

into the complaint and either discharge or recognize him to appear before the proper court at the time named in the recognition *or otherwise dispose of the complaint as provided by law.*" (Italics mine.)

The special jurisdiction of justice of the peace courts has been somewhat enlarged but I do not believe it is necessary to set forth the amendment in this opinion.

It is to be noted that the jurisdiction generally of the justices of the peace has been somewhat narrowed. The county wide jurisdiction will now be only "upon affidavit or sworn complaint filed by the prosecuting attorney, sheriff, party injured, etc., and when a person is so charged and brought before a justice of the peace, the justice shall discharge him or recognize him or *otherwise dispose of the complaint as provided by law.*"

It is to the cases in which the justice has final jurisdiction that this provision "otherwise dispose of the complaint as provided by law" refers. In such cases the procedure as regards a trial by jury is not changed. The justices of the peace still have several criminal cases in which they have final jurisdiction and in which the accused is entitled to a trial by jury. In such cases if the accused desires to have his case tried by the justice of the peace he must waive the right to the trial by jury, in writing the same as in the past and in conformance with section 13433-10, General Code.

In specific answer to your inquiry, it is my opinion that it is still necessary to waive a trial by jury before a justice of the peace to give the justice the necessary jurisdiction of the case for a final determination.

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,

Attorney General.

841.

APPROVAL — BONDS OF CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO,
\$10,800.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, July 6, 1937.

The Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

GENTLEMEN:

RE: Bonds of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, \$10,800.00.

The above purchase of bonds appears to be part of an issue of bonds of the above county dated October 1, 1934. The transcript relative to this issue was approved by this office in an opinion rendered to the Teachers Retirement System under date of November 19, 1934, being Opinion No. 3469.

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

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,
Attorney General.

842.

APPROVAL—BONDS OF CITY OF AKRON, SUMMIT COUNTY,
OHIO, \$20,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, July 6, 1937.

The Industrial Commission of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

GENTLEMEN :

RE: Bonds of City of Akron, Summit County, Ohio,
\$20,000.00.

The above purchase of bonds appears to be part of an issue of bonds of the above city dated October 1, 1918. The transcript relative to this issue was approved by this office in an opinion rendered to your commission under date of May 26, 1936, being Opinion No. 5618.

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

Respectfully,

HERBERT S. DUFFY,
Attorney General.