

Court of Claims of Ohio

The Ohio Judicial Center
65 South Front Street, Third Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
614.387.9800 or 1.800.824.8263
www.cco.state.oh.us

TED BROSS

Plaintiff

v.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2007-01495-AD

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

MEMORANDUM DECISION

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶1} 1) On January 3, 2007, at approximately 9:50 p.m., plaintiff, Ted Bross, was traveling north on Interstate 75 “and onto the connector ramp to interstate 74,” in Cincinnati when his vehicle struck a pothole causing “tire, rim, and lower support arm,” damage.

{¶2} 2) Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$648.75, the cost of replacement parts and automotive repair necessitated by the property damage event. Plaintiff implied the damage to his car was proximately caused by negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation (“DOT”), in maintaining the roadway. The \$25.00 filing fee was paid.

{¶3} 3) Defendant denied liability based on the contention that no DOT personnel had any knowledge of the pothole on the roadway prior to plaintiff’s property damage occurrence. Defendant located the damage-causing pothole between mileposts 4.23 to 4.40 on Interstate 75 in Hamilton County. Alternatively, defendant stated, “[t]he ramp for westbound I-74 from I-75 is between mileposts 19.02 to 19.47.” Defendant asserted plaintiff failed to produce any evidence showing how long the pothole existed prior to the incident forming the basis of this claim.

{¶4} 4) Defendant denied receiving any calls or complaints regarding the particular pothole before plaintiff’s incident. Defendant explained DOT employees conduct roadway inspections, “at least two times a month.” Apparently no potholes were discovered during previous roadway inspections. Defendant suggested the pothole likely, “existed for only a short time before the incident,” forming the basis of this claim. Defendant denied DOT employees were negligent in regard to roadway maintenance.

{¶5} 5) Plaintiff did not produce evidence establishing the length of time the pothole existed prior to his property damage occurrence at 9:50 p.m. on January 3, 2007. Evidence in another claim involving the same pothole (2007-01631-AD) indicates the pothole was present on the roadway by at least 4:40 p.m. on January 3, 2007.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶6} Defendant has the duty to maintain its highways 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*

Case No. 2007-01495-AD	- 3 -	MEMORANDUM DECISION
------------------------	-------	---------------------

Transp. (1990), 67 Ohio App. 3d 723.

{¶7} To prove a breach of the duty by defendant to maintain the highways plaintiff must establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that DOT had actual or constructive notice of the precise condition or defect alleged to have caused the accident. *McClellan v. ODOT* (1986), 34 Ohio App. 3d 247. Defendant is only liable for roadway conditions of which it has notice, but fails to reasonably correct. *Bussard v. Dept. of Transp.* (1986), 31 Ohio Misc. 2d 1. No evidence has shown defendant had actual notice of the damage-causing pothole.

{¶8} Therefore, to find liability plaintiff must prove DOT had constructive notice of the defect. 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 developed. *Spires v. Ohio Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262. Additionally, size of a pothole is insufficient to prove notice or duration of existence. *O'Neil v. Department of Transportation* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 287.

{¶9} In order for there to be constructive notice, plaintiff must show sufficient time has elapsed after the dangerous condition appears, so that under the circumstances defendant should have acquired knowledge of its existence. *Guiher v. Dept. of Transportation* (1978), 78-0126-AD. Size of the defect is insufficient to show notice or duration of existence. *O'Neil v. Department of Transportation* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 287. "A finding of constructive notice is a determination the court must make on the facts of each case not simply by applying a pre-set-time standard for the discovery of certain road hazards." *Bussard*, *supra*, at 4. "Obviously, the requisite length of time sufficient to constitute constructive notice varies with each specific situation." *Danko v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.* (Feb. 4, 1993), Franklin App. 92AP-1183, 1993 Ohio App. LEXIS 636.

{¶10} Evidence has shown the pothole on Interstate 75 was present at least five hours prior to plaintiff's property damage event. The issue presented is whether this evidence constitutes a finding of constructive notice of the defect. "[C]onstructive notice is

Case No. 2007-01495-AD	- 4 -	MEMORANDUM DECISION
------------------------	-------	---------------------

that which the law regards as sufficient to give notice and is regarded as a substitute for actual notice or knowledge.” *In re Estate of Fahle* (1950), 90 Ohio App. 195, 197-198. Constructive notice of roadway potholes has been determined in multiple claims involving less than a twenty-four hour time frame. See *McGuire v. Ohio Department of Transportation* (2002), 2001-08722-AD; *Piscioneri v. Ohio Dept. of Transportation, District 12*; 2002-10836-AD, 2003-Ohio-2173, jud; *Kill v. Ohio Department of Transportation*, 2003-01512-AD, 2003-Ohio-2620, jud; *Grothouse v. Ohio Department of Transportation, District 1*, 2003-01521-AD, 2003-Ohio-2621, jud; *Zeigler v. Department of Transportation*, 2003-01652-AD, 2003-Ohio-2625; *Sheaks v. Ohio Department of Transportation*, 2003-02179-AD, 2003-Ohio-2176, jud.

{¶11} However, in the matter of *Pompignano v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.*, 2005-02117-AD, jud; 2005-Ohio-3976, in a Motion for Court Review, the court concluded in reversing a determination by the Clerk that thirteen hours constructive notice of a defect is insufficient notice to invoke liability on DOT. The court in reversing the finding of constructive notice quoted and adopted DOT’s argument: “It is inappropriate that ODOT be held negligent for not patrolling every square mile or roadway every twelve hours. Such a ruling is against all case law created outside the limited arena of these administrative determination.” (Defendant’s motion for court review, page 7.) In its reversal order the court also recognized a constructive notice standard involving down signage. The court noted in finding, “that evidence of a stop sign being down for less than 24 hours was not enough time to impute constructive notice of its condition to ODOT.” See *Cushman v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.* (1995), 91-11591; affirmed (March 14, 1996), Franklin App. No. 95AP107-844, 1996 Ohio App. LEXIS 990. The court, in the instant claim is required to follow existing precedent. Consequently, plaintiff has failed to prove defendant had sufficient constructive notice of the damage-causing pothole to invoke liability.

Court of Claims of Ohio

The Ohio Judicial Center
65 South Front Street, Third Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
614.387.9800 or 1.800.824.8263
www.cco.state.oh.us

TED BROSS

Case No. 2007-01495-AD

Plaintiff

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

v.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

ENTRY OF ADMINISTRATIVE
DETERMINATION

Defendant

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:

Ted Bross
7848 Surreywood
North Bend, Ohio 45052

James Beasley, Director
Department of Transportation
1980 West Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43223

RDK/laa
4/3
Filed 4/25/07
Sent to S.C. reporter 5/18/07