

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

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,

Attorney General.

2757.

DISAPPROVAL—BONDS, COAL GROVE VILLAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT, LAWRENCE COUNTY, OHIO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, July 26, 1938.

The Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

GENTLEMEN :

RE: Bonds of Coal Grove Village School District,
Lawrence County, Ohio, \$11,400.00.

I have examined the transcript relative to the above bond issue and wish to advise you that I will be unable to approve the same for the following reasons:

In the supplemental financial statement contained in the transcript and therein known as the county auditor's certificate, it appears that Coal Grove Village School District has but \$300.00 of bonds outstanding subject to the ten mill limitation and that the estimated millage to retire this \$300.00 bond issue is 2.46 mills, whereas the Village of Coal Grove with the same tax valuation has a \$100.00 bond outstanding and shows an estimated millage to retire this bond of .11 mill. There is apparently some radical error in this certificate.

However, the reason for my disapproval is that Coal Grove Village School District has at the present time and to my knowledge more than \$300.00 bonds outstanding subject to the ten mill limitation, for the reason that on January 10, 1934, the State Teachers Retirement System purchased \$1,975.37 of indebtedness funding bonds dated December 5, 1933, and issued under authority of House Bill No. 17 of the 90th General Assembly, first special session. These bonds were approved by an opinion rendered to the State Teachers Retirement System, being Opinion No. 2068, issued December 28, 1933. Under the provisions of House Bill No. 17, this type of bonds, and I herewith quote the pertinent part of this act, "shall be full general obligations of the school district." Appreciat-

ing the fact that these bonds were issued prior to the effective date of the ten mill limitation, that is Article XII, Section 2 of the Constitution, they are not bonds which come within the exceptions of the schedule of said Section 2 and therefore are subject to the present ten mill constitutional limitation.

For your further information, there are now outstanding of this issue due and owing to the State Teachers Retirement System some \$1250.00 in bonds, of which \$375.00 are now in default.

For the above reasons, I will be unable to approve this issue and advise your Commission against the purchase of the same.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,

Attorney General.

2758.

MOTOR VEHICLE — OPERATOR WHO FAILS TO COMPLY WITH PROVISIONS OF SECTION 12606 G. C. MAY BE CHARGED WITH FAILURE TO STOP, GIVE NAME AND ADDRESS OR NUMBER OF VEHICLE—WHEN MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE NOT LAW—WORDS “WHEN REQUIRED SO TO DO BY LAW” FOUND IN SECTIONS 6298-1 AND 6296-17 G. C. REFER TO PROVSIONS OF SECTION 12606 G. C.

SYLLABUS:

1. *An operator of a motor vehicle who fails to comply with the provisions of Section 12606 of the General Code may be charged with any of the following offenses: (a) failure to stop after an accident or collision, or (b) failure to give his name and address when requested so to do by the injured person or any other person or if not the owner of the motor vehicle, the name and address of the owner thereof, together with the registered number of such motor vehicle.*

2. *A municipal ordinance is not a law in the sense in which the term “law” is used in Sections 6298-1 and 6296-17 of the General Code.*