

occurred was located within a construction area under the control of DOT contractor, John R. Jurgensen Company (Jurgensen). Additionally, defendant denied liability in this matter based on the allegation that neither DOT nor Jurgensen had any knowledge of the roadway defect plaintiff's vehicle struck.

{¶ 4} 4) Plaintiff did not submit any evidence to establish the length of time the defect was on the roadway prior to his property damage incident.¹

{¶ 5} 5) Defendant asserted Jurgensen, by contractual agreement, was responsible for maintaining the roadway within the construction area. Therefore, DOT argued Jurgensen is the proper party defendant in this action. Defendant implied all duties, such as the duty to inspect, the duty to warn, the duty to maintain, and the duty to repair defects, were delegated when an independent contractor takes control over a particular section of roadway.

{¶ 6} 6) Furthermore, defendant again denied having any notice of the damage-causing defective condition. Defendant contended plaintiff failed to introduce evidence proving any requisite notice.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶ 7} 1) The duty DOT to maintain the roadway in a safe drivable condition is not delegable to an independent contractor involved in roadway construction. DOT may bear liability for the negligent acts of an independent contractor charged with roadway construction. See *Cowell v. Ohio Department of Transportation* (2004), 2003-09343-AD, jud, 2004-Ohio-151.

{¶ 8} 2) Defendant has the duty to maintain its highway in a reasonably safe condition for the motoring public. *Knickel v. Ohio Department of Transportation* (1976), 49 Ohio App. 2d 335. However,

¹ Plaintiff filed a response.

defendant is not an insurer of the safety of its highways. See *Kniskern v. Township of Somerford* (1996), 112 Ohio App. 3d 189; *Rhodus v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.* (1990), 67 Ohio App. 3d 723.

{¶ 9} 3) In order to recover in any suit involving injury proximately caused by roadway conditions plaintiff must prove either: 1) defendant had actual or constructive notice of the defective condition and failed to respond in a reasonable time or responded in a negligent manner, or 2) that defendant, in a general sense, maintains its highways negligently. *Denis v. Department of Transportation* (1976), 75-0287-AD.

{¶ 10} 4) Defendant is only liable for roadway conditions of which it has notice, but fails to reasonably correct. *Bussard v. Dept. of Transp.* (1986), 31 Ohio Misc. 2d 1.

{¶ 11} 5) Plaintiff has not produced any evidence to indicate the length of time the defective condition was present on the roadway prior to the incident forming the basis of this claim. No evidence has been submitted to show defendant had actual notice of the roadway defect. Additionally, the trier of fact is precluded from making an inference of defendant's constructive notice, unless evidence is presented in respect to the time the condition appeared on the roadway. *Spires v. Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262. There is no indication defendant had constructive notice of the defect. Plaintiff has not produced any evidence to infer defendant, in a general sense, maintains its highways negligently or that defendant's acts caused the defective condition. *Herlihy v. Ohio Department of Transportation* (1999), 99-07011-AD. Therefore, defendant is not liable for any damage plaintiff may have suffered from the roadway defect.

{¶ 12} 6) Plaintiff has not shown, by a preponderance of the evidence, that defendant failed to discharge a duty owed to plaintiff, or that plaintiff's injury was proximately caused by

Edwin J. Rigaud
3639 Vineyard Pl.
Cincinnati, Ohio 45226

Plaintiff, Pro se

Gordon Proctor, Director
Department of Transportation
1980 West Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43223

For Defendant

RDK/laa
3/2
Filed 3/16/05
Sent to S.C. reporter 3/25/05