



JOHN A. OLSZEWSKI, JR.
County Executive

JAMES R. BENJAMIN, JR., *County Attorney*
Office of Law

April 8, 2022

VIA E-MAIL

Kelly B. Madigan
Inspector General
Office of the Inspector General
Historic Courthouse
400 Washington Avenue
Towson, MD 21204

***Re: Response to OIG External Report 22-005
Legal Opinion of the Office of Law
Councilwoman Cathy Bevins Residency Issue***

Dear Ms. Madigan:

The Office of Law respectfully submits its response to OIG External Report 22-005 issued on November 12, 2021. As you will recall, in your report, you noted it appeared that a Councilmember's (later determined to be Councilwoman Cathy Bevins) move to a residential property in Councilmanic District 5 during her term of office constituted a violation of Article II, Section 202(c) of the Baltimore County Charter ("Charter"), as she was a resident of Councilmanic District 6 at the time of her election to the County Council. As the Charter does not contain any enforcement provisions pertaining to the vacating of Council seats based on technical or substantive violations of County Council residency requirements under the Charter, you asked the Office of Law to address these issues, including any potential ramifications to the County Council. This opinion now follows.

Pertinent Factual Background

The Charter was approved by voters of Baltimore County on November 6, 1956 and adopted in early 1957. The Charter serves as the constitution for Baltimore County.

Within the Charter, residency requirements are established for County Council members. First, Article II, Section 201(a) of the Charter, states in plain language the following: "(a) Residence requirement. There shall be a county council of Baltimore County composed of seven members, each one of whom shall, at the time of his election and for two years prior thereto and during his full term of office, reside in a different one of the seven councilmanic districts described in Section 206 of this Article." *See* BALT. COUNTY CHARTER, ART. II, SEC. 201(a). The Charter further states that "[a]ll members of the county council shall be elected by the voters in the councilmanic district in which they reside, and they shall likewise be nominated as members of the General Assembly are or may be nominated under provisions of the laws of the State of Maryland." *See* BALT. COUNTY CHARTER, ART. II, SEC. 201(b). Most importantly, the Charter states, in plain language, that "[i]f any member of the county council during his term of office shall move his residence from the councilmanic district in which he resided at the time of his election, his office shall be forthwith vacated." *See* BALT. COUNTY CHARTER, ART. II, SEC. 202(c).

Kelly Madigan
Inspector General
Office of Inspector General
April 8, 2022

Councilwoman Bevins has represented Councilmanic District 6 of Baltimore County since December 6, 2010. At the time of her election in 2010, Councilwoman Bevins' residence was in District 6. Councilwoman Bevins was re-elected in 2014 and in 2018. At the time of her re-election in 2014 and 2018, Councilwoman Bevins resided in District 6. Councilwoman Bevins is not running for re-election in 2022.

In 2021, Councilwoman Bevins briefly changed her domicile from District 6 to District 5. In May 2021, Councilwoman Bevins had a brief conversation with Legislative Counsel to the County Council in the presence of two staffers. In that conversation, Councilwoman Bevins asked the Legislative Counsel if it would be permissible to purchase the District 5 residence.¹ In response, Legislative Counsel advised her that the Charter allows a councilmember to move out of their district as long as the councilmember had been residing in their district for two years prior to running for office. Legislative Counsel further advised her that because she met that requirement, it was not a problem for her to move out of District 6.

In July 2021, Councilwoman Bevins and her spouse settled on the District 5 residence. At the time of settlement, it was her intention to reside permanently at the residence, which she described as being only 0.04 miles outside of District 6.

Land records from Maryland State Archives showed that on July 30, 2021, the deed to the residence was transferred to Councilwoman Bevins and her spouse. Attached to the deed was an Owner-Occupancy Affidavit signed under oath by Councilwoman Bevins and her spouse stating that "the residence will be occupied by us."

