

1234

APPROVAL—BONDS OF BERGHOLZ VILLAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT, JEFFERSON COUNTY, OHIO, \$9,250.00 (Limited).

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 24, 1937.

*Retirement Board, State Teachers Retirement System, Columbus, Ohio.*

GENTLEMEN :

RE: Bonds of Bergholz Village School District, Jefferson County, Ohio, \$9,250.00 (Limited).

I have examined the transcript of proceedings relative to the above bonds purchased by you. These bonds comprise all of an issue of deficiency bonds dated October 1, 1937, bearing interest at the rate of 4% 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 school district.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,  
*Attorney General.*

1235

APPROVAL—BONDS OF CITY OF AKRON, SUMMIT COUNTY, OHIO, \$3,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 24, 1937.

*The Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.*

GENTLEMEN :

RE: Bond of City of Akron, Summit County, Ohio, \$3,000.00.

The above purchase of bonds appears to be part of an issue of bonds of the above city dated June 1, 1937. The transcript relative to this issue was approved by this office in an opinion rendered to the Teach-

ers Retirement System under date of July 30, 1937, being Opinion No. 944.

It is accordingly my opinion that these bonds constitute a valid and legal obligation of said city.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,  
*Attorney General.*

1236

UNIFORM CRIMINAL EXTRADITION ACT—SECTION ALLOWING FEE FOR ISSUANCE OF REQUISITION, REPEALED.

*SYLLABUS:*

1. *The allowance of fees of the clerk of courts in proceedings where Ohio seeks to extradite a fugitive from justice is unaffected by the Uniform Criminal Extradition Act, Sections 109-1, et seq., General Code.*

2. *There is no authority for the Governor to charge a five dollar (\$5.00) fee for the issuance of a requisition for the extradition of a fugitive from justice inasmuch as said fee was authorized by Section 111, which section was repealed by the Uniform Criminal Extradition Act.*

3. *Section 109-24, General Code, authorizing the payment of certain expenses in extradition cases out of the state treasury in the first instance does not repeal by implication the provisions of Section 2491, General Code, relating to such expenses as may be paid out of the treasury of the county.*

4. *The Uniform Criminal Extradition Act, in view of Section 26 of the General Code, only governs extradition proceedings begun after the effective date of the statute.*

COLUMBUS, OHIO, September 25, 1937.

HON. RALPH J. BARTLETT, *Prosecuting Attorney, Columbus, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge receipt of your recent communication which reads as follows:

“The General Assembly recently enacted a law known as the Uniform Criminal Extradition Act, House Bill No. 108, now designated as Sections 109-1, to 109-32 of the General Code.