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

2900 INVESTMENTS, LLC,	:	APPEAL NO. C-250597 TRIAL NO. A-2300729
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	
vs.	:	*JUDGMENT ENTRY*
DEANDRA JEBRIL,	:	
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

ZAYAS, 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.

This cause is before this court for a second time. In the first appeal, this court affirmed the trial's grant of a prescriptive easement in favor of plaintiff-appellee 2900 Investments, LLC, ("plaintiff"). *2900 Invests., LLC v. Jebril*, 2025-Ohio-2424, ¶ 1, 28-34, 39-44 (1st Dist.) ("*2900 I*"). However, this court remanded the cause "for the trial court to provide a sufficient description of the easement, such as by incorporating joint exhibit XI into its judgment entry." *Id.* at ¶ 38.

This court's remand was based on *Ford v. Estate of Tonti*, 1992 Ohio App. LEXIS 6094, *39-40 (10th Dist. Nov. 24, 1992), which stated, "A judgment entry describing an easement does not need to contain a metes and bounds description, so long as the description is sufficient to show the location of the easement." *2900 I* at ¶ 35-38. The trial court's initial judgment entry subject to the first appeal merely stated

that "'a valid, enforceable easement over the parcel of property, subject to this lawsuit only, is awarded to Plaintiff." *Id.* at ¶ 3. This court found that the entry did not contain a sufficient description of the easement where the entry did not reference exhibit XI and the accompanying testimony that was heavily relied upon at trial to set forth the claimed easement. *Id.* at ¶ 38.

On remand, the trial court issued a "judgment entry addendum" adding the following description,

> The Court incorporates Joint Exhibit XI and the testimony about this Exhibit as the proper description of the easement at issue, [see Paragraph 38 – Court of Appeals Judgment Entry].

Defendant-appellant Deandra Jebril now appeals from this entry, arguing in a single assignment of error that the trial court's description of the easement is still insufficient. In doing so, she challenges that the trial court included "the entire parcel indicated" in exhibit XI.

To the extent that Jebril is asserting that the trial court did not limit the easement to the area at issue during trial and in the first appeal, we disagree. Exhibit XI—a survey map from the Hamilton County Auditor exhibiting property boundaries—has areas highlighted in pink, blue, and yellow. The testimony at trial established that "the yellow area on the map is the 2900 property, the blue area is Jebril's property, and the pink area is 'what we are here today talking about.'" *2900 I* at ¶ 7. The trial court's initial entry granted an easement "over the parcel of property, subject to this lawsuit only." By adding an addendum to its initial entry that incorporates exhibit XI and the accompanying testimony, as suggested by this court in the remand order, the trial court clarified what property was at issue and included only this area as the easement granted, which is the area highlighted in pink in exhibit XI.

To the extent that Jebril challenges the scope of the easement or whether the witness testimony at trial was insufficient to support an easement over the entire area highlighted in pink in exhibit XI, these issues were resolved in the first appeal and are therefore governed by the law of the case. *See, e.g., Nolan v. Nolan*, 11 Ohio St.3d 1, 4 (1984) ("[T]he law of the case is applicable to subsequent proceedings in the reviewing court as well as the trial court."); *Carlon v. City of Cincinnati*, 2022-Ohio-1513, ¶ 15 (1st Dist.), citing *Giancola v. Azem*, 2018-Ohio-1694, ¶ 1 ("Under the law-of-the-case doctrine, 'legal questions resolved by a reviewing court in a prior appeal remain the law of that case for any subsequent proceedings at both the trial and appellate levels.'").

Further, to the extent that Jebril challenges plaintiff's failure to "reproduce" exhibit XI, it is in the record, *see 2900 I* at ¶ 26, and it is unclear why plaintiff would have any burden to reproduce the exhibit when the exhibit is in the record.

Ultimately, the trial court incorporated exhibit XI and the accompanying testimony into its judgment and did exactly as this court suggested in the first appeal to provide a sufficient description of the easement granted. *See 2900 I* at ¶ 38. Accordingly, we overrule the 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.

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

To the clerk:
Enter upon the journal of the court on 10/7/2026.

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: _____
Administrative Judge