

any evidence showing how long the pothole existed prior to 6:00 p.m. on November 20, 2005. Defendant acknowledged receiving a complaint about the pothole on November 21, 2005, the day after plaintiff's incident.

{¶ 4} 4) Defendant denied receiving any calls or complaints regarding the particular pothole before plaintiff's incident. Defendant explained DOT employees conduct roadway inspections, "at least two times a month." Apparently no potholes were discovered during previous roadway inspection. Defendant suggested the pothole likely, "existed for only a short time before the incident," forming the basis of this claim. Defendant denied DOT employees were negligent in regard to roadway maintenance.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶ 5} 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.

{¶ 6} 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.

{¶ 7} Plaintiff has not produced sufficient evidence to indicate the length of time the particular pothole was present on the roadway prior to the incident forming the basis of this claim. Plaintiff has not shown defendant had actual notice of the pothole for a sufficient length of time 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 pothole appeared on the roadway. *Spires v. Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262. There is no indication defendant had constructive notice of the pothole. 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. 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. Therefore, defendant is not liable for any damage plaintiff may have suffered from the pothole.

IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

GERALD L. PARTIN :

Plaintiff :

v. :

CASE NO. 2005-11795-AD

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION :

ENTRY OF ADMINISTRATIVE
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:

Timothy E. Potts
60 West Second Street
P.O. Box 127
Ashland, Ohio 44805

Attorney for Plaintiff

Gordon Proctor, Director
Department of Transportation

For Defendant

1980 West Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43223

RDK/laa

3/24

Filed 6/1/06

Sent to S.C. reporter 6/22/06