

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
**STATES COURT OF APPEALS**  
FIFTH STREET, ROOM 540  
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-3988

APPEALS RTS  
540  
88  
No RECORDS OF THIS  
INMATE NEED ID #

OFFICIAL BUSINESS  
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300

CINEMA  
FOR 452  
30 JUN '20  
PM 2 L

RECEIVED

JUL 17 2020



1

NIXIE 438 2 2 6887/15/20

RETURN TO SENDER  
NOT DELIVERABLE AS ADDRESSED  
UNABLE TO FORWARD

45724-89025  
45292>3988

DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

Darryl Taylor  
#71518  
Noble Correctional Institution  
15708 McConnelsville Road  
Caldwell, OH 43724

---

---

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

FILED  
Jun 30, 2020  
DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

DARRYL TAYLOR, )  
Petitioner-Appellant, )  
v. )  
TIMOTHY E. BUCHANAN, )  
Respondent-Appellee. )

ORDER

Before: STRANCH, Circuit Judge.

Darryl Taylor, an Ohio prisoner proceeding pro se, appeals the district court's judgment denying his petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Taylor has filed an application for a certificate of appealability ("COA"), *see* Fed. R. App. P. 22(b), and a motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal, *see* Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(5).

In 2015, an Ohio jury convicted Taylor of one count of trafficking oxycodone in the presence of juveniles, in violation of Ohio Revised Code § 2925.03(A)(1)(C)(1)(c); two counts of trafficking oxycodone, in violation of Ohio Revised Code § 2925.03(A)(1)(C)(1)(c); and one count of trafficking oxycodone, in violation of Ohio Revised Code § 2925.03(A)(2)(C)(1)(c). Taylor's convictions stemmed from three controlled drug purchases through a confidential informant, which led to a search warrant and Taylor's ultimate arrest. The trial court sentenced Taylor to a total of thirteen years' imprisonment.

On direct appeal, Taylor argued that: (1) his convictions were supported by insufficient evidence and were against the manifest weight of the evidence; and (2) the trial court erred by denying his motion to suppress evidence obtained by the confidential informant. The Ohio Court of Appeals affirmed Taylor's convictions but remanded for resentencing because the trial court had failed to notify Taylor that he would be subject to post-release control. *State v. Taylor*, No.

6 (Ohio 2016). On remand, the trial court held a new sentencing hearing and reimposed Taylor's thirteen-year sentence.

In July 2016, Taylor filed an application to reopen his direct appeal under Rule 26(B) of the Ohio Rules of Appellate Procedure, in which he argued that appellate counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to argue that: (1) the trial court violated his Sixth Amendment right to counsel by inadequately inquiring into whether a conflict that he had with trial counsel constituted "a complete breakdown of communication or an irreconcilable conflict which leads to an apparently unjust verdict"; and (2) trial counsel was ineffective during voir dire for not seeking to remove an allegedly biased juror for cause. The Ohio Court of Appeals denied the Rule 26(B) application, concluding that Taylor had failed to comply with the mandatory requirements of Rule 26(B)(2)(d) and (e) (requiring an application to include a sworn statement and parts of the record as required, respectively). The Ohio Supreme Court declined to accept jurisdiction over Taylor's appeal.

In April 2017, Taylor filed a § 2254 petition, in which he argued: (1) law enforcement officers' search of his home was performed in execution of a search warrant that was not supported by probable cause; (2) "[t]he admission of evidence alleged to confirm the first controlled buy of drugs violated [his] right against unreasonable search and seizure"; (3) his convictions were supported by insufficient evidence and were against the manifest weight of the evidence; (4) appellate counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to argue on direct appeal that the trial court denied him his Sixth Amendment right to counsel; and (5) appellate counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to argue on direct appeal that he was denied his right to a fair and impartial jury. The magistrate judge recommended that the district court deny the habeas petition, concluding that Claims One and Two were not cognizable on federal habeas review, Claim Three lacked merit, and Claims Four and Five were procedurally defaulted. Over Taylor's objections, the district court adopted the magistrate judge's recommendation, dismissed the habeas petition with prejudice, and declined to issue a COA.

Taylor now seeks a COA on all five claims that he raised in his habeas petition. A COA may be issued "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003). In order to be entitled to a COA, the movant must demonstrate "that jurists of reason could disagree with the district court's resolution of his constitutional claims or that jurists could conclude that the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further." *Miller-El*, 537 U.S. at 327. When the district court denies a habeas petition on procedural grounds, a COA should issue "when the prisoner shows, at least, that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

In Claims One and Two, Taylor argued that his Fourth Amendment rights were violated. Those claims are barred by *Stone v. Powell*, 428 U.S. 465 (1976), which precludes federal habeas relief "where the State has provided an opportunity for full and fair litigation of a Fourth Amendment claim," *id.* at 481-82, 494. Thus, a Fourth Amendment claim is barred by *Stone* unless "the state provided *no* procedure by which the prisoner could raise his Fourth Amendment claim, or the prisoner was foreclosed from using that procedure." *Good v. Berghuis*, 729 F.3d 636, 639 (6th Cir. 2013) (quoting *Willett v. Lockhart*, 37 F.3d 1265, 1273 (8th Cir. 1994)) (emphasis added). The record reflects that Taylor raised his Fourth Amendment claims in a suppression motion and on direct appeal. *See Taylor*, 2016 WL 1734084, at \*7-9. The State therefore offered Taylor a procedure by which he could assert his Fourth Amendment claims, and he availed himself of that procedure when he raised those claims in the Ohio trial and appellate courts. "That suffices to preclude review of the claim[s] through a habeas corpus petition under *Stone v. Powell*." *Good*, 729 F.3d at 640. Reasonable jurists could not debate the district court's conclusion that Taylor's Fourth Amendment claims are not cognizable in a federal habeas corpus proceeding.

In Claim Three, Taylor contended that his convictions are supported by insufficient evidence. In reviewing the sufficiency of the evidence, "the relevant question is whether, after

... evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, *any* rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt.” *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 319 (1979). Federal habeas courts “do not reweigh the evidence, re-evaluate the credibility of witnesses, or substitute our judgment for that of the jury.” *Brown v. Konteh*, 567 F.3d 191, 205 (6th Cir. 2009).

The jury convicted Taylor of multiple counts section 2925.03(A)(1), which states that “[n]o person shall knowingly . . . [s]ell or offer to sell a controlled substance or a controlled substance analog.” The jury also convicted Taylor of one count of section 2925.03(A)(2), which provides:

[n]o person shall knowingly . . . [p]repare for shipment, ship, transport, deliver, prepare for distribution, or distribute a controlled substance or a controlled substance analog, when the offender knows or has reasonable cause to believe that the controlled substance or a controlled substance analog is intended for sale or resale by the offender or another person.

Trafficking under section 2925.03(A)(1) requires an intent to sell, whereas trafficking under section 2925.03(A)(2) requires that the offender must know that the substance is intended for sale, but the sale can be made by a person other than the offender. *State v. Cabrales*, 886 N.E.2d 181, 188-89 (Ohio 2008). Under Ohio Revised Code § 2915.03(A)(1)(C)(1)(c), if a person violates section 2925.03(A) “in the vicinity of a . . . juvenile, aggravated trafficking in drugs is a felony of the second degree, and the court shall impose as a mandatory prison term one of the prison terms prescribed for a felony of the second degree.” “An offense is ‘committed in the vicinity of a juvenile’ if the offender commits the offense within one hundred feet of a juvenile or within the view of a juvenile.” Ohio Rev. Code § 2925.01(BB). A “juvenile” is a person under eighteen years of age. Ohio Rev. Code § 2925.01(N).

The Ohio Court of Appeals rejected Taylor’s sufficiency-of-the-evidence claim on direct appeal, concluding that “the state proved that Taylor did more than just intend to sell, he actually knowingly sold oxycodone to the confidential informant.” *Taylor*, 2016 WL 1734084, at \*5 (citing Ohio Revised Code § 2901.22(B)). In reaching that determination, the Ohio Court of Appeals recounted that:

that Taylor met with the confidential informant the day before the first controlled buy and instructed her of the protocol she must follow to purchase oxycodone from him. Several investigators and the confidential informant testified about the three controlled buys and the jury saw the audio-visual recordings of the three sales. The state also presented photographs and testimony concerning the drugs and money recovered in the search of Taylor's home, as well as the testimony and laboratory report of a forensic scientist with the Bureau of Criminal Investigation who testified that she analyzed the tablets Taylor sold and those found in the search and determined that they were 30 mg oxycodone tablets. The state presented testimony that the bulk amount of oxycodone is 450 milligrams and that each of Taylor's three sales as well as the amount found in his house during the search met or exceeded the bulk amount. [Ohio Rev. Code §] 2925.01(D)(1)(d).

*Id.* at \*6. The Ohio Court of Appeals also concluded that the State presented sufficient evidence to sustain Taylor's trafficking-in-the-presence-of-juveniles conviction, noting that the confidential informant testified "that she personally knows Taylor's children who are both under the age of 18. She identified their gender, race, and ages, and was fairly certain of both of their names and she stated that they were about 20 feet away from her when she purchased the oxycodone." *Id.* The district court adopted the magistrate judge's conclusion that the state appellate court did not unreasonably apply *Jackson* in adjudicating this claim. Reasonable jurists could not debate the district court's resolution of this claim.

To the extent Taylor separately contended his convictions are against the manifest weight of the evidence, that is a state law claim unavailable for federal habeas review independent from the constitutional sufficiency of the evidence claim just considered. *See Johnson v. Havener*, 534 F.2d 1232, 1234 (6th Cir. 1976).

In Claims Four and Five, Taylor reasserted the ineffective-assistance-of-appellate-counsel claims that he advanced before the Ohio Court of Appeals in his Rule 26(B) application. Those claims are procedurally defaulted because Taylor failed to attach to his Rule 26(B) application the relevant parts of the record that were available to him as required by Rule 26(B)(2)(e), the state courts declined to review the merits of Taylor's claims on that basis, and Rule 26(B)(2)(e) is an independent and adequate state procedural rule. *See Hutchison v. Bell*, 303 F.3d 720, 737 (6th Cir. 2002); *State v. McNeill*, 700 N.E.2d 613, 614 (Ohio 1998) (per curiam).

prejudice as a result of the alleged violation of federal law, or demonstrate that failure to consider the claims will result in a fundamental miscarriage of justice." *Coleman v. Thompson*, 501 U.S. 722, 750 (1991). A fundamental miscarriage of justice requires a showing of actual innocence. *See Dretke v. Haley*, 541 U.S. 386, 393 (2004). The district court determined that Taylor did not establish the necessary cause and prejudice to excuse the default of his ineffective-assistance-of-appellate-counsel claims. Although Taylor argued below that his default should be excused because the trial court "judge exhibited hostile ineptitude," that does not explain why he failed to comply with Rule 26(B)(2)'s mandatory requirements when he applied to reopen his direct appeal. Further, Taylor did not demonstrate that the failure to consider his procedurally defaulted claims would result in a fundamental miscarriage of justice. *See McCleskey v. Zant*, 499 U.S. 467, 494-95 (1991); *Murray v. Carrier*, 477 U.S. 478, 496 (1986). Reasonable jurists could not debate the district court's procedural ruling. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484.

