

[Cite as *R.C. v. C.S.*, 2018-Ohio-308.]

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO

TENTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

R.C.,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	
v.	:	No. 17AP-152
	:	(C.P.C. No. 14JU 7010)
C.S.,	:	
	:	(REGULAR CALENDAR)
Defendant-Appellant.	:	
R.C.,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	
v.	:	No. 17AP-153
	:	(C.P.C. No. 14JU 7010)
C.S.,	:	
	:	(REGULAR CALENDAR)
Defendant-Appellee,	:	
(Minor Child, K.M.C.,	:	
Appellant).	:	

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Rendered on January 25, 2018

Roger Warner, for appellees R.C. and G.C.

Steven E. Hillman, for appellant/mother C.S.

Erik L. Smith, for minor child K.M.C.

Christopher E. Heckert, Guardian ad Litem.

ON APPLICATIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION

TYACK, J.

{¶ 1} Counsel for C.S., the mother of teenager K.M.C., has filed an application for reconsideration of our decision affirming the trial court's granting of limited visitation for K.M.C.'s paternal grandparents. An attorney purporting to be counsel for K.M.C. to some degree has also participated in the filing of a "separate" application for reconsideration on behalf of the child.

{¶ 2} Both counsel repeatedly assert that the decision about whether or not the paternal grandparents have any access to the child is totally up to the mother. We do not see that as being so. Obviously, if the paternal grandparents and the mother were getting along there would be no need for a court action. The fact that a system to allow grandparents to have limited access to a young person when a parent objects is proof that a parent's preference does not end consideration of the issue.

{¶ 3} The applications for reconsideration do not raise issues which were not carefully considered when we drafted and released our decision. The applications merely assert at length a belief that we reached the wrong result. We do not believe that either the trial court or this appellate court reached the wrong result.

{¶ 4} Both applications for reconsideration are denied.

Applications for reconsideration denied.

BROWN, P.J., and LUPER SCHUSTER, J., concur.
