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SUMMARY: The trial court lacked jurisdiction to entertain defendant’s motion to vacate his court costs under R.C. 2947.23(C) because defendant satisfied his court costs in 1992.

The trial court lacked jurisdiction to entertain defendant’s untimely postconviction motion to vacate a $25,000 criminal fine because the motion was filed after the 365-day deadline established by R.C. 2953.21(A)(2)(a) had expired.

The trial court did not err when it denied defendant’s request to vacate his criminal fines because defendant’s arguments could have been raised on direct appeal in 1992, and therefore, were barred by res judicata.

Defendant’s challenge to alleged irregularities in the transfer of his case to a particular trial judge was not properly raised in a direct appeal of an order signed by that judge.

Defendant’s arguments that the Hamilton County Clerk of Courts violated his constitutional rights by providing allegedly conflicting deadlines for filing his appellate brief and allegedly refusing to file his sentencing transcripts were not properly before the court and were made moot by an order of the court that extended his filing deadlines and confirmed that the transcript pages had been delivered.

Defendant’s arguments that the trial court violated his constitutional right to an appeal when it failed to order service of its decision was made moot by this court’s consideration of defendant’s appeal.

Defendant’s equal-protection claim failed because he failed to establish the elements of an equal-protection claim.

JUDGMENT: AFFIRMED AS MODIFIED

JUDGES: OPINION by BOCK, J.; CROUSE, P.J., and WINKLER, J., CONCUR.