Accordingly, Taylor's COA application is **DENIED** and his motion of pauper status is **DENIED** as moot.

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT



---

Deborah S. Hunt, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

Darryl Taylor,

Petitioner,

Case No. 1:17cv267

v.

Judge Michael R. Barrett

Tim Buchanan, Warden,  
Noble Correctional Institution,

Respondent.

**JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE**

- JURY VERDICT:** This action came before the Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the Jury has rendered its verdict.
- DECISION BY COURT:** This action came to trial or hearing before the Court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision has been rendered.

**IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED:** The Report and Recommendations (Doc. 10) and the Supplemental Report and Recommendations (Doc. 22) are **ADOPTED**. The Report and Recommendations (Doc. 18) is **ADOPTED AS MODIFIED** to provide for the vacating of the Court's prior Order (Doc. 11) adopting the initial Report and Recommendations (Doc. 10) in addition to reopening the Clerk's Judgment (Doc. 12). The Petition (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED** with prejudice. Because reasonable jurists would not disagree with this conclusion, Petitioner is **DENIED** a certificate of appealability and the Court **CERTIFIES** that any appeal would be objectively frivolous.

Date: January 8, 2020

Richard W. Nagel, Clerk  
Clerk

By: S/Barbara A. Crum  
Deputy Clerk

A-9

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

DARRYL TAYLOR,

Petitioner,

CASE NO.: 1:17-cv-267

Judge Michael R. Barrett  
Magistrate Judge Michael R. Merz

v.

TIM BUCHANAN, Warden,  
Noble Correctional Institution,

Respondent.

**OPINION AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendations of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. 10), Petitioner's *pro se* objections (Doc. 19), the Supplemental Report and Recommendations of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. 22), and Petitioner's *pro se* supplemental objections (Doc. 23)—all pertaining to a petition for writ of habeas corpus. The Magistrate Judge also issued a Report and Recommendations (Doc. 18), which pertained to an intervening judgment (Doc. 12) that had adopted his initial Report and Recommendations. Convinced that this judgment was the result of an improper date calculation related to Petitioner's objection deadline, the Magistrate Judge recommended that it be reopened.

Having considered the filings *de novo*, the Court will grant Petitioner's Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment (Doc. 17) but will dismiss his petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 1).

Petitioner was convicted after a trial by jury of trafficking in oxycodone. *State v. Taylor*, 2016-Ohio-2781, ¶¶ 1, 5 (Ohio Ct. App.).<sup>1</sup> His conviction turned upon three controlled buys through a confidential informant, which led to a search warrant and his ultimate arrest. *Id.* at ¶¶ 5–7. He appealed his conviction and the Fourth District Court of Appeals (the “Fourth District”) affirmed, except to the extent that the post-release control portion of his sentence was vacated for failure to advise of the same at the time of sentencing. *Id.* at ¶ 42. Petitioner then sought to reopen the appeal to assert a claim of ineffective assistance of appellate counsel under Ohio App. R. 26(B) (Doc. 6, PAGEID 164–178) as his petition for review by the Supreme Court of Ohio was pending. Both requests were ultimately denied. (See *id.* at PAGEID 163, 182, 196).

Petitioner’s federal habeas petition sets out five grounds for relief:

**GROUND 1:** Petitioner’s motion to suppress evidence in his case should have been granted because of the lack of a proper search warrant due to the insufficient probable cause and sufficiency of the affidavit, thus, violating his Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 14 of the Ohio Constitution.

**GROUND 2:** The admission of evidence alleged to confirm the first controlled buy of drugs violated the petitioner’s right against unreasonable search and seizure under the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 14 of the Ohio Constitution.

**GROUND 3:** The evidence presented at trial is insufficient to support petitioner’s conviction for drug trafficking, which conviction is manifestly against the weight of the evidence, and the defense of entrapment is established, thus, acquittal is appropriate.

**GROUND 4:** The petitioner was denied effective assistance of appellate counsel when he failed to raise petitioner’s constitutional

---

<sup>1</sup> The “determination of a factual issue made by a State court shall be presumed to be correct” absent “clear and convincing evidence” otherwise. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1).

**GROUND 5:** The petitioner was denied effective assistance of appellate counsel when he failed to raise petitioner's constitutional right to raise petitioner's constitutional right to a fair trial by impartial, indifferent jurors.

(Doc. 10, PAGEID 525–26 (quoting Doc. 1, PAGEID 4, 6, 11, 16, and 20)).

## **II. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

When objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation are received on a dispositive matter, the assigned district judge "must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). After review, the district judge "may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions." *Id.*; *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). General objections are insufficient to preserve any issue for review: "[a] general objection to the entirety of the [magistrate judge's] report has the same effects as would a failure to object." *Howard v. Sec'y of Health and Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991). Nevertheless, the objections of a petitioner appearing *pro se* will be construed liberally. *See Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (citing *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)).

## **III. ANALYSIS**

The Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge's findings and considered all of the filings in this matter de novo. As a threshold matter, the Court finds that the Report and Recommendations (Doc. 18) concerning Petitioner's Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment (Doc. 17) correctly determines that Petitioner's objections to the initial Report and Recommendations should be considered timely. The Court will therefore adopt this Report and Recommendations—modified only to provide for the vacating of the Court's

addition to reopening the Clerk's Judgment (Doc. 12). The Court further determines that Petitioner's objections should be overruled, and that the initial Report and Recommendations (Doc. 10) and the Supplemental Report and Recommendations (Doc. 22) should be adopted—adding the following analysis as it relates to Petitioner's pending supplemental objections.

Petitioner first objects to the Magistrate Judge's conclusion that he has not demonstrated cause and prejudice necessary to excuse the procedural default of his ineffective assistance of appellate counsel claims—grounds four and five. In support of his objection, he incorporates arguments made in his initial objections (See Doc. 23 (referencing Doc. 19, PAGEID 579–583)) and attaches a portion of the state court record pertaining to the motion to suppress and potential withdrawal of his trial counsel (Doc. 6-1, PAGEID 254–64). None of these materials explain (much less excuse) Petitioner's admitted (see Doc. 23, PAGEID 601) procedural default with respect to his ineffective assistance of appellate counsel claims, and Petitioner does not object to any specific aspect of the Magistrate Judge's reasoning that led him to recommend that these claims were procedurally defaulted. (See Doc 10, PAGEID 536–41).

Petitioner's first objection also appears to conflate the procedural default of the ineffective assistance of appellate counsel claims with a procedural default of the Fourth Amendment claims. As noted by the Magistrate Judge, he did not make his recommendations on the Fourth Amendment claims on the basis of procedural default,

22, PAGEID 594). Nevertheless, to the extent that Petitioner's references to his initial objections (Doc. 19, PAGEID 579–583) and the state court trial record (Doc. 6-1) could be construed as a specific objection to the Magistrate Judge's application of *Powell*, it remains unavailing. The Court concludes that Petitioner had "an available avenue . . . to present his claim to the state courts[.]" *Good v. Berghuis*, 729 F.3d 636, 639 (6th Cir. 2013). In so finding, the Court is not required to make "an inquiry into the adequacy of the procedure actually used to resolve that particular claim." *Id.* But it is clear here that the state court was interested in an adequate procedural mechanism to consider Petitioner's Fourth Amendment claims. Petitioner's trial counsel and the state had agreed that a motion to suppress "would have no basis in the law[.]" (Doc. 6-1, PAGEID 256), yet the trial court nevertheless asked that Petitioner's counsel prepare and file the motion based on Petitioner's stated reasons (*id.* at PAGEID 260–61).<sup>3</sup> The Fourth District also

---

<sup>2</sup> *Powell* held that "where the State has provided an opportunity for full and fair litigation of a Fourth Amendment claim, a state prisoner may not be granted federal habeas corpus relief on the ground that evidence obtained in an unconstitutional search or seizure was introduced at his trial." *Id.* at 494.

<sup>3</sup> In his first set of objections, incorporated by reference (see Doc. 23, PAGEID 601), Petitioner alludes to being coerced into waiving a conflict with his trial attorney—arguably an impediment to "full and fair" litigation on Fourth Amendment issues. (See Doc. 19, PAGEID 580). The record, however, does not bear this out. The following exchange took place a March 6, 2015 hearing:

Court: And would you be willing to have [trial counsel] continue as your attorney and we take up this issue that concerns you [Petitioner] to get to the bottom of this and to figure out what the law is on it and have a preliminary decision. In other words this won't be part of the trial but this will be something that I'll be required to rule on, in writing. If I make a mistake in a case you've always got the Fourth District Court of Appeals, that you have an absolute right to take your case to if, at the end of this trial, you feel like my rulings were wrong on anything. You have the right to have them look over everything that I do. That's a three Judge panel that looks over what I do to make sure mistakes don't cause a, a um, situation of wrongful conviction or wrongful imprisonment. What do you think?

Defendant: I think that would be fair. Um, I have no objections to it.

\* \* \*

For his second objection, Petitioner disagrees with the Magistrate Judge's conclusion that consent is not a defense to a drug trafficking charge. (Doc. 22, PAGEID 598). He maintains that *State v. Mehozonek*, 8 Ohio App.3d 271, 274–75 (Ohio Ct. App. 1983), controls the outcome of his sufficiency of the evidence claim (ground three)—regardless of its distinguishing factual features and despite the fact that it is a non-controlling and nearly forty-year-old decision from Ohio's Eighth District Court of Appeals. The *Mehozonek* opinion's merits discussion opens as follows: "An essential element of the crime of theft is the victim's lack of consent." *Id.* at 274. The court went on to hold that "[i]f the owner originates the criminal plan, for the purpose of testing the trustworthiness of an employee, the courts uniformly hold that an owner by his or its conduct has consented to the taking, and that no crime has been committed." *Id.* It is logical that evidence of consent could undermine a conviction where lack of consent is an element of the crime at issue; but that logic does not apply here. Petitioner's citation to *In re Winship*, 397 U.S. 358 (1970), is inapposite. Lack of consent is not an element of drug trafficking.

---

Court: [Y]ou certainly have the right if you want to, to hire and substitute any attorney that you wish for Mr. Meadows. That's always your right under the laws of the United States and the State of Ohio. [Trial counsel] is there if and only if, you still believe that you are unable to hire and retain the services of a lawyer of your choice. I simply want to repeat that.

(Doc. 6-1, PAGEID 260–61, 262).

Consistent with the foregoing, Petitioner's Objections (Docs. 19, 23) are **OVERRULED**; and the Report and Recommendations (Doc. 10) and the Supplemental Report and Recommendations (Doc. 22) are **ADOPTED**. The Report and Recommendations (Doc. 18) is **ADOPTED AS MODIFIED** to provide for the vacating of the Court's prior Order (Doc. 11) adopting the initial Report and Recommendations (Doc. 10) in addition to reopening the Clerk's Judgment (Doc. 12). The Petition (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED** with prejudice. Because reasonable jurists would not disagree with this conclusion, Petitioner is **DENIED** a certificate of appealability and the Court **CERTIFIES** that any appeal would be objectively frivolous.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Michael R. Barrett

Judge Michael R. Barrett

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION AT CINCINNATI

DARRYL TAYLOR,

Petitioner, : Case No. 1:17-cv-267

- vs -

District Judge Michael R. Barrett  
Magistrate Judge Michael R. Merz

TIM BUCHANAN, Warden,  
Noble Correctional Institution

Respondent.

