

[Cite as *Spriggs v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.*, 2003-Ohio-5478.]

IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

DEBBIE SPRIGGS :
Plaintiff :
v. : CASE NO. 2003-06107-AD
OHIO DEPARTMENT OF : MEMORANDUM DECISION
TRANSPORTATION :
Defendant :

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶1} 1) On April 28, 2003, plaintiff, Debbie Spriggs, was traveling west on Interstate 480 near milepost 3.7 in Cuyahoga County when her automobile was struck by a large piece of concrete causing damage to the hood and door of the vehicle. Plaintiff asserted the concrete which struck her car had been propelled from an eastbound lane of Interstate 480 over a barrier dividing the east and west lanes of Interstate 480.

{¶2} 2) Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$950.27, the cost of repairing her automobile. Plaintiff contended she sustained these damages as a result of negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation, in maintaining the roadway.

{¶3} 3) Defendant has denied liability for plaintiff's damage. Defendant denied having any knowledge of the debris condition prior to plaintiff's incident. Plaintiff has failed to produce any evidence establishing the length of time the debris condition was on the roadway prior to her property damage occurrence.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶4} 1) Defendant has the duty to maintain its highway in a reasonably safe

condition for the motoring public. *Knickel v. Ohio Department of Transportation* (1976), 49 Ohio App. 2d 335. However, defendant is not an insurer of the safety of its highways. See *Kniskern v. Township of Somerford* (1996), 112 Ohio App. 3d 189; *Rhodus v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.* (1990), 67 Ohio App. 3d 723.

{¶5} 2) In order to recover in any suit involving injury proximately caused by roadway conditions including debris, plaintiff must prove either: 1) defendant had actual or constructive notice of the debris 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.

{¶6} 3) Defendant is only liable for roadway conditions of which it has notice, but fails to reasonably correct. *Bussard v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.* (1986), 31 Ohio Misc. 2d 1.

{¶7} 4) Plaintiff has not produced any evidence to indicate the length of time the debris condition was present on the roadway prior to the incident forming the basis of this claim. No evidence has been submitted to show defendant had actual notice of the debris. Additionally, 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 debris appeared on the roadway. *Spires v. Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262. There is no indication defendant had constructive notice of the debris.

{¶8} Finally, plaintiff has not produced any evidence to infer 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. Therefore, defendant is not liable for any damage plaintiff may have suffered from the roadway debris.

{¶9} 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:

Debbie Spriggs
6610 Lear Nagle Lot 286
North Ridgeville, Ohio 44039

Plaintiff, Pro se

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

For Defendant

RDK/laa
9/4
Filed 9/18/03
Sent to S.C. reporter 10/14/03