

1a

APPENDIX A  
IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF  
DELAWARE COUNTY, OHIO  
CASE NO. 22 CAF 03 0016

BRIAN E. LEAF

Plaintiff – Appellee

-vs-

RHONDA J LEAF NKA RING

Defendant-Appellant

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

BY ORDINARY MAIL

(RULE 4.6 (D), OHIO CIVIL RULES)

I hereby certify that, pursuant to written instructions received by this Office from the attorney for Plaintiff/Defendant, I complied with said written instructions and mailed the documents requested to be served to the following named person/persons at the address/addresses indicated, by ORDINARY UNITED STATES MAIL on this date: October 7, 2022.

1a cont.

## APPENDIX A

Document(s) mailed:

JUDGEMENT ENTRY VOL 67 PAGES 260 & 261  
ATTN: RHONDA LEAF RING  
3030 WILSON ROAD  
SUNBURY, OHIO 43074

DOUGLAS WARNOCK  
20 E CENTRAL AVENUE  
DELAWARE, OHIO 43015

NATALIE FRAVEL  
DELAWARE COUNTY CLERK  
By Deputy Clerk: Patricia M. Cline

APPENDIX A  
COURT OF APPEALS  
DELAWARE COUNTY, OHIO  
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

BRIAN E. LEAF

Plaintiff – Appellee

-vs-

RHONDA J. LEAF( NKA RING)

Defendant-Appellant

CHARACTER OF PROCEEDING

JUDGES: Hon. Craig R. Baldwin, J.

Hon. Earle E. Wise Jr., P.J.

Hon. John W. Wise, J.

Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016

OPINION

Civil Appeal from the Court

Of Common Pleas, Domestic

Relations Division, Case

No. 22 CAF 03 0016

Affirmed

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

### JUDGEMENT:

DATE OF JUDGMENT ENTRY

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff-Appellee

DOUGLAS W. WARNOCK

DOUGLAS W. WARNOCK CO. LPA

20 East Central Avenue

Delaware, Ohio 43015

For Defendant-Appellant

RHONDA J. RING

PRO SE

2020 Wilson Road

Sunbury, Ohio 43074

Court of Appeals Delaware Co, Ohio

I hereby certify the within be a true copy of  
the original on file in this office.

Natalie Fravel, Clerk of Courts,

By \_\_\_\_\_ Deputy Sept 20, 2022

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

Delaware County, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016 2

Wise, John J

(1) Defendant-Appellant Rhonda J.. Leaf nka Ring appeals the February 14, 2022 decision of the Delaware County Court of Common Pleas wherein the court ruled on six pending post decree motions.

(2) Plaintiff-Appellee is Brian E. Leaf

### STATEMENT OF THE FACTS AND CASE

(3) The relevant facts and procedural history are as follows:

(4) The parties in this matter were married on February 21, 1999.

(5) Two children were born as issue of the marriage: M.L. (DOB December 21, 2001) and H.L. (DOB October 16, 2004).

(6) Plaintiff-Appellee Brian E. Leaf filed a Complaint for Divorce on December 9, 2019.

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

(7) An Agreed Judgment Entry-Decree of Divorce was filed herein on June 30, 2021. Said Decree made final orders as to the allocation of parental rights and responsibilities for a minor child, the award, amount, term, and payment of

Delaware county, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016 3

spousal support by Appellee to Appellant; and the division of all of the parties' property including assets and liabilities. The Decree was reviewed and approved by both parties and their respective attorneys, initialed and signed by Appellee and Appellant; signed by legal counsel for each of the parties; and, reviewed, approved, signed, and filed by the trial court. No appeal was taken from the Divorce Decree.

(8) On December 3, 2021, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Contempt and other relief and a motion to excuse or extend time for payments and, or stay certain orders.

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

Delaware county, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016

(9) On December 7, 2021, Defendant filed a Motion to Release Attorney and to Stay Certain Orders.

(10) On January 11, 2022, Plaintiff filed a motion to approve Qualified Domestic Relations order.

(11) On January 18, 2022, Defendant filed a Motion for Contempt and other relief and a motion for completion of payment per divorce decree (6/30/21) and Contempt of court order.

Delaware County, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016

4

(12) Hearings were held on these post-decree proceedings on Dec. 13, 2021 and February2, 2022. At each of these hearings, the trial court heard testimony and took evidence. Following each of the said hearings, the trial court issued judgment entries.

