

Legion team prepares for season

Ordinary statutory notice of intent procedures, with which in the opinion of Dickinson, Wright, McKean, Coffey & Moon, the issuer has fully complied, are required with respect to the above bonds. The constitutionality of a notice of intent law was questioned by the plaintiff in *Burton et al v City of Santa Cruz, et al*, Michigan Supreme Court No. 10408, on the grounds that the law did not provide an adequate method of giving the notice to known persons. The Court held the law constitutional and the Michigan Appeals Court, after reversing a previous circuit opinion, has held the law to be constitutional. On May 19, 1978 the Michigan Supreme Court denied plaintiff leave to appeal the final Appeals Court decision. Should effectively terminating the litigation on Michigan bonds. The plaintiff could seek reconsideration by the Michigan Supreme Court of its May 19, 1978 order or could appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. It, however, in the opinion of Dickinson, Wright, McKean, Coffey & Moon that, if such an appeal or other procedural action is attempted the borrower held by the Trust could be the Michigan Courts will be sustained. Upon request by the successful purchaser of the above bonds, Dickinson, Wright, McKean, Coffey & Moon will furnish an opinion stating the foregoing. The non-litigation certificate for the bonds will except this case.

FLOYD A. CAIRNS, City Clerk
City of Farmington Hills

Dated June 6, 1978

Printed June 14, 1978