



testified that when he reported the injury to Good, Good did nothing. Plaintiff went to the infirmary after the shift and was given some over-the-counter pain medication for treatment of his subjective complaints. None of the inmates who were on duty in the sinkolator room that day testified at the trial.

C.O. Good was the supervisor of the inmates on plaintiff's shift. Good acknowledged that he was on duty in the sinkolator room that day, but denied that the incident described by plaintiff ever happened. Good did not remember complaining about dirty trays, yelling at the inmates about the trays, using profanity or kicking trays. Good stated that he does not remember plaintiff even though plaintiff had been working on kitchen crew for six months prior to the incident. Good recalled that Lieutenant Oyer was on duty in the dining hall that day but claimed not to know what Oyer's duties were.

Oyer testified that on September 17, 1999, he was on duty as the first shift security officer in the mess hall. Oyer was stationed near the phone just outside the sinkolator room. Since Oyer was required to watch the mess hall, he stood with his back to the sinkolator room. Oyer had no present recollection of the incident described by plaintiff. However, in an incident report prepared by the institutional inspector, Oyer reportedly overheard C.O. Good yelling at the inmates about the dirty trays.

According to the report, Oyer heard Good say something like "\*\*\* these trays look like shit \*\*\* get your asses in gear and clean up these trays." Because Oyer's back was to the sinkolator room, he did not see Good make the statements nor did he see Good kick any trays.

**[Cite as *Scott v. Ohio Dept. of Rehab. & Corr.*, 2001-Ohio-1859.]**

In order for plaintiff to prevail upon his claim of negligence, he must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that defendant owed him a duty, that it breached that duty, and that the breach proximately caused his injuries. *Strother v. Hutchinson* (1981), 67 Ohio St.2d 282, 285. The law is well-settled that prison officials owe inmates a duty of reasonable care. *Clemets v. Heston* (1985), 20 Ohio App.3d 132, 136. This duty includes the obligation to protect inmates in their care from reasonably foreseeable risks. *Id.*

In this case, whether defendant breached its duty to plaintiff comes down to an issue of witness credibility. In making a determination of credibility the court examines the demeanor of the witnesses, the manner in which they testify, their connection or relationship to a party and their interest, if any, in the outcome. *State v. Antill* (1964), 176 Ohio St. 61, 67. Defendant contends that plaintiff's testimony is not worthy of belief because he did not make a written complaint about this incident until October 4, 1999, just after defendant revoked plaintiff's bottom bunk restriction. The court finds, however, that even if defendant's revocation of plaintiff's bottom bunk restriction motivated plaintiff to file his written complaint, it does not necessarily follow that the incident is fictitious.

Indeed, upon examination of the above-noted factors affecting credibility, the court finds that plaintiff's testimony about this incident was the more credible. It is significant to the court that Good's denials regarding yelling and using profanity were directly contradicted by Oyer's statements cited in the inspector's report. The court finds that C.O. Good kicked a stack of trays in anger and that a few of these trays struck plaintiff. The court further finds that Good's conduct created a

foreseeable and unreasonable risk of harm to plaintiff. Therefore, defendant was negligent.

In order to establish liability on the part of defendant, plaintiff has the burden of proving that defendant's negligence proximately caused some compensable injury to plaintiff. The evidence admitted in the liability phase of the trial supports a finding that plaintiff's injury was extremely minor. Nevertheless, plaintiff has satisfied his burden of proof on this issue.

In short, plaintiff has established that defendant was negligent and that defendant's negligence proximately caused some injury to plaintiff, however minor. The nature and extent of that injury will be determined at a second trial on the issue of damages. Judgment will be rendered in favor of plaintiff on the sole issue of liability.

---

**RUSSELL LEACH**  
Judge

[Cite as *Scott v. Ohio Dept. of Rehab. & Corr.*, 2001-Ohio-1859.]  
IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

GEORGE E. SCOTT :  
Plaintiff : CASE NO. 2000-03760  
v. : JUDGMENT ENTRY  
OHIO DEPARTMENT OF : Judge Russell Leach  
REHABILITATION AND CORRECTION :  
Defendant :  
: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :

This case was tried to the court on the sole issue of liability. The court has considered the evidence, and for the reasons set forth in the decision filed concurrently herewith, judgment is rendered in favor of plaintiff in an amount to be determined after the second phase of the trial dealing with the issue of damages. The court shall issue an entry in the near future scheduling a date for the trial on the issue of damages.

---

RUSSELL LEACH  
Judge

Entry cc:

Richard F. Swope  
6504 East Main Street  
Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068

Attorney for Plaintiff

Sally Ann Walters  
65 East State St., 16th Fl.  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Assistant Attorney General

LP/cmd

Filed 10-11-2001  
Jr. Vol. 683, Pg. 9  
To S.C. reporter 11-7-2001