

[Until this opinion appears in the Ohio Official Reports advance sheets, it may be cited as *Patel v. Crawford*, Slip Opinion No. 2012-Ohio-4229.]

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-4229

PATEL ET AL., APPELLANTS, v. CRAWFORD, JUDGE, APPELLEE.

[Until this opinion appears in the Ohio Official Reports advance sheets, it may be cited as *Patel v. Crawford*, Slip Opinion No. 2012-Ohio-4229.]

*Mandamus—Petition sought to compel a judge to hear motion for sanctions—
Court of appeals’ dismissal of petition for writ affirmed.*

(No. 2012-0728—Submitted September 12, 2012—Decided September 19, 2012.)

APPEAL from the Court of Appeals for Belmont County,

Nos. 11 BE 23 and 11 BE 24, 2012-Ohio-1688.

Per Curiam.

{¶ 1} We affirm the judgment of the court of appeals dismissing the petition of appellants, Arvind and Bharati Patel, for a writ of mandamus. The Patels sought the writ to compel appellee, Judge Dale A. Crawford, sitting by assignment in *Longwell v. Patel*, Belmont C.P. No. 03-CV-036, to hear appellant

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

Arvind Patel’s motion for sanctions “prior to presiding over the trial” in the case.¹ Appellants could not establish either a clear legal right to the requested extraordinary relief nor a corresponding clear legal duty on the part of Judge Crawford to provide it because the case was dismissed before any trial could occur.

Judgment affirmed.

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

Arvind and Bharati Patel, pro se.

Chris Berhalter, Belmont County Prosecuting Attorney, and David K. Liberati, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for appellee.

1. The court of appeals also dismissed appellants’ claims for a continuance, to give them time to retain counsel and to appoint a translator to aid appellant Bharati Patel at trial, but appellants do not claim any error in the court’s holding on these claims in this appeal.