

Motorists Mutual Casualty Company which you have submitted to me for my approval. Finding the same not to be inconsistent with the Constitution or laws of the United States or of the State of Ohio, I am herewith returning the same to you with my approval endorsed thereon.

Respectfully,

JOHN W. BRICKER,
Attorney General.

4711.

APPROVAL, CONTRACT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND COMPLETION OF ELEVATOR CONTRACT FOR FRESHMAN DORMITORY, MIAMI UNIVERSITY, OXFORD, OHIO, \$1820.00, STANDARD ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY OF DETROIT, MICH., SURETY—GEM CITY ELEVATOR WORKS, INC., DAYTON, OHIO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 25, 1935.

HON. T. S. BRINDLE, *Superintendent of Public Works, Columbus, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR:—You have submitted for my approval a contract between the State of Ohio, acting by the Department of Public Works for the Board of Trustees of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, and the Gem City Elevator Works, inc., of Dayton, Ohio. This contract covers the construction and completion of Elevator Contract for Freshman Dormitory, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in accordance with the form of proposal dated May 2, 1935. Said contract calls for an expenditure of eighteen hundred and twenty dollars (\$1820.00).

You have submitted the certificate of the Secretary of the Board of Trustees of Miami University showing that there are available moneys from funds of the university, which moneys when supplemented by the moneys from the Federal Government, will be sufficient to cover the cost of erection of the improvement. In addition, you have submitted a contract bond upon which the Standard Accident Insurance Company of Detroit, Michigan, appears as surety, sufficient to cover the amount of the contract.

You have further submitted evidence indicating that plans were properly prepared and approved, notice to bidders was properly given, bids tabulated as required by law, and the contract duly awarded. Also it appears that the laws relating to the status of surety companies and the workmen's compensation have been complied with.

Finding said contract and bond in proper legal form, I have this day

noted my approval thereon, and return the same herewith to you, together with all other data submitted in this connection.

Respectfully,

JOHN W. BRICKER,
Attorney General.

4712.

JUDGMENT LIEN—REQUIREMENTS FOR PERFECTING JUDGMENT LIEN ON REGISTERED LANDS.

SYLLABUS:

Under the provisions of Section 11656, General Code (116 O. L. 274), no requirement with respect to perfecting a judgment lien on registered lands is imposed in addition to that heretofore imposed by Section 8572-50, General Code.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 25, 1935.

HON. HERMAN E. WERNER, *Prosecuting Attorney, Akron, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR:—Your assistant has requested my opinion as to the duties of the county recorder in connection with the matter of the perfecting of a judgment lien as set forth in the following letter:

“Will you please give me your opinion on the following set of facts:

In order to perfect a judgment lien on registered land, is it necessary to comply with Section 11656 of the General Code, or may a party desiring to perfect a judgment lien proceed under section 8572-50 and disregard section 11656? In other words, under section 8572-50, it never was necessary to first file in the office of the Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas a Certificate of Judgment to perfect a judgment lien on real estate within the county where the judgment was rendered. However, under section 11656, for a judgment to become a lien, it is necessary to file such a certificate. And section 11656 further provides that ‘No *such* judgment shall be a lien upon any registered lands, unless’ etc.

Our County Recorder now asks whether or not he must insist that a judgment lien be properly perfected in the Common Pleas Court under the provisions of 11656 before he accepts the Clerk’s certificate.”