

ther information could probably be supplied, but in view of the defects above specified, particularly in paragraph one, I am of the opinion that said bonds are not valid and binding obligations of the village of West Liberty and advise that the industrial commission decline to purchase the same.

Respectfully,

JOHN G. PRICE,
Attorney-General.

2767.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF CITY OF MANSFIELD, OHIO, IN AMOUNT OF \$1,400 FOR STREET IMPROVEMENTS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, December 31, 1921.

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

2768.

APPROVAL, ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION OF THE UNION CASUALTY COMPANY OF CLEVELAND, OHIO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, December 31, 1921.

HON. HARVEY C. SMITH, *Secretary of State, Columbus, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR:—Your letter of recent date transmitting to this office for approval the articles of incorporation of the Union Casualty Company of Cleveland, Ohio, was duly received.

This company is being organized under authority of sections 9445 to 9451, both inclusive, of the General Code, and the articles of incorporation are herewith returned to you with my approval endorsed thereon.

Respectfully,

JOHN G. PRICE,
Attorney-General.

2769.

DISAPPROVAL, BONDS OF VILLAGE OF NEWCOMERSTOWN, OHIO, IN AMOUNT OF \$20,000 FOR STREET IMPROVEMENTS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, December 31, 1921.

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

Re: Bonds of the village of Newcomerstown, in the amount of \$20,000 in anticipation of the collection of special assessments for the improvement of portions of Canal street and Pilling street.

GENTLEMEN:—The transcript submitted for my examination in connection with the above bond issue discloses that the bonds under consideration were

issued under authority of section 3914 G. C. in anticipation of the collection of assessments for street improvement purposes. The notice of the passage of the resolution of necessity was served on July 9, 1921, upon owners of property who could be found. Notice of the passage of such resolution to owners of property who could not be found was published on November 9th and November 16, 1921. The ordinance to proceed with the improvement was passed June 27, 1921. In view of the provisions of sections 3823 and 3824 G. C. council of the village of Newcomerstown was without authority to pass an ordinance to proceed with the improvement of said streets until after the expiration of two weeks following the service of such notice or the completion of the publication thereof. As the passage of an ordinance authorizing the issuance of bonds was dependent upon the prior passage of a proper ordinance to proceed, it follows that the village council was without authority to authorize the issuance of bonds at the date of the passage of the bond ordinance.

I am therefore of the opinion that said bonds are not valid and binding obligations of the village and advise the commission to decline to purchase the same.

Respectfully,
 JOHN G. PRICE,
Attorney-General.

2770.

DISAPPROVAL, BONDS OF CITY OF HAMILTON, OHIO, IN AMOUNT OF
 \$24,498.22 FOR STREET IMPROVEMENTS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, December 31, 1921.

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

Re: Bonds of the city of Hamilton in the amount of \$24,498.22 in anticipation of the collection of assessments for the improvement of portions of Mill road, Dayton street, Bond avenue, Hudson avenue, Kolbenstetter avenue and Fairgrove avenue, by constructing sewers therein.

GENTLEMEN:—The transcript of proceedings relative to the above bond issue submitted for my examination discloses that the bonds under consideration were issued under authority of section 3914 G. C. in anticipation of the collection of special assessments for the improvement of the streets above named by the construction therein of sewers. The notice of the passage of the resolution of necessity which was served by publication upon certain owners of property to be assessed was published September 24th and October 1, 1921. The ordinance to proceed with the improvement was passed October 1, 1921. Under authority of section 3823 G. C. owners of property to be assessed for such improvements are given two weeks from the completion of the publication of such notice to file claims for damages. Section 3824 provides:

“At the expiration of the time limited for so filing claims for damages, the council shall determine whether it will proceed with the proposed improvement or not, and whether the claims for damages so filed