Land records from Maryland State Archives also showed that on July 30, 2021 Councilwoman Bevins and her spouse signed a Purchase Money Deed of Trust for a mortgage on the Residence. On page 6 of the Purchase Money Deed of Trust, there is an "Occupancy" provision that states "Borrower shall occupy, establish, and use the Property as Borrower's principal residence within 60 days after the execution of this Security instrument and shall continue to occupy the Property as Borrower's principal residence for at least one year after the date of occupancy, unless Lender otherwise agrees in writing, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld, or unless extenuating circumstances exist which are beyond Borrower's control."

On or about September 8, 2021, Councilwoman Bevins moved into a residence located outside of District 6 under the current councilmanic boundary lines in District 5. The Baltimore County Board of Elections' records showed on that same day, Councilwoman Bevins' voter registration had been updated via an electronic notification (i.e. an ERIC Report) received from the Maryland State Board of Elections to reflect an address change from a property in District 6 to the residence in District 5.

At some point after her conversation with Legislative Counsel, Councilwoman Bevins found that the advice provided by Legislative Counsel concerning a move into District 5 was not accurate. She reviewed the Charter and determined she needed to re-establish residency in District 6. Therefore, at some point in September 2021, but after September 8, 2021, she took up residency with a family member who was already living in a one-bedroom apartment in District 6.² Since then, Councilwoman Bevins has considered the apartment to be her primary residence.

¹ According to your report, the councilwoman likely referred to the residence as an "investment property," and explained it was located outside of her district.

² Councilwoman Bevins explained the family member does not spend a lot of time at the apartment due to work and personal commitments.

Kelly Madigan
Inspector General
Office of Inspector General
April 8, 2022

On October 18, 2021, Councilwoman Bevins signed an Amendment to Residential Lease Agreement which added her to the lease as a resident or occupant of the apartment. The Agreement was provided to her by the leasing company. Councilwoman Bevins maintains her personal belongings at the apartment, possesses a key for access to the space, and sleeps there on average four nights a week. She receives mail at the apartment. In addition, her voter registration was changed and now reflects the apartment as her residence.

Legal Analysis

Article XI-A of the Maryland Constitution, known as the Home Rule Amendment, was ratified in 1915. It enabled counties choosing to adopt a home rule charter to “achieve a significant degree of political self-determination.” *See Jones v. Anne Arundel County*, 432 Md. 386, 401-02 (2013). The Express Powers Act was enacted pursuant to the Home Rule Amendment to “transfer the General Assembly’s power to enact many types of county public laws.” *McCrorry Corporation v. Fowler*, 319 Md. 12, 16-17 (1990). However, Article XI-A “does not constitute a grant of absolute autonomy to local governments.” *See Ritchmount Partnership v. Board*, 283 Md. 48, 56 (1978).

Section 202(c) of the Charter states as follows:

“If any member of the county council during his term of office shall move his residence from the councilmanic district in which he resided at the time of his election, his office shall be forthwith vacated.”

See BALT. COUNTY CHARTER, ART. II, SEC. 202(c).

The Charter must be construed in the same way as a statute. *See Baltimore Cty. Coal. Against Unfair Taxes v. Baltimore Cty.*, 321 Md. 184, 203 (1989). The plain language of a statute is generally the primary source for determining legislative intention. That being said, the plain language rule is not absolute. *See id.* at 203 (“[o]n the other hand, while the language of the statute is the primary source for determining the legislative intention, the plain meaning rule is not absolute, as the statute must be construed reasonably with reference to the purpose, aim, or policy of the enacting body” (citations omitted)).

Maryland courts have construed the term “residence” to mean a place of fixed, present domicile. *See, e.g., Jones v. Anne Arundel County*, 432 Md. at 405 (citations omitted). Indeed, Maryland highest appellate court has previously construed the term “residence,” found in language from a neighboring jurisdiction’s charter that is identical to the language found in 202(c) of the Charter, to mean “domicile.” *See id.* at 411.

