

answer to question 3b, it would appear that "A" has now lost his voting residence in Perry County because of his continued absence from said county in excess of a three-year period. As stated in your letter, section 4785-33a, General Code, would not apply to the case of "A" in that said section is concerned only with a person *in this state* who moves from one county to another to attend any college, etc., located in such other county.

The problem presented by your fourth question is very similar to your second question and may be answered in like manner. Your second question deals with one in the state service, while question No. 4 is concerned with the voting residence of one who was engaged in the service of the federal government. Section 4785-31g, *supra*, provides that if a person remove to the District of Columbia to engage in the government service he shall not be considered to have lost his residence in this state *during the period of such service* and the place where such a person resided at the time of his removal shall be considered and held to be his place of residence. As stated in my answer to question No. 2, while such person is engaged in the government service, for the purpose of voting, he is considered to be a resident of the voting district from which he removed and the provisions of section 4785-31j, *supra*, would not apply. However, as soon as such employe leaves the government service, the provisions of that section will become operative and should such person then be absent from his voting district, in excess of three years, as in the case stated in your fourth question, he would then lose his voting residence in such district.

Respectfully,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,

*Attorney General.*

---

879.

BONDS—SUMMIT COUNTY, \$430,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, July 14, 1939.

*Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.*

GENTLEMEN:

RE: Bonds of Summit County, Ohio, \$430,000.

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 in the aggregate amount of \$430,000, dated June 1, 1939, and bearing interest at the rate of  $2\frac{1}{4}\%$  per annum.

From this examination, in the light of the law under authority of which the above bonds have been authorized, I am of the opinion that bonds issued under these proceedings constitute valid and legal obligations of said county.

Respectfully,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,  
*Attorney General.*

---

880.

BONDS—CLEVELAND CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, CUYAHOGA  
COUNTY, \$30,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, July 14, 1939.

*Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.*

GENTLEMEN :

RE: Bonds of Cleveland City School District, Cuyahoga  
County, Ohio, \$30,000. (Unlimited.)

I have examined the transcript of proceedings relative to the above bonds purchased by you. These bonds comprise part of an issue of building bonds in the aggregate amount of \$2,500,000, dated April 1, 1939, and bearing interest at the rate of 2½% per annum.

From this examination, in the light of the law under authority of which the above bonds have been authorized, I am of the opinion that bonds issued under these proceedings constitute valid and legal obligations of said city school district.

Respectfully,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,  
*Attorney General.*