

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

BRUCE COLLIER

Plaintiff

v.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2008-01090-AD

Clerk Miles C. Durfey

MEMORANDUM DECISION

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶ 1} 1) Plaintiff, Bruce Collier, related that he sustained property damage to his automobile while traveling on US Route 322 when his vehicle was struck by a dislodged centerline road reflector. Plaintiff stated, "I was traveling westbound on U.S. 322 between Bass Lake Road and Auburn road at about 7:00 a.m. on April 17, 2007 when a pick-up truck traveling eastbound kicked up a raised pavement marker." According to plaintiff, the act of the passing truck striking the raised reflector propelled the reflector into the path of his car. Plaintiff noted, "[t]he raised pavement marker went through the front bumper of my 2006 Toyota Corolla LE." Plaintiff submitted photographs depicting the damage-causing road reflector and the damage to his automobile.

{¶ 2} 2) Plaintiff asserted that the damage to his car was proximately caused by negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation (DOT), in maintaining the roadway free of hazards. Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover damages in the amount of \$752.59, for automotive repair and related expenses. The filing fee was paid.

{¶ 3} 3) Defendant denied liability based on the contention that no DOT personnel had any knowledge of a loose reflector on the roadway prior to plaintiff's April

17, 2007 property damage occurrence. Defendant related that DOT records indicate that no previous calls or complaints were received from any entity regarding the particular dislodged reflector which DOT located between mileposts 10.02 and 7.78 on US Route 322 in Geauga County. Defendant contended plaintiff failed to produce any evidence to show how long the dislodged reflector existed on the roadway prior to 7:00 a.m. on April 17, 2007. Defendant suggested that the loose reflector condition likely, “existed in that location for only a relatively short amount of time before plaintiff’s incident.”

{¶ 4} 4) Defendant asserted that plaintiff did not provide evidence to establish that his property damage was caused by negligent maintenance on the part of DOT. Defendant explained that DOT regularly maintains the roadway in the vicinity of plaintiff’s damage event. Defendant contended that the evidence tends to show plaintiff’s damage was caused by an unidentified third party motorist not affiliated with DOT.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶ 5} 1) 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} 2) 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} 3) “[C]onstructive notice is 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, 47 O.O. 231, 105 N.E. 2d 429. “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*, 31 Ohio Misc. 2d 1 at 4, 31 OBR 64, 507 N.E. 2d 1179. “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. In order for there to be a finding of constructive notice, plaintiff must prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that 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; *Gelarden v. Ohio Dept. of Transp., Dist. 4*, Ct. of Cl. No. 2007-02521-AD, 2007-Ohio-3047.

{¶ 8} 4) Plaintiff has not produced any evidence to indicate the length of time the loosened road reflector was present on the roadway prior to the incident forming the basis of this claim. Plaintiff has not shown defendant had actual notice of the uprooted reflector. 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 loosened road reflector 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 dislodged reflector. 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* (1999), 99-07011-AD.

{¶ 9} 5) For plaintiff to prevail on a claim of negligence, he must prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that defendant owed him a duty, that it breached that duty, and that the breach proximately caused his injuries. *Armstrong v. Best Buy*

Company, Inc. 99 Ohio St. 3d 79, 2003-Ohio-2573, 788 N.E. 2d 1088, ¶8 citing *Menifee v. Ohio Welding Products, Inc.* (1984), 15 Ohio St. 3d 75, 77, 15 OBR 179, 472 N.E. 2d 707. Plaintiff has the burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, that he suffered a loss and that this loss was proximately caused by defendant's negligence. *Barnum v. Ohio State University* (1977), 76-0368-AD. However, "[i]t is the duty of a party on whom the burden of proof rests to produce evidence which furnishes a reasonable basis for sustaining his claim. If the evidence so produced furnishes only a basis for a choice among different possibilities as to any issue in the case, he fails to sustain such burden." Paragraph three of the syllabus in *Steven v. Indus. Comm.* (1945), 145 Ohio St. 198, 30 O.O. 415, 61 N.E. 2d 198, approved and followed. This court, as trier of fact, determines questions of proximate causation. *Shinaver v. Szymanski* (1984), 14 Ohio St. 3d 51, 14 OBR 446, 471 N.E. 2d 477. Defendant professed liability cannot be established when requisite notice of the damage-causing conditions cannot be proven. Generally, defendant is only liable for roadway conditions of which it has notice, but fails to correct. *Bussard*, 31 Ohio Misc. 2d 1, 31 OBR 64, 507 N.E. 2d 1179. However, proof of a dangerous condition is not necessary when defendant's own agents actively cause such condition. See *Bello v. City of Cleveland* (1922), 106 Ohio St. 94, 138 N.E. 526, at paragraph one of the syllabus; *Sexton v. Ohio Department of Transportation* (1996), 94-13861. Plaintiff has failed to produce sufficient evidence to prove that his property damage was caused by a defective condition created by DOT. The evidence tends to show plaintiff's damage was caused by an unidentified third party not connected with defendant.

{¶ 10} 6) Plaintiff has not proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that defendant failed to discharge a duty owed to him or that his injury was proximately caused by defendant's negligence. Plaintiff failed to show that the damage-causing condition was created by conduct under the control of defendant, or negligent maintenance on the part of defendant. *Taylor v. Transportation Dept.* (1998), 97-10898-AD; *Weininger v. Department of Transportation* (1999), 99-10909-AD; *Witherell v. Ohio*

Dept. of Transportation (2000), 2000-04758-AD. Plaintiff has failed to provide sufficient evidence to prove that defendant maintained a hazardous condition on the roadway which was the substantial or sole cause of plaintiff's property damage. Plaintiff has failed to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that defendant's roadway maintenance activity created a nuisance. Plaintiff has not submitted conclusive evidence to prove a negligent act or omission on the part of defendant caused the damage to his vehicle. *Hall v. Ohio Department of Transportation* (2000), 99-12863-AD.



Case No. 2008-01090-AD

- 6 -

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

BRUCE COLLIER

Plaintiff

v.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2008-01090-AD

Clerk Miles C. Durfey

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.

MILES C. DURFEY
Clerk

Entry cc:

Bruce Collier
12637 Ravenna Road
Chardon, Ohio 440124

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

RDK/laa

5/22
Filed 7/14/08
Sent to S.C. reporter 9/26/08