UPDATED: 1/29/2020

JANUARY 2020 ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR

LOCATION: COURT OF APPEALS COURTROOM, 360 DEMOCRAT DRIVE,

FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY

DATE: Wednesday, January 22, 2020

PJ: MAZE, HON. IRV ACREE, HON, GLENN E. COMBS, HON. SARA W. 10:45 AM

2018CA001800 BRUCE MARIO BENTON v COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

> Facts: Police stop Appellant's vehicle on the grounds that they ran the plates and discovered there was an active arrest warrant for owner of the vehicle. Appellant tells police that he is driving father's car and produces identification. Upon checking this information, police learn Appellant is not subject to an active arrest warrant. Police search car anyway on ground they smell marijuana. At the subsequent suppression hearing, police officer cannot produce warrant or remember name of individual who allegedly had active warrant. Trial court denies motion to suppress, crediting police officer's testimony that police ran plates and discovered there was an active warrant for owner of the car.

Issue: Was there substantial evidence to support trial court's finding that police had reasonable suspicion for

Appellant Atty: BEWLEY, JARED MATTINGLY, MOLLY Appellee Atty: Appellee Atty: Appellee Atty: Appellee Name: BECKETT, JOSEPH REDCORN, LOU ROBBINS, JESSE * NOTE: 11:30 AM PJ: MAZE, HON. IRV ACREE, HON. GLENN E. COMBS, HON. SARA W. 2018CA000991 DAVID HENGEHOLD v CITY OF FLORENCE 2018CA001454 Facts: Appellants keep 48 chickens on their residential property as pets. The City of Florence has ordinance that lists "keeping and use of pets and animals" as permissible use of building in residential zone. However city also has ordinance that prohibits "chickens do not qualify as "pets" under ordinance. Issues: 1) What deference should be given to a Code Enforcement Board's interpretation of a city ordinance. 2) Should Appellant's appeal be dismissed because it failed to name an indispensable party in the District Court Proceedings? 3) Is the keeping of chickens as pets prohibited under the City's ordinance? BOONE COUNTY HON JAMES R. SCHRAND Appellant Atty: PURTELL, WILLIAM Appellee Name:	CRIMINA	AL FAYETTE COUNTY		TE COUNTY	HON ER	NESTO M. SCORSONE	
Appellee Atty: Appellee Atty: BECKETT, JOSEPH REDCORN, LOU ROBBINS, JESSE * NOTE: 11:30 AM PJ: MAZE, HON. IRV ACREE, HON. GLENN E. COMBS, HON. SARA W. 2018CA000991 DAVID HENGEHOLD v CITY OF FLORENCE 2018CA001454 Facts: Appellants keep 48 chickens on their residential property as pets. The City of Florence has ordinanc that lists "keeping and use of pets and animals" as permissible use of building in residential zone. However city also has ordinance that prohibits "chicken coops." Code Enforcement Board, District Court, and Circuit Court finds that Appellants' chickens do not qualify as "pets" under ordinance. Issues: 1) What deference should be given to a Code Enforcement Board's interpretation of a city ordinance 2) Should Appellant's appeal be dismissed because it failed to name an indispensable party in the District Court Proceedings? 3) Is the keeping of chickens as pets prohibited under the City's ordinance? BOONE COUNTY HON JAMES R. SCHRAND Appellant Atty: PURTELL, WILLIAM HENGEHOLD, JULIE	BEWLEY, JARED MATTINGLY, MOLLY			Appellant Name:			
Appellee Atty: BECKETT, JOSEPH REDCORN, LOU ROBBINS, JESSE * NOTE: 11:30 AM PJ: MAZE, HON. IRV ACREE, HON. GLENN E. COMBS, HON. SARA W. 2018CA000991 DAVID HENGEHOLD v CITY OF FLORENCE 2018CA001454 Facts: Appellants keep 48 chickens on their residential property as pets. The City of Florence has ordinanc that lists "keeping and use of pets and animals" as permissible use of building in residential zone. However city also has ordinance that prohibits "chicken coops." Code Enforcement Board, District Court, and Circuit Court finds that Appellants' chickens do not qualify as "pets" under ordinance. Issues: 1) What deference should be given to a Code Enforcement Board's interpretation of a city ordinance 2) Should Appellants' appeal be dismissed because it failed to name an indispensable party in the District Court Proceedings? 3) Is the keeping of chickens as pets prohibited under the City's ordinance? BOONE COUNTY HON JAMES R. SCHRAND Appellant Atty: PURTELL, WILLIAM HENGEHOLD, JULIE			EY, JARED		BENTON	BENTON, BRUCE	
BECKETT, JOSEPH REDCORN, LOU ROBBINS, JESSE * NOTE: 11:30 AM PJ: MAZE, HON. IRV ACREE, HON. GLENN E. COMBS, HON. SARA W. 2018CA000991 DAVID HENGEHOLD v CITY OF FLORENCE 2018CA001454 Facts: Appellants keep 48 chickens on their residential property as pets. The City of Florence has ordinance that lists "keeping and use of pets and animals" as permissible use of building in residential zone. However city also has ordinance that prohibits "chicken coops." Code Enforcement Board, District Court, and Circuit Court finds that Appellants' chickens do not qualify as "pets" under ordinance. Issues: 1) What deference should be given to a Code Enforcement Board's interpretation of a city ordinance 2) Should Appellant's appeal be dismissed because it failed to name an indispensable party in the District Court Proceedings? 3) Is the keeping of chickens as pets prohibited under the City's ordinance? BOONE COUNTY HON JAMES R. SCHRAND Appellant Atty: PURTELL, WILLIAM HENGEHOLD, JULIE			NGLY, MOLLY				