Domicile is considered the place with which one has a settled connection for legal purposes, the place where one “has his [or her] true, fixed, permanent home, habitation and principal establishment, without any present intention of removing therefrom...” *See Blount v. Boston*, 351 Md. 360, 367 (1998). The controlling factor in determining a person’s domicile is his or her intent. *See id.* at 368. The two most significant objective factors evidencing one’s intent as to domicile are where the person lives and where he or she votes or is registered to vote. *See id.* at 368-69.

Here, when Councilwoman Bevins moved out of District 6 and into District 5 last summer, she intended for her residence in District 5 to be her primary residence. Indeed, she said so under oath. She lived at the District 5 residence. Furthermore, Councilwoman Bevins’ voter registration noted that the District 5 property was her residence. As a result, Councilwoman Bevins clearly intended for the District 5

Kelly Madigan
Inspector General
Office of Inspector General
April 8, 2022

residence to be her domicile. Thus, when Councilwoman Bevins moved to District 5 from District 6, section 202(c) of the Charter was violated.

Once a person's place of domicile is established, the presumption is that it continues unless the evidence affirmatively shows an abandonment of the domicile and acquisition of a new one that is clearly established. *See Blount*, 351 Md. at 371 (citation omitted). In order to effect a change of domicile, there must be an actual removal to another habitation, coupled with an intention. *See id.* at 372. Here, shortly after Councilwoman Bevins moved to District 5 she recognized that she made a mistake and moved back to District 6. She clearly established her intent to return to District 6 by moving to and leasing an apartment in that district. She accepts mail at this location. Her belongings are there. SDAT records note that the District 5 property is no longer the primary residence. Consequently, her voting registration reflects that her residence is the apartment in District 6.

The question at hand is whether the period that Councilwoman Bevins was in violation of the Charter due to her having her domicile outside of District 6 during her term of office is enough to mandate that she forthwith vacate her Council seat. The answer is that it is somewhat unclear. This is especially true considering the Charter's legislative history as found in the Reporter's Notes and Index from the Proposed Home Rule Charter, 1956.

The Reporter's notes appear to be an official commentary on the reasoning of each Charter section. Here is what the notes say for Section 202(c):

“(c) Change in Residence. The manifest object of this provision is to insure continuous representation in the county council of each of the seven councilmanic districts.”

At all times between settling on the District 5 residence and re-establishing her domicile in District 6, Councilwoman Bevins performed her day-to-day work conducting legislative business and providing continuous representation and service for her constituents in District 6. Indeed, Councilwoman Bevins continues to do so now.

A plainly worded statute must be construed without forced or subtle interpretations designed to limit its scope. *See State v. Intercontinental, Ltd.*, 302 Md. 132, 137 (1985); *see also Hornbeck v. Somersset Co. Bd. of Educ.* 295 Md. 597, 619 (1983). As noted above, while the language of the statute is the primary source for determining the legislative intention, the plain meaning rule is not absolute, however, as the statute must be construed reasonably with reference to the purpose, aim, or policy of the enacting body. *See Tucker v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co.*, 308 Md. 69, 73 (1986); *see also Kaczorowski v. City of Baltimore*, 309 Md. 505, 513 (1987).

The term “forthwith” often means as soon as can be reasonably done, implying immediacy with no excuses for delay. However, the term “forthwith” can also mean that the act is to be done within a reasonable time. *See BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY*. Indeed, the U.S. Supreme Court stated the following in *Dickerman v. N. Tr. Co.*, 176 U.S. 181, 193 (1900):

“‘[F]orthwith’ is defined by Bouvier as indicating that ‘as soon as by reasonable exertion, confined to the object, it may be accomplished. This is the import of the term; it varies, of course, with every particular case.’ In matters of practice and pleading it is usually construed, and sometimes defined by rule of court, as within twenty-four hours. Anderson (Law. Dict.) says of the word that it ‘**has a relative meaning, and will imply a longer or shorter period, according to the nature of the thing to be done.**’ (emphasis added).

