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

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO. C-260182 TRIAL NO. B-2506895
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	
vs.	:	
DEMETRIUS HUNLEY,	:	*JUDGMENT ENTRY*
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

MOORE, 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.

On December 16, 2025, then 19-year-old defendant-appellant Demetrius Hunley was in a car that was lawfully stopped by police. After an officer detected an odor of marijuana from inside the car, the officer ordered all occupants out of the car. Once outside of the car, Hunley told police that he had a gun in his waistband.

Hunley was charged with unlawfully carrying a concealed weapon, in violation of R.C. 2923.12(A)(2), and improper handling of a firearm in a motor vehicle, in violation of R.C. 2923.16(B). R.C. 2923.111 provides that for an adult to lawfully carry a concealed weapon, they must meet several criteria, including that they must be at least 21 years of age. Therefore, Hunley was not "qualified" under Ohio law to carry a concealed weapon. Hunley filed a motion to dismiss the indictment, which was denied. This appeal followed.

Hunley argues that the court erred when it denied his motion to dismiss, and that Ohio's concealed-carry laws restricting adults under the age of 21 from carrying a concealed weapon and Ohio's laws restricting how an adult may carry a concealed weapon in a motor vehicle violate the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution, as interpreted in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Assn. v. Bruen*, 597 U.S. 1 (2022).

We review a trial court's denial of a motion to dismiss de novo. *State v. Craig*, 2026-Ohio-3131, ¶ 9 (1st Dist.).

We have previously considered *Bruen* challenges similar to those raised by Hunley in this appeal and have rejected those arguments. We do so again here.

Specifically, in *State v. Stonewall*, 2025-Ohio-4974, ¶ 25, 39 (1st Dist.), we held that Ohio's age-based limitation on adults under the age of 21 was a constitutional manner-based restriction and concluded that the defendant's convictions for unlawful carrying of a concealed firearm and improper handling were constitutional. *Id.*; *see State v. Ngaide*, 2026-Ohio-478, ¶ 6 (1st Dist.) (upholding defendant's convictions for improper handling and concealed carry based on *Stonewall*); *State v. Baxter*, 2025-Ohio-5722, ¶ 9-10, 13-14 (1st Dist.); *State v. Reed*, 2025-Ohio-4708, ¶ 5-6 (1st Dist.).

In accordance with our precedence in *Stonewall* and *Ngaide*, we hold that the trial court did not err in denying Hunley's motion to dismiss.

Therefore, Hunley's sole assignment of error is overruled, and the judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

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

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on 9/2/2026.

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