(13) in the December 21, 2021, Judgement Entry and the February 14, 2022, judgement entry, the

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

trial court set forth what transpired at the December 13, 2021 and February 2, 2022 hearings, respectively, and made orders. The February 14, 2022 Judgement Entry made final orders with respect to the then pending motions as follows:

1. Qualified Domestic Relations Order. After further discussion and drafting, the parties agreed on the terms and language to be included in the qualified domestic relations order (QDRO) called for in section 14 C. (on pages 27-28) of the Decree of Divorce. The parties approved the QDRO and submitted it to the Court for review and approval. The court approved the QDRO, signed it and filed it on February 2, 2022.

2. Timeshare-Hilton Grand Vacation Company; LLC. LV Tower 52 Vacation Suites, A Vacation Ownership Resort Member Number.

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

Delaware County, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016 5

792701696, The orders and provisions set forth in the Decree of Divorce in section 7.D (on pages 18-19), as the same relate to the said timeshare: are clear and unambiguous, shall not be changed; and, shall remain in full force and effect as written therein. The evidence showed that the timeshare cannot be divided into two separate one-bedroom units for each of the parties. Therefore, as provided in the Decree of Divorce, the parties shall proceed to “sell the timeshare at the best price obtainable.” With either of the parties having the option to “buy out” the interest of the other at a price mutually agreed to by both of the parties.” Ms. Ring declined to ‘buy out’ the interest of Mr. Leaf, so the parties shall proceed to sell the timeshare as provided in the Decree of Divorce and according to the terms therein. Further, there is no provision in

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

the Decree of Divorce for Ms. Ring's planned use of the timeshare in 2022.

3. 2021 PPP loan. Referring to section 12. B. (on page 25) of the Decree of Divorce and section 2. (on page 3-4) of the 12/21/2021 Judgment Entry, the Court

Delaware County, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016 6

finds that Mr. Leaf requested and received formal notice of forgiveness of the 2021 PPP loan, in the amount of \$60,425.00. Mr. Leaf received such formal notice on January 20, 2022 therefore, Mr. Leaf is obligated under the previous orders of the court to pay to Ms. Ring one-half of the forgiven amount, i.e., \$30,212.50, on or before February 19, 2022.

(3) Business Interests: After the Pretrial on December 13, 2021, Ms. Ring signed and delivered certain documents to transfer to Mr. Leaf and, or to release, her ownership and other

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

interests in Leaf Chiropractic & Wellness Center, Inc. Mikhan Properties LLC, and Mikhan, LLC. Without modifying or limiting the orders in or provisions of the Decree of Divorce (for example, in section 12, on pages 24-26), but to enforce these orders and provisions, the Court now requires Ms. Ring to complete such transfer(s) and release(s) by resigning as an office of Leaf Chiropractic & Wellness Center, Inc and signing the document(s) reasonably necessary to do so. Further, Mr. Leaf has agreed to sign documents reasonably necessary to evidence that he does not own any interest in Massage Professionals, LLC. The “refinancing” and payment in full of the State Route 521 mortgage debts having been completed by Mr. Leaf on or before December 31,

Delaware County, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016

7

2021 (as provided in section 7B, on pages 16-17 of the Decree of Divorce), and the equalizing

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

distribution (provided for in section 13, on page 26-27 of the Decree of Divorce) having been paid in full, all of the original transfer documents described, and all of the escrow obligations set forth in section 4. (on page 4) of the 12/21/2021 Judgement Entry are released.

(5) Apple Home Application. As provided in section 22 (on Page 31) of the Decree of Divorce. Mr. Leaf shall not use the (Apple) Home application for the Wilson Road real estate. The parties disagreed about whether Mr. Leaf had been using, accessing, or controlling the said Home application since June 30, 2021. The court declines to find that Mr. Leaf has violated this provision of the Decree of Divorce. Going forward, it shall be the obligation of Ms. Ring to provide to Mr. Leaf specific, detailed , and step-by-step instructions in writing as to what actions (if any) Mr. Leaf needs to take so that he cannot use, access, or control the said Home application (for

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

example, but not limited to passwords and, or, user names). Such instructions shall be on official Apple letterhead and, or, authenticated by Apple so that Mr. Leaf (and, if necessary, the Court) can rely thereon for accuracy and to take any corrective action(s) needed.

