

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

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO. C-060886
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	TRIAL NO. B-0502606
vs.	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
REASHAWNDA SUGGS,	:	
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

We consider this appeal on the accelerated calendar. This judgment entry is not an opinion of the court.¹

Raising a single assignment of error, defendant-appellant Reashawnda Suggs appeals from the trial court's September 21, 2006, entry adjudicating her a sexual predator following a classification hearing. Suggs's classification as a sexual predator stemmed from her plea of guilty to one count of unlawful sexual conduct with a minor. The 24-year-old Suggs admitted to having had a sexual relationship with a 13-year-old male neighbor. In exchange for her guilty plea, a second count was dismissed, and the trial court imposed an agreed sentence of one year's imprisonment.

Following the classification hearing, which included testimony from a court-appointed clinical psychologist who had evaluated Suggs, the trial court reviewed the factors identified in R.C. 2950.09(B) and found that Suggs had had a sexual relationship with the 13-year-old boy and also with his 16-year-old sister. The trial court also found

¹ See S.Ct.R.Rep.Op. 3(A), App.R. 11.1(E), and Loc.R. 12.

that Suggs had a history of emotional problems resulting from previous sexual abuse inflicted upon her, had a substance-abuse problem, and had committed a series of violent offenses while she was a juvenile, and that the court-appointed psychologist had noted that a diagnosis of pedophilia could not be “ruled out” in light of Suggs’s history. The court also noted a previous psychological evaluation that characterized Suggs as being “thrilled by the opportunity to be sexually intimate with [the boy].”

We are persuaded that the trial court had ample evidentiary material before it to produce a firm belief or conviction that Suggs “was likely to engage in one or more sexually oriented offenses sometime in the future.”² Consequently, the trial court’s determination that Suggs is a sexual predator was supported by competent, credible evidence and will not be reversed.³ The assignment of error is overruled.

Therefore, the trial court’s sexual-predator adjudication is affirmed.

Further, a certified copy of this judgment entry shall constitute the mandate, which shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

SUNDERMANN, P.J., HENDON and CUNNINGHAM, JJ.

To the Clerk:

Enter upon the Journal of the Court on November 28, 2007

per order of the Court _____.

Presiding Judge

² R.C. 2950.01(E)(1); see, also, *State v. Eppinger*, 91 Ohio St.3d 158, 162, 2001-Ohio-247, 743 N.E.2d 881.

³ See *State v. Wilson*, 113 Ohio St.3d 382, 2007-Ohio-2202, 865 N.E.2d 1264, syllabus; see, also, *In re Adoption of Holcomb* (1985), 18 Ohio St.3d 361, 368, 481 N.E.2d 613.