

IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

CLAUDE D. HIGHLANDER	:	
24 N. Cty. Rd. 29	:	
Attica, Ohio 44807-9713	:	Case No. 2002-06227-AD
Plaintiff	:	MEMORANDUM DECISION
v.	:	
OHIO STATE TRANSPORTATION	:	
DEPT.	:	
Defendant	:	

: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :

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

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶1} 1) On May 29, 2002, plaintiff, Claude D. Highlander, was traveling east on State Route 162 about 1/4 mile east of Route 4 in Seneca County, when his truck struck a broken road reflector laying on the traveled portion of the roadway. Plaintiff stated his truck fender was damaged as a result of striking the broken reflector.

{¶2} 2) Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$441.39, the cost of repairing the truck. Plaintiff asserted he incurred these damages as a proximate cause of negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation, in maintaining the roadway. On July 15, 2002, plaintiff submitted the filing fee.

{¶3} 3) Defendant has denied liability based on the fact it had no knowledge the broken reflector existed prior to plaintiff's

incident.

{¶4} 4) Plaintiff has not submitted any evidence to indicate the length of time the loosened road reflector was on the roadway surface prior to plaintiff's property damage occurrence.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶5} 1) Defendant has the duty to keep its roads in a safe, drivable condition. *Amica Mutual v. Dept. of Transportation* (1982), 81-02289-AD.

{¶6} 2) Defendant must exercise due care and diligence in the proper maintenance and repair of highways. *Hennessey v. State of Ohio Highway Department* (1985), 85-02071-AD.

{¶7} 3) In order to recover on a claim of this type, plaintiff must prove either: 1) defendant had actual or constructive notice of the broken reflector and failed to respond in a reasonable time or responded in a negligent manner, or 2) that defendant, in a general sense, maintains its highways negligently. *Denis v. Department of Transportation* (1976), 75-0287-AD.

{¶8} 4) There is no evidence defendant had actual notice of the damage-causing reflector.

{¶9} 5) 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 developed. *Spires v. Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262.

{¶10} 6) 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. Jackson* (1978), 78-0126-AD.

{¶11} 7) No evidence has shown defendant had constructive notice of the damage-causing reflector.

{¶12} 8) Plaintiff has not submitted any evidence to prove the roadway was negligently maintained.

{¶13} Having considered all the evidence in the claim file and adopting the memorandum decision concurrently herewith;

{¶14} IT IS ORDERED THAT:

{¶15} 1) Plaintiff's claim is DENIED and judgment is rendered in favor of defendant;

{¶16} 2) The court shall absorb the court costs of this case in excess of the filing fee.

DANIEL R. BORCHERT
Deputy Clerk

RDK/laa
11/7
Filed 11/22/02
Jr. Vol. 726, Pg. 42
Sent to S.C. reporter 12/2/02