

[Cite as *Ullmann v. Ohio Dept. of Transp., Dist. 10, 2004-Ohio-3271.*]

IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

TERESA KAY ULLMANN :
 :
 Plaintiff :
 :
 v. : CASE NO. 2004-02610-AD
 :
 OHIO DEPARTMENT OF : MEMORANDUM DECISION
 TRANSPORTATION, DISTRICT 10 :
 :
 Defendant :
 :::::::::::::::

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶1} 1) Plaintiff, Teresa Kay Ullman, stated she was, "driving on State Route 339 South .5 mile out of Waterford Oh. Avoided pothole on right side of may 2002 Ford Taurus and hit road debris with front tire on driver side hitting driver side door." Plaintiff asserted the debris caused body damage to the vehicle. According to plaintiff the incident occurred on February 12, 2004.

{¶2} 2) Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$423.55, the cost for automotive repair. Plaintiff asserted she sustained these damages as a result of negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation, in maintaining the roadway. Plaintiff paid the filing fee.

{¶3} 3) Defendant denied liability based on the fact it had no knowledge the debris condition and roadway defect were on the roadway.

{¶4} 4) Plaintiff has not presented any evidence to indicate

the length of time the debris condition was on the roadway prior to her 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 diligence in the 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 (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.

{¶8} 4) There is no evidence defendant had actual notice of the debris condition.

{¶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 (debris) 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 (debris) 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 debris condition.

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

{¶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:

Teresa Kay Ullmann
1042 Bell Road
Vincent, Ohio 45784

Plaintiff, Pro se

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

For Defendant

RDK/laa
5/5
Filed 5/25/04
Sent to S.C. reporter 6/22/04