## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO

## TENTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

| Gregory B. Morgan,        | : |                            |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Plaintiff-Appellant,      | : | No. 15AP-455               |
| V.                        | : | (Ct. of Cl. No. 2014-0974) |
| Attorney General of Ohio, | : | (REGULAR CALENDAR)         |
| Defendant-Appellee.       | : |                            |

DECISION

Rendered on March 1, 2016

**On brief:** *Gregory B. Morgan,* pro se. **Argued:** *Gregory B. Morgan* 

**On brief:** *Michael DeWine,* Attorney General, and *Daniel R. Forsythe,* for appellee. **Argued:** *Daniel R. Forsythe* 

APPEAL from the Court of Claims of Ohio

TYACK, J.

{¶ 1} Gregory B. Morgan is appealing from adverse rulings in the Court of Claims of Ohio. He assigns a single error for our consideration:

The trial Court abused its discretion when it failed to grant appellant his constitutional right to due process, and his right to remedy by due course of law as guaranteed by the United States and Ohio constitutions.

**{¶ 2}** As is apparent from the wording of his assignment of error, Morgan bases his theories of recovery on rights set forth in the Ohio Constitution and the United States Constitution. The jurisdiction of the Court of Claims of Ohio is limited. The jurisdiction does not include the jurisdiction to litigate purely constitutional claims. The Tenth District Court of Appeals so held in *Bleicher v. Univ. of Cincinnati College of Medicine*, 78 Ohio App.3d 302 (10th Dist.1992).

 $\{\P 3\}$  The Court of Claims of Ohio followed our ruling in the *Bleicher* case when it ordered Morgan's most recent cases to be dismissed.

 $\{\P 4\}$  We believe the panel of this appellate court ruled correctly in deciding the *Bleicher* case. We likewise believe that the Court of Claims of Ohio was correct to follow our binding precedent. We, therefore, overrule Morgan's single assignment of error and affirm the dismissal of Morgan's case on appeal before us.

Judgment affirmed.

LUPER SCHUSTER and HORTON, JJ., concur.