

Court of Claims of Ohio

The Ohio Judicial Center
65 South Front Street, Third Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
614.387.9800 or 1.800.824.8263
www.cco.state.oh.us

ROBERT C. JUNIUS, JR.

Case No. 2005-11141

Plaintiff

Judge Clark B. Weaver Sr.
Magistrate Steven A. Larson

v.

JUDGMENT ENTRY

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF
REHABILITATION AND CORRECTION

Defendant

{¶1} On June 29, 2007, the magistrate issued a decision recommending judgment for plaintiff.

{¶2} Civ.R. 53(D)(3)(b)(i) states in part: “A party may file written objections to a magistrate’s decision within fourteen days of the filing of the decision, whether or not the court has adopted the decision during that fourteen-day period as permitted by Civ.R. 53(D)(4)(e)(i).” Defendant filed objections on July 12, 2007. On July 26, 2007, plaintiff filed a response.

{¶3} At all times relevant to this action, plaintiff was an inmate in the custody and control of defendant at the Belmont Correctional Institution (BeCI), pursuant to R.C. 5120.16. On October 11, 2004, plaintiff was working as a porter when a raw sewage back-up occurred in his housing unit. Plaintiff and other porters were directed to clean up the sewage. Plaintiff alleges that he was not given proper equipment, that his hands and feet became covered in sewage during the cleanup effort, and that he was not permitted to take a shower until 3:15 p.m. the following day. Soon after the incident, plaintiff reported to the BeCI infirmary where he was screened and vaccinated for Hepatitis. Plaintiff also worried about the effect of the sewage on his feet because he has diabetes and suffers from chronic foot problems.

Case No. 2005-11141	- 2 -	JUDGMENT ENTRY
---------------------	-------	----------------

{¶4} The magistrate found that defendant acted in a negligent manner when it subjected plaintiff to an unreasonable risk of harm and then denied him the opportunity to shower for more than 24 hours after his exposure to raw sewage.

{¶5} Defendant raises two objections to the magistrate’s decision. Defendant argues in its first objection that plaintiff failed to prove any injury that was proximately caused by defendant’s breach. In its second objection, defendant asserts that the magistrate’s decision is against the manifest weight of the evidence.

{¶6} Upon review of the record, the magistrate’s decision and the objections, the court finds that the magistrate has properly determined the factual issues and appropriately applied the law. Therefore, the objections are OVERRULED and the court adopts the magistrate’s decision and recommendation as its own, including findings of fact and conclusions of law contained therein. Judgment is rendered in favor of plaintiff. The case will be set for trial on the issue of damages. All outstanding motions are DENIED as moot.

CLARK B. WEAVER SR.
Judge

cc:

Douglas R. Folkert Assistant Attorney General 150 East Gay Street, 23rd Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215-3130	Richard F. Swope 6504 East Main Street Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068-2268
MR/cmd	

Filed August 27, 2007
To S.C. reporter September 27, 2007