NOTICE

This slip opinion is subject to formal revision before it is published in an advance sheet of the Ohio Official Reports. Readers are requested to promptly notify the Reporter of Decisions, Supreme Court of Ohio, 65 South Front Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215, of any typographical or other formal errors in the opinion, in order that corrections may be made before the opinion is published.

SLIP OPINION No. 2012-OHIO-1006

THE STATE EX REL. WATSON, APPELLANT, v. MOHR, DIR., ET AL., APPELLEES.

[Until this opinion appears in the Ohio Official Reports advance sheets, it may be cited as State ex rel. Watson v. Mohr,

Slip Opinion No. 2012-Ohio-1006.]

Mandamus—Public records—R.C. 149.43—Statutory award of attorney fees not warranted when relator has not paid copying costs for requested records.

(No. 2011-1873—Submitted March 7, 2012—Decided March 15, 2012.)

APPEAL from the Court of Appeals for Franklin County,

No. 10AP-949, 2011-Ohio-402.

Per Curiam.

{¶ 1} We affirm the judgment of the court of appeals denying the request of appellant, Robert Watson, for statutory damages in connection with his mandamus case, which included claims for public records and for nonpublic records.

 $\{\P\ 2\}$ The court of appeals granted a writ of mandamus to compel appellees, various correctional officials and employees, "to provide the

SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

documents directly related to Watson * * * to the extent they exist and have not already been provided, if or when Watson has paid the \$.95 for the copies." (Emphasis added.) State ex rel. Watson v. Mohr, 10th Dist. No. 10AP-949, 2011-Ohio-402, ¶ 18. In effect, the court of appeals did not conclusively determine that Watson had submitted the applicable cost for the copies. A request for statutory damages under the Public Records Act, R.C. 149.43, is properly denied if the requester refuses to submit payment for the cost of the requested copies. State ex rel. Dehler v. Kelly, 127 Ohio St.3d 309, 2010-Ohio-5724, 939 N.E.2d 828, ¶ 2.

- {¶ 3} Nor did the court of appeals specify that appellees had breached any duty owed to Watson under R.C. 149.43(B). To the contrary, the court of appeals concluded that "based upon the record before us and the reality of the crowding of the penal system in Ohio, we cannot say that respondents failed to act promptly in response to Watson's requests for public records." 2011-Ohio-402, ¶ 18. An award of statutory damages is premised on the court's determination that "the public office or the person responsible for public records failed to comply with an obligation in accordance with [R.C. 149.43(B)]." R.C. 149.43(C)(1); State ex rel. Patton v. Rhodes, 129 Ohio St.3d 182, 2011-Ohio-3093, 950 N.E.2d 965, ¶ 21.
- {¶ 4} Finally, Watson's mandamus claim was based in part on his request for nonpublic records. The claim is not authorized by R.C. 149.43, and he cannot be awarded statutory damages for this claim under R.C. 149.43(C)(1).
- $\{\P 5\}$ Therefore, the court of appeals did not abuse its discretion in denying Watson's request for statutory damages notwithstanding its judgment conditionally granting the writ. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the court of appeals.

Judgment affirmed.

O'CONNOR, C.J., and PFEIFER, LUNDBERG STRATTON, O'DONNELL, LANZINGER, CUPP, and McGee Brown, JJ., concur.

January Term, 2012

	Robert Watson, pro se.
	Michael DeWine, Attorney General, and Jason Fuller, Assistant Attorney
General	l, for appellees.