

212.

APPROVAL—BONDS OF VILLAGE OF REYNOLDSBURG,
FRANKLIN COUNTY, OHIO, \$5,000.00 (Unlimited).

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 6, 1937.

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

GENTLEMEN:

RE: Bonds of Village of Reynoldsburg, Franklin County,
Ohio, \$5,000.00 (Unlimited).

I have examined the transcript of proceedings relative to the above bonds purchased by you. These bonds comprise all of an issue of bonds dated January 1, 1937, bearing interest at the rate of 4% per annum, issued for the purpose of a sanitary sewerage system and sewage disposal plant.

From this examination, in the light of the law under authority of which these bonds have been authorized, I am of the opinion that bonds issued under these proceedings constitute a valid and legal obligation of said village.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,
Attorney General.

213.

APPROVAL—GRANTS OF EASEMENT IN LANDS IN MARION
AND JACKSON TOWNSHIPS, HANCOCK COUNTY, OHIO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 6, 1937.

HON. L. WOODDELL, *Conservation Commissioner, Columbus, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR: You have submitted for my examination and approval certain grants of easement executed to the State of Ohio by several property owners in Marion and Jackson Townships, Hancock County, Ohio, conveying to the State of Ohio, for the purposes therein stated, certain tracts of land in said townships and county.

The grants of easement here in question, designated with respect to the number of the instrument and the name of the grantor, are as follows:

Number	Name
496	Audria and Hazel Elsea
497	James B. Bright.
498	Levi Harvitt
499	Dave Bishop
500	Frank Swab
501	Minerva Rose

By the above grants there is conveyed to the State of Ohio, certain lands described therein, for the sole purpose of using said lands for public fishing grounds, and to that end to improve the waters or water courses passing through and over said lands.

Upon examination of the above instruments, I find that the same have been executed and acknowledged by the respective grantors in the manner provided by law and am accordingly approving the same as to legality and form, as is evidenced by my approval endorsed thereon, all of which are herewith returned.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,
Attorney General.

214.

CITY TREASURER—THEFT OF MONEY—NO CLAIM UNDER
BURGLARY AND ROBBERY POLICY—RESPONSIBILITY
OF CITY TREASURER AND CASHIER—SURETY.

SYLLABUS:

1. *An insurance company is not liable to a city by the terms of its contract for a loss of money when the loss does not occur by burglary or robbery as defined in the contract.*

2. *A city treasurer and his surety and a cashier and his surety are severally liable to a city for the loss of money coming into their hands as such officials, unless such loss is due to an act of God or a public enemy.*