

[Cite as *Chin v. Ohio Dept. of Transp., Dist. 12, 2004-Ohio-1358.*]

IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

HUAJEN CHIN	:	
	:	
Plaintiff	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO. 2003-11801-AD
	:	
OHIO DEPARTMENT OF	:	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
TRANSPORTATION, DISTRICT 12	:	
	:	
Defendant	:	
	:	
	:	

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶1} 1) On November 13, 2003, at approximately 7:25 p.m., plaintiff, Huajen Chin, was traveling west on Interstate 480 just past the intersection to Interstate 77 in Cuyahoga County when his automobile struck “wooden barricade” laying on the roadway.

{¶2} 2) Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$1,100.00, the cost of automobile repair, which he contends was incurred as a result of negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation, in maintaining the roadway. Plaintiff also seeks reimbursement of the \$25.00 filing fee.

{¶3} 3) Defendant has denied liability for plaintiff’s damage. Defendant denied having requisite knowledge of the debris condition prior to plaintiff’s incident. Defendant submitted evidence showing notice of the debris condition was received at approximately 7:20 p.m. on November 13, 2003.

{¶4} 4) Plaintiff has failed to produce any evidence establishing the length of time the debris condition was on the roadway prior to his property damage occurrence.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶5} 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, 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.

{¶6} In order to recover in any suit involving injury proximately caused by roadway conditions including debris, plaintiff must prove either: 1) defendant had actual or constructive notice of the debris 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.

{¶7} 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.

{¶8} Plaintiff has not produced any evidence to indicate the length of time the debris condition was present on the roadway prior to the incident forming the basis of this claim. Evidence has been submitted to show defendant had actual notice of the debris. However, defendant did not have actual notice of the debris condition for a sufficient time period to invoke liability. 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 debris appeared on the roadway. *Spires v. Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262. There is no indication defendant had constructive notice of the debris.

{¶9} Finally, 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 debris.

{¶10} 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:

Huajen Chin  
34300 Park East Dr. #B8  
Solon, Ohio 44139

Plaintiff, Pro se

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

For Defendant

RDK/laa  
2/25  
Filed 3/3/04  
Sent to S.C. reporter 3/19/04