

[Cite as *Dougan v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.*, 2003-Ohio-2614.]

IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

ERIC W. DOUGAN

Plaintiff

V.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION, DISTRICT 3

Defendant

.....

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶1} 1) On November 22, 2002, plaintiff, Eric W. Dougan, was traveling west on U.S. Route 30 about two miles east of Township Road 145 in Wayne County when his automobile struck a pothole causing tire and rim damage to the vehicle.

{¶2} 2) Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$444.97, the cost of automotive repair and filing fees which plaintiff contends he incurred as a result of negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation, in maintaining the roadway.

{¶3} 3) Defendant has denied liability based on the fact it had no knowledge of the pothole prior to plaintiff's property damage occurrence.

{¶4} 4) On February 20, 2003, plaintiff filed a response to defendant's investigative report. However, plaintiff has not submitted any evidence to indicate the length of time the pothole existed prior to the incident forming the basis of this claim.

~~{¶5}~~ 5) Defendant has asserted maintenance records show no pothole patching operations were needed in the general vicinity of plaintiff's incident during the six-month period preceding plaintiff's property damage event.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

{¶7} 2) In order to recover on a claim of this type, plaintiff must prove either: 1) defendant had actual or constructive notice of the defect (pothole) 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} 3) There is no evidence that 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. Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262.

{¶10} 5) 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 297.

{¶11} 6) In order for there to be constructive notice, plaintiff must show sufficient time has elapsed after dangerous condition (pothole) appears, so that under the circumstances, defendant should have acquired knowledge of its existence. *Guiher v. Jackson* (1978), 78-0126-AD.

{¶12} 7) No evidence has shown defendant had constructive notice of the pothole.

{¶13} 8) Furthermore, plaintiff has failed to show defendant negligently maintained the roadway.

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

{¶15} IT IS ORDERED THAT:

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

{¶17} 2) The court shall absorb the court costs of this case in excess of the

filing fee.

DANIEL R. BORCHERT
Deputy Clerk

Entry cc:

Eric W. Dougan Plaintiff, Pro se
5869 Carlew St. N.W.
North Canton, Ohio 44720

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

For Defendant

RDK/laa
4/16
Filed 5/8/03
Sent to S.C. Reporter 5/20/03