

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

**[Cite as *State v. Fortman*, 1998-Ohio-577.]**

*Criminal procedure—Classification as sexual predator—Court of appeals’ judgment on Proposition of Law No. I affirmed on authority of State v. Cook—APPEAL dismissed as improvidently allowed on Proposition of Law No. II.*

(No. 98-899—Submitted October 13, 1998—Decided November 25, 1998.)

APPEAL from the Court of Appeals for Montgomery County, No. CA 16565.

---

*Mathias H. Heck, Jr.*, Montgomery County Prosecuting Attorney, and  
*Cheryl A. Ross*, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for appellee.

*Rudd, Silverberg, Zaharieff & Orlins Co., L.P.A.*, and *Anthony J. Zaharieff*,  
for appellant.

---

{¶ 1} The judgment of the court of appeals on Proposition of Law No. I is affirmed on the authority of *State v. Cook* (1998), 83 Ohio St.3d 404, 700 N.E.2d 570.

{¶ 2} The appeal is dismissed as having been improvidently allowed on Proposition of Law No. II.

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

---