

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

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO. C-170099
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	TRIAL NO. M-17CRB-2681
vs.	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
BUTLER OBASOGIE,	:	
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 Butler Obasogie was cited by the Village of Woodlawn to appear in the Woodlawn Mayor’s Court to answer the charge of disorderly conduct in violation of Woodlawn Ordinance 648-04(A)(3) for his disruptive conduct at the Woodlawn Kroger store. After a trial to a magistrate, Obasogie was found guilty as charged. He appealed the judgment of the mayor’s court to the Hamilton County Municipal Court.

Following a bench trial, the municipal court found Obasogie guilty of minor-misdemeanor disorderly conduct, imposed a \$150 fine, and ordered him to stay away from the Woodlawn Kroger store.

From that conviction, Obasogie appeals. He presents on appeal a single assignment of error that essentially challenges the weight and sufficiency of the evidence to support his conviction for disorderly conduct, because the witnesses were not credible and because the courts erroneously failed to provide him with a copy of the videotape from the Kroger store prior to his trials.

**OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS**

---

An appeal from the mayor's court to the municipal court proceeds as a trial de novo. See R.C. 1905.25. See also *Blue Ash v. Hensley*, 2014-Ohio-3428, 17 N.E.3d 1180, ¶ 16 (1st Dist.); *Covington v. Lytle*, 69 Ohio St.2d 659, 662, 433 N.E.2d 597 (1982). Thus, we are limited to reviewing Obasogie's conviction by the municipal court.

The municipal court record reflects that Obasogie proceeded pro se. He did not file a motion for discovery of the videotape. Nor did he subpoena witnesses to bring the videotape to his trial.

Obasogie, moreover, has not provided this court with a transcript of his trial before the municipal court. As the appellant, Obasogie is responsible for providing this court with the parts of the record necessary to resolve his assignment of error. See App.R. 9(B). Without a transcript from his trial, this court cannot review his challenges to the admission of evidence or to the sufficiency or weight of the evidence supporting his conviction, and we must presume the validity of the lower court's proceedings. See *Knapp v. Edwards, Laboratories*, 61 Ohio St.2d 197, 199, 400 N.E.2d 384 (1980). We, therefore, overrule the sole assignment of error and affirm the judgment of the trial court.

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.

**MYERS, P.J., MILLER and DETERS, JJ.**

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on May 23, 2018

per order of the court \_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Judge