

[Cite as *Collins v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.*, 2004-Ohio-3655.]

IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

BRIAN K. COLLINS	:	
Plaintiff	:	
v.	:	CASE NO. 2004-04400-AD
OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	:	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
Defendant	:	
	:	

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶1} 1) On March 28, 2004, plaintiff, Brian K. Collins, was traveling on State Route 28 entering the town of Goshen, when his vehicle struck a broken road reflector laying on the traveled portion of the roadway. Plaintiff stated the tire and rim of his vehicle were damaged as a result of striking the broken reflector.

{¶2} 2) Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$440.00, the cost of vehicle repair, plus filing fees. Plaintiff asserted he incurred these damages as a proximate cause of negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation, in maintaining the roadway. Plaintiff submitted the filing fee with the complaint.

{¶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) On May 26, 2004, plaintiff filed a response to defendant's investigation report. However, plaintiff has not submitted any evidence to indicate the length of time the loose reflector was on the roadway surface prior to his 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) 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 (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:

Brian K. Collins
4461 Glady Road
Lynchburg, Ohio 45142

Plaintiff, Pro se

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

For Defendant

RDK/laa
6/8
Filed 6/17/04
Sent to S.C. reporter 7/7/04