

1310.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF MISSISSINAWA TOWNSHIP RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, DARKE COUNTY, \$7,186.73, TO FUND CERTAIN INDEBTEDNESS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 29, 1924.

*Department of Industrial Relations, Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.*

---

1311.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF CITY OF PORTSMOUTH, SCIOTO COUNTY, \$10,747.10, FOR STREET IMPROVEMENTS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 29, 1924.

*Department of Industrial Relations, Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.*

---

1312.

ABSTRACT, STATUS OF TITLE, 31.24 FEET OFF SOUTH SIDE OF LOT 119 OF HAMILTON'S SECOND GARDEN ADDITION, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 31, 1924.

HON. CHARLES V. TRUAX, *Director of Agriculture, Columbus, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR:—An examination of an abstract of title submitted by your office to this department discloses the following:

The abstract under consideration was prepared by E. M. Baldrige, Attorney at Law, March 24, 1924. The first thirty-seven sections of the abstract were certified by the abstracter as being a true and correct copy of an original abstract prepared by Poste and Atkinson, Abstracters, and a continuation thereto by Adolph Haak & Co., Abstracters. The abstract as submitted by E. M. Baldrige pertains to the following premises:

Being 31.24 feet off the south side of Lot Number One Hundred and Nineteen (119) of Hamilton's Second Garden Addition to said city, as the same is numbered and delineated upon the recorded plat thereof, of record in Plat Book 7, page 186, Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio, excepting 12 feet off the rear end thereof reserved for use as an alley.

Upon examination of said abstract, I am of the opinion same shows a good and merchantable title to the premises under consideration in Anselm T. Holcomb, except as indicated below.

Attention is directed to the restrictions found in the conveyance shown at section 2 of the last continuation, wherein are found restrictions for a period of twenty-five years against the use of the premises for the erection of any building to be used for slaughter houses and the killing of animals, or the use of said premises for the sale of intoxicating liquors or malt beverages.

Taxes for the year 1923, amounting to \$3.89, are a lien and unpaid, one-half of which, amounting to \$1.95, was due and payable in December, 1923.

It is suggested that the proper execution of a general warranty deed by Anselm T. Holcomb and wife, if married, will be sufficient to convey the title of said premises to the State of Ohio when properly delivered.

Attention is also directed to the necessity of the proper certificate of the Director of Finance to the effect that there are unincumbered balances legally appropriated sufficient to cover the purchase price before the purchase can be consummated.

The abstract submitted is herewith returned.

Respectfully,  
C. C. CRABBE,  
*Attorney General.*

1313.

ABSTRACT, STATUS OF TITLE, SOUTH ONE-HALF OF LOT NO. 114, OF HAMILTON'S SECOND GARDEN ADDITION, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 31, 1924.

HON. CHARLES V. TRUAX, *Director of Agriculture, Columbus, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR:—An examination of an abstract of title submitted by your office to this department discloses the following:

The abstract under consideration was prepared by E. M. Baldrige, Attorney at Law, March 24, 1924. The first thirty-seven sections of the abstract are certified by the abstracter as being a true and correct copy of an original abstract prepared by Poste and Atkinson, Abstracters, and a continuation thereto by Adolph Haak & Co., Abstracters. The abstract as submitted by E. M. Baldrige pertains to the following premises:

Being the south one-half of Lot Number One Hundred Fourteen (114) of Hamilton's Second Garden Addition, as the same is numbered and delineated upon the recorded plat thereof, of record in Plat Book 7, page 186, Recorder's Office, Franklin County, Ohio.

Upon examination of said abstract, I am of the opinion same shows a good and merchantable title to the premises under consideration in Henry O. Wood, except as indicated below.

Attention is directed to the restrictions found in the conveyance shown at section 2 of the last continuation, wherein are found restrictions for a period of twenty-five years against the use of the premises for the erection of any buildings