

discrimination, including the fact that defendant violated its own hiring practices and policies. In plaintiff's fourth objection, he asserts that the magistrate ignored other compelling evidence of discrimination, including the fact that plaintiff was far better qualified than the 28-year-old hired for the job.

{¶4} Civ.R. 53(E)(3)(b) states, in pertinent part: "Objections shall be specific and state with particularity the grounds of objection. *** Any objection to a finding of fact shall be supported by a transcript of all the evidence submitted to the magistrate relevant to that fact or an affidavit of that evidence if a transcript is not available. ***" In this case, plaintiff did not file a transcript, partial transcript or an affidavit of evidence with his objections. As such, he has failed to properly support any of his objections. Accordingly, plaintiff's first, second, third and fourth objections are OVERRULED.

{¶5} Furthermore, upon review of the record and the magistrate's decision, the court finds that all of the factual findings challenged by plaintiff are supported by competent, credible evidence and are not against the manifest weight of the evidence. In addition, the court finds that the magistrate's conclusions are supported by the greater weight of the evidence and are in accordance with law. Therefore, the court adopts the magistrate's decision and recommendation as its own. Judgment is rendered in favor of defendant. Court costs are assessed against plaintiff. The clerk shall serve upon all parties notice of this judgment and its date of entry upon the journal.

J. WARREN BETTIS
Judge

Entry cc:

John S. Marshall
Joshua J. Morrow
111 West Rich Street, Suite 430
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5296

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Larry Y. Chan
65 East State St., 16th Fl.
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Assistant Attorney General

HTS/cmd
Filed 1-22-2003
Jr. Vol. 731, Pgs. 45-47
To S.C. reporter 1-29-2003