FILED

IN THE FRANKLIN COUNTY MUNICIPAL COURT COLUMBUS, OHIO

24 SEP 23 PM 1:03

FANYI ZING,

v.

Plaintiff.

Case No. 2024CVG010017RT

JUDGE JESSICA D'VARGA

DUSTIN WAYNE,

Defendant.

ENTRY

This matter is before the Court on Defendant's Motion for Relief from Judgment. Defendant argues that no evidence was ever considered by this court in granting Plaintiff restitution of the premises and that any judgment entered by this court is void due to Defendant being deprived of due process and fair legal proceedings.

The Complaint for Forcible Entry and Detainer in this matter was filed on March 4, 2024 based on breach of lease and failure to pay rent. The matter was timely scheduled for an eviction on March 21, 2024. Per the court's docket and a Magistrate's Order filed on March 21, 2024, Defendant appeared at the eviction hearing and requested a continuance to March 28, 2024, which was granted.

On March 28, 2024, the parties appeared and requested another continuance to April 4, 2024. The Magistrate's Order from March 28, 2024 indicates, "Tenant to submit repair invoice to landlord. Tenant to pay Feb & March rents minus \$1308 & security deposit payments for 1/8, 2/1, 3/1 & 4/1 of \$308 [sic] each."

On April 4, 2024, the date chosen by the parties for the continued eviction hearing, Defendant filed an "Answer" at 8:15 a.m., <u>prior</u> to the hearing, which alleged that Defendant had paid \$2500 to remedy conditions issues and that Plaintiff and Defendant agreed that Defendant would not have to pay rent if Defendant did certain work for Plaintiff.

At 9:31 a.m., the case was called for hearing by Magistrate Sparks. Both Plaintiff and Defendant were provided an opportunity to present evidence to the court. The Defendant confirmed that he had received the eviction notice on February 13, 2024 and that, at that time, he was behind on rent. He presented testimony that he had made repairs but did not provide documentation to support his testimony. The Magistrate questioned the Defendant as to whether

present the formal materials and the second The state of and the first of the AT I A BE ARE THE SECOND OF TH The second of delice of the following the second of the se I comment southern the rest to the terminal than the second termination to the second termination termination to the second termination terminatio the state of the second and the same and the same of the same and the weeking the complete production of grown and the boundaries of the complete of the complete and a surface of the first of the contract of proper a tasang a siyarawa batang a siyara en de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la companya de la companya del companya de la compa the second of th an experience of the experienc

he had complied with the previous agreements of the parties entered into on March 28, 2024. The Defendant testified that he had not, nor did he have documentation to present to the court regarding any repairs. Defendant was given an opportunity to question Plaintiff's witness and then given an additional opportunity to provide any other information to the court that he deemed appropriate before the Magistrate issued a ruling. At that point, the Magistrate found in favor of the Plaintiff and issued a Decision in Plaintiff's favor for restitution of the premises and court costs. The next day, the Duty Judge adopted the Magistrate's Decision and issued judgment for Plaintiff.

Despite the fact the case was concluded as of April 5, 2024, the case was assigned to Judge Green based upon the filing of the "Answer" by Defendant. This was done in error as the Answer had been filed prior to the eviction hearing and Defendant was given an opportunity to present his case to the Magistrate after his Answer was filed. This case never should have been assigned to a Judge, as the case was appropriately heard and decided on by the Magistrate on April 4, 2024.

After the case was erroneously assigned to Judge Green, Defendant filed an Objection to the Magistrate's Decision on April 11, 2024. In the Objection, Defendant attempted to submit evidence that could and should have been presented at the April 4, 2024 hearing. Plaintiff timely responded to Defendant's Objection on April 22, 2024. On that same date, the Writ of Restitution expired and Defendant remained in the property.

On May 30, 2024, the case came before Judge Green for an automatically scheduled pretrial hearing. At this pretrial hearing, Judge Green only considered the Objection to the Magistrate's Decision, which was appropriate given that the case should have been closed after the Magistrate's Order was adopted by Judgment Entry on April 5, 2024 and the Writ of Restitution was issued. After a hearing on the Objection, Judge Green overruled Defendant's Objection and the Judgment for restitution of the premises stood.

On June 20, 2024, after that full hearing on the Objection and a written decision overruling Defendant's Objection, a Supplemental Writ of Restitution was issued. On July 1, 2024, Defendant filed an "Emergency" Motion to Stay Execution of Writ and Setout. That Motion was overruled by Judge Green on the same day.

On July 3, 2024, Defendant filed a Motion for Reconsideration of Denial of Emergency Stay. The Writ was executed on July 5, 2024 and the return indicates that the Defendant "walked away." Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration was denied by Judge Green on July 11, 2024.

On July 30, 2024, Defendant filed a Motion for Relief from Judgment. On August 13, 2024, Judge Green recused himself from the proceedings because Defendant filed an affidavit of disqualification with the Supreme Court. The case was then reassigned to this branch of the Court.

In order to prevail on a 60(B) motion, a movant must demonstrate that: (1) the party has a meritorious defense or claim to present if relief is granted, (2) the party is entitled to relief under one of the grounds stated in Civ. R. 60(B)(1) through (5), and (3) the motion is made within a reasonable time. GTE Auto. Elec. v. ARC Indus., Inc., 47 Ohio St. 2d 146, para. 2 (1976). Here, Defendant has not shown that he has a meritorious defense to Plaintiff's claim.

Defendant has asserted that his evidence is not new, but rather was never considered, acknowledged, or allowed in a fair trial and that the judgement is void because he did not receive a fair trial. However, Defendant's claims were fully and fairly litigated during the April 4, 2024 eviction hearing. His Objection, which attached additional information that Defendant should have presented at the original eviction hearing, was also given a full hearing by Judge Green on May 30, 2024. No new evidence has been presented to this court demonstrating a meritorious defense to the original eviction action. In fact, Defendant remained in the property for approximately three months after the judgment for restitution of premises was granted.

Moreover, given that Defendant has now vacated the property at issue in the original Complaint, Defendant's Motion for Relief from Judgment is moot. Rithy Properties, Inc. v. Cheeseman, 2016-Ohio-1602 (10th Dist.) ("Actions for forcible entry and detainer become moot when the defendant vacates the property the plaintiff seeks restitution of.").

After a thorough review of the entire record in this matter, Defendant's Motion for Relief from Judgment is DENIED.

The Clerk is directed to serve a copy of this Entry upon the parties.

SO ORDERED.

Date

JUDGĖ JESSICA D'VARGA