

[Cite as *Converse v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.*, 2007-Ohio-4866.]

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

CHRIS B. CONVERSE

Plaintiff

v.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2007-01983-AD

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

MEMORANDUM DECISION

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶1} 1) On January 2, 2007, at approximately 10:00 p.m., plaintiff, Chris B. Converse, was traveling north on Interstate 75, “.07 miles before you reach the overpass of I-27,” when his automobile struck a pothole causing tire and rim damage to the vehicle.

{¶2} 2) Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$392.35, the cost of replacement parts and automotive repair resulting from the January 2, 2007, property damage event. Plaintiff implied the damage to his car was proximately caused by negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation (“DOT”), in maintaining the roadway. The \$25.00 filing fee was paid and plaintiff requested reimbursement of that amount along with his property damage claim.

{¶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 property damage occurrence. Defendant located the damage-causing pothole at milepost 16.00 on Interstate 75, in Hamilton County. Defendant asserted plaintiff failed to produce evidence showing how long the pothole existed prior to the incident forming the basis of this claim.

{¶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 inspections. 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.

{¶5} 5) Despite submitting photographs of the pothole, plaintiff did not submit any evidence to establish the length of time the defect was on the roadway prior to his property damage incident.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶6} 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, 361 N.E. 2d 486. However, defendant is not an insurer of the safety of its highways. See *Kniskern v. Township of Somerford* (1996), 112 Ohio App. 3d 189, 678 N.E. 2d 273; *Rhodus v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.* (1990), 67 Ohio App. 3d 723, 588 N.E. 2d 864.

{¶7} In order to prove a breach of the duty to maintain the highways, plaintiff must

Case No. 2007-01983-AD	- 3 -	MEMORANDUM DECISION
------------------------	-------	---------------------

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, 517 N.E. 2d 1388. Defendant is only liable for roadway condition of which it has notice but fails to reasonably correct. *Bussard v. Dept. of Transp.* (1986), 31 Ohio Misc. 2d 1, 507 N.E. 2d 1179.

{¶8} 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. 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, 577 N.E. 2d 458. 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 287, 587 N.E. 2d 891. 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

CHRIS B. CONVERSE

Plaintiff

v.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2007-01983-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.

DANIEL R. BORCHERT
Deputy Clerk

Entry cc:

Chris B. Converse
475 Carthage Drive
Beavercreek, Ohio 45434

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

RDK/laa
7/20
Filed 7/26/07
Sent to S.C. reporter 9/20/07