

OPINIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

The full texts of the opinions of the Supreme Court of Ohio are being transmitted electronically beginning May 27, 1992, pursuant to a pilot project implemented by Chief Justice Thomas J. Moyer.

Please call any errors to the attention of the Reporter's Office of the Supreme Court of Ohio. Attention: Walter S. Kobalka, Reporter, or Justine Michael, Administrative Assistant. Tel.: (614) 466-4961; in Ohio 1-800-826-9010. Your comments on this pilot project are also welcome.

NOTE: Corrections may be made by the Supreme Court to the full texts of the opinions after they have been released electronically to the public. The reader is therefore advised to check the bound volumes of Ohio St.3d published by West Publishing Company for the final versions of these opinions. The advance sheets to Ohio St.3d will also contain the volume and page numbers where the opinions will be found in the bound volumes of the Ohio Official Reports.

Bobersky et al., Appellants, v. City of Youngstown et al., Appellees.

[Cite as Bobersky v. Youngstown (1992), Ohio St.3d .]  
Appeal dismissed as improvidently allowed.

(No. 91-1336 -- Submitted May 6, 1992 -- Decided June 10, 1992.)

Appeal from the Court of Appeals for Mahoning County,  
No. 90 C.A. 52.

Green, Haines, Sgambati, Murphy & Macala Co., L.P.A., Dennis Haines, Barry Laine and David A. Bobovnyik, for appellants.

Edwin Romero, Law Director, and Cheryl L. Waite, for appellee city of Youngstown.

Richard J. Mastriana, for appellees Carl and Joann Ross.

Lee I. Fisher, Attorney General, John P. Bartley and Joan C. Weiser, urging affirmance for amicus curiae, Ohio Department of Natural Resources.

This cause is dismissed, sua sponte, as having been improvidently allowed.

The court orders that the court of appeals' opinion not be published in the Ohio Official Reports, and that it may not be cited as authority except by the parties inter se.

Sweeney, Holmes, Wright and Resnick, JJ., concur.

Moyer, C.J., Douglas and H. Brown, JJ., separately dissent.

Moyer, C.J., dissenting. Although I agree with the reasons of Justice Brown that a merit decision should be rendered in this cause, I would affirm the judgment of the court of appeals.

Herbert R. Brown, J., dissenting. This case presents significant issues of real property law. The issues presented are not easily resolved under existing law. Thus, it is not appropriate in this case to render a de facto decision by finding the appeal to have been "improvidently allowed." This case should be decided on the merits. Moreover, I think that the decision reached by the court of appeals should be reversed.

Douglas, J., concurs in the foregoing dissenting opinion.