

[Cite as *Grizzell v. Ohio Dept. of Transp., Dist. 8, 2008-Ohio-5614.*]

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

BONNIETTA GRIZZELL

Plaintiff

v.

OHIO DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION,
DIST. 8

Defendant

Case No. 2008-03122-AD

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

MEMORANDUM DECISION

[Cite as *Grizzell v. Ohio Dept. of Transp., Dist. 8, 2008-Ohio-5614.*]

FINDINGS OF FACT

{¶ 1} 1) On February 6, 2008, at approximately 10:00 a.m., plaintiff, Bonnietta Grizzell, was traveling east on Interstate 275, “[b]efore 5 mile exit between 69 and 70 milemarker” in Hamilton County, when her automobile struck a pothole causing tire and rim damage to the vehicle.

{¶ 2} 2) Plaintiff implied her property damage was proximately caused by negligence on the part of defendant, Department of Transportation (“DOT”), in failing to keep Interstate 275 free of roadway defects. Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking to recover \$710.78, the total cost of automotive repair and replacement parts resulting from the described incident. The filing fee was paid.

{¶ 3} 3) Defendant denied liability based on the contention that no DOT personnel had any knowledge of the pothole prior to plaintiff’s property damage event. Defendant denied receiving any previous reports of a pothole which DOT located at state milepost 68.76 on Interstate 275 in Hamilton County. Defendant suggested that, “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 argued plaintiff failed to produce sufficient evidence to establish the roadway was negligently maintained. Defendant submitted records showing no pothole repairs were conducted near milepost 68.76 on Interstate 275 during the six-month period preceding plaintiff’s January 7, 2008 damage occurrence. Pothole patching was performed at other locations on Interstate 275 in Hamilton County from August 2007 through February 6, 2008. Defendant advised that the concrete roadway pavement on Interstate 275 “is in excellent condition.” Defendant denied breaching any duty owed to the motoring public in regard to roadway 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 recover in a suit involving damage proximately caused by

roadway conditions including potholes, plaintiff must prove that either: 1) defendant had actual or constructive notice of the pothole 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.

{¶ 7} To prove a breach of 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, 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. No evidence has shown that defendant had actual notice of the damage-causing pothole.

{¶ 8} 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 defective condition (pothole) developed. *Spires v. Ohio Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262, 577 N.E. 2d 458. There is no evidence of constructive notice of the pothole.

{¶ 9} 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. Therefore, defendant is not liable for any damage plaintiff may have suffered from the pothole.

{¶ 10} Plaintiff has not shown, by a preponderance of the evidence, that defendant failed to discharge a duty owed to her or that her property damage was proximately caused by defendant's negligence. Plaintiff failed to show that the damage-causing pothole was connected to any conduct under the control of defendant or that there was any negligence on the part of defendant. *Taylor v. Transportation Dept.*

(1999), 99-10909-AD; *Weininger v. Department of Transportation* (1999), 99-10909-AD;
Witherell v. Ohio Dept. of Transportation (2000), 2000-04758-AD.

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

BONNIETTA GRIZZELL

Plaintiff

v.

OHIO DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION,
DIST. 8

Defendant

Case No. 2008-03122-AD

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

ENTRY OF ADMINISTRATIVE
DETERMINATION

[Cite as *Grizzell v. Ohio Dept. of Transp., Dist. 8, 2008-Ohio-5614.*]

[Cite as *Grizzell v. Ohio Dept. of Transp., Dist. 8, 2008-Ohio-5614.*]

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:

Bonnietta Grizzell
3120 Piney Creek Circle
Burlington, Kentucky 41005

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

RDK/laa
7/7
Filed 7/31/08
Sent to S.C. reporter 10/28/08