---

**SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

This habeas corpus case is before the Court on Petitioner's Objections (ECF No. 19) to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendations recommending dismissal (ECF No. 10). Judge Barrett has recommitted the case for reconsideration in light of the Objections (Recommittal Order, ECF No. 20).

The Petition pleads five grounds for relief:

**GROUND 1:** Petitioner's motion to suppress evidence in his case should have been granted because of the lack of a proper search warrant due to the insufficient probable cause and sufficiency of the affidavit, thus, violating his Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 14 of the Ohio Constitution.

**GROUND 2:** The admission of evidence alleged to confirm the first controlled buy of drugs violated the petitioner's right against unreasonable search and seizure under the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 14 of the Ohio Constitution.

**GROUND 3:** The evidence presented at trial is insufficient to

support petitioner's conviction for drug trafficking, which conviction is manifestly against the weight of the evidence, and the defense of entrapment is established, thus, acquittal is appropriate.

**GROUND 4:** The petitioner was denied effective assistance of appellate counsel when he failed to raise petitioner's constitutional right to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

**GROUND 5:** The petitioner was denied effective assistance of appellate counsel when he failed to raise petitioner's constitutional right to raise petitioner's constitutional right to a fair trial by impartial, indifferent jurors.

(Petition, ECF No. 1, Page ID 4, 6, 11, 16 and 20.)

---

#### **Grounds One and Two: Violations of the Fourth Amendment**

The Report recommended that Grounds One and Two, which allege violations of the Fourth Amendment, should be dismissed under the doctrine of *Stone v. Powell*, 428 U.S. 465 (1976).

Taylor begins his Objections by asserting that procedural default was raised as a defense to his presentation of his Fourth Amendment claims. That is correct. In the Return of Writ Respondent pointed out that because Taylor "did not challenge in the state court the legality of the warrant and accompanying affidavit executed for the purposes of searching Taylor's home (or an affidavit attached to the complaint) this claim is procedurally defaulted." (Return, ECF No. 7, PageID 501.)

The Report does not discuss the procedural default defense as to Grounds One and Two, but decided these claims on the basis of *Stone v. Powell, supra* (Report, ECF No. 10, PageID 526). It is not necessary for the Court to consider the procedural default issue when the *Stone v. Powell* doctrine is dispositive.

## **Grounds Four and Five: Ineffective Assistance of Appellate Counsel**

In his Fourth and Fifth Grounds for Relief,<sup>1</sup> Taylor asserts he was deprived of his Sixth Amendment right to the effective assistance of counsel (IV) “when he failed to raise Petitioner’s right to have assistance of counsel for his defense” (PageID 16); and (V) “when he failed to raise Petitioner’s constitutional right to a fair trial by impartial, indifferent jurors” (PageID 20). The Report recommended dismissing these two Grounds as barred by Taylor’s procedural default in presenting them to the state courts (Report, ECF No. 10, PageID 541).

The only method Ohio recognizes for raising an ineffective assistance of appellate counsel claim is by Application to Reopen the appeal under Ohio R. App. P. 26(B). The Fourth District Court of Appeals refused to reach the merits of Taylor’s ineffective assistance of appellate counsel claims because he failed in several respects to comply with the procedural requirements of that rule (see relevant portions of that court’s decision quoted at Report, ECF No. 10, PageID 538-40).

Noting that a federal habeas court is bound by state court interpretation of state law, Taylor argues, “[t]he Ohio Supreme Court has held that a Rule 26(B) application is not part of the direct appeal process and, therefore, its denial cannot be construed as an estoppel to a full and fair opportunity to litigate a claim.” (Objections, ECF No. 19, PageID 577, citing *State v. Davis*, 119 Ohio St. 3d 422 (2008).) That is a misreading of *Davis* where the syllabus rule is “[t]he filing of a motion seeking a discretionary appeal in this court does not create a bar to a merit ruling on a timely filed application to reopen an appeal claiming ineffective assistance of appellate counsel

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Petition, Taylor has two separate grounds labeled “IV.” The second of these, beginning on PageID 16, is the claim analyzed here and in the Report as Ground Four.

under App.R. 26(B)." The *Davis* court then remanded the case for a ruling on the merits of the 26(B) application, holding that dismissing the 26(B) on the basis of *res judicata* was in error. Nothing of the sort is involved here. The Fourth District dismissed the 26(B) application for failure to comply with procedural portions of 26(B) itself, and not on *res judicata* grounds.

Taylor also asserts the procedural portions of the Rule "have never been strictly enforced." (Objections, ECF No. 19, PageID 578.) In support, however, he cites three cases from the Ohio Eighth District Court of Appeals. None of those precedents is binding on the Fourth District. Moreover, the most recent of those cases, *State v. Hubbard*, 2016-Ohio-918, 2016 Ohio App. LEXIS 943 (8<sup>th</sup> Dist. Mar. 9, 2016), the court enforced the ninety-day deadline for filing. The language relied on by Taylor is in Judge Kilbane's dissent, not the majority opinion. See *Hubbard* at ¶ 18. It is worth noting, too, that the Ohio Supreme Court has enforced the 90-day deadline set in 26(B), finding it a "reasonable procedural requirement." *State v. Gumm*, 103 Ohio St.3d 162, 163, 2004-Ohio-4755 ¶¶ 7-8 (2004); see also, *State v. Lamar*, 102 Ohio St.3d 467, 467-68 2004-Ohio-3976 ¶¶ 3-9 (2004); *State v. Cooey*, 73 Ohio St.3d 411, 412, 1995-Ohio-328 (1995); *State v. Elkins*, 74 Ohio St.3d 9, 10, 1995-Ohio-250 (1995).

State procedural rules bar federal habeas corpus review only if the rules are "firmly established and regularly followed." *Walker v. Martin*, 562 U.S. 307, 316 (2011); *James v. Kentucky*, 466 U.S. 341, 348-49 (1984); *Ford v. Georgia*, 498 U.S. 411, 423-24 (1991); *Barr v. City of Columbia*, 378 U.S. 146 (1964); *Rogers v. Howes*, 144 F.3d 990 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998); *Jones v. Toombs*, 125 F.3d 945, 946-47 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997). A procedural rule need not be followed in every case; it is sufficient if it is applied in the vast majority of cases. *Byrd v. Collins*, 209 F.3d 486, 521 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000), *citing Dugger v. Adams*, 489 U.S. 401, 410 n. 6 (1989). "[A]n occasional act of grace by a state court in excusing or disregarding a state procedural rule does not render the rule

inadequate.” *Coleman v. Mitchell* (*Storey murder*), 268 F.3d 417, 429 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001), quoting *Amos v. Scott*, 61 F.3d 333, 342 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995). “[A] discretionary state procedural rule can serve as an adequate ground to bar federal habeas review.” *Beard v. Kindler*, 558 U.S. 53 (2009).

A petitioner must show more than an occasional act of grace by a state court by a state court in excusing or disregarding a state procedural rule for a federal court to conclude that the state procedural rule is inadequate because it is inconsistently applied. *Hutchison v. Bell*, 303 F.3d 720, 737 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002), citing *Coleman v. Mitchell*, 268 F.3d 417, 429 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001).

Here the portions of Rule 26(B) relied on by the Fourth District are part of the Rule as adopted by the Ohio Supreme Court. They are not unique to the Fourth District or somehow invented for this case alone. They serve the legitimate state interest of ensuring applications to reopen are properly supported and of obtaining finality of criminal judgments.

The Objections spend several pages discussing supposed cause and prejudice to excuse the procedural default (ECF No. 19, PageID 579-83). However, none of this discussion is directed to reasons why his 26(B) Application was improper as to form. Instead, he discusses the trial judge’s hostile attitude about his claim of conflict of interest on the part of his trial attorney. The prejudice portion of this part of the Objections discusses prejudice arising from trial counsel’s failure to move to suppress certain evidence. But that is not what is as issue on the Fourth and Fifth Grounds for Relief, which are directed to claims of ineffective assistance of appellate counsel.

### **Ground Three: Insufficiency of the Evidence**

In his Third Ground for Relief, Taylor claims he was convicted on insufficient evidence. The Report concluded the Fourth District had thoroughly considered this claim under the relevant

federal standard provided by *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307 (1979), and its conclusion was entitled to deference under the AEDPA (Report, ECF No. 10, PageID 536).

Taylor objects that the State failed to produce evidence sufficient to support a finding that his sale of drugs took place within one hundred feet of a juvenile. Taylor asserts the State was required "to present some sort of recording establishing this allegation beyond a reasonable doubt." (Objections, ECF No. 19, PageID 584.) The Fourth District's opinion recounts the eyewitness testimony of the confidential informant about age, gender, appearance, and proximity. *State v. Taylor*, 2016 Ohio App. LEXIS 1644, ¶ 27 (4<sup>th</sup> Dist. Apr. 27, 2016). The Fourteenth Amendment does not require recorded corroboration.

Taylor concludes his Objections by asserting that his buyers consented to buy the drugs and consent is a defense (Objections, ECF No. 19, PageID 584-85, citing *State v. Mehozonek*, 8 Ohio App. 3d 271 (8<sup>th</sup> Dist. 1983)). In that case the appellate court dismissed an indictment against several security guards for facilitating theft when in fact no theft had occurred. The case in no way suggests that consent is a defense to a drug trafficking charge.

### **Conclusion**

Having reconsidered the case in light of the Objections, the Magistrate Judge again concludes it should be dismissed with prejudice. Because reasonable jurists would not disagree with this conclusion, Petitioner should be denied a certificate of appealability and the Court should certify to the Sixth Circuit that any appeal would be objectively frivolous and therefore should not

be permitted to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

July 24, 2018.

*s/ Michael R. Merz*  
United States Magistrate Judge

**NOTICE REGARDING OBJECTIONS**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations within fourteen days after being served with this Report and Recommendations. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), this period is extended to seventeen days because this Report is being served by mail. Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendations are based in whole or in part upon matters occurring of record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections within fourteen days after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 153-55 (1985).

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION AT CINCINNATI**

DARRYL TAYLOR,

Petitioner, : Case No. 1:17-cv-267

- vs -

District Judge Michael R. Barrett  
Magistrate Judge Michael R. Merz

TIM BUCHANAN, Warden,  
Noble Correctional Institution

Respondent.

---

**RECOMMITTAL ORDER**

---

This case is before the Court on Petitioner's Objections (ECF No. 10) to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendations (ECF No. 10).

The District Judge has preliminarily considered the Objections and believes they will be more appropriately resolved after further analysis by the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3), this matter is hereby returned to the Magistrate Judge with instructions to file a supplemental report analyzing the Objections and making recommendations based on that analysis.

July 6, 2018.



Michael R. Barrett  
United States District Judge

*A-24*

$$\left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta} \right)_{\theta = \theta^*} = \mathbb{E}_{\theta = \theta^*} \left[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\theta = \theta^*} \left[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta} \right]_{\theta = \theta^*} = \mathbb{E}_{\theta = \theta^*} \left[ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta} \right]_{\theta = \theta^*} = 0$$

10. *U. S. Fish Commission, Report for the Year 1877, Part I, Fishes, by G. B. Goode and R. H. Hildebrand, Washington, 1884.*

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, the discussion of the 1992 Constitutional Convention in the *Constitutional Convention of 1992: The Final Report* (1993).