Delaware County, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016 8

(6) Requested Changes to Decree of Divorce. Ms. Ring has requested changes and, or, additions to language and orders in the Decree of Divorce. The court declines to modify the Decree of Divorce and make such changes and, or, additions and, therefore, denies all of those requests.including, but not limited to those set forth in Ms. Ring's pending post-decree motions and those specifically ruled on in this section 6.

(a) Spousal Support-cohabitation Language.

The Court has declined to modify language in the Decree of Divorce about cohabitation or to

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

add new additional language. So, the orders and provisions set forth in section 6., pages 13-14 of the Decree of Divorce relating to spousal support and cohabitation shall not be changed and shall remain in full force and effect as written therein.

(b) Quickbooks. The court has declined to revisit the disputes regarding the use and sharing of Quickbooks accounting software and records. So, Ms. Ring shall not be reimbursed by Mr. Leaf for any loss, expenses, and, or, changes incurred by Ms. Ring as it relates to Quickbooks software, accounting, and tax and accounting records. In section 7.B of the Decree of Divorce (on Page 17), Ms. Ring was required inter alia, to transfer to Mr. Leaf all of the Quickbooks accounting software and records. See also section 12. (on pages 25-26) of the Decree of Divorce.

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

Delaware County, Case No 22 CAF 03 0016 9

(c) Income Tax Issues The agreements made by the parties, the orders of this Court, and the obligations of Mr. Leaf and Ms. Ring with respect to income tax returns are set forth clearly and unambiguously in the Decree of Divorce, including in section 4. (on pages 6-9) and in section 16. (on pages 29-30) thereof, both of the parties shall comply with the orders in the Decree of Divorce

(d) Dissolution of LLC Any and all requests by Ms. Ring to dissolve Mikhan Properties, LLC and, or Mikhan LLC are denied and overruled.

Each and both of the parties shall abide by and comply with the orders contained and set forth in the Decree of Divorce, as such orders are written, except only as otherwise provided in this Judgment Entry.

(7.) Use of Telephone Number. Within a reasonable time after the filing of this Judgement

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

Entry, and weather permitting. Mr. Leaf has agreed to remove Ms. Ring's telephone number (which is her cellular telephone number) from his business sign(s).

Delaware County, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016 10

8. No Findings Of Contempt. The court has declined to make any finding of contempt. Therefore, the Court Denies and overrules the respective requests and claims of Mr. Leaf and Ms. Ring for such findings and to hold the other in )ontempt.

(14) Defendant-Appellant now appeals.

### ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR

(15) Appellant Rhonda Leaf sets forth no assignments of error, as required by App.R.16 (A)(3). Rather, in the Argument section of her brief, Appellant set forth the following:1

(16) "THE COURT ERRED WHEN IT ALLOWED THE JUDGEMENT (SIC) TO BE FILED

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

WITHOUT FIRST GIVING A COPY TO  
RHONDA J. RING (LEAF) DEFENDANT-  
APPELLANT PRO – SE PER RULE 28.02.”

(17) Although Appellant in the instant case has presented no assignments of error for our review, in the interest of judicial economy we shall construe the above to be an assignment of error for purposes of the disposition of this appeal.

Delaware County, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016 11

(18) Initially, we note that Appellant’s brief submitted in support of this appeal presents no statement of facts, no references to the record of evidence, and cites no legal authority, as required by App. R.16(A)(7).

(19) In providing guidance to appellate courts faced with vague matters such as that presented in the instant case, the Ohio Supreme Court has established that appellate courts, “(A)re not obligated to search the record or formulate legal

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

arguments on behalf of the parties. "Risner v. Ohio Dept. of Nat. Res., Ohio Div. of Wildlife, 144 Ohio St. 3 d 278, 2015-Ohio-3731, 42 N.E> 3 d 718, 28.

(20) App. R. 12 (A)(2) establishes that, "The court may disregard an assignment of error presented for review if the party raising it fails to identify in the record the error on which the assignment of error is based or fails to argue the assignment separately in the brief, as required under App.R. 16( A)."

(21) In the instant case, the entirety of appellant's argument, as set forth under IX. THE ARGUMENT AND VIII. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT, is as follows:

Delaware County, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016 12

### IX. THE ARGUMENT

A. The court erred when it allowed the judgement (sic) to be filed without first giving a copy to

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

Rhonda J. Ring (Leaf) Defendant-Appellant Pro  
Se per rule 28.02.

