

[Cite as *Wettering v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.*, 2003-Ohio-3898.]

IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

MATTHEW WETTERING	:	
Plaintiff	:	
v.	:	CASE NO. 2003-03621-AD
OHIO DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION	:	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
Defendant	:	

: : : : : : : :

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶1} 1) On February 15, 2003, plaintiff, Matthew Wettering, was traveling east on Interstate 74 at milepost 3.58 on the exit ramp to Dry Fork Road in Hamilton County, when his vehicle struck a broken road reflector laying on the traveled portion of the roadway. Plaintiff stated the floor board of his vehicle was damaged as a result of striking the broken reflector.

{¶2} 2) Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$500.00, his expense incurred for repairing his automobile. Plaintiff asserted he incurred these damages as a proximate cause 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 the defective condition 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 the February 15, 2003 property damage occurrence.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶5} 1) Defendant has the duty to keep the 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 defect (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 (reflector) appeared on the roadway. *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 (loosened reflector) 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, 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. The clerk shall serve upon all parties notice of this judgment and its date of entry upon the journal.

DANIEL R. BORCHERT
Deputy Clerk

Entry cc:

Matthew Wettering
27458 Dogridge Road
Brookville, Indiana 47012

Plaintiff, Pro se

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

For Defendant

RDK/laa
7/2
Filed 7/11/03
Sent to S.C. reporter 7/22/03