

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

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO. C-160269
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	TRIAL NO. B-0307193-A
vs.	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
BARRON BROWN,	:	
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

We consider this appeal on the accelerated calendar, and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court. *See* Rep.Op.R. 3.1; App.R. 11.1(E); 1st Dist. Loc.R. 11.1.1.

Defendant-appellant Barron Brown appeals the Hamilton County Common Pleas Court’s judgment overruling his “Motion to Vacate and Set Aside Sentences \* \* \* Handed Down in 2009 and 2010.” We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

Brown was convicted in 2004 for possession of and trafficking in heroin, along with an accompanying major-drug-offender specification, and for conspiracy to possess and traffick in heroin. A series of successful challenges to those convictions culminated in a judgment of conviction entered February 13, 2012, nunc pro tunc to December 16, 2010, convicting Brown of possession with a major-drug-offender specification and sentencing him to consecutive prison terms of ten years for possession and ten years for the specification. *See State v. Brown*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-110057 (Sept. 21, 2011); *State v. Brown*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-100050, 2010-Ohio-4599; *State v. Brown*, 1st

**OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS**

---

Dist. Hamilton No. C-081026, 2009-Ohio-5347; *State v. Brown*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-040103 (Dec. 15, 2004).

Brown failed to perfect a timely appeal from the 2012 judgment of conviction. And the common pleas court overruled postconviction motions filed in 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015.

In his 2015 “Motion to Vacate and Set Aside Sentences \* \* \* Handed Down in 2009 and 2010,” Brown contended that the trial court had denied him due process and had violated R.C. 2929.14(B) and (C) and 2929.19(B)(2), when, in sentencing him in 2009 and 2010, it failed to make the findings required for imposing maximum and consecutive sentences. In this appeal, he advances a single assignment of error challenging the overruling of that motion. We follow our decision in *State v. Wang*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-150487, 2016-Ohio-7578, to hold that we have no jurisdiction to review the common pleas court’s judgment overruling the motion. Accordingly, we do not reach the merits of the assignment of error, and we dismiss this appeal.

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.

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

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on November 18, 2016  
per order of the court \_\_\_\_\_.

Presiding Judge