

1981 WL 158245 (S.C.A.G.)

Office of the Attorney General

State of South Carolina

April 23, 1981

\*1 Mr. David G. Jennings  
Attorney at Law  
Post Office Box 10943  
Charleston, South Carolina 29411

Dear Mr. Jennings:

Mr. McLeod has referred your letter to me for reply. You have inquired if there is any basis for a claim by the North Charleston District against the City of Charleston and the City of North Charleston for contribution to the repayment of a bond issued by the District prior to the annexation of certain property into the City of Charleston and the City of North Charleston. This claim would be based upon the value of the properties annexed to the cities subsequent to the issuance of the Bond Anticipation Note but prior to the repayment of the bond.

The present policy of this Office is to limit the opinions issued only to those to whom we are authorized to render legal advice and opinions, and this includes the Governor and the General Assembly ([§ 1-7-90, 1976 Code](#)), the Solicitors ([§ 1-7-100, 1976 Code](#)), and Constitutional and other State Officers ([§ 1-7-110, 1976 Code](#)).

On questions of local concern, we must refer you to your county attorney who would be in the best position to assist you. I regret, therefore, that we will not be able to aid you in the resolution of this matter.

However, I would refer you to [Mosley v. Welch, 209 S.C. 19, 39 S.E.2d 133 \(1946\)](#). Additionally, I am enclosing a prior letter from this Office concerning legal problems that were occasioned by a portion of Edisto being annexed from Collecton County to Charleston County. I believe that though these are not directly on point, they will assist you in your resolution of your question.

Very truly yours,

Treva G. Ashworth  
Senior Assistant Attorney General

1981 WL 158245 (S.C.A.G.)

---

End of Document

© 2015 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.