## 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

DOYLE W. BLOOMER

Case No. 2008-03408-AD

Plaintiff

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

٧.

MEMORANDUM DECISION

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

## FINDINGS OF FACT

- {¶ 1} 1) On March 5, 2008, at approximately 8:30 p.m., plaintiff, Doyle W. Bloomer, was traveling west on Interstate 275 and had turned onto the entrance ramp for Interstate 75 North (Dayton), when his automobile struck a large pothole causing rim damage to the vehicle. The impact of striking the pothole also resulted in the loss of the hub cap on plaintiff's car, a 2002 Hyundai Sonata.
- {¶ 2} 2) Plaintiff asserted his property damage was proximately caused by negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation ("DOT"), in failing to keep the roadway free of hazardous conditions. Consequently, plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$229.89, the total cost he incurred for replacement parts. 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 particular damage-causing pothole prior to plaintiff's property damage occurrence. Defendant denied receiving any prior complaints regarding the pothole which DOT located between mileposts 43.60 and 43.30 on Interstate 275 in Hamilton County. Defendant noted plaintiff did not produce any evidence to establish the length of time the pothole was present on the roadway before 8:30 p.m. on March 5, 2008. Defendant suggested, "it is more likely than not that

Case No. 2008-03408-AD	- 2 -	MEMORANDUM DECISION

the pothole existed in that location for only a relatively short amount of time before plaintiff's incident."

- {¶ 4} 4) Furthermore, defendant argued plaintiff failed to produce evidence to show the roadway was negligently maintained. Defendant explained the DOT "Hamilton County Manager conducts roadway inspections on all state roadways within the county on a routine basis, at least one to two times a month." Apparently no potholes were discovered between mileposts 43.60 and 43.30 on Interstate 275 the last time that specific section of roadway was inspected prior to March 5, 2008. Defendant observed that if any DOT employees had found "any defects they would have been promptly scheduled for repair." DOT records show potholes were patched in the vicinity of plaintiff's property damage incident on December 20, 2007 and December 24, 2007.
- {¶ 5} 5) Plaintiff filed a response pointing out he discovered numerous hubcaps in the area where his damage occurred, but could not find the hubcap to his car. Plaintiff stated the pothole his vehicle struck "was deep (and) had to have been there more than one day." Plaintiff further stated his belief that the formation of the pothole "couldn't have happened over night." Plaintiff also expressed his sense of injury in being required to pay a filing fee to pursue this action.

## **CONCLUSION 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, 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.
- {¶ 7} 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.

Case No. 2008-03408-AD	- 3 -	MEMORANDUM DECISION

Defendant is only liable for roadway condition 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.

{¶8} 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* (1999), 99-07011-AD. Size of the defect (pothole) is insufficient to show notice or duration fo 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.

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 DOYLE W. BLOOMER

Case No. 2008-03408-AD

Plaintiff

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

٧.

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.

DANIEL R. BORCHERT Deputy Clerk

Entry cc:

Doyle W. Bloomer 10 Chris Court Middletown, Ohio 45042

RDK/laa 7/8 Filed 7/16/08 Sent to S.C. reporter 10/2/08 James G. Beasley, Director Department of Transportation 1980 West Broad Street Columbus, Ohio 43223