

use for park and pasturage purposes that portion of the State Reservoir property in the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 23, Town 17, Range 18, Fairfield County, Ohio, that lies between the ordinary low water line of Buckeye Lake and a line drawn parallel to and 12 feet back of the standard water level of said lake that lies between Station 1510+99 and Station 1525+92 of W. C. Row's survey of Buckeye Lake formerly known as the Licking Reservoir as surveyed by W. C. Row under the direction of the Ohio Canal Commission in 1890.

It appears from a recital in this lease that the same is a renewal of a lease originally granted to one William F. Burdell under date of September 30, 1919, and which by proper assignment and transfer is now owned by the lessee above named.

Upon examination of this lease I find that the same has been properly executed by the Conservation Commissioner and by Edgar T. Wolfe, the lessee therein named. I further find upon an examination of the provisions of this lease and of the conditions and restrictions therein contained, that the same are in conformity with section 471, General Code, and other statutory enactments relating to reservoir land leases.

I am therefore, approving this lease as to legality and form and as an evidence thereof I have endorsed my approval upon the lease and upon the duplicate and triplicate copies thereof, all of which are herewith returned.

Respectfully,

JOHN W. BRICKER,

Attorney General.

3339.

APPROVAL, RESERVOIR LAND LEASE TO LAND AT INDIAN LAKE,
LOGAN COUNTY, OHIO, FOR THE RIGHT TO OCCUPY AND USE
FOR WALKWAY AND PRIVATE DOCKLANDING PURPOSES—
HARRY WAGNER.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, October 23, 1934.

HON. EARL H. HANEFELD, *Director, Department of Agriculture, Columbus, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR:—This is to acknowledge the receipt of a communication over the signature of the Chief of the Bureau of Inland Lakes and Parks, submitting for my examination and approval a reservoir land lease executed by the Conservation Commissioner to one Harry Wagner of Lakeview, Ohio. This lease, which is one for a term of fifteen (15) years, and which provides for an annual rental of six dollars (\$6.00), payable semi-annually, leases and demises to the lessee above named the right to occupy and use for walkway and private docklanding purposes, that part of the outer slope of the westerly embankment of Indian Lake and adjacent lands that is included in the south one-half of Embankment Lot No. 48 and the northerly one-half of Embankment Lot No. 47, north of Stubb's Landing and being a part of the Northeast Quarter of Section 27, Range 8 East, Town 6 South, Logan County, Ohio.

Upon examination of this lease I find that the same has been properly executed by the Conservation Commissioner on behalf of the state of Ohio and by Harry Wagner, the lessee therein named. I further find upon examination of the provisions of this lease and of the conditions and restrictions therein contained,

that the same are in conformity with section 471, General Code, under the authority of which these leases are executed, and with other statutes relating to leases of this kind.

I am, therefore, approving this lease as to legality and form as is evidenced by my approval endorsed upon the lease and the duplicate and triplicate copies thereof, all of which are herewith returned.

Respectfully,
 JOHN W. BRICKER,
Attorney General.

3340.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF YOUNGSTOWN CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
 MAHONING COUNTY, OHIO, \$439,868.60.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, October 23, 1934.

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

3341.

MOTOR VEHICLE—DRIVER EMPLOYED BY COUNTY, OPERATING
 COUNTY OWNED AUTOMOBILE, LIABLE FOR NEGLIGENT OPER-
 ATION THEREOF.

SYLLABUS:

The driver of a county owned motor vehicle, employed by the county for that purpose, is liable in damages for the direct and proximate results of his negligence in the operation of said motor vehicle.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, October 24, 1934.

HON. GEORGE N. GRAHAM, *Prosecuting Attorney, Canton, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR:—This will acknowledge receipt of your request for my opinion, which reads as follows:

“Some time ago you gave your opinion that the county commissioners could not purchase liability insurance on trucks owned and operated by the county, and further that the county could not be held in damages by reason of the operation of such trucks for the county.

The question now presents itself as follows: Would an individual employed by the county as a truck driver and operating a truck owned by the county and doing work for the county be individually liable for damage done by such trucks while being operated by such individual and employee.

We would appreciate your opinion on this question and we feel that it is of sufficient importance throughout the state to justify us in calling upon you for your opinion.”