

# 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)

---

FRANCIS M. LANN

Case No. 2006-07911-AD

Plaintiff

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

v.

MEMORANDUM DECISION

OHIO DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

---

## FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶ 1} 1) On December 5, 2006, at approximately 7:00 a.m., plaintiff, Francis M. Lann, was traveling south on Interstate 271 in Cuyahoga County, when his automobile struck a pothole in the roadway. The impact of striking the pothole caused substantial tire damage to plaintiff's vehicle.

{¶ 2} 2) Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$521.67, 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 fact it professed to have no knowledge of the damage-causing pothole prior to plaintiff's incident. Defendant denied receiving any prior complaints about the pothole which DOT located at milepost 27.5 on I-271 in Cuyahoga County. Defendant explained, "it is more likely than not that the pothole existed in that location for only a relatively short amount of time before plaintiff's incident."

{¶ 4} 4) Plaintiff did not submit any evidence to establish the length of time the pothole existed prior to the December 5, 2006, property damage event.

{¶ 5} 5) Furthermore, defendant explained DOT employees conduct roadway inspections on a routine basis and had any of these employees detected a roadway defect that defect would have promptly been repaired. Defendant contended, plaintiff did not

Case No. 2006-07911-AD	- 2 -	MEMORANDUM DECISION
------------------------	-------	---------------------

produce sufficient evidence to prove DOT breached any duty of care owed to the traveling public in respect to roadway maintenance.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶ 6} 1) 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.

{¶ 7} 2) 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.

{¶ 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. Ohio Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262.

{¶ 10} 5) 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 pothole.

{¶ 11} 6) Plaintiff has not shown, by a preponderance of the evidence, that defendant failed to discharge a duty owed to plaintiff, or that plaintiff's injury was proximately caused by defendant's negligence. Plaintiff failed to show that the damage-

Case No. 2006-07911-AD	- 3 -	MEMORANDUM DECISION
------------------------	-------	---------------------

causing pothole was connected to any conduct under the control of defendant or that there was any negligence on the part of defendant or its agents. *Taylor v. Transportation Dept.* (1998), 97-10898-AD; *Weininger v. Department of Transportation* (1999), 99-10909-AD; *Witherell v. Ohio Dept. of Transportation* (2000), 2000-04758-AD.

[C



Ohio Dept. of Transp., 2007-Ohio-1993.]

# 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)

FRANCIS M. LANN

Plaintiff

v.

OHIO DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2006-07911-AD

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

ENTRY OF ADMINISTRATIVE  
DETERMINATION

---

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:

Francis M. Lann  
2709 Hampshire Road #202  
Cleveland Hts., Ohio 44106

James Beasley, Director  
Department of Transportation  
1980 West Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43223

RDK/laa  
3/14  
Filed 3/29/07  
Sent to S.C. reporter 4/25/07