Kelly Madigan
Inspector General
Office of Inspector General
April 8, 2022

The Office of Law was able to uncover information which demonstrates that the drafters of the Charter may not have intended the term “forthwith,” as is provided in section 202(c) of the Charter, to mean immediate or without delay. Consider the case of Milton ("Mickey") H. Miller. Mr. Miller was a councilman in Baltimore County’s Second Councilmanic district during the 1960s. Here is what the Office of Law found:

1) On December 19, 1967, one year after Mr. Miller was elected to the Second Councilmanic district, the Evening Sun ran an article noting he had moved his residence to the Third Councilmanic district but maintained a residence in the Second Councilmanic district. This article notes the Charter section stating that moving of residency is a violation. *See* attached Articles.

2) On December 20, 1967, the Evening Sun ran an article noting the 4 Sudbrook Court Pikesville residence was being questioned by the council's President who stated “that house is not a home”. Mr. Miller's new house in Greenspring was 1,200 yards into the third district. He maintained that he was acting legally. *See id.*

3) On December 22, 1967, Mr. Miller's Republican challenger, in an article in the Evening Sun, noted the “legal residence” was a fiction that didn’t meet Charter section 202 despite being a mistake by Mr. Miller. *See id.*

4) On April 28, 1968, Mr. Miller was noted in the Evening Sun as still being the representative for the Second Councilmanic district in an article regarding the 1968 riots and his call for better living conditions. *See id.*

5) Interestingly, in an April 20, 1970 article, Mr. Miller was asked if he would run in the Third Councilmanic district race and he said he wanted an appointment position instead -- which could be argued that ownership of a residence in the Second Councilmanic district would possibly not have allowed him to run again. *See id.*

6) On Monday, November 29, 1971, the Metropolitan newspaper (also known as the “Evening Sun” in newspaper references) ran an article discussing new districting lines in Baltimore County. In the article, they noted that in the prior year Mr. Miller, who was the popular Second Councilmanic district councilman from Pikesville, did not run again after moving out of the Second district. *See id.*

Importantly, it seems the County Council *allowed* Mr. Miller to stay on the Council, but Mr. Miller agreed not to run again. Of particular interest, it appears Mr. Miller *did not* move back to the Second Councilmanic district. Based upon the *Miller* case, it appears the County Council did not believe that Mr. Miller had to vacate his office immediately. This actually is not surprising, considering the Charter’s legislative history for section 202(c) as found in the Reporter’s Notes and Index from the Proposed Home Rule Charter, 1956, where it was noted that “[t]he manifest object of this provision is to insure continuous representation in the county council of each of the seven councilmanic districts.”

In contrast, the Maryland Court of Appeals in *Jones, supra*, reviewed the Anne Arundel County Charter section 202(c) – which appears to be identical to the Charter’s section 202(c). The Court specifically noted that the following with respect to the legislative history of the Anne Arundel County Charter:

“Thus, the Reporter’s Note to Section 202(c), in commenting that the council member “actually reside[]” in the district “during his full term,” is a reference to the previous County Code's requirement that a candidate “have actually resided” in the County prior to

Kelly Madigan
Inspector General
Office of Inspector General
April 8, 2022

the election. “[A]ctually resides” does not, therefore, refer to “place of abode.” Neither the express language of Section 202(c), nor its legislative purpose, thus, demonstrates any intent to vary the jurisprudential norm that the term residence is domicile.

See Jones, 432 Md. at 410.

In comparing the legislative history of Section 202(c) of the Charter to the Anne Arundel County Charter’s section 202(c), it appears that the drafters of the Baltimore County charter did not expressly require council members to reside in the district they represent for the entire term. Indeed, this is likely the reason why the County Council allowed Mr. Miller to serve out his term instead of immediately vacating his elected office.

