

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO**

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO. C-140441
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	TRIAL NO. B-1206599
vs.	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
DAVION ROEBUCK,	:	
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

We consider this appeal on the accelerated calendar, and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court. *See* S.Ct.R.Rep.Op. 2; App.R. 11.1(E); 1st Dist. Loc.R. 11.1.1.

This is a criminal appeal from convictions for aggravated robbery and having a weapon while under a disability. Davion Roebuck contends that the trial court erred by imposing consecutive sentences for two firearm specifications and running these specifications consecutive to the rest of his sentences. We affirm the judgment of the trial court.

Mr. Roebuck pled guilty to three counts of aggravated robbery with firearm specifications and one count of having a weapon while under a disability. The court sentenced him to four years for each aggravated robbery, with three years for each accompanying specification, and to three years for having a weapon while under a disability. The three aggravated-robbery sentences were made consecutive to one another and concurrent with the sentence for having a weapon while under a disability. The three-year terms for two of the specifications were ordered to be

served consecutively with each other and concurrent to the third. The aggregate sentence was 18 years.

In an earlier appeal, Mr. Roebuck argued that the trial court erred when it sentenced him to consecutive sentences without first having made the requisite findings. We agreed, vacated his sentences and remanded for resentencing. *State v. Roebuck*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-130350, 2014-Ohio-1708. Upon remand, the court made the findings on the record and imposed the same sentence.

In this appeal, Mr. Roebuck argues that court abused its discretion by sentencing him to consecutive terms for two of the firearm specifications. But under R.C. 2929.14(B)(1)(g), the court was required to impose at least two prison terms for the specifications. *See State v. Adams*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-120059, 2013-Ohio-926, ¶ 31; *State v. Lawrence*, 8th Dist. Cuyahoga Nos. 100371 and 100387, 2014-Ohio-4797, ¶ 16; *State v. Clayton*, 9th Dist. Summit No. 26910, 2014-Ohio-2165, ¶ 40. The sentences for the specifications must be made consecutive to each other and consecutive to the sentences for the underlying felonies. *See State v. Isreal*, 12th Dist. Warren No. CA2011-11-115, 2012-Ohio-4876, ¶ 72; R.C. 2929.14(C)(1)(a). Roebuck's sole assignment of error is overruled.

We therefore affirm the judgment of the trial court.

A certified copy of this judgment entry is the mandate, which shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

HENDON, P.J., FISCHER and DEWINE, JJ.

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on September 9, 2015
per order of the court _____.

Presiding Judge