

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

MICHAEL WASHINGTON,	:	APPEAL NO. C-160877
Plaintiff-Appellant,	:	TRIAL NO. P01-1247Z
vs.	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
LATASHA HOLLOWAY-ALEXANDER,	:	
Defendant-Appellee.	:	

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.

Michael Washington appeals the judgment of the Hamilton County Juvenile Court denying his motion to terminate his child-support arrearage.

In July 2013, the juvenile court terminated Washington’s child-support order because the child turned 18. The court ordered him to pay a monthly amount toward the arrearage that he still owed. Washington did not appeal the order.

In June 2016, Washington filed a motion to terminate “child support.” Washington argued that he should not have to pay any child-support arrearage. In September 2016, at a hearing on the motion, the magistrate offered Washington a continuance to get an audit to confirm the arrearage amount, but he declined. The magistrate denied Washington’s motion to terminate, noting that the child-support order had been terminated when the child reached 18 but that an arrearage existed that was required to be paid.

Washington filed objections to the magistrate's decision. Following a hearing, the juvenile court overruled the objections and adopted the magistrate's decision.

In his first assignment of error, Washington argues that the juvenile court erred by allowing the Hamilton County Child Support Enforcement Agency to collect any arrearages, where the child's mother, the obligee on the child-support order, did not pursue the matter.

Under R.C. 3121.36, the termination of a child-support order does not abate the power of any court or a child support enforcement agency to collect any arrearage owed under the terminated support order or the power of the court to punish any person for failure to comply with the terminated order. And, under R.C. 3123.22, a child support enforcement agency is granted authority to collect any arrearage amount. *See, e.g., Sweeney v. Sweeney*, 2016-Ohio-1384, 63 N.E.3d 542 (8th Dist.). Therefore, the court and the CSEA had authority to collect arrearages under the terminated support order. We overrule the first assignment of error.

In his second assignment of error, Washington argues that the juvenile court erred in stating that its July 2013 order would be enforced under R.C. 3113.21(D), a statute that had been repealed in 2001. We assume that the citation of the statute was merely a scrivener's error. In any event, we find that any error in the court's citation of the wrong statutory section was harmless because the analogous enforcement provisions are contained in R.C. Chapter 3121, enacted upon the repeal of R.C. 3113.21. *See* 2000 Am.Sub.S.B. No. 180; *see also* R.C. 3121.36. We overrule the second assignment of error.

In his third assignment of error, Washington argues that the juvenile court displayed bias toward him through certain comments in its entry. However, our review of the entry and the transcript of the hearing on the objections reflects that the court demonstrated no bias toward Washington and that he was given a full and fair opportunity to be heard. *See State ex rel. Pratt v. Weygandt*, 164 Ohio St. 463, 469,

**OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS**

---

132 N.E.2d 191 (1956), paragraph four of the syllabus. We overrule the third assignment of error and affirm the juvenile court's judgment.

Further, a certified copy of this judgment entry shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

**ZAYAS, P.J., MYERS and MILLER, J.J.**

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on October 27, 2017

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

Presiding Judge