

{¶ 5} 5) Defendant produced evidence showing potholes were previously patched in the vicinity of plaintiff's incident on March 18, 2005, March 31, 2005, April 26, 2005, May 27, 2005, and August 5, 2005.

{¶ 6} 6) Furthermore, defendant explained DOT employees conduct roadway inspections of State Route 21 at least two times a month and any discovered defects are promptly repaired. Defendant contended, plaintiff did not produce sufficient evidence to prove DOT breached any duty of care owed to the traveling public in respect to roadway maintenance.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

{¶ 7} 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. However, defendant is not an insurer of the safety of its highways. See *Kniskern v. Township of Somerford* (1996), 112 Ohio App. 3d 189; *Rhodus v. Ohio Dept. of Transp.* (1990), 67 Ohio App. 3d 723.

{¶ 8} 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. 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.

{¶ 9} 3) There is no evidence defendant had actual notice of the damage-causing pothole.

{¶ 10} 4) 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 defective condition (pothole) developed. *Spires v. Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262.

{¶ 11} 5) 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 297.

{¶ 12} 6) In order for there to be constructive notice, plaintiff must show sufficient time has elapsed after the dangerous condition (pothole) appears, so that under the circumstances, defendant should have acquired knowledge of the existence of the defects. *Guiher v. Dept. of Transportation* (1978), 78-0126-AD.

{¶ 13} 7) No evidence has shown defendant had constructive notice of the pothole.

{¶ 14} 8) Furthermore, plaintiff has failed to show defendant negligently maintained the roadway.

IN THE COURT OF CLAIMS OF OHIO

CATHERINE MEHL :
 :
 Plaintiff :
 :
 v. : CASE NO. 2005-10144-AD
 :
 OHIO DEPARTMENT OF : ENTRY OF ADMINISTRATIVE
 TRANSPORTATION : 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. The clerk shall serve upon all parties notice of this judgment and its date of entry upon the journal.

DANIEL R. BORCHERT
Deputy Clerk

Entry cc:

Catherine Mehl
2768 North Street Box 191
Clinton, Ohio 44216

Plaintiff, Pro se

Gordon Proctor, Director
Department of Transportation
1980 West Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43223

For Defendant

RDK/laa
1/20
Filed 1/26/06
Sent to S.C. reporter 2/22/06