Regardless, based on the *Miller* case, it would seem that the temporary period Councilwoman Bevins was in violation of the Charter due to her having her domicile outside of District 6 during her term of office **would not** be enough to mandate that she immediately vacate her Council seat – notwithstanding the different ways the term “forthwith” can be defined. There were clear opportunities subsequent to the *Miller* case to clarify or amend the language of Charter section 202(c) and have it state unequivocally that “forthwith” meant immediate or without delay. In fact, this could have been done with the 1978 Charter Review Commission, as that Commission was convened at a time that was in relative proximity to the *Miller* case, and could have provided guidance on this issue. It elected not to do so.³

The failure of the 1978 Charter Review Commission and/or the County Council to take affirmative steps to clarify Section 202(c) of the Charter means that the working definition of “forthwith” is unclear, at best. As such, the *Miller* case, combined with the County Council’s failure to amend or clarify the definition of forthwith, means that there does not appear to be legal precedent to require the immediate removal of Councilwoman Bevins.⁴

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Office of Law is of the opinion that Councilwoman Bevins, in moving to District 5 from District 6 and establishing domicile there, was in violation of section 202(c) of the Charter. It is unclear that the Charter requires Councilwoman Bevins to immediately vacate her councilmatic seat. However, as stated above, there does not appear to be legal precedent requiring the immediate removal of Councilwoman Bevins.

It may be helpful for the County Council and/or a subsequent County Charter Commission to clarify whether Section 202(c) is self-executing provision. It may be helpful for the County Council and/or a

³ It appears no other Commissions convened since the 1978 Commission have done so either, including the one in 2017 on which the undersigned served.

⁴ It should be noted that the County Council is not empowered under the Express Powers Act to pass a special bill removing Councilwoman Bevins from her councilmatic seat. *See, e.g., Jones*, 432 Md. at 403 (The enactment of a special law is prohibited “for any case, for which provision has been made, by an existing General Law.” Maryland Constitution Article 3, Section 33. If the General Assembly cannot enact a special law when a general law applies, then under the Express Powers Act, Anne Arundel County cannot be empowered to enact a special law where an applicable local law exists. Section 202(c) affected residency qualifications of councilmembers at the time Bill 85–11 was enacted. The county council, therefore, lacked the authority under Section 5(S) Express Powers Act to enact Bill 85–11 to remove Jones”).

Kelly Madigan
Inspector General
Office of Inspector General
April 8, 2022

subsequent County Charter Commission, as part of such work, to consider whether amendments to the Charter are necessary to specify who can declare a vacancy if a Councilmember moves from their councilmanic district and to determine who can remove a Councilmember from office if a vacancy has been found to exist due to the Councilmember moving from their councilmanic district.⁵ Under the Charter, the County Executive cannot make these calls.⁶

Please note that the opinion rendered by the Office of Law is based on the information currently before it. The Office of Law's opinion could change, be supplemented, or amended should additional historical information or authority become available.

Sincerely yours,

James R. Benjamin, Jr.

James R. Benjamin, Jr.
County Attorney

cc: Honorable John A. Olszewski, Jr., County Executive
Honorable Julian E. Jones, Jr., Chairman, County Council, District 4
Honorable Cathy Bevins, County Council, District 6
Stacy L. Rodgers, County Administrative Officer

⁵ Interestingly, as you note in your report, Anne Arundel County, Maryland has a provision in its Code (Section 209) that permits its county council to declare a council seat vacant with an affirmative vote of not less than five members under certain conditions. As you note, one of those conditions is failing to meet the qualifications for residency requirements.

⁶ Under the Charter, if a vacancy is determined to occur in the office of councilmember prior to the expiration of his term, the office shall be filled within thirty days after the vacancy occurs by appointment by the County Executive of the person whose name shall be submitted to him in writing by the State Central Committee members representing the political party to which the previous member belonged, and whose legislative district is wholly or partially included in the councilmanic district in which the vacancy has occurred. Each of these members is entitled to one vote for each precinct in which his or her name was on the ballot. If the previous incumbent was not a member of a political party, then the county executive shall appoint the person selected by the remaining members of the county council. *See* BALT. COUNTY CHARTER, ART. II, SEC. 205.

Importantly, the County Executive cannot be the one to determine that a vacancy has occurred. The County Executive only gets involved once the determination has been made, and even then, only to appoint a replacement that has been determined by others – the State Central Committee or the County Council.



