

THE STATE OF OHIO, APPELLANT, v. LARABEE, APPELLEE.

[Cite as *State v. Larabee*, 1995-Ohio-56.]

Evidence—R.C. 2933.52(A) prohibition of purposeful interception of wire or oral communications through use of an interception device applicable to cordless telephone communications.

(No. 94-2556—Submitted March 7, 1995—Decided April 19, 1995.)

APPEAL from the Court of Appeals for Fairfield County, No.

8-CA-92.

Richard L. Ross, Special Prosecuting Attorney, for appellant.

Harry R. Reinhart; Lantz, Lantz & Lipp Co., L.P.A. and Charles J. Lantz,
for appellee.

{¶ 1} The discretionary appeal is allowed. The judgment of the court of appeals is reversed on the authority of *State v. Bidinost* (1994), 71 Ohio St.3d 449, 644 N.E.2d 318.

MOYER, C.J., DOUGLAS, WRIGHT, RESNICK, F.E. SWEENEY, PFEIFER and
COOK, JJ., concur.
