COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUF	FOLK, ss.		SUPERIOR COURT CIVIL ACTION NO. 2484CV1583
	SSACHUSETTS DEPARTM NSPORTATION, Plaintiff	,	2909000
V.)	
DOV	/E TRANSPORTATION, LL Defendant	C)	SUFFOLK CIVIL C 2024 JUL ACTING C
	COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND		
		<u>PARTIES</u>	ROR A STREET
1.	Plaintiff, Massachusetts D	epartment of Transportation	n ("MassDOF"), is an executive
	office of the Commonwea	Ith of Massachusetts locate	d in Boston, County of Suffolk,
	Commonwealth of Massac	chusetts.	
2.	Defendant, Dove Transpo	rtation, LLC ("Dove"), is a	n Alabama corporation with a usual
	place of business in Linco	ln, Alabama.	· · ·
	FAC	TS COMMON TO ALL C	COUNTS
3.	On July 19, 2021, a tracto	r-trailer operated by Curtis	Henry ("Henry") and owned,
	controlled by, and register	red to Dove was traveling o	n Interstate 93 southbound in
	Medford, Massachusetts.		i !
4.	At the same time and place	e, the defendant's tractor-t	railer was transporting a metal tank.
5.	As the defendant's tractor	trailer passed under the se	cond overpass of Roosevelt Circle,
	the metal tank struck the u	inderside of the overpass b	ridge.
6.	The collision occurred be	ause the trailer and tank e	xceeded the height limit of the
	overpass bridge.		1 1 1

- 7. The impact of the collision caused substantial damage to the support beams of the bridge.
- 8. The aforementioned bridge is owned by MassDOT.
- 9. Prior to the collision, Dove applied for and received a permit from MassDOT to operate the tractor-trailer with its cargo on certain Massachusetts roadways. However, the permit did not authorize the tractor-trailer to travel on Interstate 93 south. In addition, the permit required that the defendant find a suitable detour for all bridges having insufficient clearance.

COLINTI

Massachusetts Department of Transportation v. Dove Transportation, LLC Negligence

- 10. MassDOT repeats, re-alleges and incorporates all preceding paragraphs as if set forth herein.
- 11. At all relevant times, Henry was operating the vehicle for the benefit of defendant, Dove.
- 12. At all relevant times, Henry was an agent, servant, employee, within the scope of his authority and/or employment, and/or otherwise under the direction and control of Dove.
- Dove owed MassDOT a duty of care while its vehicle was operating on Massachusetts roadways and consistent with the proper transaction of Dove's business.
- Dove vicariously and/or independently breached its duty of care owed to MassDOT on the date of the alleged incident.
- As a direct and proximate result, MassDOT was caused to sustain substantial property damage.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff, Massachusetts Department of Transportation, demands judgment against defendant, Dove Transportation, LLC, granting the plaintiff damages, costs,

interest, and any other relief which this Court deems just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff, Massachusetts Department of Transportation, demands a trial by jury as to all issues and claims.

Respectfully Submitted,

Plaintiff
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

By its Attorneys

ANDREA JOY CAMPBELL ATTORNEY GENERAL

/s/ Patrick J. Johnston

Patrick J. Johnston
Special Assistant Attorney General
Johnston Law Office
141 Tremont Street, 3rd Floor
Boston, MA 02111
(617) 523-4808
BBO No. 634415
patrick@johnstonlawboston.com

Dated: June 14, 2024