

plication of the teacher, or was, in the words in the statute, Section 4752, General Code, "a motion to adopt a resolution * * * to employ a * * * teacher," and no further action was taken in the matter.

In the light of the foregoing authorities, and upon the facts submitted in your letter, it is my opinion that the action of the board of education in question in voting to accept the application of the teacher, did not amount to the making of a contract with the applicant, and did not vest in the applicant any rights which would preclude a reconsideration by the board of its former action at the same meeting. The action of the board was subject to the implied condition, as stated in the Massachusetts case referred to, that the action taken might be reconsidered in accordance with ordinary parliamentary practice and the resolution was passed subject to the usual incidents of votes of that kind.

I am therefore of the opinion that the board may reconsider its former action at the adjourned session to be held on June 3rd, next. A motion to reconsider should be made by one who had voted with the majority at the time the vote was taken on the motion which it is sought to reconsider, and requires a majority vote for its passage.

Respectfully,
GILBERT BETTMAN,
Attorney General.

466.

APPROVAL, NOTES OF MADISON RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, GUERNSEY COUNTY, OHIO—\$15,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 1, 1929.

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

467.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF WILLOUGHBY RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, LAKE COUNTY—\$50,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 1, 1929.

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