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

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO. C-250494 TRIAL NOS. C/25/CRB/8605/A/B
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	
vs.	:	*JUDGMENT ENTRY*
TODD WILSON,	:	
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

This cause was heard upon the appeal, the record, the briefs, and arguments.

For the reasons set forth in the Opinion filed this date, the appeal is dismissed.

Further, the court holds that there were reasonable grounds for this appeal, allows no penalty, and orders that costs be taxed under App.R. 24.

The court further orders that (1) a copy of this Judgment with a copy of the Opinion attached constitutes the mandate, and (2) the mandate be sent to the trial court for execution under App.R. 27.

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on 9/18/2026.

Pursuant to App.R. 30, the clerk is directed to send all parties, or their counsel if represented, a copy of the court's judgment and note such action on the docket.

By: Jennifer A. Hensley
Administrative Judge

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

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO. C-250494 TRIAL NOS. C/25/CRB/8605/A/B
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	
vs.	:	
TODD WILSON,	:	*O P I N I O N*
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

Criminal Appeal From: Hamilton County Municipal Court

Judgments Appealed From Are: Appeal Dismissed

Date of Judgment Entry on Appeal: September 18, 2026

Connie Pillich, Hamilton County Prosecuting Attorney, and *Verjine V. Adanalian,* Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for Plaintiff-Appellee,

Raymond L. Katz, for Defendant-Appellant.

BOCK, Judge.

{¶1} Defendant-appellant Todd Wilson appeals from the trial court's judgments convicting him of two misdemeanor counts of aggravated menacing. In two assignments of error, Wilson argues that the trial court erred by failing to merge the offenses as allied offenses of similar import and that his convictions are against the manifest weight of the evidence. Because Wilson did not request a stay of execution of his sentences and had fully served them before his appeal was heard, we hold that his appeal is moot and this court lacks jurisdiction to consider the merits of his appeal.

I. Procedural and Factual Background

{¶2} After a bench trial, the trial court found Wilson guilty of two counts of aggravated menacing in violation of R.C. 2903.21. The trial court imposed concurrent 30-day jail terms for the two counts. At sentencing, Wilson orally requested permission to report to jail the next day so he could attend a funeral. The court denied his request. Wilson was taken into custody and began serving his sentences on August 8, 2025. Two weeks later, Wilson moved to mitigate his sentences, noting his employment, his expression of remorse at sentencing, and the victim's lack of a request for jail time. The trial court granted the motion, and Wilson was released from jail on September 3, 2025. Five days later, he filed his notice of appeal.

{¶3} On appeal, this court asked the parties at oral argument to address mootness, given that Wilson had already completed his sentences. The parties submitted supplemental briefing. Wilson's supplemental brief asserted that he had been terminated from his job while incarcerated, noting that he had held that job since 2017 and supervised other employees. He stated that he has suffered financial hardship due to his inability to secure full-time employment since his release.

II. Mootness

{¶4} An appellate court lacks jurisdiction to consider the merits of a moot appeal. *State v. Ekouevi*, 2023-Ohio-703, ¶ 4 (1st Dist.), citing *In re Chambers*, 2019-Ohio-3596, ¶ 9 (1st Dist.). Under Ohio law, an appeal from a misdemeanor conviction is moot when the defendant voluntarily serves the sentence, unless the defendant demonstrates a collateral legal disability or loss of civil rights arising from the conviction. *Id.* Defendants voluntarily serve their sentences when they do not seek a stay of execution pending appeal. *City of Bowling Green v. Al-Murshidy*, 2025-Ohio-3302, ¶ 6 (6th Dist.), citing *State v. Golston*, 71 Ohio St.3d 224, 226 (1994). "'A collateral disability is an adverse legal consequence of a conviction or judgment that survives despite the court's sentence having been satisfied or served.'" *Id.* at ¶ 8, quoting *In re S.J.K.*, 2007-Ohio-2621, ¶ 10.

{¶5} Wilson did not move to stay execution of his sentences. Despite his argument to the contrary, requesting permission to report to jail the following day to attend a funeral is not equivalent to seeking a stay to pursue appellate review. He cited no authority supporting this position, and we have found none. In addition, Wilson failed to demonstrate any collateral legal disability resulting from his convictions. Although he asserts he suffered employment consequences, the letter from his employer reflects that he was terminated for missing work and not for being convicted of aggravated menacing. And Wilson provided no evidence that his convictions will automatically disqualify him from future employment.

III. Conclusion

{¶6} Because Wilson voluntarily served his sentences and has not demonstrated that he will suffer any collateral disability or loss of civil rights arising from his convictions, his appeal is moot. Accordingly, as we lack jurisdiction to

consider the appeal, we dismiss it.

Appeal dismissed.

CROUSE, P.J., and **NESTOR, J.,** concur.