<sup>11</sup> See *U.S. v. Gandy*, 102 F.3d 1257, 1262 (11th Cir. 1996) (“[T]he *Brink's* rule is not limited to the *Brink's* case.”).

## 第十一章 亂世之亂世

$$T \in \mathcal{C}^{(1,2)} \subset \mathcal{F}_0 \cap \mathcal{M}^{(1,2)}.$$

“*It is the duty of every man to be a good man, and the duty of every woman to be a good woman.*”

19. *Phragmites australis* (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud. (Common reed)

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION AT CINCINNATI**

DARRYL TAYLOR,

Petitioner,

: Case No. 1:17-cv-267

- vs -

District Judge Michael R. Barrett  
Magistrate Judge Michael R. Merz

TIM BUCHANAN, Warden,  
Noble Correctional Institution

Respondent.

---

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

This is a habeas corpus case brought *pro se* by Petitioner Darryl Taylor to obtain relief from his conviction for drug trafficking in the Lawrence County, Ohio, Court of Common Pleas (Petition, ECF No. 1).

**Procedural History**

Taylor was indicted by the Lawrence County grand jury on September 24, 2014, and charged with trafficking oxycodone in the presence of juveniles, three other drug felonies, and a firearm specification. After his motion to suppress evidence obtained by a confidential informant was denied, he was tried to a jury and convicted on all charges except the firearm specification. He was then sentenced to thirteen years of imprisonment, the term he is now serving.

Taylor appealed to the Ohio Fourth District Court of Appeals which affirmed except for failure to advise of a mandatory term of post-release control. *State v. Taylor*, 2016 Ohio App.

A-25

1. **Introduction**

1.1. **Background**

1.1.1. **Problem Statement**

1.1.2. **Objectives**

1.1.3. **Scope and Limitations**

1.1.4. **Significance of the Study**

1.1.5. **Delimitations**

1.1.6. **Methodology**

1.1.7. **Organization of the Study**

1.1.8. **Conclusion**

1.2. **Methodology**

1.2.1. **Design and Data Collection**

1.2.2. **Sampling**

1.2.3. **Measurement and Data Analysis**

1.2.4. **Statistical Methods**

1.2.5. **Reliability and Validity**

1.2.6. **Ethical Considerations**

1.2.7. **Limitations of the Methodology**

1.2.8. **Conclusion**

1.3. **Conclusion**

1.3.1. **Summary of Findings**

1.3.2. **Implications for Practice**

1.3.3. **Limitations of the Study**

1.3.4. **Future Research Directions**

1.3.5. **Conclusion**

LEXIS 1644 (4<sup>th</sup> Dist. Apr. 27, 2016), appellate jurisdiction declined, 147 Ohio St. 3d 1446 (2016).

Taylor moved to reopen his appeal to raise claims of ineffective assistance of appellate counsel (State Court Record, ECF No. 6, PageID 164). The Fourth District declined to reach the merits of the application, concluding Taylor had failed to properly present his claims. *State v. Taylor*, Case No. 15 CA 12 (4<sup>th</sup> Dist. Aug. 30, 2016)(unreported; copy at State Court Record, ECF No. 6, PageID 179-82). Taylor unsuccessfully sought review in the Ohio Supreme Court. *State v. Taylor*, 147 Ohio St. 3d 1446 (2016).

At the time the Return of Writ was filed, Taylor had a pending appeal from his resentencing. That case does not involve any issue presented here, so the exhaustion doctrine does not prevent this Court from proceeding.

Taylor filed his Petition in this Court on April 5, 2017, pleading the following grounds for relief:

**GROUND 1:** Petitioner's motion to suppress evidence in his case should have been granted because of the lack of a proper search warrant due to the insufficient probable cause and sufficiency of the affidavit, thus, violating his Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 14 of the Ohio Constitution.

**GROUND 2:** The admission of evidence alleged to confirm the first controlled buy of drugs violated the petitioner's right against unreasonable search and seizure under the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article 1, Section 14 of the Ohio Constitution.

**GROUND 3:** The evidence presented at trial is insufficient to support petitioner's conviction for drug trafficking, which conviction is manifestly against the weight of the evidence, and the defense of entrapment is established, thus, acquittal is appropriate.

**GROUND 4:** The petitioner was denied effective assistance of appellate counsel when he failed to raise petitioner's constitutional right to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

卷之三

在對外開放的過程中，我們要堅持

**GROUND 5:** The petitioner was denied effective assistance of appellate counsel when he failed to raise petitioner's constitutional right to raise petitioner's constitutional right to a fair trial by impartial, indifferent jurors.

(Petition, ECF No. 1, Page ID # 4, 6,11, 16 and 20).

## **Analysis**

### **Grounds One and Two: Violations of the Fourth Amendment**

In his first two grounds for relief, Taylor alleges his Fourth Amendment rights were violated by the admission of evidence obtained from him in that the first controlled buy of drugs was an unreasonable search and the subsequent search of his home was performed in execution of a search warrant which was not supported by probable cause.

Although the State asserts a procedural default defense to these two grounds, a more fundamental problem, also raised by Respondent, is that they are not cognizable in habeas corpus. Federal habeas corpus relief is not available to state prisoners who allege they were convicted on illegally seized evidence if they were given a full and fair opportunity to litigate that question in the state courts. *Stone v. Powell*, 428 U.S. 465, 494-95 (1976). *Stone* requires the district court to determine whether state procedure in the abstract provides full and fair opportunity to litigate, and Ohio procedure does. The district court must also decide if a Petitioner's presentation of claim was frustrated because of a failure of the state mechanism. Habeas relief is allowed if an unanticipated and unforeseeable application of a procedural rule prevents state court consideration

and the  $\mathbf{H}_1$  and  $\mathbf{H}_2$  terms in the right-hand side of (1) are zero.

<sup>14</sup> See, for example, the discussion of the 'right to be forgotten' in the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), Article 17(1).

