

OPINIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

**** SUBJECT TO FURTHER EDITING ****

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 Deborah J. Barrett, 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.

Reed et al., Appellants, v. City of Miamisburg, Appellee.
[Cite as Reed v. Miamisburg (1994), Ohio St.3d .]
Appeal dismissed as improvidently allowed.

(No. 93-1910 -- Submitted November 29, 1994 -- Decided December 30, 1994.)

Appeal from the Court of Appeals for Montgomery County,
No. 13446.

Susco, Hecht & Derosé Co., L.P.A., and David P. Hecht, for appellants.

Jenks, Surdky & Cowdrey Co., L.P.A., Robert F. Cowdrey and Arden Lynn Achenberg, for appellee.

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

Moyer, C.J., A.W. Sweeney, Douglas, Wright, Resnick and F.E. Sweeney, JJ., concur.

Pfeifer, J., dissents.

Pfeifer, J., dissenting. I would not have dismissed this case as having been improvidently allowed, but would have heard the case on its merits. I would then have applied to this case my analysis of sovereign immunity as discussed in my concurrence in Garrett v. Sandusky (1994), 68 Ohio St.3d 139, 141, 624 N.E.2d 704, 706.