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

STATE OF OHIO, : APPEAL NOS. C-160295

C-160303

Plaintiff-Appellee, : C-160304

vs. : TRIAL NOS. B-9800321

B-9802147

EARL INGELS, :

JUDGMENT ENTRY.

Defendant-Appellant. :

We consider these appeals 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 Earl Ingels appeals the trial court's failure to correct claimed sentencing—enhancement errors. We affirm the trial court's judgments.

Following a jury trial in 1998, Ingels was convicted of multiple offenses contained in two indictments, including four counts of kidnapping, two counts of gross sexual imposition, one count of abduction, and a single count of attempted abduction. Those convictions were affirmed on direct appeal. *State v. Ingels*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-980673 and C-980674, 1999 Ohio app. LEXIS 5788 (Dec. 3, 1999), *appeal not accepted*, 99 Ohio St.3d 1539, 2003-Ohio-4671, 795 N.E.2d 679. His challenges to these convictions in multiple postconviction motions have also failed. *See generally State v. Ingels*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-130311, 2014-Ohio-363, ¶ 2.

In February 2014, in reviewing yet another postconviction challenge, this court found that, at sentencing, the trial court had failed to inform Ingels of the postrelease-control portion of his sentence, and had not incorporated the postrelease-control notification in the judgments of conviction. *State v. Ingels*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-140312, C-140313 and C-140328, 2015-Ohio-1621,  $\P$  3. Because Ingels's sentences were void to the extent that he had not been notified concerning postrelease control, we remanded the matter for correction of the offending portions of Ingels's sentences. *Id.* On remand, the trial court informed Ingels, with respect to each offense, about the length and mandatory or discretionary nature of postrelease control to be imposed. But the resulting judgment entries did not reflect that postrelease control had been imposed. *Id.* at  $\P$  4. Ingels appealed from those judgments, and we remanded the matter again for proper notification of postrelease control. *Id.* at  $\P$  10.

On the second remand, Ingels argued, as he has since 2010, that errors surrounding the imposition of indefinite, nine-year-to-life prison terms for two of the kidnapping offenses rendered those judgments void. The trial court noted that this court had already fully reviewed and rejected Ingels's sentencing—enhancement argument in *State v. Ingles*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-100297, 2011-Ohio-2901, and thus, applying the doctrine of law of the case, refused to correct the claimed sentencing errors. The trial court then proceeded to properly notify Ingels of postrelease control for the relevant offenses, and incorporated that notification into its judgment entries.

Ingels now appeals. In his single assignment of error, he argues that the trial court erred by failing to correct the claimed sentencing errors. We overrule this assignment of error. As noted, we have already rejected this argument in a previous

## OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS

appeal. And a reviewing court's decision in a case remains the law of that case on the legal questions involved for all subsequent proceedings in that case. *Nolan v. Nolan*, 11 Ohio St.3d 1, 3, 462 N.E.2d 410 (1984). Thus, under the doctrine of law of the case, the trial court did not err when it refused to vary from this court's determination that the claimed sentencing errors had not rendered Ingels' sentences void. *See Ingels*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-140312, C-140313 and C-140328, 2015-Ohio-1621, at ¶ 6, citing *Nolan* at 3.

The judgment of the trial court 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.

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

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on October 7, 2016

per order of the court \_\_\_\_\_

Presiding Judge

.