

arise, difficult questions may perhaps be presented as to the constitutional effect of the position that a particular proceeding is within the terms of the act as providing a trial by jury. But in the determination of such questions, it must be remembered that it is a well established rule that where an act as applied to a given case is susceptible to two constructions, one of which will render it valid and the other of which will render it violative of the Constitution, the construction will be adopted which will support its constitutionality. *State ex rel. vs. Zangerle*, 103 O. S. 566.

In view of the foregoing, it is my opinion that in the event of the enactment of House Bill No. 16, the provisions contained in Section 7, paragraph (c) thereof relating to the right of trial by jury in certain criminal contempt proceedings, would not be violative of the Constitution.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,

Attorney General.

260.

APPROVAL—BONDS OF SOUTH EUCLID-LYNDHURST VILLAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT, CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO, \$15,000.00 (Unlimited).

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 16, 1937.

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

RE: Bonds of South Euclid-Lyndhurst Village School Dist., Cuyahoga County, Ohio, \$15,600.00 (Unlimited).

I have examined the transcript of proceedings relative to the above bonds purchased by you. These bonds comprise all of an issue of refunding bonds dated February 1, 1937, 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.