

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 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.

Herald, Appellee, v. Hood, Appellant.

[Cite as Herald v. Hood (1994), Ohio St.3d .]

Statutes of limitations -- Discovery rule applied to toll statute of limitations where victim of childhood sexual abuse represses memories of that abuse until a later time -- Appeal dismissed as improvidently allowed.

(No. 93-1864 -- Submitted August 31, 1994 -- Decided September 28, 1994.)

Appeal from the Court of Appeals for Summit County, No. 15986.

Robert A. Royer and Suzanne C. Porter, for appellee.

Ted Chuparkoff and Wayne Hassay, for appellant.

Joan Krauskopf, urging affirmance for amici curiae, Now Legal Defense and Education Fund and Ohio National Organization for Women, Inc.

Based upon our decision in Ault v. Jasko (1994), 70 Ohio St.3d 114, N.E.2d , wherein we applied the discovery rule for purposes of tolling the statute of limitations in child-sexual-abuse-repressed-memory cases, this appeal is dismissed, sua sponte, as having been improvidently allowed.

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

Wright, J., dissents for the reasons stated in his dissenting opinion in Ault v. Jasko (1994), 70 Ohio St.3d 114, N.E.2d .