

the administration of the Department of Liquor Control by the Director or his agents or employes, it necessarily follows that the provisions of Section 6064-3, General Code, which authorize the Board of Liquor Control to subpoena persons and books, could not be invoked by the Board for such purpose.

The same conclusion must be reached in respect to the power of the Board to subpoena persons or to conduct investigations with reference to persons not connected with the Department of Liquor Control and who are not the holders of permits issued by the Department of Liquor Control. That is to say, that the Board of Liquor Control does not have the authority to subpoena persons who are not permit holders to appear before the Board and conduct an investigation of the activities of such persons with reference to the Department of Liquor Control.

Concluding, it is my opinion that under the provisions of the Liquor Control Act the Board of Liquor Control does not have the power to conduct an investigation of the administration of the Department of Liquor Control by the Director or his employes, nor does the Board of Liquor Control have the authority to conduct an investigation with reference to the activities of persons who are not the holders of permits issued by the Department of Liquor Control. Likewise, the Board of Liquor Control does not have authority to exercise its power of subpoenaing witnesses in such cases in view of the fact that the Board of Liquor Control does not have the authority to conduct such investigations.

Respectfully,

JOHN W. BRICKER,  
*Attorney General.*

---

5770.

APPROVAL—BONDS OF INDEPENDENT RURAL SCHOOL  
DISTRICT No. 2, JEFFERSON COUNTY, OHIO, \$15,500.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 30, 1936.

*State Employes Retirement Board, Columbus, Ohio.*

---

5771.

APPROVAL—BONDS OF CITY OF CLEVELAND, CUYAHOGA  
COUNTY, OHIO, \$12,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, June 30, 1936.

*State Employes Retirement Board, Columbus, Ohio.*