

2145.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF BUTLER TOWNSHIP, MERCER COUNTY, OHIO,
IN AMOUNT OF \$7,500 FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENTS.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 6, 1921.

Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

2146.

APPROVAL, FINAL RESOLUTIONS FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENTS,
WILLIAMS COUNTY, OHIO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 6, 1921.

HON. LEON C. HERRICK, *State Highway Commissioner, Columbus, Ohio.*

2147.

APPROVAL, SUBJECT TO CERTAIN CONDITIONS, PREMISES SIT-
UATED IN STATE OF OHIO, COUNTY OF MIAMI, LOTS NUMBERED
SIX HUNDRED TWENTY-ONE AND THIRTY-EIGHT EIGHTY-ONE,
PIQUA ARMORY.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 7, 1921.

HON. GEORGE FLORENCE, *Adjutant-General of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR:—Sometime ago you submitted an abstract prepared and cer-
tified by H. E. Green & Son, abstracters, Troy, Ohio, April 18, 1921, and in-
quired as to the status of the title to the following described premises as
disclosed by said abstract:

Situated in the state of Ohio, county of Miami, and city of Piqua,
being lots number 621 and 3881, as shown on the plat of said city.

The abstract was returned to those interested in correcting some imper-
fections which were disclosed on a rather hasty examination of the same.
The abstract has been supplemented by the history of the title of lot No.
3881 from the government down to August 14, 1894, at which time said prem-
ises were conveyed to the city of Piqua. Also, it was noted in the original
examination that a certain mortgage upon said premises, given to the Border
City Building and Loan Association by John M. McDonald and wife, October
2, 1889, to secure the payment of \$1,200 was uncanceled of record, according
to the abstract. This release now accompanies the original abstract. Also,
it was pointed out in the original examination that the mortgage disclosed
by the abstract which was given by John M. McDonald and wife to J. T.
McKnight to secure the payment of \$2,000, which said mortgage was later

assigned to J. H. Clark, was not released of record. A release from the said J. H. Clark now accompanies said abstract.

Other affidavits, made by Albert Shroeder, are also submitted, clearing up a number of minor objections relating to the heirs at law of Jacob D. Holtzman, and defects in the names in some of the instruments executed as disclosed by the abstract. The abstract now shows that Edward Wilber, who, if living, would have a dower interest in some of the premises, is now deceased.

While there are a number of imperfections in the title as disclosed by said abstract in the earlier transfers, it would seem that the history of the title to lot No. 3881 seems to be reasonably clear from the time that J. M. Kinsel acquired title in 1877, and the history of the title to lot No. 621 above described is rather definite from the time John Hilliard acquired title from Joseph Defrees by warranty deed in 1851.

While there are some imperfections in the title from the dates mentioned above, after careful consideration it is my opinion that with the affidavits and releases heretofore mentioned accompanying the abstract, the abstract now shows a sufficient title to said premises to be in the name of Mary H. Robbins, subject to the following tax liens for the year 1920, which are payable in June, 1921; general taxes, \$82.78; sewer assessments, \$5.74; conservancy, \$31.85. The taxes for the year 1921, the amount of which is undetermined, are also a lien.

The abstract discloses that no examination was made in the court of appeals of Miami county, nor in any of the United States courts.

Respectfully,

JOHN G. PRICE,
Attorney-General.

2148.

DISAPPROVAL, BONDS OF SALT CREEK TOWNSHIP RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, MUSKINGUM COUNTY, OHIO, IN AMOUNT OF \$9,000, FOR ERECTION OF SCHOOL BUILDING.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 8, 1921.

Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

Re: Bonds of Salt Creek township rural school district, Muskingum county, in the amount of \$9,000, for the erection of a new school building.

GENTLEMEN :—I have examined the transcript of proceedings of the board of education of Salt creek township rural school district submitted to me in connection with the above bond issue, and decline to approve the validity of said bonds for the following reasons :

(1) Section 7625 G. C., under authority of which the question of issuing the bonds under consideration was submitted to the electors of Salt Creek township rural school district, provides as follows :

“When the board of education of any school district determines that for the proper accommodation of the schools of such district it