

# Court of Claims of Ohio

The Ohio Judicial Center  
65 South Front Street, Third Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614.387.9800 or 1.800.824.8263  
[www.cco.state.oh.us](http://www.cco.state.oh.us)

---

JUSTIN HAWKINS

Plaintiff

v.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2006-05578-AD

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

MEMORANDUM DECISION

## FINDINGS OF FACTS

{¶1} 1) On June 26, 2006, at approximately 1:00 a.m., plaintiff, Justin Hawkins, was traveling south on Interstate 75, “near the Shephard Lane exit,” when his automobile struck a large pothole causing tire and rim damage to the vehicle.

{¶2} 2) Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$495.19, his total cost of automotive repair which plaintiff contends he 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.

{¶3} 3) Defendant denied liability based on the contention that no DOT personnel had any knowledge of the pothole on the roadway prior to plaintiff’s June 26, 2006, property damage occurrence. Defendant located the damage-causing pothole at about milepost 12.92 on Interstate 75 in Hamilton County. Defendant asserted plaintiff failed to produce any evidence showing how long the pothole existed prior to 1:00 a.m. on June 26, 2006.

{¶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 a 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 any 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.

Case No. 2006-05578-AD	- 3 -	MEMORANDUM DECISION

{¶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. Ohio 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. Ohio Department of Transportation* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 287. Therefore, defendant is not liable for any damage plaintiff may have suffered from the pothole.

## Court of Claims of Ohio

The Ohio Judicial Center  
65 South Front Street, Third Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614.387.9800 or 1.800.824.8263  
[www.cco.state.oh.us](http://www.cco.state.oh.us)

JUSTIN HAWKINS

Plaintiff

v.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2006-05578-AD

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

ENTRY OF ADMINISTRATIVE  
DETERMINATION

Case No. 2006-05578-AD	- 4 -	MEMORANDUM DECISION
------------------------	-------	---------------------

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:

Justin Hawkins  
1880 Fullerton Drive  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45240

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

RDK/laa  
12/15  
Filed 1/9/07  
Sent to S.C. reporter 2/15/07