

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

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NO. C-180253
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	TRIAL NO. B-1600504
vs.	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
DARYL CHRISTOPHER BEDELL,	:	
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 Christopher Bedell was originally convicted of two counts of gross sexual imposition on December 19, 2016. He then appealed his convictions to this court. This court affirmed all aspects of his convictions except for his sentences. *State v. Bedell*, 2018-Ohio-721, 107 N.E.3d 160 (1st Dist.). This court concluded that the trial court had not considered the proper sentencing range when imposing concurrent, 36-month prison terms. *Id.* at ¶ 37. We vacated the prison terms and remanded the cause for resentencing. *Id.* at ¶ 44. On remand, the trial court conducted a hearing and, after considering the appropriate sentencing range, again imposed concurrent 36-month sentences.

In one assignment of error, defendant-appellant Christopher Bedell claims that the trial court erred when it again sentenced him to 36 months in prison. The state has filed a motion to dismiss the appeal on the grounds that Bedell has served his prison time, having been released on February 8, 2019. Bedell opposed the motion, claiming that he was still on postrelease control and had been classified as a Tier II sex offender.

In his appeal, Bedell only argued that the trial court erred when imposing concurrent, 36-month prison terms, claiming that he should have only been

**OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS**

---

sentenced to time served. At no point did he raise arguments about his sex-offender classification or his postrelease control. And issues beyond the scope of a previous remand are beyond the scope of review following a return of the case from remand. *State ex rel. Natl. Elec. Contrs. Assn., Ohio Conference v. Ohio Bur. of Emp. Serv.*, 88 Ohio St.3d 577, 579, 728 N.E.2d 395 (2000), citing *State v. Gillard*, 78 Ohio St.3d 548, 549, 679 N.E.2d 276 (1997).

Bedell's only claim of error was that the length of his sentences was inappropriate. And since he has served his sentences, his appeal is moot. *See State v. Howell*, 5th Dist. Stark No. 2001CA00346, 2002-Ohio-3947, ¶ 18; *State v. Adams*, Cuyahoga App. No. 85267, 2005-Ohio-3837, ¶ 5. We dismiss the appeal.

A certified copy of this judgment entry is the mandate, which shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

**MOCK, P.J., ZAYAS and BERGERON, JJ.**

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on May 8, 2019,  
per order of the court \_\_\_\_\_.  
Presiding Judge