

# 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

SHELBY JEAN SPARKS

Plaintiff

v.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2010-06419-AD

Deputy Clerk Daniel R. Borchert

## MEMORANDUM DECISION

{¶ 1} Plaintiff, Shelby Jean Sparks, filed this action against defendant, Department of Transportation (ODOT), contending her vehicle was damaged as a proximate cause of negligence on the part of ODOT in maintaining a hazardous condition on State Route 132 in Clermont County. Plaintiff related she was traveling on State Route 132 “going into Batavia” when her vehicle struck a pothole “close to the entrance of Sycamore Park.” Plaintiff noted the impact of striking the pothole caused damage “to the passenger side in the wheel area” of her vehicle. Plaintiff recalled the described incident occurred on March 16, 2010 at approximately 1:45 p.m. In her complaint, plaintiff requested damages in the amount of \$241.86, the total stated cost of replacement parts and repair expenses. The filing fee was paid.

{¶ 2} Defendant denied liability based on the contention that no ODOT personnel had any knowledge of the particular pothole on the roadway prior to plaintiff’s property damage occurrence. Defendant advised no prior reports of a pothole were received at the location described (milepost 10.80 on State Route 132) despite the fact this section of roadway is “heavily traveled” with an average daily traffic count of over

5,000 vehicles. Defendant denied receiving any calls or complaints regarding a pothole at milepost 10.80 on State Route 132 prior to plaintiff's March 16, 2010 property damage event. Defendant suggested, "it is likely the pothole existed for only a short time before the incident." Furthermore, defendant asserted plaintiff did not produce any evidence to prove her property damage was caused by negligent maintenance. Defendant explained the ODOT "Clermont County Manager inspects all state roadways within the county at least two times a month." Apparently no potholes were discovered at milepost 10.80 on State Route 132 the last time that section of roadway was inspected prior to March 16, 2010. The claim file is devoid of any inspection record. Defendant did submit maintenance records for State Route 132 which show no pothole repairs were made in the vicinity of milepost 10.80 during the six-month period preceding March 16, 2010.

{¶ 3} For plaintiff to prevail on a claim of negligence, she must prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that defendant owed her a duty, that it breached that duty, and that the breach proximately caused her injuries. *Armstrong v. Best Buy Company, Inc.*, 99 Ohio St. 3d 79, , 2003-Ohio-2573, ¶8 citing *Menifee v. Ohio Welding Products, Inc.* (1984), 15 Ohio St. 3d 75, 77, 15 OBR 79, 472 N.E. 2d 707. Plaintiff has the burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, that she 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.

{¶ 4} 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.

{¶ 5} 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. There is no evidence that defendant had actual notice of the pothole. Therefore, for the court to find liability on a notice theory, evidence of constructive notice of the pothole must be presented.

{¶ 6} “[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*, 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. 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.

{¶ 7} 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. No evidence was presented to establish the length of time that the particular pothole was present. Size 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. Plaintiff has failed to prove that defendant had constructive notice of the pothole.

{¶ 8} Ordinarily in a claim involving roadway defects, plaintiff must prove either:  
1) defendant had actual or constructive notice of the defective condition 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. 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 that plaintiff may have suffered from the roadway defect.

## 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](http://www.cco.state.oh.us)

SHELBY JEAN SPARKS

Plaintiff

v.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Defendant

Case No. 2010-06419-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:

Shelby Jean Sparks  
2241 St. Rt. 232  
New Richmond, Ohio 45157

Jolene M. Molitoris, Director  
Department of Transportation  
1980 West Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43223

RDK/laa  
9/15  
Filed 11/10/10  
Sent to S.C. reporter 2/11/11