

IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

STEPHEN SAVICK, #A255-178 :  
P.O. Box 1812 :  
670 Marion-Williamsport Road : Case No. 2002-06294-AD  
Marion, Ohio 43301-1812 :

Plaintiff

MEMORANDUM DECISION

v.

NORTH CENTRAL CORR. INST.

Defendant

: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :

For Defendant: Gregory C. Trout, Chief Counsel  
Department of Rehabilitation and  
Correction  
1050 Freeway North  
Columbus, Ohio 43229

: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶1} 1) Plaintiff, Stephen Savick, an inmate at defendant, North Central Correctional Institution, stated his locker box was broken into on April 8, 2002 and several items of personal property were stolen.

{¶2} 2) Defendant conducted a prompt, but fruitless, search after being informed of the theft.

{¶3} 3) Plaintiff has filed this complaint seeking to recover \$121.54, the estimated value of his personal property, which he asserts was stolen as a direct result of defendant's negligence in failing to provide adequate protection. Plaintiff submitted the filing fee with the complaint.

{¶4} 4) On October 15, 2002, plaintiff filed a response to

defendant's investigation report. Plaintiff again asserts it was the negligence of defendant's agents which caused his property loss.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶5} 1) The mere fact a theft occurred is insufficient to show defendant's negligence, *Williams v. Southern Ohio Correctional Facility* (1985), 83-07091-AD; *Custom v. Southern Ohio Correctional Facility* (1985), 84-02425. Plaintiff must show defendant breached a duty of ordinary or reasonable care. *Williams*, supra.

{¶6} 2) Defendant is not responsible for actions of other inmates unless an agency relationship is shown or it is shown that defendant was negligent. *Walker v. Southern Ohio Correctional Facility* (1978), 78-0217-AD.

{¶7} 3) The fact defendant supplied plaintiff with a locker box and access to a lock to secure valuables constitutes prima facie evidence of defendant discharging its duty of reasonable care. *Watson v. Department of Rehabilitation and Correction* (1987), 86-02635.

{¶8} 4) This court in *Mullett v. Department of Correction* (1976), 76-0292-AD, held that defendant does not have the liability of an insurer (i.e., is not liable without fault) with respect to inmate property, but that it does have the duty to make "reasonable attempts to protect, or recover" such property.

{¶9} 5) Plaintiff has failed to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, he suffered any loss as a result of a negligent act or omission on the part of defendant. Consequently, plaintiff's case is denied. *Fitzgerald v. Department of Rehabilitation and Correction* (1998), 97-10146-AD.

{¶10} Having considered all the evidence in the claim file and adopting the memorandum decision concurrently herewith;

{¶11} IT IS ORDERED THAT:

{¶12} 1) Plaintiff's claim is DENIED and judgment is rendered

in favor of defendant;

{¶13} 2) The court shall absorb the court costs of this case in excess of the filing fee.

---

DANIEL R. BORCHERT  
Deputy Clerk

RDK/laa  
11/7  
Filed 12/5/02  
Jr. Vol. 727, Pg. 28  
Sent to S.C. reporter 12/17/02