<sup>17</sup> See, e.g., *W.M. F. T. and the First World War* (1998), 10–11, 13–14, 17–18, 21–22, 25–26, 29–30, 33–34, 37–38, 41–42, 45–46, 49–50, 53–54, 57–58, 61–62, 65–66, 69–70, 73–74, 77–78, 81–82, 85–86, 89–90, 93–94, 97–98, 101–102, 105–106, 109–110, 113–114, 117–118, 121–122, 125–126, 129–130, 133–134, 137–138, 141–142, 145–146, 149–150, 153–154, 157–158, 161–162, 165–166, 169–170, 173–174, 177–178, 181–182, 185–186, 189–190, 193–194, 197–198, 201–202, 205–206, 209–210, 213–214, 217–218, 221–222, 225–226, 229–230, 233–234, 237–238, 241–242, 245–246, 249–250, 253–254, 257–258, 261–262, 265–266, 269–270, 273–274, 277–278, 281–282, 285–286, 289–290, 293–294, 297–298, 301–302, 305–306, 309–310, 313–314, 317–318, 321–322, 325–326, 329–330, 333–334, 337–338, 341–342, 345–346, 349–350, 353–354, 357–358, 361–362, 365–366, 369–370, 373–374, 377–378, 381–382, 385–386, 389–390, 393–394, 397–398, 401–402, 405–406, 409–410, 413–414, 417–418, 421–422, 425–426, 429–430, 433–434, 437–438, 441–442, 445–446, 449–450, 453–454, 457–458, 461–462, 465–466, 469–470, 473–474, 477–478, 481–482, 485–486, 489–490, 493–494, 497–498, 501–502, 505–506, 509–510, 513–514, 517–518, 521–522, 525–526, 529–530, 533–534, 537–538, 541–542, 545–546, 549–550, 553–554, 557–558, 561–562, 565–566, 569–570, 573–574, 577–578, 581–582, 585–586, 589–590, 593–594, 597–598, 601–602, 605–606, 609–610, 613–614, 617–618, 621–622, 625–626, 629–630, 633–634, 637–638, 641–642, 645–646, 649–650, 653–654, 657–658, 661–662, 665–666, 669–670, 673–674, 677–678, 681–682, 685–686, 689–690, 693–694, 697–698, 701–702, 705–706, 709–710, 713–714, 717–718, 721–722, 725–726, 729–730, 733–734, 737–738, 741–742, 745–746, 749–750, 753–754, 757–758, 761–762, 765–766, 769–770, 773–774, 777–778, 781–782, 785–786, 789–790, 793–794, 797–798, 801–802, 805–806, 809–810, 813–814, 817–818, 821–822, 825–826, 829–830, 833–834, 837–838, 841–842, 845–846, 849–850, 853–854, 857–858, 861–862, 865–866, 869–870, 873–874, 877–878, 881–882, 885–886, 889–890, 893–894, 897–898, 901–902, 905–906, 909–910, 913–914, 917–918, 921–922, 925–926, 929–930, 933–934, 937–938, 941–942, 945–946, 949–950, 953–954, 957–958, 961–962, 965–966, 969–967, 973–974, 977–978, 981–982, 985–986, 989–987, 993–994, 997–998, 1001–1002, 1005–1006, 1009–1007, 1013–1014, 1017–1018, 1021–1022, 1025–1026, 1029–1027, 1033–1034, 1037–1038, 1041–1042, 1045–1046, 1049–1047, 1053–1054, 1057–1058, 1061–1062, 1065–1066, 1069–1067, 1073–1074, 1077–1078, 1081–1082, 1085–1086, 1089–1087, 1093–1094, 1097–1098, 1101–1102, 1105–1106, 1109–1107, 1113–1114, 1117–1118, 1121–1122, 1125–1126, 1129–1127, 1133–1134, 1137–1138, 1141–1142, 1145–1146, 1149–1147, 1153–1154, 1157–1158, 1161–1162, 1165–1166, 1169–1167, 1173–1174, 1177–1178, 1181–1182, 1185–1186, 1189–1187, 1193–1194, 1197–1198, 1201–1202, 1205–1206, 1209–1207, 1213–1214, 1217–1218, 1221–1222, 1225–1226, 1229–1227, 1233–1234, 1237–1238, 1241–1242, 1245–1246, 1249–1247, 1253–1254, 1257–1258, 1261–1262, 1265–1266, 1269–1267, 1273–1274, 1277–1278, 1281–1282, 1285–1286, 1289–1287, 1293–1294, 1297–1298, 1301–1302, 1305–1306, 1309–1307, 1313–1314, 1317–1318, 1321–1322, 1325–1326, 1329–1327, 1333–1334, 1337–1338, 1341–1342, 1345–1346, 1349–1347, 1353–1354, 1357–1358, 1361–1362, 1365–1366, 1369–1367, 1373–1374, 1377–1378, 1381–1382, 1385–1386, 1389–1387, 1393–1394, 1397–1398, 1401–1402, 1405–1406, 1409–1407, 1413–1414, 1417–1418, 1421–1422, 1425–1426, 1429–1427, 1433–1434, 1437–1438, 1441–1442, 1445–1446, 1449–1447, 1453–1454, 1457–1458, 1461–1462, 1465–1466, 1469–1467, 1473–1474, 1477–1478, 1481–1482, 1485–1486, 1489–1487, 1493–1494, 1497–1498, 1501–1502, 1505–1506, 1509–1507, 1513–1514, 1517–1518, 1521–1522, 1525–1526, 1529–1527, 1533–1534, 1537–1538, 1541–1542, 1545–1546, 1549–1547, 1553–1554, 1557–1558, 1561–1562, 1565–1566, 1569–1567, 1573–1574, 1577–1578, 1581–1582, 1585–1586, 1589–1587, 1593–1594, 1597–1598, 1601–1602, 1605–1606, 1609–1607, 1613–1614, 1617–1618, 1621–1622, 1625–1626, 1629–1627, 1633–1634, 1637–1638, 1641–1642, 1645–1646, 1649–1647, 1653–1654, 1657–1658, 1661–1662, 1665–1666, 1669–1667, 1673–1674, 1677–1678, 1681–1682, 1685–1686, 1689–1687, 1693–1694, 1697–1698, 1701–1702, 1705–1706, 1709–1707, 1713–1714, 1717–1718, 1721–1722, 1725–1726, 1729–1727, 1733–1734, 1737–1738, 1741–1742, 1745–1746, 1749–1747, 1753–1754, 1757–1758, 1761–1762, 1765–1766, 1769–1767, 1773–1774, 1777–1778, 1781–1782, 1785–1786, 1789–1787, 1793–1794, 1797–1798, 1801–1802, 1805–1806, 1809–1807, 1813–1814, 1817–1818, 1821–1822, 1825–1826, 1829–1827, 1833–1834, 1837–1838, 1841–1842, 1845–1846, 1849–1847, 1853–1854, 1857–1858, 1861–1862, 1865–1866, 1869–1867, 1873–1874, 1877–1878, 1881–1882, 1885–1886, 1889–1887, 1893–1894, 1897–1898, 1901–1902, 1905–1906, 1909–1907, 1913–1914, 1917–1918, 1921–1922, 1925–1926, 1929–1927, 1933–1934, 1937–1938, 1941–1942, 1945–1946, 1949–1947, 1953–1954, 1957–1958, 1961–1962, 1965–1966, 1969–1967, 1973–1974, 1977–1978, 1981–1982, 1985–1986, 1989–1987, 1993–1994, 1997–1998, 2001–2002, 2005–2006, 2009–2007, 2013–2014, 2017–2018, 2021–2022, 2025–2026, 2029–2027, 2033–2034, 2037–2038, 2041–2042, 2045–2046, 2049–2047, 2053–2054, 2057–2058, 2061–2062, 2065–2066, 2069–2067, 2073–2074, 2077–2078, 2081–2082, 2085–2086, 2089–2087, 2093–2094, 2097–2098, 2101–2102, 2105–2106, 2109–2107, 2113–2114, 2117–2118, 2121–2122, 2125–2126, 2129–2127, 2133–2134, 2137–2138, 2141–2142, 2145–2146, 2149–2147, 2153–2154, 2157–2158, 2161–2162, 2165–2166, 2169–2167, 2173–2174, 2177–2178, 2181–2182, 2185–2186, 2189–2187, 2193–2194, 2197–2198, 2201–2202, 2205–2206, 2209–2207, 2213–2214, 2217–2218, 2221–2222, 2225–2226, 2229–2227, 2233–2234, 2237–2238, 2241–2242, 2245–2246, 2249–2247, 2253–2254, 2257–2258, 2261–2262, 2265–2266, 2269–2267, 2273–2274, 2277–2278, 2281–2282, 2285–2286, 2289–2287, 2293–2294, 2297–2298, 2301–2302, 2305–2306, 2309–2307, 2313–2314, 2317–2318, 2321–2322, 2325–2326, 2329–2327, 2333–2334, 2337–2338, 2341–2342, 2345–2346, 2349–2347, 2353–2354, 2357–2358, 2361–2362, 2365–2366, 2369–2367, 2373–2374, 2377–2378, 2381–2382, 2385–2386, 2389–2387, 2393–2394, 2397–2398, 2401–2402, 2405–2406, 2409–2407, 2413–2414, 2417–2418, 2421–2422, 2425–2426, 2429–2427, 2433–2434, 2437–2438, 2441–2442, 2445–2446, 2449–2447, 2453–2454, 2457–2458, 2461–2462, 2465–2466, 2469–2467, 2473–2474, 2477–2478, 2481–2482, 2485–2486, 2489–2487, 2493–2494, 2497–2498, 2501–2502, 2505–2506, 2509–2507, 2513–2514, 2517–2518, 2521–2522, 2525–2526, 2529–2527, 2533–2534, 2537–2538, 2541–2542, 2545–2546, 2549–2547, 2553–2554, 2557–2558, 2561–2562, 2565–2566, 2569–2567, 2573–2574, 2577–2578, 2581–2582, 2585–2586, 2589–2587, 2593–2594, 2597–2598, 2601–2602, 2605–2606, 2609–2607, 2613–2614, 2617–2618, 2621–2622, 2625–2626, 2629–2627, 2633–2634, 2637–2638, 2641–2642, 2645–2646, 2649–2647, 2653–2654, 2657–2658, 2661–2662, 2665–2666, 2669–2667, 2673–2674, 2677–2678, 2681–2682, 2685–2686, 2689–2687, 2693–2694, 2697–2698, 2701–2702, 2705–2706, 2709–2707, 2713–2714, 2717–2718, 2721–2722, 2725–2726, 2729–2727, 2733–2734, 2737–2738, 2741–2742, 2745–2746, 2749–2747, 2753–2754, 2757–2758, 2761–2762, 2765–2766, 2769–2767, 2773–2774, 2777–2778, 2781–2782, 2785–2786, 2789–2787, 2793–2794, 2797–2798, 2801–2802, 2805–2806, 2809–2807, 2813–2814, 2817–2818, 2821–2822, 2825–2826, 2829–2827, 2833–2834, 2837–2838, 2841–2842, 2845–2846, 2849–2847, 2853–2854, 2857–2858, 2861–2862, 2865–2866, 2869–2867, 2873–2874, 2877–2878, 2881–2882, 2885–2886, 2889–2887, 2893–2894, 2897–2898, 2901–2902, 2905–2906, 2909–2907, 2913–2914, 2917–2918, 2921–2922, 2925–2926, 2929–2927, 2933–2934, 2937–2938, 2941–2942, 2945–2946, 2949–2947, 2953–2954, 2957–2958, 2961–2962, 2965–2966, 2969–2967, 2973–2974, 2977–2978, 2981–2982, 2985–2986, 2989–2987, 2993–2994, 2997–2998, 3001–3002, 3005–3006, 3009–3007, 3013–3014, 3017–3018, 3021–3022, 3025–3026, 3029–3027, 3033–3034, 3037–3038, 3041–3042, 3045–3046, 3049–3047, 3053–3054, 3057–3058, 3061–3062, 3065–3066, 3069–3067, 3073–3074, 3077–3078, 3081–3082, 3085–3086, 3089–3087, 3093–3094, 3097–3098, 3101–3102, 3105–3106, 3109–3107, 3113–3114, 3117–3118, 3121–3122, 3125–3126, 3129–3127, 3133–3134, 3137–3138, 3141–3142, 3145–3146, 3149–3147, 3153–3154, 3157–3158, 3161–3162, 3165–3166, 3169–3167, 3173–3174, 3177–3178, 3181–3182, 3185–3186, 3189–3187, 3193–3194, 3197–3198, 3201–3202, 3205–3206, 3209–3207, 3213–3214, 3217–3218, 3221–3222, 3225–3226, 3229–3227, 3233–3234, 3237–3238, 3241–3242, 3245–3246, 3249–3247, 3253–3254, 3257–3258, 3261–3262, 3265–3266, 3269–3267, 3273–3274, 3277–3278, 3281–3282, 3285–3286, 3289–3287, 3293–3294, 3297–3298, 3301–3302, 3305–3306, 3309–3307, 3313–3314, 3317–3318, 3321–3322, 3325–3326, 3329–3327, 3333–3334, 3337–3338, 3341–3342, 3345–3346, 3349–3347, 3353–3354, 3357–3358, 3361–3362, 3365–3366, 3369–3367, 3373–3374, 3377–3378, 3381–3382, 3385–3386, 3389–3387, 3393–3394, 3397–3398, 3401–3402, 3405–3406, 3409–3407, 3413–3414, 3417–3418, 3421–3422, 3425–3426, 3429–3427, 3433–3434, 3437–3438, 3441–3442, 3445–3446, 3449–3447, 3453–3454, 3457–3458, 3461–3462, 3465–3466, 3469–3467, 3473–3474, 3477–3478, 3481–3482, 3485–3486, 3489–3487, 3493–3494, 3497–3498, 3501–3502, 3505–3506, 3509–3507, 3513–3514, 3517–3518, 3521–3522, 3525–3526, 3529–3527, 3533–3534, 3537–3538, 3541–3542, 3545–3546, 3549–3547, 3553–3554, 3557–3558, 3561–3562, 3565–3566, 3569–3567, 3573–3574, 3577–3578, 3581–3582, 3585–3586, 3589–3587, 3593–3594, 3597–3598, 3601–3602, 3605–3606, 3609–3607, 3613–3614, 3617–3618, 3621–3622, 3625–3626, 3629–3627, 3633–3634, 3637–3638, 3641–3642, 3645–3646, 3649–3647, 3653–3654, 3657–3658, 3661–3662, 3665–3666, 3669–3667, 3673–3674, 3677–3678, 3681–3682, 3685–3686, 3689–3687, 3693–3694, 3697–3698, 3701–3702, 3705–3706, 3709–3707, 3713–3714, 3717–3718, 3721–3722, 3725–3726, 3729–3727, 3733–3734, 3737–3738, 3741–3742, 3745–3746, 3749–3747, 3753–3754, 3757–3758, 3761–3762, 3765–3766, 3769–3767, 3773–3774, 3777–3778, 3781–3782, 3785–3786, 3789–3787, 3793–3794, 3797–3798, 3801–3802, 3805–3806, 3809–3807, 3813–3814, 3817–3818, 3821–3822, 3825–3826, 3829–3827, 3833–3834, 3837–3838, 3841–3842, 3845–3846, 3849–3847, 3853–3854, 3857–3858, 3861–3862, 3865–3866, 3869–3867, 3873–3874, 3877–3878, 3881–3882, 3885–3886, 3889–3887, 3893–3894, 3897–3898, 3901–3902, 3905–3906, 3909–3907, 3913–3914, 3917–3918, 3921–3922, 3925–3926, 3929–3927, 3933–3934, 3937–3938, 3941–3942, 3945–3946, 3949–3947, 3953–3954, 3957–3958, 3961–3962, 3965–3966, 3969–3967, 3973–3974, 3977–3978, 3981–3982, 3985–3986, 3989–3987, 3993–3994, 3997–3998, 4001–4002, 4005–4006, 4009–4007, 4013–4014, 4017–4018, 4021–4022, 4025–4026, 4029–4027, 4033–4034, 4037–4038, 4041–4042, 4045–4046, 4049–4047, 4053–4054, 4057–4058, 4061–4062, 4065–4066, 4069–4067, 4073–4074, 4077–4078, 4081–4082, 4085–4086, 4089–4087, 4093–4094, 4097–4098, 4101–4102, 4105–4106, 4109–4107, 4113–4114, 4117–4118, 4121–4122, 4125–4126, 4129–4127, 4133–4134, 4137–4138, 4141–4142, 4145–4146, 4149–4147, 4153–4154, 4157–4158, 4161–4162, 4165–4166, 4169–4167, 4173–4174, 4177–4178, 4181–4182, 4185–4186, 4189–4187, 4193–4194, 4197–4198, 4201–4202, 4205–4206, 4209–4207, 4213–4214, 4217–4218, 4221–4222, 4225–4226, 4229–4227, 4233–4234, 4237–4238, 4241–4242, 4245–4246, 4249–4247, 4253–4254, 4257–4258, 4261–4262, 4265–4266, 4269–4267, 4273–4274, 4277–4278, 4281–4282, 4285–4286, 4289–4287, 4293–4294, 4297–4298, 4301–4302, 4305–4306, 4309–4307, 4313–4314, 4317–4318, 4321–4322, 4325–4326, 4329–4327, 4333–4334, 4337–4338, 4341–4342, 4345–4346, 4349–4347, 4353–4354, 4357–4358, 4361–4362, 4365–4366, 4369–4367, 4373–4374, 4377–4378, 4381–4382, 4385–4386, 4389–4387, 4393–4394, 4397–4398, 4401–4402, 4405–4406, 4409–4407, 4413–4414, 4417–4418, 4421–4422, 4425–4426, 4429–4427, 4433–4434, 4437–4438, 4441–4442, 4445–4446, 4449–4447, 4453–4454, 4457–4458, 4461–4462, 4465–4466, 4469–4467, 4473–4474, 4477–4478, 4481–4482, 4485–4486, 4489–4487, 4493–4494, 4497–4498, 4501–4502, 4505–4506, 4509–4507, 4513–4514, 4517–4518, 4521–4522, 4525–4526, 4529–4527, 4533–4534, 4537–4538, 4541–4542, 4545–4546, 4549–4547, 4553–4554, 4557–4558, 4561–4562, 4565–4566, 4569–4567, 4573–4574, 4577–4578, 4581–4582, 4585–4586, 4589–4587, 4593–4594, 4597–4598, 4601–4602, 4605–4606, 4609–4607, 4613–4614, 4617–4618, 4621–4622, 4625–4626, 4629–4627, 4633–4634, 4637–4638, 4641–4642, 4645–4646, 4649–4647, 4653–4654, 4657–4658, 4661–4662, 4665–4666, 4669–4667, 4673–4674, 4677–4678, 4681–4682, 4

