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

IN RE: T.C.	:	APPEAL NO. C-260026 TRIAL NO. 21/3947 X
	:	
	:	*JUDGMENT ENTRY*
	:	

ZAYAS, Presiding Judge.

This court sua sponte removes this cause from the regular calendar and places it on the court's accelerated calendar, and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court. *See* Rep.Op.R. 3.1; App.R. 11.1(E); Loc.R. 11.1.

T.C. was adjudicated delinquent for sexual imposition and classified as a Tier I offender. At his end of disposition hearing, T.C. requested the juvenile court to terminate his classification and registration requirements. The juvenile court denied the request. T.C. now appeals, and in one assignment of error, he contends that the juvenile court abused its discretion by continuing him as a Tier I juvenile registrant.

Both parties addressed the statutory factors in R.C. 2953.83(D) and the relevant factors in R.C. 2950.11(K) and 2929.12(B) and (C). T.C. submitted several exhibits to establish that he successfully completed probation, and the disposition and treatment order had been effective.

The State expressed its concerns regarding T.C.'s mental health. T.C. was not engaged in any therapy despite his diagnosis of major depressive disorder and generalized anxiety disorder. The State noted that T.C.'s former roommate, coworker,

and friend had recently committed suicide, which could cause T.C. to experience distress and lead him to commit another offense. T.C. had been living with his coworker and his coworker's father.

The court questioned T.C. about the traumatic event and his living environment. T.C. admitted that he was having difficulty coping with the trauma and had contacted his former therapist to obtain options for continued treatment. The court informed T.C. that it would take the motion under advisement until his counsel updated the court that T.C. had secured a mental-health provider. The court reiterated that it was not ordering him to participate in therapy and noted the urgency and importance of T.C. seeking therapy after the traumatic event to ensure his continued rehabilitation.

Four months later, T.C. filed a motion requesting a decision on his request for declassification and informed the court that it lacked jurisdiction to enforce its order for additional therapy, and that he did not need additional therapy to process his roommate's suicide. Three days later, the juvenile court granted T.C.'s motion to issue a decision and continued his classification as a Tier I juvenile-offender registrant "after consideration of all relevant factors."

In his sole assignment of error, T.C. contends the court erred by continuing him as a Tier I juvenile registrant. We review for an abuse of discretion. *See In re J.C.*, 2023-Ohio-1501, ¶ 8 (1st Dist.), citing *In re P.R.*, 2019-Ohio-4751, ¶ 23 (1st Dist.). A court abuses its discretion when its decision is unreasonable, arbitrary, or unconscionable. *Blakemore v. Blakemore*, 5 Ohio St.3d 217, 219 (1983).

Under R.C. 2152.84(A), upon completion of the disposition, a juvenile court is required to conduct a hearing to review the effectiveness of the disposition and any treatment to determine the child's risk of reoffending to decide whether the prior

juvenile offender order should be continued, modified or terminated. R.C. 2152.84(A)(1); *In re A.B.*, 2026-Ohio-2170, ¶ 24 (1st Dist.). "As an exercise of its authority, the juvenile court may continue, reclassify, or declassify a child after conducting an 'individualized risk assessment of the juvenile's potential to reoffend and [] determin[ing] [] the effectiveness of the juvenile's treatment.'" *Id.* at ¶ 24, citing *In re D.R.*, 2022-Ohio-4493, ¶ 28.

To make this determination, the court must consider all relevant statutory factors under R.C. 2152.83(D), 2950.11(K), and 2929.12(B)-(C). *See A.B.* at ¶ 26. The court must consider "(1) the nature of the offense, (2) whether the offender has shown remorse, (3) the public interest and safety, [and] (4) the results of any treatment and follow-up professional assessments." R.C. 2152.83(D); *In re K.B.*, 2018-Ohio-4810, ¶ 6 (1st Dist.). The court must also consider the seriousness factors in R.C. 2929.12(B) and (C). *See In re K.B.* at ¶ 6.

T.C. argues that the record is not clear that the court considered the statutory factors from the "proper perspective," and the decision to continue his classification and registration duties was not supported by the record. The juvenile court stated in its entry that its decision was made in accordance with R.C. 2152.84 and "after consideration of all relevant factors." And the record reflects that both parties addressed the relevant statutory factors during the hearing.

T.C. insists that the court abused its discretion by ordering him to engage in additional therapy and submit proof of the treatment before the court would issue its order. As the State points out, the juvenile court did not order T.C. to engage in additional therapy. The court expressed its concern for T.C.'s mental health because he had suffered a traumatic experience due to the suicide of his former roommate,

coworker, and friend. T.C. acknowledged the trauma and need for continued treatment.

Under R.C. 212.83(D)(6) and 2950.11(K), the juvenile court is required to consider the juvenile's mental health and any need for future treatment. *See A.B.*, 2026-Ohio-2170 at ¶ 40 (1st Dist.). T.C. admitted that he was struggling with the trauma and needed additional therapy, and the juvenile court found a need for further rehabilitation based on the recent trauma. To that end, the court requested an update on his treatment status before making its decision.

As this court recently explained, "Of course, mental health treatment is often nonlinear, as patients may experience 'good days and bad days,' depending on their current stressors." *A.B.* at ¶ 39, citing *Matos v. Commr. of Social Ser.*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 191060, *18 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 17, 2019), quoting *Drysdale v. Colvin*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78616, *5 (S.D.N.Y. June 16, 2015). T.C.'s recent trauma created a current stressor that impacted his mental health and rehabilitation and "it was reasonable for the juvenile court to construe [T.C.'s] mental health and continued need for treatment as end-of-disposition factors weighing in favor of [continued classification] rather than declassification." *See A.B.* at ¶ 40, citing R.C. 2152.83(D)(6) and 2950.11(K). A history of mental illness and mental health stressors are proper factors for the court to consider regarding recidivism. *See In re T.C.*, 2025-Ohio-4730, ¶ 25 (6th Dist.).

Accordingly, the juvenile court did not abuse its discretion in continuing T.C.'s classification and registration duties.

We overrule T.C.'s sole assignment of error and affirm the judgment of the trial court.

The court further orders that (1) a copy of this Judgment constitutes the mandate, (2) the mandate be sent to the trial court for execution under App.R. 27, and (3) costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

BOCK and **MOORE, JJ.,** concur.

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