

1974 WL 27847 (S.C.A.G.)

Office of the Attorney General

State of South Carolina

July 9, 1974

*1 Daul A. Sansbury, Esq.
City Attorney
City of Darlington
P. O. Drawer 57
Darlington, South Carolina 29532

Dear Mr. Sansbury:

Thank you for your letter of May 24, 1974, in which you requested an opinion of this office as to whether or not the property delineated on the in you unclosed would be considered as 'abutting' for purposes of annexation. It is my understanding that seventy (70') feet out of four hundred (400') feet of the land proposed to be annexed actually touches the present city line.

The word 'abutting' and the word 'contiguous' as used in annexation procedures appears to generally only require a touching of the property to be annexed to the city line. See Words and Phrases, 'Abut'; PLACE'S Law Dictionary, 'Abut'; McQuillin, Municipal Corporations § 7.20.

Therefore, it is the opinion of this office that for the purposes of annexation the property shown on your enclosed map would be deemed to 'abut' or be 'contiguous' with the city line.

Sincerely,

Treva Ashworth
Assistant Attorney General

1974 WL 27847 (S.C.A.G.)

End of Document

© 2019 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.