

The source's video camera falls within what the statute refers to as a "device" capable of generating visual and audio recordings and is comparable to the device used to eavesdrop on a private conversation in People v. Stone, which was also decided in Michigan, People v. Stone, 621 N.W. 2d 702 (Mich. 2001).

Comment [A1]: This is extraneous information – the legal reader will already know this was decided in Michigan because it is clear from the cite.