

[Cite as *Marcis v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.*, 2004-Ohio-4830.]

IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

JANIS E. MARCIS :
Plaintiff :
v. : CASE NO. 2004-05830-AD
OHIO DEPARTMENT OF : MEMORANDUM DECISION
TRANSPORTATION :
Defendant :
:.....

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶1} 1) On January 5, 2004, plaintiff, Janis E. Marcis, was traveling on State Route 28 about fifty feet west on Elm Street in Mulberry, Ohio when her automobile struck a large pothole causing damage to the vehicle.

{¶2} 2) Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$192.74, the cost of tire and rim replacement which plaintiff contends she incurred as a result of negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation, in maintaining the roadway. Plaintiff submitted the \$25.00 filing fee and also seeks reimbursement for this amount.

{¶3} 3) Defendant has denied liability based on the fact it had no knowledge of the pothole prior to plaintiff's property damage occurrence.

{¶4} 4) Plaintiff has not submitted any evidence to indicate the length of time the pothole existed prior to the incident forming the basis of this claim.

{¶5} 5) Defendant has asserted maintenance records show one pothole patching operation was needed in the general vicinity of plaintiff's incident during the three weeks prior to the January 5, 2004, property damage event.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶6} 1) Defendant has the duty to keep roads in a safe, drivable condition. *Amica Mutual v. Dept. of Transportation* (1982), 81-02289-AD.

{¶7} 2) In order to recover on a claim of this type, plaintiff must prove either: 1) defendant had actual or constructive notice of the defect (pothole) 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.

{¶8} 3) There is no evidence defendant had actual notice of the damage-causing pothole.

{¶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.

{¶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.

{¶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 its existence. *Guiher v. Jackson* (1978), 78-0126-AD.

{¶12} 7) No evidence has shown defendant had constructive notice of the pothole.

DRB/RDK/laa

7/15

Filed 8/19/04

Sent to S.C. reporter 9/13/04