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, the discussion of the 'right to be forgotten' in the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), Article 17(1).

Chen, Y. (1991). The role of the teacher in the classroom: A study of Chinese primary school teachers. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 12, 351-372. [CrossRef]

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, the discussion of the 'right to be forgotten' in the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), Article 17(1).

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, the discussion of the 'right to be forgotten' in the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), Article 17(1).

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, the discussion of the 1992 Constitutional Convention in the *Constitutional Convention of 1992: The Final Report* (1993).

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, the discussion of the 1992 Constitutional Convention in the *Constitutional Convention of 1992: The Final Report* (1993).

<sup>12</sup> See, for example, the discussion of the 1992 Constitutional Convention in the *Constitutional Convention of 1992: The Final Report* (1993).

總計：1956年1月1日到1957年1月1日，共12個月，平均每天1000人。

<sup>12</sup> See, for example, the 1997 report of the UN Commission of Enquiry on Human Rights in Eritrea.

TABLE 2. Distribution of the species of the genus *Thlaspi* in Europe and Asia.

6. *Leptodora* (L.) *hirsutum* (L.) *var. angustatum* (L.) *var. angustatum* (L.) *var. angustatum* (L.)

“我就是爲了你，才來到這裏的，你爲我做了這件事情，我心裏真不是滋味。”

the CAA does not have the power to regulate the use of aircraft in foreign countries.

1952-1953 1953-1954 1954-1955 1955-1956 1956-1957

19. 11. 2009 10:00:00 19. 11. 2009 10:00:00

19. *Chlorophytum comosum* (L.) Willd. (Fig. 19)

of merits. *Riley v. Gray*, 674 F.2d 522 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982). The *Riley* court, in discussing the concept of a “full and fair opportunity,” held:

The mechanism provided by the State of Ohio for resolution of Fourth Amendment claims is, in the abstract, clearly adequate. Ohio R. Crim. P. 12 provides an adequate opportunity to raise Fourth Amendment claims in the context of a pretrial motion to suppress, as is evident in the petitioner’s use of that procedure. Further, a criminal defendant, who has unsuccessfully sought to suppress evidence, may take a direct appeal of that order, as of right, by filing a notice of appeal. See Ohio R. App. P. 3(A) and Ohio R. App. P. 5(A). These rules provide an adequate procedural mechanism for the litigation of Fourth Amendment claims because the state affords a litigant an opportunity to raise his claims in a fact-finding hearing and on direct appeal of an unfavorable decision.

*Id.* at 526.

In his Reply to the Return of Writ, Taylor asserts he did not get a full and fair opportunity to litigate his Fourth Amendment claims because the Common Pleas Court failed to hold a suppression hearing (ECF No. 8, PageID 517). He notes that his attorney filed a motion to suppress (State Court Record, ECF No. 6, PageID 43-44). In the decision on that motion, the trial judge wrote as an introductory paragraph, “Defendant’s motion to suppress came on for hearing before the Court with the Defendant, Defense Counsel and Prosecuting Attorney present and before the Court.” *Id.* at PageID 47. Taylor claims this is a “bold fabrication. Petitioner avers that he attended no such hearing, and a search of the record provide[s] no transcript depicting the same.” (Response, ECF No. 8, PageID 517.)

Taylor is correct that the State Court Record does not include any transcript of a suppression hearing. Taylor claims this violates the Court Reporter Act, 28 U.S.C. § 753(b), but that statute only applies to the recording of proceedings in federal courts. It is likely, instead, that

the opening language of the trial judge's decision is merely formal language indicating when the motion to suppress was ready for decision. Taylor's counsel did not ask for a hearing on the motion and it appears the issues were well known from the briefs; indeed, Judge Cooper states “[b]oth State and Defendant briefed the arguments of law and submitted them to the Court.” (Judgment Entry, State Court Record, ECF No. 6, PageID 47.) The absence of a transcript of any suppression hearing, if in fact one took place, did not prevent the Fourth District from thoroughly considering Taylor's second assignment of error, which challenged only the audio-video recording made by the confidential informant on the first controlled buy, and made no challenge of the search warrant. *State v. Taylor, supra*, ¶¶ 29-38.

In *Good v. Berghuis*, 729 F.3d 636 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2013), the Sixth Circuit held an evidentiary hearing was not required by due process and followed its prior conclusion that “opportunity means opportunity . . . the state court need do no more than ‘take cognizance of the constitutional claim and render a decision in light thereof.’” *Id.* at 638, quoting *Moore v. Cowan*, 560 F.2d 1298, 1302 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1977).

Consistent with *Moore* and with two of the three votes in *Bradley v. Cowan*, 561 F.2d 1213 (1977)], we make clear that the [*Stone v. Powell*, 428 U.S. 465 (1976)] “opportunity for full and fair consideration” means an available avenue for the prisoner to present his claim to the state courts, not an inquiry into the adequacy of the procedure actually used to resolve that particular claim.

*Id.* at 639.

Because Taylor was given a full and fair opportunity to litigate his Fourth Amendment claims, his first two grounds for relief are not cognizable in habeas corpus and should be dismissed.

### Ground Three: Sufficiency of the Evidence

In his Third Ground for Relief, Taylor asserts that he was convicted on insufficient evidence. Taylor presented this claim on direct appeal to the Fourth District, along with a manifest weight claim that is not cognizable in habeas corpus. That court decided the claim as follows:

A. Drug Convictions: Sufficiency and Manifest Weight of the Evidence

[\*P12] Taylor contends that his convictions for trafficking in oxycodone and trafficking in oxycodone in the presence of juveniles are not supported by sufficient evidence and are against the manifest weight of the evidence. "When a court reviews a record for sufficiency, '[t]he relevant inquiry is whether, after viewing the evidence in a light most favorable to the prosecution, any rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime proven beyond a reasonable doubt.'" *State v. Maxwell*, 139 Ohio St.3d 12, 2014-Ohio-1019, 9 N.E.3d 930, ¶ 146, quoting *State v. Jenks*, 61 Ohio St.3d 259, 574 N.E.2d 492 (1991), paragraph two of the syllabus; *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 99 S.Ct. 2781, 61 L.Ed.2d 560 (1979). That analysis does not include a weighing of the evidence or witness credibility. See *State v. Tolbert*, 4th Dist. Washington No. 15CA5, 2015-Ohio-4733. It simply determines whether the evidence, if believed, would support a conviction. But the weight and credibility of evidence are to be determined by the trier of fact. *State v. Kirkland*, 140 Ohio St.3d 73, 2014-Ohio-1966, 15 N.E.3d 818, ¶ 132. "A jury, sitting as the trier of fact, is free to believe all, part or none of the testimony of any witness who appears before it." *State v. West*, 4th Dist. Scioto No. 12CA3507, 2014-Ohio-1941, ¶ 23. We defer to the trier of fact on these evidentiary weight and credibility issues because it is in the best position to gauge the witnesses' demeanor, gestures, and voice inflections, and to use these observations to weigh their credibility. *Id.*

[\*P13] In determining whether a criminal conviction is against the manifest weight of the evidence, an appellate court must review the entire record, weigh the evidence and all reasonable inferences, consider the credibility of witnesses, and determine whether, in resolving conflicts in the evidence, the trier of fact clearly lost its way and created such a manifest miscarriage of justice that the conviction must be reversed. *State v. Thompkins*, 78 Ohio St.3d 380, 387, 1997 Ohio 52, 678 N.E.2d 541 (1997); *State v. Hunter*, 131 Ohio St.3d 67, 2011-Ohio-6254, 960 N.E.2d 955, ¶ 119. "Although a court of appeals may determine that a judgment of a trial court is sustained by sufficient evidence, that court may nevertheless

conclude that the judgment is against the weight of the evidence." *Thompkins* at 387.

[\*P14] We review Taylor's implicit challenge to the jury's rejection of his affirmative defense of entrapment under the manifest weight of the evidence standard. The sufficiency-of-the-evidence standard is inapplicable when a defendant raises an affirmative defense as justification for the crime because such a defense admits the facts that amount to a violation but interposes a justification for the otherwise illegal conduct. *See State v. Bundy*, 2012-Ohio-3934, 974 N.E.2d 139, ¶30-31 (4th Dist.) We do, however, find entrapment cognizable under a manifest-weight-of-the evidence standard.

[\*P15] The jury convicted Taylor of trafficking in oxycodone. R.C. 2925.03(A) sets forth the essential elements of drug trafficking: "No person shall knowingly do any of the following: (1) Sell or offer to sell a controlled substance or a controlled substance analog.\* \* \*"

[\*P16] Taylor claims that his drug convictions are against the manifest weight of the evidence because "[t]here is simply no evidence that [he] independently formed the intent to sell or offer to sell oxycodone as charged in the indictment." We construe this statement to imply he was entitled to an acquittal based upon entrapment. In other words, he claims the genesis of the crimes originated with the state and not him. The trial court gave the jury an instruction on entrapment, but the jury rejected Taylor's entrapment defense and found him guilty on all the trafficking offenses.