1971 10 of 13 matches

Milton h. Miller

Find

Cancel

If he does find the western county going rough, **Milton H. Miller**, a popular former Second district councilman, could be expected to benefit the most.

But Mr. **Miller** is very reluctant to enter the early going and has said the only thing that would get him in the race right away would be if the strong county Democratic organization drafted him as its candidate.

"I want to make it clear that I'm not seeking anybody's support at this time," Mr. **Miller** said recent.

That stance is not shared by Councilman Harry J. Bartenfelder (D., 5th), and State Sen-

the Long seat.

Half-Mile Win

Both the Fifth district councilman and the Sixth state senator have shown they can win in the political mile races, each winning during the last two years as part of the county's stable.

They have received training mostly from James A. Pine (D), Democratic strong must hold the record as the most winner.

A bumping between two East county organizers would improve the odds on both Miller and Samuel A. Green.

Outdoor YMCA Young



1971

10 of 13 matches



Milton h. Miller

Find

Cancel

(D.,
hard-
est in

state's attorney, the most
proven vote getter of the possi-
ble field.

ty residents but ma
few ears in the v
of the district
county's estimated
ly eligible youth v

coun-
strict
they
half-
seats
ctions
aniza-

Like Mr. Miller, he is a for-
mer councilman who is popu-
lar in the rapidly growing cen-
tral and northwestern county
areas.

Although none of
gibles has said he
enter the starting
that matter has M
jockeying for posi
vious that one of
leading spokesmen
pressed displeasur
vious preoccupati
was interfering
persons doing th
jobs.

their
nator
h), a
who
field-

Green Might Hold Edge

Since he ran with the party
ticket in 1970 and gained even
more votes than Dale Ander-
son, County executive, Mr.
Green would seem to have an
edge, countywide, over Mr.
Miller who did not run last
year after moving out of the
Second district.

At least two of
will probably be s
fore race time b
certain Mr. Long
stiffest primary
since he first won
1962.

these
ation
open-
Miller
, the

The countywide vote for the
state's attorney's second suc-
cessful bid for his current of-
fice would seem to indicate
both liberal and conservative
support, but the latter group





THE '72 RACE

Long's Challengers Eye Paddock

By James F. Bay
That there is more than one challenger to the nomination for the Democratic Party's nomination for Governor in Maryland is no longer a matter of debate. The race is open to all, and several men are expected to enter the fray. The race is open to all, and several men are expected to enter the fray. The race is open to all, and several men are expected to enter the fray.

TABLE: Candidates for the 1972 race, including names like W. J. Bennett, J. P. ...

... [Continuation of the article text, mentioning various candidates and the political landscape in Maryland.]

Lan For Site

Outdoor YMCA Young People Can Rap Yale Glee Club

Miller Moves His Residence

By David Runkel

(Baltimore County Bureau)

Baltimore county's Second district councilman acknowledged today that he has moved to a new house that is located in the Third Councilmanic district.

The Baltimore county charter states that "if any member of the County Council during his term of office shall move his residence from the councilmanic district in which he resided at the time of his election, his office shall be forthwith vacated."

Milton H. Miller, Democrat, said that although he is now living in the Third district, he is maintaining his legal residence in the Second.

"My attorney has assured me

[Continued, Page B 20, Col. 2]

T
yea
tar
Mr
V
the
the
suc
pin
the

F
tod
tify
Lal
sai
the
M
he
tha
wa
rai

A
pin
cal
Gov
the
Gov

[C



The House That Is Not Home

Baltimore county Executive Dale Anderson said today he will investigate whether a county councilman's move from this house at 4 Sudbrook court, Pikesville, to the Greenspring valley would require him to resign his seat. Milton Miller (D., 2nd), said he would retain the house as long as he served the Second district. The house he moved into in Grenadier court is 1,200 yards into the Third district, and the county charter requires councilmen to live in the district they represent or vacate their seats. Mr. Miller says he's acting legally.

