

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

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO. C-140662
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	TRIAL NO. 14CRB-20831
vs.	:	
NATALIE HOLLIS,	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

We consider this appeal on the accelerated calendar, and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court. *See* S.Ct.R.Rep.Op. 2; App.R. 11.1(E); 1st Dist. Loc.R. 11.1.1.

This is an appeal from a misdemeanor conviction for assault following a bench trial. In a single assignment of error, Natalie Hollis argues her conviction was not supported by sufficient evidence and was against the manifest weight of the evidence. We affirm the judgment of the trial court.

Ms. Hollis's husband had fathered a child with Ebony Kemp. After a hearing in which Ms. Kemp sought to increase her child support, the two women got into an altercation that led to the assault charge. Conflicting stories were presented at trial. Ms. Kemp testified that after the support hearing, Ms. Hollis approached her with her husband and three other people. She said that Ms. Hollis was swinging as she approached. Ms. Kemp further recounted that Ms. Hollis and the other four individuals punched and kicked her. Alternatively, Ms. Hollis and two of her cousins testified that it was Ms. Kemp who attacked Ms. Hollis, yelling and swinging.

The statute under which Ms. Hollis was convicted, R.C. 2903.13(A), requires a showing that the defendant knowingly caused physical harm to another. Here, Ms.

**OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS**

---

Hollis admitted that she punched the victim when she was on the ground, and that she was “sure [she] probably did” cause the victim’s injuries. This evidence was sufficient to meet the elements of the offense. *See State v. Jenks*, 61 Ohio St.3d 259, 574 N.E.2d 492 (1991), paragraph two of the syllabus.

Ms. Hollis also argues that the manifest weight of the evidence supports a claim of self-defense. In essence, Ms. Hollis asks us to believe her story and not Ms. Kemp’s. The trial court, however, is in the best position to determine the credibility of evidence, particularly with regard to witness testimony. *State v. Bryan*, 101 Ohio St.3d 272, 2004-Ohio-971, 804 N.E.2d 433, ¶ 116; *State v. Williams*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-060631 and C-060668, 2007-Ohio-5577, ¶ 45. Based upon our review of the record—including a weighing of the evidence and all reasonable inferences, and consideration of the credibility of the witnesses—we cannot conclude that the trial court so clearly lost its way as to create a manifest miscarriage of justice. *See State v. Thompkins*, 78 Ohio St.3d 380, 387, 678 N.E.2d 541 (1997).

Ms. Hollis’s sole assignment of error is overruled, and we affirm the judgment of the trial court.

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

**FISCHER, P.J., DEWINE and STAUTBERG , JJ.**

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on September 30, 2015  
per order of the court \_\_\_\_\_.

Presiding Judge