

[Cite as *In re Maki*, 2004-Ohio-4170.]

IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO
VICTIMS OF CRIME DIVISION

IN RE: BONNIE J. MAKI : Case No. V2003-41042
BONNIE J. MAKI : DECISION
Applicant : Judge J. Warren Bettis
: : : : : :

{¶1} This matter came on to be considered upon the applicant's appeal from the February 5, 2004, order issued by the panel of commissioners. The panel's determination affirmed the final decision of the Attorney General, which denied applicant's claim for an award of reparations based upon the finding that applicant failed to qualify as a victim of criminally injurious conduct and that she failed to report the matter to law enforcement officials.

{¶2} R.C. 2743.52(A) places the burden of proof on an applicant to satisfy the Court of Claims Commissioners that the requirements for an award have been met by a preponderance of the evidence. *In re Rios* (1983), 8 Ohio Misc.2d 4, 8 OBR 63, 455 N.E.2d 1374. The panel found, upon review of the evidence, that applicant failed to present sufficient evidence to meet her burden.

{¶3} The standard for reviewing claims that are appealed to the court is established by R.C. 2743.61(C), which provides in pertinent part: "If upon hearing and consideration of the record and evidence, the judge decides that the decision of the panel of commissioners is unreasonable or unlawful, the judge shall reverse and vacate the decision or modify it and enter judgment

on the claim. The decision of the judge of the court of claims is final.”

{¶4} Neither applicant nor anyone on her behalf appeared at the hearing.

{¶5} Upon review of the file in this matter, the court finds that the panel of commissioners was not arbitrary in finding that applicant did not show by a preponderance of the evidence that she was entitled to an award of reparations.

{¶6} Based on the evidence and R.C. 2743.61, it is the court’s opinion that the decision of the panel of commissioners was reasonable and lawful. Therefore, this court affirms the decision of the three-commissioner panel, and hereby denies applicant’s claim.

{¶7} Upon review of the evidence, the court finds the order of the panel of commissioners must be affirmed and the applicant’s appeal must be denied.

{¶8} IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

{¶9} 1) The order of February 5, 2004, (Jr. Vol. 2252, Pages 159-160) is approved, affirmed and adopted;

{¶10} 2) This claim is DENIED and judgment entered for the State of Ohio;

{¶11} 3) Costs assumed by the reparations fund.

J. WARREN BETTIS
Judge

AMR/cmd

A copy of the foregoing was personally served upon the Attorney General and sent by regular mail to Summit County Prosecuting Attorney and to: