## IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

ALISHA J. WORLEY :

Plaintiff :

v. : CASE NO. 2005-06350-AD

OHIO DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION, : MEMORANDUM DECISION

DISTRICT 8

:

Defendant

## FINDINGS OF FACT

- $\{\P 1\}$  1) On March 23, 2005, at approximately 6:00 p.m., plaintiff, Alisha J. Worley, was traveling south on State Route 747, "prior to the tylersville road intersection" in Butler County, when her automobile struck a large pothole in the roadway. The pothole, which was about four to five feet in length and more than six inches deep, caused tire and rim damage to plaintiff's vehicle.
- $\{\P\,2\}\,$ 2) Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$635.00, her total cost of automotive repair which plaintiff contends she incurred as a result of negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation ("DOT"), in maintaining the roadway. The \$25.00 filing fee was paid.
- $\{\P\,3\}\,$ 3) Defendant denied liability based on the fact it professed to have no knowledge of the damage-causing pothole prior to plaintiff's incident. Defendant suggested the pothole plaintiff's car struck probably existed "for only a short time before the incident." Defendant denied receiving any prior complaints about the pothole which DOT located at "milepost 4.14 in Butler County." Defendant denied receiving any calls or complaints

or being notified in any way about the pothole in question. Defendant explained DOT employees were working in the area two weeks prior to March 23, 2005, and did not discover any potholes.

- $\{\P\,4\}\,4)$  Despite filing a response, plaintiff did not submit any evidence to establish the length of time the pothole existed prior to the March 23, 2005, property damage event.
- $\{\P 5\}$  5) Furthermore, defendant explained DOT employees conduct roadway inspections on a routine basis and had any of these employees detected a roadway defect that defect would have promptly been repaired. Defendant contended, plaintiff did not produce sufficient evidence to prove DOT breached any duty of care owed to the traveling public in respect to roadway maintenance.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- $\{\P 6\}$  1) Defendant has the duty to maintain its highways in a reasonably safe condition for the motoring public. Knickel v. Ohio Department of Transportation (1976), 49 Ohio App. 2d 335. However, 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.
- $\{\P7\}$  2) In order to prove a breach of the duty to maintain the highways, plaintiff must prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that defendant had actual or constructive notice of the precise condition or defect alleged to have caused the accident. *McClellan v. ODOT* (1986), 34 Ohio App. 3d 247. 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.
- $\{\P\ 8\}$  3) There is no evidence defendant had actual notice of the damage-causing pothole.
- $\{\P\ 9\}\ 4)$  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 defective condition (pothole) developed.

Spires v. Highway Department (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262.

- $\{\P \ 10\}$  5) Size of the defect (pothole) is insufficient to show notice or duration of existence. O'Neil v. Department of Transportation (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 297.
- $\{\P 11\}$  6) In order for there to be constructive notice, plaintiff must show sufficient time has elapsed after the dangerous condition (pothole) appears, so that under the circumstances, defendant should have acquired knowledge of the existence of the defects. Guiher v. Jackson (1978), 78-0126-AD.
- $\{\P\ 12\}$  7) No evidence has shown defendant had constructive notice of the pothole.
- $\{\P\ 13\}$  8) Furthermore, plaintiff has failed to show defendant negligently maintained the roadway.

## IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

ALISHA J. WORLEY :

Plaintiff :

v. : CASE NO. 2005-06350-AD

OHIO DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION, : ENTRY OF ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT 8 DETERMINATION

:

Defendant

Having considered all the evidence in the claim file and, for the reasons set forth in the memorandum decision filed concurrently herewith, 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.

DANIEL R. BORCHERT Deputy Clerk

# Entry cc:

Alisha J. Worley 8370 Waterbury Ct. Apt. 207 West Chester, Ohio 45069

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

RDK/laa 7/27 Filed 8/5/05 Sent to S.C. reporter 8/19/05 Plaintiff, Pro se

For Defendant