



**NAILAH K. BYRD**  
**CUYAHOGA COUNTY CLERK OF COURTS**  
1200 Ontario Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44113

**Court of Appeals**

**OTHER**  
**March 31, 2025 14:21**

By: SUBODH CHANDRA 0069233

Confirmation Nbr. 3449128

GEORGEANNA M. SEMARY

CA 24 114219

vs.

LESLIE ANN CELEBREZZE

**Judge:**

**Pages Filed: 5**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
EIGHTH APPELLATE DISTRICT  
CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO**

<b>GEORGEANNA M. SEMARY,</b> <i>Appellant-Plaintiff,</i> v. <b>LESLIE ANN CELEBREZZE</b> <i>Appellee- Defendant.</i>	Case No. CA-24-114219  Appeal from Common Pleas Court Case No. CV-23-984974
<b>APPELLANT GEORGEANNA SEMARY’S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE</b>	

Plaintiff-Appellant Georgeanna M. Semaury respectfully requests that this Court take judicial notice of critical admissions made by Defendant-Appellee Leslie Ann Celebrezze on the eve of the March 27, 2025 oral argument. These admissions were entered as stipulations in the disciplinary proceeding against her, *Disciplinary Counsel v. Celebrezze*, Case No. 2024-024 (Supreme Court of Ohio Bd. Prof'l Conduct), available at <https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/bpccm/Case?caseId=2286e9a2-8714-4ad5-975b-06007ce247e5>. See Appellant Semaury’s Opening Br. at 5 and n.2 (noting that on September 26, 2024, Supreme Court of Ohio Disciplinary Counsel filed charges against Celebrezze arising out of her relationship with, and steering of cases to herself to make receivership appointments to, Mark Dottore—and alleged lying to disciplinary counsel about all this).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Under Evid.R. 201, a court may take judicial notice of a fact “capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.” Appellate courts generally “may take judicial notice of any fact of which the trial court could have taken notice, even where the trial court failed to do so.” *State v. Bracford*, 2018-Ohio-1417, ¶ 68 (8th Dist.) (citing *Twinsburg v. Wesby*, 2012-Ohio-569, ¶ 5 (9th Dist.)). Semaury’s request satisfies these conditions.

Although Celebrezze’s stipulations are file-stamped March 26, 2025, they did not appear on the docket until **March 27, 2025**—the date of oral argument here—and Ms. Semaury’s counsel discovered them immediately afterward. Ms. Semaury had been subpoenaed to testify in that case on Monday, March 31, 2025 as a key witness.

The Court should take judicial notice that Celebrezze’s stipulated admissions directly contradict her denials in her Answer to Plaintiff’s February 1, 2024, Amended Complaint in this case. Highlights are discussed below.

**I. Celebrezze finally admits to engaging in an extramarital relationship with Mark Dottore**

On March 26, 2025, Appellee Celebrezze stipulated to multiple intimate interactions with Dottore, including a recorded kiss at Delmonico’s Steakhouse, multiple visits to his home (entering through an open garage without knocking), and daily phone calls, placed several times a day. The Court will note that some of these calls between the two occurred during the days when, as alleged in the Complaint here, Celebrezze, in concert with other court staff, took adverse actions against Ms. Semaury. These interactions also coincided with judicial decisions that benefitted Dottore financially. *See* Stipulations ¶¶ 34–49; Ex. 85 at 5–7; Ex. 86D; Ex. 86H; Ex. 89.

Celebrezze admitted developing an emotional attachment to Dottore, even telling other judges she was “in love” with him—an admission that contradicts her earlier public denials and responses during the disciplinary process. She also admitted she had misrepresented the relationship during the disciplinary investigation. *Id.* ¶¶ 129–32.

Despite these truths, in her Answer to Ms. Semaury’s Amended Complaint, Celebrezze denied any extramarital or intimate relationship with Dottore. She went so far as to characterize these allegations as “untrue and misinformed,” and denied she had

misrepresented her relationship with Dottore. Def.'s Answer to Pl.'s Am. Comp. ¶¶ 7–9, 29(a)–(1), 119, 139. She also falsely denied the Dottore relationship in her responses to Requests for Admissions (attached in the record to Ms. Semary's Opposition to the Celebrezze's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings) Nos. 10, 11, 31, 42–44, 55, 74–75 (denying she expressed to other judges that she expressed romantic love for Dottore), 76, 77, 104, 151, 164–65. (She evaded answering other Requests for Admissions on that topic.)

## **II. Improper steering of cases**

Celebrezze admitted to three times she intentionally bypassed mandatory random-assignment procedures, assigned significant cases directly to herself, expanded Dottore's scope of authority, and approved payments totaling hundreds of thousands of dollars. Stipulations ¶¶ 24–29, 53, 70, 89–94.

But in her Answer here—relied upon for the motion for judgment on the pleadings—she maintained she hadn't steered cases to benefit Dottore or otherwise misused her administrative authority. Def.'s Answer ¶¶ 3, 8, 27.

## **III. False statements and misrepresentations**

Celebrezze stipulated to failing to disclose her relationship with Dottore during litigation—violating judicial impartiality and transparency rules—and acknowledged making false statements during disciplinary proceedings and in trial-court filings. Stipulations ¶¶ 56–57, 129–32.

Yet in her Answer here, she denied making false statements and writings, misleading the court, or concealing her relationship with Dottore, insisting that these allegations were inaccurate. Def.'s Answer ¶¶ 7–9, 29(b), 35.

#### IV. Conclusion

Celebrezze's willful falsehoods illustrate her persistent pattern of dishonesty before both the disciplinary body and this Court, severely undermining her credibility and providing fodder for future amended and supplemental pleadings in the trial court. Despite knowing she had *just stipulated* to devastating facts establishing a corrupt relationship between her and Dottore and unethical behavior, she denied those facts in this case—and allowed her counsel to stand up in oral argument before this Court and argue there is no set of facts on which Ms. Semaury could prevail.

Plaintiff-Appellant respectfully requests that the Court take judicial notice of Celebrezze's Stipulations on the publicly available docket in the parallel case. If the Court so directs, the 1,500-some pages can be uploaded to the docket here or to the trial-court record. Upon remand, Celebrezze's stipulations, attached evidence including her phone records and the investigator's report, and additional facts adduced will be the subject of an amended and supplemental Complaint under Civ.R. 15(E).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> And now that Celebrezze's counsel *know* her denials to be false, under Prof.Cond.R. 3.3 they will be obligated to correct her Answer and likewise bogus responses to Requests for Admissions (attached as Ex. 1 to Ms. Semaury's opposition to the Celebrezze's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings).

Date: March 31, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Subodh Chandra  
Subodh Chandra (0069233)  
Donald P. Screen (0044070)  
THE CHANDRA LAW FIRM LLC  
The Chandra Law Building  
1265 West 6th Street, Suite 400  
Cleveland, Ohio 44113  
216.578.1700 Phone  
216.578.1800 Fax  
Subodh.Chandra@ChandraLaw.com  
Donald.Screen@ChandraLaw.com

*Attorneys for Appellant Georgeanna Semaury*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on March 31, 2025 my office filed the above document electronically with the Clerk of the 8th District Court of Appeals. The Court's electronic-notification system is expected to automatically generate and email a notification to all counsel of record.

I further certify that my office has sent a copy of this document by email to counsel for Appellee Leslie Ann Celebrezze.

/s/ Subodh Chandra  
*Attorney for Appellant Georgeanna Semaury*