

decisions in respect to claims for benefits, it would seem that as a matter of sound and economical administrative practice you should follow the precedents established by the Board of Review, even though you deem the decision to be erroneous. Otherwise, the party who loses by your decision has but to take an appeal to the Board of Review and have the same reversed. Judges of trial courts in this State regard the principles of law established by the decisions of the higher courts as binding and follow them in future cases.

You are therefore advised, in specific answer to your questions, that :

1. The Administrator of the Bureau of Unemployment Compensation is bound to give effect to a decision of the Unemployment Compensation Board of Review in a matter properly appealed to it and to pay benefits in accordance with the decision, even though the Administrator is of the opinion that the decision of the Board of Review is inconsistent with the Unemployment Compensation Act.

2. The Administrator of the Bureau of Unemployment Compensation is not bound as a matter of law to accept the decision of the Unemployment Compensation Board of Review as a binding precedent to be followed in future cases involving similar facts, but as a matter of sound, economical and efficient administrative policy he should do so until such decision may have been overruled or reversed by the Board itself or by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Respectfully,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,
Attorney General.

1209.

BONDS—CITY OF CLEVELAND, CUYAHOGA COUNTY, \$15,000.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 20, 1939.

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

GENTLEMEN :

RE: Bonds of the City of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio,
\$15,000.

The above purchase of bonds appears to be part of a \$405,000 issue of refunding bonds of the above city dated September 1, 1939. The transcript relative to this issue was approved by this office in an opinion rendered to the State Teachers Retirement Board under date of September 7, 1939, being Opinion No. 1146.

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

Respectfully,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,
Attorney General.

1210.

BONDS—PARMA RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, CUYAHOGA COUNTY, \$5,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 20, 1939.

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

GENTLEMEN :

RE: Bonds of Parma Rural School District, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, \$5,000.00. (Unlimited.)

The above purchase of bonds appears to be part of a \$225,000 issue of bonds of the above rural school district dated January 1, 1920. The transcript relative to this issue was approved by this office in an opinion rendered to your Board under date of July 12, 1939, being Opinion No. 912.

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

Respectfully,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,
Attorney General.

1211.

BONDS—BROOKLYN RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, CUYAHOGA COUNTY, \$15,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 20, 1939.

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

GENTLEMEN :

RE: Bonds of Brooklyn Rural School District, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, \$15,000.00.

I have examined the transcript of proceedings relative to the above bonds purchased by you. These bonds comprise part of an issue of school