IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO

DR. TRUDY BOND, et al.,

Relators : CASE NO. 11CV-4711

vs. : JUDGE CRAWFORD

STATE BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY,

Respondent

<u>DECISION AND ENTRY ADOPTING</u> <u>MAGISTRATE'S DECISION ON RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS AND</u> NOTICE OF FINAL APPEALABLE ORDER

CRAWFORD, JUDGE

On April 13, 2011, Relators filed the Complaint seeking a writ of mandamus against Respondent Ohio State Board of Psychology. The writ sought by Relators would require Respondent to take action on Relators' complaint against Dr. Larry C. James, a psychologist licensed by Respondent.

On December 16, 2011, the Magistrate filed a Decision granting Respondent's Motion to Dismiss this action. On December 30, 2011, Relators filed objections to the Magistrate's Decision.

Pursuant to Civ. R. 53, the Court has undertaken an independent and *de novo* review of the record and Relators' objections to the Magistrate's Decision.

The Magistrate concluded that this case must be dismissed because Relators do not have standing to pursue this action. "It is well established that before an Ohio court can consider the merits of a legal claim, the person seeking relief must establish standing to sue." *State ex rel. Ohio Academy of Trial Lawyers v. Sheward*, 86 Ohio St.3d 451, 469 (1999). The Court finds that Relators have not alleged direct and concrete personal

injury as required for private litigant standing and have not established "public right"

standing.

The Magistrate further concluded that this action must be dismissed for failure to

state a claim under Civ. R. 12(B)(6). In order to obtain a writ of mandamus, a Relator

must demonstrate that: (1) Relator has a clear legal right to the relief sought; (2)

Respondent has a clear legal duty to provide the requested relief; and (3) Relator has no

plain and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of the law. State ex. rel. Gill v. School

Emp. Retirement Sys. of Ohio, 121 Ohio St.3d 567, 2009-Ohio-1358, ¶18.

R.C. 4732.17(A) provides that Respondent "may" issue a reprimand or suspend or

revoke the license of a psychologist on the specified grounds. Relators have cited no

legal authority requiring Respondent to initiate disciplinary action against a licensee or to

provide an explanation of a decision not to pursue formal action. The Court concludes

that Relators cannot establish a clear legal right to the relief sought or that Respondent

has a clear legal duty to provide the requested relief.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court hereby overrules Relators' objections to the

Magistrate's December 16, 2011 Decision and adopts said Decision in its entirety. This

case is hereby dismissed. Respondent's Motion to Stay Discovery filed May 18, 2011 is

moot and Relators' Motion for an Oral Hearing filed August 24, 2011 is denied. This is a

final appealable Order.

Copies to:

Terry J. Lodge, Counsel for Relators 316 N. Michigan Street, Suite 520

Toledo OH 43604-5627

Roger F. Carroll, Counsel for Respondent

30 E. Broad Street, 26th Floor

Columbus OH 43215-3400

2

Franklin County Court of Common Pleas

Date: 06-26-2013

Case Title: DR TRUDY BOND -VS- OHIO STATE BOARD PSYCHOLOGY

Case Number: 11CV004711

Type: DECISION/ENTRY

It Is So Ordered.

/s/ Judge Dale Crawford

Electronically signed on 2013-Jun-26 page 3 of 3

Court Disposition

Case Number: 11CV004711

Case Style: DR TRUDY BOND -VS- OHIO STATE BOARD

PSYCHOLOGY

Case Terminated: 18 - Other Terminations

Final Appealable Order: Yes

Motion Tie Off Information:

1. Motion CMS Document ld: 11CV0047112011-12-3099980000

Document Title: 12-30-2011-OBJECTION TO

Disposition: OBJECTION DENIED

2. Motion CMS Document ld: 11CV0047112011-05-1899980000

Document Title: 05-18-2011-MOTION TO STAY

Disposition: MOTION IS MOOT

3. Motion CMS Document ld: 11CV0047112011-06-1499980000

Document Title: 06-14-2011-MOTION

Disposition: MOTION IS MOOT