

Amica Mutual v. Dept. of Transportation (1982), 81-02289-AD.

{¶6} 2) Defendant must exercise due care and diligence in the proper maintenance and repair of highways. *Hennessey v. State of Ohio Highway Department* (1985), 85-02071-AD.

{¶7} 3) In order to recover on a claim of this type, plaintiff must prove either: 1) defendant had actual or constructive notice of the defect 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.

{¶8} 4) There is no evidence defendant had actual notice of the damage-causing condition.

{¶9} 5) 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 developed. *Spires v. Highway Department* (1988), 61 Ohio Misc. 2d 262.

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

{¶11} 7) No evidence has shown defendant had constructive notice of the damage-causing condition.

{¶12} 8) Plaintiff has not submitted any evidence to prove the roadway was negligently maintained.

{¶13} Having considered all the evidence in the claim file and adopting the memorandum decision concurrently herewith;

{¶14} IT IS ORDERED THAT:

{¶15} 1) Plaintiff's claim is DENIED and judgment is rendered in favor of defendant;

{¶16} 2) The court shall absorb the court costs of this case in excess of the filing fee.

DANIEL R. BORCHERT
Deputy Clerk

Order cc:

Marlene M. Harrison
6237 Montrose Drive
Madison, Ohio 44057

Plaintiff, Pro se

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

For Defendant

RDK/laa
4/15
Filed 5/1/03
Sent to S.C. Reporter 5/14/03