



court also imposed restitution in the amount of \$2,700 to Coulter for the costs to repair her car.

R.C. now appeals raising two assignments of error. First, R.C. alleges that his counsel was ineffective for failing to determine whether the victim's car insurance affected the restitution amount. To prevail on an ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim, R.C. must show that trial counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness, and that he was prejudiced as a result. *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 687-688, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 80 L.Ed.2d 674 (1984). In order to demonstrate prejudice, R.C. must establish that, but for counsel's errors, there is a reasonable probability that the result of the proceeding would have been different. *State v. Burke*, 97 Ohio St.3d 55, 2002-Ohio-5310, 776 N.E.2d 79, ¶ 6. The failure to make an adequate showing on either prong is fatal to an ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim. *See Strickland* at 697.

Before imposing restitution, the trial court asked the victim if the \$2,700 were her out-of-pocket expenses, and the victim responded that she only had liability insurance. Based on this record, there is no evidence that the restitution amount exceeded the economic loss suffered by the victim. Therefore, R.C. has failed to demonstrate that there is a reasonable probability that the restitution order would have been different had counsel challenged the amount. We overrule the first assignment of error.

Next, R.C. argues that the juvenile court committed plain error when it failed to make a finding regarding R.C.'s eligibility for a three-year commitment because he did not display or brandish the firearm. However, as part of his plea agreement, he admitted that he either displayed or brandished a firearm while the offenses were being committed, and he agreed to the three-year commitment for the firearm specification.

**OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS**

---

Therefore, he waived the right to challenge those allegations on appeal, and the juvenile court did not err by committing him to three years on the gun specification. *See In re B.H.*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-180108 and C-180109, 2018-Ohio-3350, ¶ 8-9. Accordingly, we overrule his second assignment of error and affirm the judgments of the juvenile court.

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.

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

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on July 10, 2019

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

Presiding Judge