

ter provision for notices to the property owners, when the charter provision is in conflict with state laws. This decision was based on the rule as laid down in the case of *Berry et al. vs. City of Columbus*, 104 O. S., 607 and following the case of *Toledo vs. Cooper*, 97 O. S., 86 and *Dayton vs. Bish*, 104 O. S., 206, in which case the rule has been made as follows:

"The power of municipalities both to incur debt and levy taxes, may be restricted or limited by law and a municipality by adopting a charter cannot escape from the limitations imposed thereon by the General Assembly."

"The provisions of a city charter relating to assessments that are in conflict with the requirements of the state law governing special assessments for street improvements must yield to the laws of the state."

In view of the findings of the Supreme Court in each of the foregoing cases, I cannot approve proceedings for the issuance of bonds under legislation as provided by city charters, when the provisions of such charters are in conflict with state laws.

You are therefore advised not to purchase said bonds for the reasons as herein set forth.

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

---

2044.

APPROVAL, ASSESSMENT BONDS, MIAMI CONSERVANCY DISTRICT,  
\$263,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, December 8, 1924.

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

---

2045.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF MIAMI CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, \$50,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, December 8, 1924.

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

---

2046.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF MIAMI CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, \$43,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, December 8, 1924.

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