### 1. Standard of Review

This court reviews judgements (sic) as a matter of law and in this case Brian E. Leaf Plaintiff-Appellee (sic) vs Rhonda J. Ring (Leaf) Defendant-Appellant-Pro Se, the judgement cannot be used as it is improperly written and served.

A motion to remove the judgement (sic) in its entirety is further requested.

### 2. Argument

It is evident that the Defendant-Appellant Pro Se was not served the judgement (sic) prior to it being filed and therefore should not be used as it is in error.

### Xlll. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

The evidence in this case shows that the Judgement (sic) was filed (sic) without following rule 28.02 and providing the

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

judgement (sic) to Rhonda J. Ring Defendant-Appellant Pro Se prior to it being filed (sic).

Delaware County, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016 13

The evidence also shows that there were items both left off of the judgment entry and put into the Judgement entry in error.

Therefore the evidence shows that the Timeshare should be either worked out in an effectuated agreement, or the Defendant-Appellant Pro Se should be able to keep it since the Plaintiff-Appellee (sic) does not want to share in it.

The Defendant-Appellant Pro Se should also be awarded half of the \$44K that the plaintiff-appellee (sic) removed from their joint account (TD into National Financial Services)

The Defendant-Appellant should also be awarded \$700,000.00 in damages from Defamation of character.

(Appellant's Brief at 18-19).

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

(22) The local rule cited by Appellant, Delaware County Court of Common Pleas, Domestic Relations Division, Local Rule 28.02 Signature by Both Parties, which provides that “(a)ll judgement entries, magistrate orders,

Delaware County, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016 14

and magistrate decisions shall be signed by all attorneys of record and by any party not represented by an attorney...” is found under section Rule 28 Judgement Entries, Magistrate Orders and Magistrate Decisions Prepared By Attorneys/Parties and applies only to those entries, orders, and decisions that the court has ordered a party, or counsel to prepare. As such, we find such rule to be inapplicable here.

(23) Other than this local rule, Appellant has not provided any support for her assertion.

(24) This court finds that no statutory or common-law right of a party to review a court’s judgement

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

entry prior to its filing exists. Further, the trial court is not obligated to allow a party to review a judgment entry in advance of its filing.

(25) Additionally troublesome is the fact that Appellant failed to timely provide this Court with a written transcript of the audio recordings of either the December 13, 2021, or the February 2, 2022, proceedings in which she is alleging error occurred.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 2 By Judgment Entry filed June 6, 2022, Appellant was permitted to supplement the record with a transcript of the audio recording of the February 2, 2022 hearing. Appellant filed a transcript of June 10, 2022, but failed to use an officially appointed court reporter as required by App. R. 9. Which states that an officially appointed court reporter must transcribe an audio recording of a trial. See City of Twinsburg v. Atkins, 9th Dist. No. 20510, 2001-Ohio-1400. Without evidence in the record that a transcript of proceedings was prepared by an official court reporter of the Delaware County Court of Common Pleas, this Court could not consider the transcript in deciding the merits of the appeal. See also, City of Akron v. Giermann, 9th Dist. No. 20780, 2002-Ohio-2650 and Citifinancial, Inc. v. Budzik, 9th Dist. No. 02CA008155, 2003-Ohio-4149.

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

Delaware County, Case no. 22 CAF 03 0016 15

(26) An appellant is required to provide a transcript for appellate review. Knapp v. Edwards laboratories, 61 Ohio St. 2d 197, 199, 400 N.E. 2d 384 (1980). Such is necessary because an appellant bears the burden of demonstrating error by reference to matters within the record. See. State v. Skaggs, 53 Ohio St 2d 162, 163, 372 N.E. 2d 1355 (1978)

Delaware County, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016 16

(27) This principle is embodied in App R. 9(B), which states in relevant part: if the appellant intends to urge on appeal that a finding or conclusion is unsupported by the evidence or is contrary to the weight of the evidence, the appellant shall include in the record a transcript of all evidence relevant to the findings or conclusion. App. R. 9 (B)

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

(28) Where portions of the transcript necessary for the resolution of assigned errors are omitted from the record, an appellate court has nothing to pass upon. As appellant cannot demonstrate those errors, the court has no choice but to presume the validity of the lower court's proceedings. State v. Ridgway, 5th Dist. Stark No. 1998CA00147, 1999 WL 100349 (Feb 1, 1999), citing Knapp, *supra*.

