

[Cite as *Johnson v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.*, 2008-Ohio-4200.]

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

BRYAN B. JOHNSON

Plaintiff

v.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2008-02258-AD

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

MEMORANDUM DECISION

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶ 1} 1) On December 8, 2007, at approximately 6:45 p.m., plaintiff, Bryan B. Johnson, was traveling north “on State Route 23 just past the I-270 overpass,” when his automobile struck a pothole causing tire damage to the vehicle.

{¶ 2} 2) Plaintiff asserted the damage to his car was proximately caused by negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation (“DOT”), in failing to maintain the roadway. Consequently, plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$419.47, the cost of replacement parts and related repair expenses. The filing fee was paid.

{¶ 3} 3) Defendant denied liability in this matter based on the contention that no DOT personnel had any knowledge of the pothole prior to plaintiff’s property damage occurrence. Defendant denied receiving any previous calls or complaints regarding the particular damage-causing pothole which DOT located at approximately milepost 22.91 on US Route 23 in Franklin County. Defendant asserted plaintiff failed to provide evidence to establish the length of time the pothole existed prior to 6:45 p.m. on December 8, 2007. Defendant suggested “it is more likely than not that the pothole existed in that location for only a relatively short amount of time before plaintiff’s incident.”

{¶ 4} 4) Defendant contended plaintiff failed to produce any evidence to show his damage was proximately caused by negligent roadway maintenance on the part of DOT. Defendant related the DOT “Franklin County Manager conducts roadway inspections of all state roadways within the county on a routine basis, at least one to two

times a month.” Apparently, no potholes were discovered at or near milepost 22.91 on US Route 23 the last time that particular section of roadway was inspected before December 8, 2007. Defendant asserted that if any potholes had been discovered by DOT personnel, the roadway defects “would have been promptly scheduled for repair.”

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶ 5} 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, 3 O.O. 3d 413, 361 N.E. 2d 486. However, defendant is not an insurer of the safety of its highways. See *Kniskern v. Township of Somerford* (1996), 112 Ohio App. 3d 189, 678 N.E. 2d 273; *Rhodus v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.* (1990), 67 Ohio App. 3d 723, 588 N.E. 2d 864.

{¶ 6} In order to prove a breach of the duty to maintain the highways, plaintiff must prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that defendant 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, 517 N.E. 2d 1388. 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, 31 OBR 64, 507 N.E. 2d 1179.

{¶ 7} Plaintiff has not produced sufficient evidence to indicate the length of time that the particular pothole was present on the roadway prior to the incident forming the basis of this claim. Plaintiff has not shown that defendant had actual notice of the pothole. 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 that the pothole appeared on the roadway. *Spires v. Ohio Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262, 577 N.E. 2d 458. There is no indication that defendant had constructive notice of the pothole. Plaintiff has not produced any evidence to infer that defendant, in a general sense, maintains its highways negligently or that defendant's acts caused the defective condition. *Herlihy v. Ohio Department of Transportation*

Case No. 2008-02258-AD	- 4 -	MEMORANDUM DECISION
------------------------	-------	---------------------

(1999), 99-07011-AD. Sized of the defect (pothole) is insufficient to show notice or duration of existence. *O'Neil v. Department of Transportation* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 287, 587 N.E. 2d 891. Therefore, defendant is not liable for any damage that plaintiff may have suffered from the pothole.



Case No. 2008-02258-AD

- 5 -

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

BRYAN B. JOHNSON

Plaintiff

v.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2008-02258-AD

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

ENTRY OF ADMINISTRATIVE DETERMINATION

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.

DANIEL R. BORCHERT
Deputy Clerk

Entry cc:

Bryan B. Johnson
6241 Memorial Drive
Dublin, Ohio 43017

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

RDK/laa
5/14
Filed 5/30/08
Sent to S.C. reporter 8/18/08