REDCORN, LOU ROBBINS, JESSE * NOTE: 11:30 AM			pellee Atty:	Appellee Name:		Name:	
ACREE, HON. GLENN E. COMBS, HON. SARA W. 2018CA000991 DAVID HENGEHOLD v CITY OF FLORENCE 2018CA001454 Facts: Appellants keep 48 chickens on their residential property as pets. The City of Florence has ordinance that lists "keeping and use of pets and animals" as permissible use of building in residential zone. However city also has ordinance that prohibits "chicken coops." Code Enforcement Board, District Court, and Circuit Court finds that Appellants' chickens do not qualify as "pets" under ordinance. Issues: 1) What deference should be given to a Code Enforcement Board's interpretation of a city ordinance 2) Should Appellant's appeal be dismissed because it failed to name an indispensable party in the District Court Proceedings? 3) Is the keeping of chickens as pets prohibited under the City's ordinance? BOONE COUNTY HON JAMES R. SCHRAND Appellant Atty: PURTELL, WILLIAM HENGEHOLD, JULIE	_	REDCO	ORN, LOU		COMMONWEAL	TH OF KENTUCKY	
2018CA000991 DAVID HENGEHOLD v CITY OF FLORENCE Facts: Appellants keep 48 chickens on their residential property as pets. The City of Florence has ordinance that lists "keeping and use of pets and animals" as permissible use of building in residential zone. However city also has ordinance that prohibits "chicken coops." Code Enforcement Board, District Court, and Circuit Court finds that Appellants' chickens do not qualify as "pets" under ordinance. Issues: 1) What deference should be given to a Code Enforcement Board's interpretation of a city ordinance 2) Should Appellant's appeal be dismissed because it failed to name an indispensable party in the District Court Proceedings? 3) Is the keeping of chickens as pets prohibited under the City's ordinance? BOONE COUNTY HON JAMES R. SCHRAND Appellant Atty: PURTELL, WILLIAM HENGEHOLD, JULIE	* NOTE	:					
Facts: Appellants keep 48 chickens on their residential property as pets. The City of Florence has ordinance that lists "keeping and use of pets and animals" as permissible use of building in residential zone. However city also has ordinance that prohibits "chicken coops." Code Enforcement Board, District Court, and Circuit Court finds that Appellants' chickens do not qualify as "pets" under ordinance. Issues: 1) What deference should be given to a Code Enforcement Board's interpretation of a city ordinance 2) Should Appellant's appeal be dismissed because it failed to name an indispensable party in the District Court Proceedings? 3) Is the keeping of chickens as pets prohibited under the City's ordinance? BOONE COUNTY HON JAMES R. SCHRAND Appellant Atty: PURTELL, WILLIAM HENGEHOLD, JULIE	11:30 AN	/ PJ:	MAZE, HON. IRV		ACREE, HON. GLENN E.	COMBS, HON. SARA W.	
Facts: Appellants keep 48 chickens on their residential property as pets. The City of Florence has ordinance that lists "keeping and use of pets and animals" as permissible use of building in residential zone. However city also has ordinance that prohibits "chicken coops." Code Enforcement Board, District Court, and Circuit Court finds that Appellants' chickens do not qualify as "pets" under ordinance. Issues: 1) What deference should be given to a Code Enforcement Board's interpretation of a city ordinance 2) Should Appellant's appeal be dismissed because it failed to name an indispensable party in the District Court Proceedings? 3) Is the keeping of chickens as pets prohibited under the City's ordinance? BOONE COUNTY HON JAMES R. SCHRAND Appellant Atty: PURTELL, WILLIAM HENGEHOLD, JULIE	2018CA0	000991	DAVID HE	NGEHOLD v CITY O	F FLORENCE		
Appellant Atty: PURTELL, WILLIAM Appellant Name: HENGEHOLD, JULIE	20180	CA0014	Facts: Appel that lists "kectity also has Court finds to Issues: 1) W 2) Should App Court Procee	eping and use of pets a ordinance that prohibit hat Appellants' chickens hat deference should be opellant's appeal be disedings?	nd animals" as permissible use of build s "chicken coops." Code Enforcement I s do not qualify as "pets" under ordinan e given to a Code Enforcement Board's missed because it failed to name an ind	ding in residential zone. However, Board, District Court, and Circuit ace. Interpretation of a city ordinance? dispensable party in the District	
PURTELL, WILLIAM HENGEHOLD, JULIE			BOON	E COUNTY	ном ј	AMES R. SCHRAND	
	_	Арр	Appellant Atty:		Appellant Name:		
Appellee Atty: Appellee Name:	PURTE		URTELL, WILLIAM		HENGEHOLD, JULIE		
		Appellee Atty:			Appellee	Name:	

CITY OF FLORENCE

NIENABER, THOMAS

** NOTE:

V., M.