(29) Under the circumstances, a transcript of the proceedings is necessary for a complete review of the error alleged in Appellant's brief since Appellant is challenging the trial court's findings. As Appellant has failed to provide this Court with a transcript, we must presume regularity of the proceedings below and affirm.

2a cont.

## APPENDIX A

Delaware County, Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016 17

(30) Accordingly, the judgment of the Court of  
Common Pleas, Domestic Relations DivisRon,  
Delaware County, Ohio is affirmed.

By: Wise, John. J.

Wise, Earle, P.J. and  
Baldwin. J., Concur

---

HON. JOHN W. WISE

---

HON. EARLE E. WISE, JR

---

HON. CRAIG R. BALDWIN

APPENDIX A  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR  
DELAWARE COUNTY, OHIO  
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

BRIAN E. LEAF

Plaintiff-Appellee

-vs-

RHONDA J. LEAF nka Ring

Defendant-Appellant

JUDGEMENT ENTRY

Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016

This matter came before the Court on Appellant Rhonda J. Leaf nka Ring's Motion to Reconsider a Judgement Entry Filed on Sept 20, 2022 and to Review the transcripts already submitted:, filed September 26, 2022, Appellant's Addendum filed September 28, 2022, and Appellee's Answer Brief filed October 3, 2022.

3a cont.

Appellate Rule 26(A)(1) provides, in pertinent part:

Application for reconsideration of any cause or motion submitted on appeal shall be made in writing no later than ten days after the clerk has both mailed to the parties judgment or order in question and made a note on the docket of the mailing as required by App. R. 30 (A).

Although App.R 26\*A) does not set forth the test to be used in determining whether to reconsider a decision, the test generally applied by this court and other courts is whether the motion for reconsideration calls to the attention of the court an obvious error in its decision or raises an issue for our consideration that was either not considered or not fully considered in the appeal. *Deutsche Bank Natl. Trust Co. v. Knox*, 7th Dist. Belmont No. 09-BE-4, 2011-Ohio-421, 2011 WL 334508, 2, citing *Matthews v. Matthews*, 5 Ohio App.3d 140, 143, 450 N.E. 2 d 278 (10th Dist. 1981). An application for reconsideration may not be filed simply on the basis

3a cont.

that a party disagrees with the prior appellate court decision. *State v. Owens* (1996), 112 Ohio App. 3d 334, 336, 676 N.E. 2 d 956.

Here, Appellant asks this Court to reconsider its Opinion filed September 20, 2022, wherein this court upheld the decision of the Delaware County Common Plea Court, Domestic Relations Division.

Upon review, we find that Appellant's reconsideration request essentially sets forth her disagreement with this Court's decision. Appellant's appeal that this Court either failed to address or adequately analyze.

Based on the foregoing, Appellant's motion for reconsideration lacks merit and is Overruled.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

---

HON. JOHN W. WISE

---

HON. EARLE E. WISE, JR

---

HON. CRAIG R. BALDWIN

4a

APPENDIX A  
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR  
DELAWARE COUNTY, OHIO  
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

BRIAN E. LEAF

Plaintiff-Appellee

-vs-

RHONDA J. LEAF (nka RING)

Defendant-Appellant

JUDGEMENT ENTRY

Case No. 22 CAF 03 0016

For the reasons stated in our accompanying  
Memorandum-Opinion, the judgement of the Court of  
Common Pleas, Domestic Relations Division,  
Delaware County, Ohio. Is affirmed.

Costs assessed to Appellant.

4a cont.

## APPENDIX A

---

HON. JOHN W. WISE

---

HON. EARLE E. WISE, JR

---

HON. CRAIG R. BALDWIN

Court of appeals filed: 2022 SEP 20 PM 12:11

APPENDIX B

Supreme Court of Ohio Clerk of Court-Filed  
January 17, 2023 – Case No. 2022-1310

The Supreme Court of Ohio

Brian E Leaf

v.

Rhonda J. Leaf (nka-Ring)

Case No. 2022-1310

ENTRY

Upon consideration of the jurisdictional memoranda filed in this case, the court declines to accept jurisdiction of the appeal pursuant to S. Ct. Prac. R. 7.08(B)(4).

It is further ordered that appellant's motion for stay of certain orders is denied.

(Delaware County Court of Appeals; No. 22 CAF 03 0016)

5a cont.

## APPENDIX B

---

Sharon L. Kennedy

Chief Justice

The Official Case Announcement can be found at

<http://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/ROD/docs>

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**