OPINIONS 916

2381.

APPROVAL—BONDS, CITY OF TOLEDO, LUCAS COUNTY, OHIO, \$10,000.00, PART OF ISSUE DATED MARCH 1, 1936.

Columbus, Ohio, April 26, 1938.

Retirement Board, State Teachers Retirement System, Columbus, Ohio. Gentlement

> RE: Bonds of City of Toledo, Lucas County, Ohio, \$10,000.00.

The above purchase of bonds appears to be part of an issue of bonds of the above city dated March 1, 1936. The transcript relative to this issue was approved by this office in an opinion rendered to your board under date of December 8, 1936, being Opinion No. 6489.

It is accordingly my opinion that these bonds constitute valid and legal obligations of said city.

> Respectfully, HERBERT S. DUFFY, Attorney General

2382.

APPROVAL—BONDS, CITY OF CLEVELAND, CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO, \$1,000.00, PART OF ISSUE DATED MARCH 1. 1919.

Columbus, Ohio, April 26, 1938.

Retirement Board, State Public School Employes' Retirement System, Columbus, Ohio.

GENTLEMEN:

RE: Bonds of City of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, \$1,000.00.

The above purchase of bonds appears to be part of an issue of bonds of the above city dated March 1, 1919. The transcript relative to this issue was approved by this office in an opinion rendered to the Teachers Retirement System under date of August 21, 1935, being Opinion No. 4565.

It is accordingly my opinion that these bonds constitute valid and legal obligations of said city.

Respectfully,
HERBERT S. DUFFY,
Attorney General

2383

APPROVAL—BONDS, CITY OF CLEVELAND, CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO, \$2,000.00, PART OF ISSUE DATED DECEMBER 1, 1932.

Columbus, Ohio, April 26, 1938.

Retirement Board, State Public School Employes' Retirement System, Columbus, Ohio.

GENTLEMEN:

RE: Bonds of City of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, \$2,000.00.

The above purchase of bonds appears to be part of an issue of bonds of the above city dated December 1, 1932. The transcript relative to this issue was approved by this office in an opinion rendered to the Teachers Retirement System under date of April 7, 1938, being Opinion No. 2244.

It is accordingly my opinion that these bonds constitute valid and legal obligations of said city.

Respectfully,
HERBERT S. DUFFY,
Attorney General