Library

The State of South Carolinah Carolit #1809





## Office of the Attorney Generalorney General

T. TRAVIS MEDLOCK T. TRAVIS MEDLOCK ATTORNEY GENERAL ATTORNEY GENERAL

POST OFFICE BOX 11549 POST OF FICE BOX 1889 L TOUGH COLUMBIA S C 29211 COLUMBIA SC 29214 COLUMBIA S C 29211 CUEURGAN TO THE POST TO

March 29, 1985chi29, 1985r bandas elected all all and the control of the control

Ms. Frances Wilborn Member, Folly Beach City Council Post Office Box 674 Folly Beach, South Carolina 29439

Dear Ms. Wilborn:

Gary Baker, Executive Director of the State Ethics Commission, has referred your letter of March 22, 1985, to the Office of the Attorney General, since this Office, and not the Ethics Commission, responds to inquiries about dual office holding: I am sorry that you found my letter of March 20, 1985 to be ambiguous. I will try to clarify the points in that letter. I must add that ordinarily this Office does not undertake an opinion for a single member of a city or county council, but I have discussed this matter with the attorney for the City of Folly Beach to comply with the policy of this Office.

Article XVII, § 1A of the South Carolina Constitution provides that "... no person shall hold two offices of honor or profit at the same time." For this provision to be contravened, a person concurrently must hold two public offices which have duties involving an exercise of some portion of the sovereign power of the State. Sanders v. Belue, 78 S.C. 171, 58 S.E. 762 (1907). Other relevant considerations are whether statutes, or other such authority, establish the position, prescribe its tenure, duties or duries or salary, or require qualifications or an oath for them by for the State vi Crenshaw, 274 SiC: 475,4266 S.E. 2d 255 S F 2d position. 61 (1980). **51 (1980)**.

As I stated\in\my letter of March 20; 1985; a20 1985, 3 member of a city council is a public officer, as is as as member of a city's board of adjustment. This Office has repeatedly advised that both of the positions about which

Ms. Wilborn
Page Two Fage Two
March 29, 1985ch 29, 1985

you inquired are public officers; cast shown by the hopinions to opinions enclosed with the letter of March 200 f 1985 th Thus, one who would serve was a membera of a city become idiand on the board of adjustment would most probably sviolate they dual office holding prohibition possible State Constitution of a city because of the board of th

The other problem inherenteiniyour dinquiry is thatiry is that public policy and most probably the common law master-law master-servant principle would be violated if vacity councility council with the power to appoint to another public body (here, a board of adjustment) appoints one or more of its own members to the second public body. I refer you to the Opinion dated January 31, 1985, which was enclosed with my first letter, as well as the opinions from the Ethics commission. The South Carolina Supreme Court stated in Bradley v. City Council of Greenville, 212 S.C. 389, 46 S.E.2d 291 (1948):

In the absence of constitutional or statutory provision it is ...
"contrary to public policy to permit an officer having an appointing power to use such power as a means of conferring an office upon himself, or to permit an appointing body to appoint one of its own members."

212 S.C. at 397. The Code section authorizing city councils to establish boards of adjustment (Section 5-23-70) was quoted in the letter of March 20; it must be noted that the statute makes no provision for ex officio membership of council members on the board of adjustment. Because, as you describe the situation, it would appear that council is appointing its own members to a second office, the court's reasoning in Bradley would appear to be applicable to the situation you have described.

Based on the prohibition against dual office holding of the State Constitution, common law master-servant principles, ethical considerations cited to you by the Ethics Commission, and the public policy established by the Ethics Commission, and the public policy established by the Ethics Commission, and the public policy established by the Ethics Council appears to Bradley v. City Council to South Carolina Supreme Court in Bradley v. City Council to South of Greenville, supra, it would be advisable that the Folly seemed to Beach City Council appoint, to serve on the board of the Ethics Council or persons who are not presently members of mountain City Council or persons who would not have some other conflict (dual office holding, master-servant, or ethical).

Ms. Wilborn Page Three Fage Three March 29, 1985ch 29, 1985

I hope that I thise letter thas sufficiently clarified my letter ofy Marche 200f 1985ch Please8 advise this Office if you need additional assistance or clarification with this with this The attorne Theort then Cityo oft Folly Beach Fehry alsoch can also give you exceldentuguidahteringthis matterthis matter.

Patricia D. Petriay:

Patricia D. Petway Assistant Attorney General

PDP/an

REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY:

Executive Assistant for Opinions

cc: Gary Baker, Executive Director State Ethics Commission

> The Honorable Richard L. Beck Mayor, City of Folly Beach