[This opinion has been published in *Ohio Official Reports* at 84 Ohio St.3d 17.]

THE STATE OF OHIO, APPELLEE, *v.* LANCE, APPELLANT.

[Cite as *State v. Lance*, 1998-Ohio-304.]

Criminal procedure—Classification as sexual predator—Court of appeals' judgment on Propositions of Law Nos. I and II affirmed on authority of State v. Cook—Appeal dismissed as improvidently allowed on Propositions of Law Nos. III, IV, and V.

(Nos. 98-603 and 98-605—Submitted October 13, 1998—Decided November 25, 1998.)

CERTIFIED by and APPEAL from the Court of Appeals for Hamilton County, No. C-970301.

Joseph T. Deters, Hamilton County Prosecuting Attorney, and *Sherry Green*, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for appellee.

Schuh & Goldberg and *Raul E. Tellez*, for appellant.

{¶ 1} The judgment of the court of appeals on Propositions of Law Nos. I and II is affirmed on the authority of *State v. Cook* (1998), 83 Ohio St.3d 404, 700 N.E.2d 570.

{¶ 2} Propositions of Law Nos. III, IV, and V are dismissed as having been improvidently allowed.

DOUGLAS, RESNICK, F.E. SWEENEY, PFEIFER and LUNDBERG STRATTON, JJ., concur.

MOYER, C.J., and COOK, J., concur in part and dissent in part.

COOK, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part.

{¶ 3} I dissent from the dismissal of Propositions of Law Nos. III, IV, and V.

MOYER, C.J., concurs in the foregoing opinion.