

1976 S.C. Op. Atty. Gen. 414 (S.C.A.G.), 1976 S.C. Op. Atty. Gen. No. 4545, 1976 WL 23162

Office of the Attorney General

State of South Carolina

Opinion No. 4545

December 15, 1976

*1 George M. Stuckey, Jr., Esquire
Lee County Attorney
Stuckey Building
Bishopville, South Carolina 29010

Dear George:

In response to your question about county council members being reimbursed for travel under the provisions of Act No. 283 of 1975, the 'home rule' legislation, they can be reimbursed for actual expenses [see, § 14-3707, CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, 1962, as amended (Cum. Supp.)] but can no longer receive a per diem or other type of expense reimbursement that is not based on actual expenses incurred. Some counties (like Richland) have increased the salary of the members in order to make up for the loss of a per diem reimbursement.

I appreciate the kind words which you wrote to Mr. McLeod on my behalf in connection with the Bailey and Hopkins litigation. I shall eagerly await the next Lee County lawsuit!

With kind personal regards,

Karen LeCraft Henderson
Assistant Attorney General

1976 S.C. Op. Atty. Gen. 414 (S.C.A.G.), 1976 S.C. Op. Atty. Gen. No. 4545, 1976 WL 23162

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.