

nizes the marriage, or procure a license in said county. If the minister fails to comply with this law he is penalized under Section 11196, General Code, by the payment of a fine not exceeding \$50.00.

When a marriage ceremony is performed outside of the county issuing the license and the minister performing the same files his license with the probate judge in that county the record is complete in that county. The minister then returns the marriage certificate to the probate judge of the county issuing the license and the record is there complete. If any question arises concerning the validity of the marriage ceremony, the fact of the filing of the minister's license in the county in which he performed the ceremony is evidence of such minister's authority to solemnize marriages.

In specific answer to your inquiry, in view of the foregoing statutory provisions, it is my opinion that the law is properly complied with when duly licensed couples are married by a licensed minister any place in the State of Ohio so long as the licensed minister files in that county his license to perform marriage ceremonies, and that the probate judge of Scioto County may not demand that the minister performing a ceremony in a county foreign to Scioto submit his license so to do to the probate judge in Scioto County in addition to the marriage certificate provided for in Section 11195, General Code.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,

*Attorney General.*

---

596.

APPROVAL—BONDS OF CINCINNATI CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO, \$50,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, May 14, 1937.

*The Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.*

GENTLEMEN:

RE: Bonds of Cincinnati City School Dist., Hamilton County, Ohio, \$50,000.00.

I have examined the transcript of proceedings relative to the above bonds purchased by you. These bonds comprise part of an issue of

building bonds in the aggregate amount of \$300,000.00, dated January 5, 1917, and bearing interest at the rate of 4% per annum.

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 school district.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,  
*Attorney General.*

---

597.

APPROVAL—BONDS OF CINCINNATI CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO, \$64,500.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, May 14, 1937.

*The Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.*

GENTLEMEN:

RE: Bonds of Cincinnati City School Dist., Hamilton County, Ohio, \$64,500.00.

I have examined the transcript of proceedings relative to the above bonds purchased by you. These bonds comprise part of an issue of building bonds in the aggregate amount of \$300,000.00, dated January 8, 1917, and bearing interest at the rate of 4% per annum.

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 school district.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,  
*Attorney General.*