[\*P17] By raising an entrapment defense, the defendant admits that he committed the offense but seeks to avoid criminal liability for his conduct. *State v. Doran*, 5 Ohio St.3d 187, 193, 5 Ohio B. 404, 449 N.E.2d 1295 (1983); *State v. Pack*, 4th Dist. Athens No. 09CA26, 2009-Ohio-6960, ¶ 9-12. The Supreme Court of Ohio defines entrapment under a subjective test that focuses on the defendant's predisposition to commit an offense. *Doran* at 191. "[E]ntrapment is established where the criminal design originates with the officials of the government, and they implant in the mind of an innocent person the disposition to commit the alleged offense and induce its commission in order to prosecute." *Id.* at paragraph one of the syllabus. The defense is available "when the government acts, under a prearranged agreement, through an 'active government informer,' whether paid or not." *State v. Klapka*, 11th Dist. Lake No. 2003-L-044, 2004-Ohio-2921, ¶ 29, citing *Sherman v. United States*, 356 U.S. 369, 373-374, 78 S.Ct. 819, 2 L.Ed.2d 848 (1958). "However, entrapment is not established when government officials 'merely

afford opportunities or facilities for the commission of the offense' and it is shown that the accused was predisposed to commit the offense." *Doran* at 192, 449 N.E.2d 1295, quoting *Sherman* 356 U.S. at 372.

[\*P18] To assist in determining predisposition, the *Doran* court advanced a nonexclusive list of relevant factors: "(1) the accused's previous involvement in criminal activity of the nature charged, (2) the accused's ready acquiescence to the inducements offered by the police, (3) the accused's expert knowledge in the area of the criminal activity charged, (4) the accused's ready access to contraband, and (5) the accused's willingness to involve himself in criminal activity." *Doran*, 5 Ohio St.3d at 192.

[\*P19] Because entrapment is an affirmative defense, the defendant has the burden of going forward, as well as the burden of proving the defense by a preponderance of the evidence. *Id.* at paragraph two of the syllabus; R.C. 2901.05(A). Thus the defendant asserting an entrapment defense must adduce evidence supporting his lack of predisposition. *Doran* at 193. The Supreme Court of Ohio has found this requirement fair:

The accused, as a participant in the commission of the crime, will be aware of the circumstances surrounding the crime, and is at no disadvantage in relaying to the fact-finder his version of the crime as well as the reasons he was not predisposed to commit the crime. Moreover, the accused will certainly be aware of his previous involvement in crimes of a similar nature which may tend to refute the accused's claim that he was not predisposed to commit the offense. In summary, none of the evidence which is likely to be produced on the issue of predisposition would be beyond the knowledge of the accused or his ability to produce such evidence.

*Id.*

[\*P20] The record confirms that Taylor failed to carry his burden to establish the entrapment defense. First, Taylor failed to adduce any evidence that the criminal design in this case originated with a government agent. The Director of the Lawrence County Drug Task Force testified that they received information that Taylor was involved in trafficking in drugs from persons who said they were able to purchase drugs from Taylor. As a result, the Task Force began an investigation of Taylor.

[\*P21] The confidential informant testified that prior to making any buys from Taylor, Taylor set up a meeting with her in which he told

her "how we were going to do things." She testified that Taylor told her, "we were never going to talk on the phone. He's never going to hand me the pills and I couldn't get under ten [pills]." The Director also testified that the price that Taylor sold the oxycodone tablets to the informant, \$30 per tablet, was indicative of his level of significance in the drug trafficking trade. Taylor's price was lower than that typically sold at the street level, indicating that Taylor is higher up on the drug trafficking chain. After officers searched Taylor's residence, they found an additional nineteen 30 mg oxycodone tablets, a number of small plastic baggies, nine hundred and thirty dollars in cash, a bill counter and a counterfeit bill detector. One of the officers testified that the evidence seized from the search showed that Taylor was involved in drug trafficking.

[\*P22] Taylor presented no evidence that the criminal design for the trafficking offenses originated with the government or that a government agent implanted in his mind the disposition to commit these offenses. Thus, the jury's finding that he failed in his burden to prove entrapment was not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

[\*P23] Trafficking under R.C. 2925.03(A)(1) requires an intent to sell and trafficking under R.C. 2925.03(A)(2) requires that the offender must know that the substance is intended for sale, but the sale can be made by a person other than the offender. *State v. Cabrales*, 118 Ohio St.3d 54, 2008-Ohio-1625, 886 N.E.2d 181, ¶ 29, 32. Here, the state proved that Taylor did more than just intend to sell, he actually knowingly sold oxycodone to the confidential informant. "A person acts knowingly, regardless of his purpose, when he is aware that his conduct will probably cause a certain result or will probably be of a certain nature. A person has knowledge of circumstances when he is aware that such circumstances probably exist." R.C. 2901.22(B).

[\*P24] The state introduced evidence that Taylor met with the confidential informant the day before the first controlled buy and instructed her of the protocol she must follow to purchase oxycodone from him. Several investigators and the confidential informant testified about the three controlled buys and the jury saw the audio-visual recordings of the three sales. The state also presented photographs and testimony concerning the drugs and money recovered in the search of Taylor's home, as well as the testimony and laboratory report of a forensic scientist with the Bureau of Criminal Investigation who testified that she analyzed the tablets Taylor sold and those found in the search and determined that they were 30 mg oxycodone tablets. The state presented testimony

that the bulk amount of oxycodone is 450 milligrams and that each of Taylor's three sales as well as the amount found in his house during the search met or exceeded the bulk amount. R.C. 2925.01(D)(1)(d).

[\*P25] On the charge that the trafficking occurred in the presence of juveniles, Taylor claims that the informant "identified two of Mr. Taylor's children playing in the yard at the time of the September 9, 2014 transaction, yet she was unable to provide either their names or physical descriptions with any certainty and the video was inconclusive — casting significant doubt on the first count of the indictment."

[\*P26] The state presented sufficient evidence that drug trafficking occurred in the presence of juveniles. Under R.C. 2915.03(A)(1)(C)(1)(c), "if the offense was committed in the vicinity of a school or in the vicinity of a juvenile, aggravated trafficking in drugs is a felony of the second degree, and the court shall impose as a mandatory prison term one of the prison terms prescribed for a felony of the second degree." An offense is "committed in the vicinity of a juvenile" if an offender (1) commits the offense within one hundred feet of a juvenile, or (2) within the view of a juvenile. R.C. 2925.01(BB). A "juvenile" is a person under 18 years of age. R.C. 2925.01(N).

[\*P27] The confidential informant gave sufficient testimony to establish that there were juveniles present within 100 feet of the controlled buys, even though on cross-examination she was unclear about some of the details. She testified that she personally knows Taylor's children who are both under the age of 18. She identified their gender, race, and ages, and was fairly certain of both of their names and she stated that they were about 20 feet away from her when she purchased the oxycodone. On cross examination she testified that she was certain of one of the child's name, but less certain of the other's. She also stated that she was no longer certain if they had long or short hair because it had been ten months since she saw them during the first controlled buy and it was possible that they had cut or grown out their hair. The confidential informant's testimony provided sufficient evidence that juveniles were within 100 feet of the first controlled buy. The state need not prove details about the children's hair length ten months later or identify them by name to prove that juveniles were present.

[\*P28] Based on this substantial, credible evidence, the jury properly found the essential elements of these crimes proven beyond a reasonable doubt and did not clearly lose its way or create a

manifest miscarriage of justice so as to warrant a reversal. We overrule Taylor's first assignment of error.

*State v. Taylor, supra.*

When a state court decides on the merits a federal constitutional claim later presented to a federal habeas court, the federal court must defer to the state court decision unless that decision is contrary to or an objectively unreasonable application of clearly established precedent of the United States Supreme Court. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1); *Harrington v. Richter*, 562 U.S. 86, 131 S. Ct. 770, 785 (2011); *Brown v. Payton*, 544 U.S. 133, 140 (2005); *Bell v. Cone*, 535 U.S. 685, 693-94 (2002); *Williams (Terry) v. Taylor*, 529 U.S. 362, 379 (2000).

An allegation that a verdict was entered upon insufficient evidence states a claim under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307 (1979); *In re Winship*, 397 U.S. 358 (1970); *Johnson v. Coyle*, 200 F.3d 987, 991 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000); *Bagby v. Sowders*, 894 F.2d 792, 794 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990)(en banc). In order for a conviction to be constitutionally sound, every element of the crime must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. *In re Winship*, 397 U.S. at 364.

[T]he relevant question is whether, after viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, any rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt . . . . This familiar standard gives full play to the responsibility of the trier of fact fairly to resolve conflicts in the testimony, to weigh the evidence and to draw reasonable inferences from basic facts to ultimate facts.

*Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. at 319; *United States v. Paige*, 470 F.3d 603, 608 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006); *United States v. Somerset*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 76699 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 12, 2007). This rule was recognized in Ohio law at *State v. Jenks*, 61 Ohio St. 3d 259 (1991). Of course, it is state law which determines the elements of offenses; but once the state has adopted the elements, it must

then prove each of them beyond a reasonable doubt. *In re Winship, supra.*

In cases such as Petitioner's challenging the sufficiency of the evidence and filed after enactment of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (Pub. L. No 104-132, 110 Stat. 1214)(the "AEDPA"), two levels of deference to state decisions are required:

In an appeal from a denial of habeas relief, in which a petitioner challenges the constitutional sufficiency of the evidence used to convict him, we are thus bound by two layers of deference to groups who might view facts differently than we would. First, as in all sufficiency-of-the-evidence challenges, we must determine whether, viewing the trial testimony and exhibits in the light most favorable to the prosecution, any rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. *See Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 319, 99 S.Ct. 2781, 61 L. Ed. 2d 560 (1979). In doing so, we do not reweigh the evidence, re-evaluate the credibility of witnesses, or substitute our judgment for that of the jury. *See United States v. Hilliard*, 11 F.3d 618, 620 (6th Cir. 1993). Thus, even though we might have not voted to convict a defendant had we participated in jury deliberations, we must uphold the jury verdict if any rational trier of fact could have found the defendant guilty after resolving all disputes in favor of the prosecution. Second, even were we to conclude that a rational trier of fact could not have found a petitioner guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, on habeas review, we must still defer to the state appellate court's sufficiency determination as long as it is not unreasonable. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(2).

*Brown v. Konteh*, 567 F.3d 191, 204-5 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009). In a sufficiency of the evidence habeas corpus case, deference should be given to the trier-of-fact's verdict under *Jackson v. Virginia* and then to the appellate court's consideration of that verdict, as commanded by AEDPA. *Tucker v. Palmer*, 541 F.3d 652 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2008); *accord Davis v. Lafler*, 658 F.3d 525, 531 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2011)(en banc); *Parker v. Matthews*, 567 U.S. 37, 43 (2012). Notably, "a court may sustain a conviction based upon nothing more than circumstantial evidence." *Stewart v. Wolfenbarger*, 595 F.3d 647, 656 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010).