LOCATION: JEFFERSON COUNTY JUDICIAL CENTER, 10TH FLOOR COURT OF

APPEALS COURTROOM, LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

DATE: Wednesday, January 22, 2020

VICHEZ, MARTIN

** NOTE:

PJ: JONES, HON. ALLISON E. KRAMER, HON. JOY A. TAYLOR, HON. JEFF S. 11:00 AM 2019CA000445 JORDAN R. SANDERS v COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY The issue on appeal is whether the trial court erroneously denied the Appellant jail credit for the time he spent on home incarceration pending trial and sentencing. Appellant was placed on home incarceration without electronic monitoring. **EDMONSON COUNTY CRIMINAL** HON TIMOTHY R COLEMAN **Appellant Atty: Appellant Name:** SIMPSON, B. SANDERS, JORDAN Appellee Name: Appellee Atty: **NEWBERG, JOSEPH** COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY ** NOTE: PJ: KRAMER, HON. JOY A. JONES, HON. ALLISON E. TAYLOR, HON. JEFF S. 01:15 PM 2019CA000480 S. M. v CABINET FOR HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES Termination of Parental Rights **JEFFERSON COUNTY** HON GINA KAY CALVERT **Appellant Atty: Appellant Name: BRICKING, ELIZABETH** M., S. Appellee Name: Appellee Atty: CABINET FOR HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES **CLAY, JENNIFER ELDER, JOSEPH II** M., B.

LOCATION: JEFFERSON COUNTY JUDICIAL CENTER, 10TH FLOOR COURT OF

APPEALS COURTROOM, LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

DATE: Wednesday, January 22, 2020

02:45 PM PJ: TAYLOR, HON. JEFF S. JONES, HON. ALLISON E. KRAMER, HON. JOY A.

2018CA001710 DAVID JONES v CLARK COUNTY, KENTUCKY

Whether circuit court erred by determining that KRS 441.265 authorizes a jail to assess and collect fees from

inmates who have not been convicted.

CIVIL	CLARK COUNTY	HON JEAN CHENAULT LOGUE	
	Appellant Atty:	Appellant Name:	
	BATHURST, CAMILLE	JONES, DAVID	
	BELZLEY, GREGORY		
	BOYD, MATTHEW		
	Appellee Atty:	Appellee Name:	
	MANDO, JEFFREY	CLARK COUNTY, KENTUCKY	

** NOTE:

LOCATION: JEFFERSON COUNTY JUDICIAL CENTER, 10TH FLOOR COURT OF

APPEALS COURTROOM, LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

DATE: Tuesday, January 28, 2020

10:00 AM PJ: CLAYTON, HON. DENISE G. NICKELL, HON. C. SHEA THOMPSON, HON. LARRY E.

2018CA000793 KENTUCKY AUTHORITY FOR EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION v ESTATE OF PATRICK WISE

Whether unclassified state employee may seek relief before Personnel Board for claims of discrimination.

CIVIL	FRANKLIN COUNTY	HON THOMAS D. WINGATE	
	Appellant Atty:	Appellant Name:	
	GOLD, SHARON	KENTUCKY AUTHORITY FOR EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION	
	IACCARINO, CARMINE		
	PATTERSON, DEBORAH		
	WILLIAMSON, SEAN		
	Appellee Atty:	Appellee Name:	
	CORNETTE, ROBIN	SIPEK, MARK STEPHENS, THOMAS	
	SIPEK, MARK		
	BILBY, LESLEY HOLBROOK, ROSEMARY		
** NOT	ΓE:		
10:45 A	M PJ: CLAYTON, HON. DENISE G.	NICKELL, HON. C. SHEA THOMPSON, HON. LARRY E	
2018C <i>A</i>	A001574 DOVONTIA REED v COM	MMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY	
	Appeal from denial of suppre information (CSLI).	ession motion; is a warrant necessary to obtain real-time cell site location	
CRIMINA	AL WOODFORD COUNTY	HON JEREMY MICHAEL MATTOX	
CRIMINA	AL WOODFORD COUNTY Appellant Atty:	HON JEREMY MICHAEL MATTOX Appellant Name:	
CRIMINA			
CRIMINA	Appellant Atty:	Appellant Name:	