954

OPINIONS

750.

BONDS—CITY OF YOUNGSTOWN, MAHONING COUNTY, \$3,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 12, 1939.

Retirement Board, State Public School Employes Retirement System, Columbus, Ohio.

## GENTLEMEN:

RE: Bonds of the City of Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio, \$3,000 (Unlimited).

The above purchase of bonds apears to be part of a \$168,575.00 issue of municipal building bonds of the above city dated October 1, 1938. The transcript relative to this issue was approved by this office in an opinion rendered to your Board under date of March 28, 1939, being Opinion No. 367.

It is accordingly my opinion that these bonds constitute valid and legal obligations of said city.

Respectfully,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,

Attorney General.

751.

BONDS—TOLEDO CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, LUCAS COUNTY, \$1,000.00.

Columbus, Ohio, June 12, 1939.

Retirement Board, State Public School Employes Retirement System, Columbus, Ohio.

## GENTLEMEN:

RE: Bonds of Toledo City School District, Lucas County, Ohio, \$1,000 (Limited).

The above purchase of bonds appears to be part of a \$2,000,000 issue of bonds of the above school district dated February 1, 1921. The transcript relative to this issue was approved by this office in an opinion rendered to the State Teachers Retirement Board under date of July 13, 1935, being Opinion No. 4417.

It is accordingly my opinion that these bonds constitute valid and legal obligations of said city school district.

Respectfully,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,

Attorney General.

752.

BONDS—CITY OF YOUNGSTOWN, MAHONING COUNTY, \$6,000.00.

Columbus, Ohio, June 12, 1939.

Retirement Board, State Public School Employes Retirement System, Columbus, Ohio.

## GENTLEMEN:

RE: Bonds of the City of Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio, \$6,000 (Unlimited).

The above purchase of bonds appears to be part of a \$590,600 issue of bridge bonds of the above city dated October 1, 1938. The transcript relative to this issue was approved by this office in an opinion rendered to your Board under date of January 27, 1939, being Opinion No. 52.

It is accordingly my opinion that these bonds constitute valid and legal obligations of said city.

Respectfully,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,

Attorney General.