

In conclusion, it should be stated that in pointing out the different ways in which the question first above discussed may be presented with the view of ultimately obtaining a majority decision of the Supreme Court with respect to the constitutionality of Section 2253, General Code, as amended, it is not thereby intended to hold that the prosecuting attorney of the county in which a common pleas judge is assigned may by action on a finding of the Bureau, or otherwise, recover from a common pleas judge monies paid to him out of the treasury of the county in pursuance of and in obedience to a writ of mandamus issued by any court having jurisdiction of the case. On the contrary, the decision of the court in such a case is conclusive against any action or proceeding to recover monies paid to any such common pleas judge out of the treasury of the county in pursuance of the writ of mandamus issued in such case. *Baer vs. State ex rel Stanton*, 111 O. S. 327.

Respectfully,  
EDWARD C. TURNER,  
*Attorney General.*

---

1848.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF THE VILLAGE OF CRIDERSVILLE, AUGLAIZE COUNTY, OHIO—\$27,012.54.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 14, 1928.

*Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.*

---

1849.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF THE VILLAGE OF WHITEHOUSE, LUCAS COUNTY, OHIO—\$22,945.41.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 14, 1928.

*Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.*

---

1850.

APPROVAL, NOTE OF BELPRE VILLAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON COUNTY—\$122,500.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 14, 1928.

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