

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

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO. C-080174
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	TRIAL NO. B-0706479(C)
vs.	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
GUILLERMO ESTANISLAO,	:	
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

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

Defendant-appellant Guillermo Estanislao, a Mexican citizen, was charged with various drug offenses including trafficking in marijuana and possession of marijuana, each punishable as a third-degree felony. After the trial court denied his motion to suppress incriminating statements that he had made to police, Estanislao and the state reached a plea agreement. In exchange for Estanislao's guilty plea to one count of trafficking and one of possession, the state offered to dismiss an additional trafficking count and to agree to a four-year term of imprisonment. The trial court accepted Estanislao's guilty plea and imposed the agreed sentence.

In a single assignment of error, Estanislao asserts that the trial court erred in overruling his motion to suppress. Estanislao claims that his rudimentary knowledge of English prevented him from knowingly and voluntarily waiving his right against self-

---

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

incrimination when police officers had given the *Miranda* warning in English and not in Spanish. We need not address the merits of this claim.

A guilty plea is a complete admission of guilt.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, “[a] defendant who enters a plea of guilty waives the right to appeal all nonjurisdictional issues arising at prior stages of the proceedings.”<sup>3</sup> By entering a guilty plea, a defendant waives the right to contest on appeal the correctness of a trial court’s suppression ruling.<sup>4</sup>

Our review of the record reveals that the trial court, pursuant to Crim.R. 11(C), ensured that Estanislao’s plea was made knowingly and voluntarily. A qualified Spanish-language interpreter was employed during the plea colloquy. And the trial court personally addressed Estanislao and informed him of the deportation, exclusion, and denial-of-naturalization consequences for a noncitizen offender entering a guilty plea.<sup>5</sup> The assignment of error is overruled.

Therefore, 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.

**HENDON, P.J., CUNNINGHAM and DINKELACKER, JJ.**

*To the Clerk:*

Enter upon the Journal of the Court on February 11, 2009

per order of the Court \_\_\_\_\_.  
Presiding Judge

---

<sup>2</sup> See Crim.R. 11(B)(1); see, also, *State v. Chichester*, 1st Dist. No. C-050381, 2006-Ohio-4030, ¶11.

<sup>3</sup> See *State v. Kuhner*, 154 Ohio App.3d 457, 2003-Ohio-4631, 797 N.E.2d 992, ¶4, citing *Ross v. Common Pleas Court of Auglaize Cty.* (1972), 30 Ohio St.2d 323, 323-324, 285 N.E.2d 25.

<sup>4</sup> See *State v. Kelley* (1991), 57 Ohio St.3d 127, 566 N.E.2d 658, paragraph two of the syllabus; see, also, *Huber Heights v. Duty* (1985), 27 Ohio App.3d 244, 500 N.E.2d 339; *State v. Chichester* at ¶11.

<sup>5</sup> See R.C. 2943.031; see, also, *State v. Yanez*, 150 Ohio App.3d 510, 2002-Ohio-7076, 782 N.E.2d 146.