We have made clear that *Jackson* claims face a high bar in federal habeas proceedings because they are subject to two layers of judicial

deference. First, on direct appeal, "it is the responsibility of the jury -- not the court -- to decide what conclusions should be drawn from evidence admitted at trial. A reviewing court may set aside the jury's verdict on the ground of insufficient evidence only if no rational trier of fact could have agreed with the jury." *Cavazos v. Smith*, 565 U. S. 1, \_\_\_, 132 S.Ct. 2, 181 L. Ed. 2d 311, 313 (2011) (*per curiam*). And second, on habeas review, "a federal court may not overturn a state court decision rejecting a sufficiency of the evidence challenge simply because the federal court disagrees with the state court. The federal court instead may do so only if the state court decision was 'objectively unreasonable.'" *Ibid.* (quoting *Renico v. Lett*, 559 U. S. \_\_\_, \_\_\_, 130 S.Ct. 1855, 176 L. Ed. 2d 678 (2010)).

*Coleman v. Johnson*, 566 U.S. 650, 651 (2012) (*per curiam*); *Parker v. Matthews*, 567 U.S. 37, 43 (2012) (*per curiam*).

On direct appeal the Fourth District thoroughly considered the evidence presented at trial, including that given on the entrapment defense. It applied the correct legal standard enunciated in *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307 (1979). Its application of the *Jackson* standard is not objectively unreasonable and is therefore entitled to deference under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d). Taylor's Third Ground for Relief should therefore be dismissed.

#### **Grounds Four and Five: Ineffective Assistance of Appellate Counsel**

In his Fourth and Fifth Grounds for Relief, Taylor asserts he was deprived of his Sixth Amendment right to the effective assistance of counsel in several ways. Respondent claims that review of these claims in habeas is barred by Taylor's procedural default in presenting them to the state courts (Return, ECF No. 7, PageID 511-12).

The procedural default doctrine in habeas corpus is described by the Supreme Court as follows:

In all cases in which a state prisoner has defaulted his federal claims in state court pursuant to an adequate and independent state procedural rule, federal habeas review of the claims is barred unless the prisoner can demonstrate cause of the default and actual prejudice as a result of the alleged violation of federal law; or demonstrate that failure to consider the claims will result in a fundamental miscarriage of justice.

*Coleman v. Thompson*, 501 U.S. 722, 750 (1991); *see also Simpson v. Jones*, 238 F.3d 399, 406 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000). That is, a petitioner may not raise on federal habeas a federal constitutional rights claim he could not raise in state court because of procedural default. *Wainwright v. Sykes*, 433 U.S. 72 (1977); *Engle v. Isaac*, 456 U.S. 107, 110 (1982). Absent cause and prejudice, a federal habeas petitioner who fails to comply with a State's rules of procedure waives his right to federal habeas corpus review. *Boyle v. Million*, 201 F.3d 711, 716 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000)(citation omitted); *Murray v. Carrier*, 477 U.S. 478, 485 (1986); *Engle*, 456 U.S. at 110; *Wainwright*, 433 U.S. at 87.

[A] federal court may not review federal claims that were procedurally defaulted in state court—that is, claims that the state court denied based on an adequate and independent state procedural rule. E.g., *Beard v. Kindler*, 558 U.S. 53, 55, 130 S.Ct. 612, 175 L. Ed. 2d 417 (2009). This is an important “corollary” to the exhaustion requirement. *Dretke v. Haley*, 541 U.S. 386, 392, 124 S.Ct. 1847, 158 L. Ed. 2d 659 (2004). “Just as in those cases in which a state prisoner fails to exhaust state remedies, a habeas petitioner who has failed to meet the State’s procedural requirements for presenting his federal claims has deprived the state courts of an opportunity to address” the merits of “those claims in the first instance.” *Coleman*, 501 U.S., at 731-732, 111 S.Ct. 2546, 115 L. Ed. 2d 640. The procedural default doctrine thus advances the same comity, finality, and federalism interests advanced by the exhaustion doctrine. See *McCleskey v. Zant*, 499 U.S. 467, 493, 111 S.Ct. 1454, 113 L. Ed. 2d 517 (1991).

*Davila v. Davis*, 137 S.Ct. 2058, 2064 (2017).

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals requires a four-part analysis when the State alleges a habeas claim is precluded by procedural default. *Guilmette v. Howes*, 624 F.3d 286, 290 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir.

2010)(*en banc*); *Eley v. Bagley*, 604 F.3d 958, 965 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010); *Reynolds v. Berry*, 146 F.3d 345, 347-48 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998), *citing Maupin v. Smith*, 785 F.2d 135, 138 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986); *accord Lott v. Coyle*, 261 F.3d 594, 601-02 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001); *Jacobs v. Mohr*, 265 F.3d 407, 417 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001).

First the court must determine that there is a state procedural rule that is applicable to the petitioner's claim and that the petitioner failed to comply with the rule.

Second, the court must decide whether the state courts actually enforced the state procedural sanction, *citing County Court of Ulster County v. Allen*, 442 U.S. 140, 149, 99 S.Ct. 2213, 60 L.Ed.2d 777 (1979).

Third, the court must decide whether the state procedural forfeiture is an "adequate and independent" state ground on which the state can rely to foreclose review of a federal constitutional claim.

Once the court determines that a state procedural rule was not complied with and that the rule was an adequate and independent state ground, then the petitioner must demonstrate under *Sykes* that there was "cause" for him to not follow the procedural rule and that he was actually prejudiced by the alleged constitutional error.

*Maupin v. Smith*, 785 F.2d 135, 138 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986); *accord, Hartman v. Bagley*, 492 F.3d 347, 357 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007), *quoting Monzo v. Edwards*, 281 F.3d 568, 576 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002). A habeas petitioner can overcome a procedural default by showing cause for the default and prejudice from the asserted error. *Atkins v. Holloway*, 792 F.3d 654, 657 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2015).

Ohio has a single method of presenting claims of ineffective assistance of appellate counsel: an application for reopening the appeal under Ohio R. App. P. 26(B). Taylor attempted to raise his claims of ineffective assistance of appellate counsel by filing such an application. However, the Fourth District declined to reach the merits of his claims because of his failure to comply with procedural portions of that rule. It held:

{¶5} An application for reopening must comply with App.R. 26(B)(2)(a) through (e):

(2) An application for reopening shall contain all of the following:

- (a) The appellate case number in which reopening is sought and the trial court case number or numbers from which the appeal was taken;
- (b) A showing of good cause for untimely filing if the application is filed more than ninety days after journalization of the appellate judgment;
- (c) One or more assignments of error or arguments in support of assignments of error that previously were not considered on the merits in the case by any appellate court or that were considered on an incomplete record because of appellate counsel's deficient representation;
- (d) A sworn statement of the basis for the claim that appellate counsel's representation was deficient with respect to the assignments of error or arguments raised pursuant to division (B)(2)(c) of this rule and the manner in which the deficiency prejudicially affected the outcome of the appeal, which may include citations to applicable authorities and references to the record;
- (e) Any parts of the record available to the applicant and all supplemental affidavits upon which the applicant relies.

{¶ 6} Here Taylor failed to include a sworn statement and parts of the record as required by App. R. 26 (B)(2)(d) and (e). Under App. R. 26(B)(2)(d), an applicant must provide a sworn statement of the basis for his claim that appellate counsel's representation was deficient and the manner in which the deficiency prejudicially affected the outcome of the appeal. Taylor's application contains only his unsworn statements of appellate counsel's deficiencies and does not include any statements, sworn or unsworn, about the manner in which the deficiency prejudicially affected the outcome of the appeal. Taylor's failure to include a sworn statement in compliance with App. R. 26(B)(2)(d) is fatal to his application to reopen. *State v. Lechner*, 72 Ohio St.3d 374, 375, 1995-Ohio-25, 650 N.E.2d 449 (1995) (the sworn statement required by App. R. 26(B)(2)(d) is mandatory and the court of appeals properly denied the application because applicant failed to include it); *see also State v. Franklin*, 72 Ohio St.3d 372, 1995-Ohio-8, 650 N.E.2d 447 (1995) (an affidavit swearing to the truth of the allegations in the

application falls short of the requirements set forth in App.R. 26(B)(2)(d); application denied).

{¶ 7} Taylor also failed to comply with App. R. 26(B)(2)(e), which requires that he include parts of the record upon which he relies. Taylor cited to a motion to withdraw, a hearing on the motion, and various parts of the trial transcript, but did not include any portion of this record with his application. "App. R. 26(B)(2)(e) places the responsibility squarely upon the applicant to provide the court of appeals with such portions of the record as are available to him." *State v. McNeill*, 83 Ohio St.3d 457, 459, 1998-Ohio-38, 700 N.E.2d 613 (1998) (court of appeals properly denied an application to reopen on the ground that applicant failed to include portions of the record); *State v. Wolfe*, 7th Dist. Belmont No. 97 BA 37, 2000-Ohio-2629, \*3 (Dec. 21, 2000) (application denied where appellant cites to a suppression motion, a suppression hearing transcript and his trial transcript but failed to attach any portion of this record to his application).

A defendant may not point us to pages of the record without ordering that the record be sent to us or copying the relevant pages and then hope that we turn his general allegation of deficiency into a particular one and then hope that we create our own explanations on how his defense could have been prejudiced. We are left unaware of the strength of the three briefly mentioned potential assignments of error, and as the Supreme Court says, "refusal to raise these weak arguments simply does not create a genuine issue of ineffective assistance." *State v. Allen* (1996), 77 Ohio St.3d 172, 173.

*State v. Wolfe*, at \*3.

{¶ 18} Taylor has failed to comply with the mandatory requirements of App. R. 26(B) (2) and failed to demonstrate by sworn statement or inclusion of relevant portions of the record that there is a genuine issue regarding the effectiveness of his appellate counsel. We **DENY** appellant's application to reopen his appeal.

*State v. Taylor*, Case No. 15CA12 (Fourth Dist., Aug. 30, 2016)(unreported; copy at ECF No. 6, PageID 179 et seq.).

In this case, the Fourth District recognized the existence of an Ohio procedural rule in the form of a Rule 26(B) application, found that Taylor had not complied with the rule, and enforced

it against him.

The adequacy of the state ground is determined by examining the State's legitimate interests in the procedural rule in light of the federal interest in considering federal claims. *Maupin*, 785 F.2d at 138, *citing Henry v. Mississippi*, 379 U.S. 443, 446-48 (1965). Ohio has a legitimate judicial economy interest in having ineffective assistance of appellate counsel claims properly presented for decision by its appellate courts. That interest is independent of federal law.

A habeas petitioner can overcome procedural default by showing excusing cause and prejudice or actual innocence. Although Taylor recites this standard in his Response (ECF No. 8, PageID 514), he makes no effort to show he has complied with the standard. That is, he offers no explanation for his failure to comply with the procedural requirements of Ohio R. App. P. 26(B) and no new evidence to show that he is actually innocent. Therefore his Fourth and Fifth Grounds for Relief should be dismissed.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully recommended that the Petition herein be dismissed with prejudice. Because reasonable jurists would not disagree with this conclusion, Petitioner should be denied a certificate of appealability and the Court should certify to the Sixth Circuit that any appeal would be objectively frivolous and therefore should not be permitted to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

May 17, 2018.

s/ *Michael R. Merz*  
United States Magistrate Judge

*A-42*

### **NOTICE REGARDING OBJECTIONS**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations within fourteen days after being served with this Report and Recommendations. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), this period is extended to seventeen days because this Report is being served by mail. Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendations are based in whole or in part upon matters occurring of record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections within fourteen days after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 153-55 (1985).