
it may be cited as *State ex rel. Hudson v. Sutula*,  
Slip Opinion No. 2012-Ohio-554.]**

*Mandamus and procedendo—Sentencing errors—Adequate remedy by appeal  
precludes issuance of writs.*

(No. 2011-1680—Submitted February 8, 2012—Decided February 16, 2012.)

APPEAL from the Court of Appeals for Cuyahoga County,  
No. 96705, 2011-Ohio-4644.

---

**Per Curiam.**

{¶ 1} We affirm the judgment of the court of appeals dismissing the complaint of appellant, William Hudson, for writs of mandamus and procedendo to compel appellees, Judge John D. Sutula and the Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas, to resentence him to account for his allied offenses of similar import. Neither mandamus nor procedendo will issue if the party seeking

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

extraordinary relief has an adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law. *State ex rel. Jelinek v. Schneider*, 127 Ohio St.3d 332, 2010-Ohio-5986, 939 N.E.2d 847, ¶ 13. Hudson had an adequate remedy by way of appeal to raise the claimed sentencing error. *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”); *compare Smith v. Voorhies*, 119 Ohio St.3d 345, 2008-Ohio-4479, 894 N.E.2d 44, ¶ 10 (“allied-offense claims are not jurisdictional and are not cognizable in habeas corpus”). And Hudson’s double-jeopardy claim was also remediable by appeal rather than by extraordinary writ. *See State ex rel. Douglas v. Burlew*, 106 Ohio St.3d 180, 2005-Ohio-4382, 833 N.E.2d 293, ¶ 15.

Judgment affirmed.

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

---

William Hudson, pro se.

William D. Mason, Cuyahoga County Prosecuting Attorney, and James E. Moss, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for appellee.

---