

the law of this state, and inasmuch as Section 6212-20 has to do with legal procedure on appeal in connection with said law, it is my opinion that said Section 6212-20 of the General Code is no longer effective, not for the reasons assigned by the commentators in Baldwin's and Page's Supplements, heretofore referred to, but for the reason that said Section 6212-20 of the General Code involves subject matter to which it relates which has been repealed. In other words, there is no subject matter upon which this statute can operate and said statute is a vain and useless thing under the circumstances and for that reason ineffective.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,  
*Attorney General*

---

232.

APPROVAL—BONDS OF CITY OF BARBERTON, SUMMIT  
COUNTY, OHIO, \$15,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 11, 1937.

*State Employees Retirement Board, Columbus, Ohio.*

GENTLEMEN :

RE: Bonds of City of Barberton, Summit 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 water works bonds in the aggregate amount of \$762,394.20, dated January 1, 1924, bearing interest at the rate of 5% per annum.

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

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,  
*Attorney General*