

safety of invitees such as plaintiff and to keep the premises in a reasonably safe condition for normal use. *Presley v. City of Norwood* (1973), 36 Ohio St. 2d 29. The duty to exercise ordinary care for the safety and protection of invitees such as plaintiff includes having the premises in a reasonably safe condition and warning of latent or concealed defects or perils which the possessor has or should have knowledge. *Durst v. VanGundy* (1982), 8 Ohio App. 3d 72.

{¶4} However, defendant is not an insurer of visitor safety, and it is under no duty to protect visitors from conditions “which are known to such invitee or are so obvious and apparent to such invitee that [she] may reasonable be expected to discover them and protect [herself] against them.” *Sidle v. Humphrey* (1968), 13 Ohio St. 2d 45, paragraph one of the syllabus. This rationale is based on the principles that an open and obvious danger is itself a warning and the premises owner may expect persons entering the premises to notice the danger and take precautions to protect themselves from such dangers. *Simmers v. Bentley Constr. Co.* (1992), 64 Ohio St. 3d 642. Where an invitee voluntarily exposes herself to a hazard, the owner or occupier of the premises will not be the insurer of her safety, since an invitee is required to exercise some degree of care for her own safety. *Thompson v. Kent State Univ.* (1987), 36 Ohio Misc. 2d 16. In the instant claim, plaintiff has not offered any evidence to indicate the hole in the parking deck floor was not readily discernible.

{¶5} To recover damages in a negligence action an invitee must establish:

{¶6} “1) That the defendant through its officers or employees was responsible for the hazard complained of; or

{¶7} “2) That at least one of such persons had actual knowledge of the hazard and neglected to give adequate notice of its presence or remove it promptly; or

{¶8} “3) That such danger had existed for a sufficient length of time reasonably to justify the inference that the failure to warn against it or remove it was attributable to a want of ordinary care.” *Evans v. Armstrong* (Sept. 23, 1999), Franklin App No. 99AP-17, quoting, *Johnson v. Wagner Provision Co.* (1943), 141 Ohio St. 584, 589. Plaintiff has failed to produce evidence establishing any of these elements. Therefore, plaintiff’s claim

is denied.

{¶9} 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:

Shunnah Antione
1082 Roslyn Avenue
Akron, Ohio 44320

Plaintiff, Pro se

Michael D. Sermersheim
Associate Vice President
and Deputy General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
The University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325-4706

For Defendant

RDK/laa
8/11
Filed 8/22/03
Sent to S.C. reporter 9/4/03