

# 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

CHRISTOPHER LEE MCCHESENEY

Plaintiff

v.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2009-03380-AD

Clerk Miles C. Durfey

## MEMORANDUM DECISION

### FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶ 1} 1) On February 2, 2009, at approximately 4:00 p.m., plaintiff, Christopher Lee McChesney, was traveling west on State Route 95 in Marion County, “crossing the bridge over the Olentangy River,” when the Ford F-250 truck he was driving struck a large pothole causing tire and rim damage to the vehicle.

{¶ 2} 2) Plaintiff implied that his property damage was proximately caused by negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation (DOT), in failing to keep the roadway free of hazardous conditions. Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$585.88, the cost of replacement parts and related repair expenses. The filing fee was paid.

{¶ 3} 3) Defendant denied liability in this matter based on the contention that no DOT personnel had any knowledge of the particular damage-causing pothole prior to plaintiff’s property damage occurrence. Defendant denied receiving any prior complaints regarding the particular pothole which DOT located at milepost 22.66 on State Route 95 in Marion County. Defendant noted that plaintiff did not produce any

evidence to establish the length of time that the pothole existed prior to 4:00 p.m. on February 2, 2009.

{¶ 4} 4) Furthermore, defendant argued that plaintiff failed to produce evidence to prove that the roadway was negligently maintained. Defendant explained that the DOT “Marion County Manager conducts roadway inspections on all state roadways within the county on a routine basis, at least one to two times a month.” Apparently no potholes were discovered at milepost 22.66 on State Route 95 the last time that specific section of roadway was inspected before February 2, 2009. Defendant observed that if any DOT employees had found “any defects they would have been promptly scheduled for repair.” DOT records show that potholes were patched in the vicinity of plaintiff’s property damage incident on December 30, 2008. The particular pothole at milepost 22.66 was repaired on February 3, 2009, the day after plaintiff’s incident.

#### 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, 3 O.O. 3d 413, 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.

{¶ 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, 517 N.E. 2d 1388. 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, 31 OBR 64, 507 N.E. 2d 1179. There is no evidence that defendant had actual notice of the pothole on State Route 95 prior to 4:00 p.m. on February 2, 2009.

{¶ 7} Therefore, to find liability plaintiff must prove that DOT had constructive notice of the defect. The trier of fact is precluded from making an inference of defendant’s constructive notice, unless evidence is presented in respect to the time that the defective condition developed. *Spires v. Ohio Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio

Misc. 2d 262, 577 N.E. 2d 458.

{¶ 8} In order for there to be constructive notice, plaintiff must show sufficient time has elapsed after the dangerous condition appears, so that under the circumstances defendant should have acquired knowledge of its existence. *Guiher v. Dept. of Transportation* (1978), 78-0126-AD. Size of the defect 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. “A finding of constructive notice is a determination the court must make on the facts of each case not simply by applying a pre-set time standard for the discovery of certain road hazards.” *Bussard*, 31 Ohio Misc. 2d at 4, 31 OBR 64, 567 N.E. 2d 1179. “Obviously, the requisite length of time sufficient to constitute constructive notice varies with each specific situation.” *Danko v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.* (Feb. 4, 1993), Franklin App. 92AP-1183. No evidence has shown that DOT had constructive notice of the pothole.

{¶ 9} Plaintiff has not produced any evidence to infer that 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. Plaintiff has failed to introduce sufficient evidence to prove that defendant maintained a known hazardous roadway condition. Plaintiff has failed to prove that his property damage was connected to any conduct under the control of defendant, that defendant was negligent in maintaining the roadway area, or that there was any negligence on the part of defendant. *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.

## 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)

CHRISTOPHER LEE MCCHESENEY

Plaintiff

v.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2009-03380-AD

Clerk Miles C. Durfey

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.

---

MILES C. DURFEY  
Clerk

Entry cc:

Christopher Lee McChesney  
3300 Twp. Rd. 129  
Cardington, Ohio 43315

Jolene M. Molitoris, Director  
Department of Transportation  
1980 West Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43223

RDK/laa  
7/9  
Filed 8/7/09  
Sent to S.C. reporter 12/11/09