

# 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

FRANK D. WILLIAMS

Plaintiff

v.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2008-09091-AD

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

## ENTRY OF DISMISSAL

{¶ 1} On August 18, 2008, plaintiff, Frank D. Williams, filed a complaint against defendant, Department of Transportation. Plaintiff alleges on June 6, 2008 at approximately 3:00 p.m. while traveling on the Akron interbelt, he hit an “18' buckel in the street,” which caused damage to his 2000 Cadillac DTS. Plaintiff seeks damages in the amount of \$1,373.57 for repair costs as the result of defendant’s negligence in maintaining the roadway. Plaintiff submitted the filing fee shortly after filing his complaint.

{¶ 2} Defendant filed a motion to dismiss. In support of the motion to dismiss, defendant stated in pertinent part:

{¶ 3} “Defendant has performed an investigation of this site and the Akron Innerbelt or SR 59 falls under the maintenance jurisdiction of the City of Akron. (See Exhibit A & map) As such, this section of roadway is not within the maintenance jurisdiction of the defendant.”

{¶ 4} Plaintiff has not responded to defendant’s motion to dismiss. The site of

the damage-causing incident was located in the City of Akron.

{¶ 5} Ohio Revised Code Section 5501.31 in pertinent part states:

{¶ 6} “Except in the case of maintaining, repairing, erecting traffic signs on, or pavement marking of state highways within villages, which is mandatory as required by section 5521.01 of the Revised Code, and except as provided in section 5501.49 of the Revised Code, no duty of constructing, reconstructing, widening, resurfacing, maintaining, or repairing state highways within municipal corporations, or the culverts thereon, shall attach to or rest upon the director . . .”

{¶ 7} The site of the damage-causing incident was not the maintenance responsibility of defendant. Consequently, plaintiff’s case is dismissed.

{¶ 8} Having considered all the evidence in the claim file and, for the reasons set forth above, defendant’s motion to dismiss is GRANTED. Plaintiff’s case is DISMISSED. The court shall absorb the court costs of this case.

---

DANIEL R. BORCHERT  
Deputy Clerk

Entry cc:

Frank D. Williams  
3751 Tamarisk Drive  
Fairlawn, Ohio 44333

Thomas P. Pannett  
Department of Transportation  
1980 West Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43223

DRB/laa  
12/18  
Filed 12/31/08  
Sent to S.C. reporter 3/13/09