**Legal Aid Hits
Bar Action**

**Code Of Fair Practices
Issued By Governor**

[Continued From Page C 28]



ed.

Admits Moving

"From what I see in the papers, Mr. Miller had admitted moving into the Third Legislative district and in my opinion this constitutes a change of residence. I think by any legal definition, residence would require bodily presence and I just don't see how Mr. Miller can avoid this requirement.

"I am sure that the purchase of a home by him in the Third Legislative district was an oversight. He either was misinformed about the boundary line, or overlooked the restriction in the Baltimore county charter as to residency.

I do not think that he deliberately moved into the Third District with the preconceived notion of keeping his residence in Pikesville as a paper resident, it being no more than a mailing address.

A Bad Situation"

I feel he is only trying to make the best of a bad situation. I think Mr. Miller accidentally jammed his finger in the grist mill and is hoping that the fiction of a mailing address in Pikesville will pry him loose." Mr. Seiland said.

On Tuesday, Mr. Miller acknowledged that he has moved from 4 Sudbrook court, Pikesville, to a new house on Grenadier court in the Green Spring Valley, 1,200 yards outside the Second District.

He maintained however that he is retaining the Pikesville home as his legal address and that he is legally serving on the council and will continue to serve.

County executive Dale Anderson has said that he intends to look into the matter.

disclose what Anne Arundel county retail outlets were allegedly in violation of the Sunday sales restrictions.

Letters Sent

The letters were sent to Lt. John J. Blades, commanding officer of the Annapolis State Police barracks, Lt. William M. Bohler, commanding officer of the Waterloo State Police barracks, and county police Chief Elmer F. Hagner, Jr.,

A letter was also sent to Chief Anthony W. Howe, chief of the Annapolis Police Department.

The complaints were apparently received after it was determined a number of retail outlets were in full operation during the past two Sundays, apparently open for the Christmas holiday rush.

In Carroll Coun

Zoning Ch

Westminster, Md.—Proposed changes in the Carroll county zoning ordinance affecting trailer parks, restaurant parking and the keep of animals in residential neighborhoods will be aired at a public hearing by the Board of County Commissioners January 16.

Keeping Of Animals

George Grier, county planner, said most of the fourteen proposed changes are to "clean up the ordinance" by correcting errors and clarifying language.

One of the proposed changes will require restaurants and lunchrooms in the county to

Miller's Home Shift Brings Challenge

[Baltimore County Bureau]

The Republican whom Milton H. Miller defeated for the Second district seat on the Baltimore County Council a year ago said today that he cannot see how Mr. Miller can avoid vacating his seat.

"As I read the Baltimore county charter," John O. Seiland said, "it has a residence requirement stating that during his full term of office the councilman must reside in the district he is going to represent.

"Section 202 specifically requires that if any member of the County Council, during his term of office, shall move his residence from the councilmanic district in which he resided at the time of his election, his office shall be forthwith vacated.

Admits Moving

"From what I see in the papers, Mr. Miller had admitted moving into the Third Legislative district and in my opinion this constitutes a change of residence. I think by any legal definition, residence would

Mr. Stevens "to take appropriate action" after his office had received complaints from non-county sources.

Source Not Revealed

Although Mr. Stevens did not reveal the source of complaints, he indicated some agency in Baltimore city, acting in behalf of city merchants, had lodged charges that blue laws were being violated in the two counties.

The State's sales restrictions, complex and involved measures, generally prohibits the sale of any items not needed on a daily basis.

1 Employee, Owner

In Anne Arundel county, retail outlets may trade in such things as furniture, autos and other non-essential items, providing not more than one employe and the owner is operating from the premises.

Violation of the blue laws carries a fine of between \$20 to \$50 for the first conviction and on a second conviction, the fine jumps to between \$50 and \$500 accompanied by a jail sentence of 10 to 30 days and voiding of trading licenses.

Mr. Stevens also refused to disclose what Anne Arundel county retail outlets were allegedly in violation of the Sunday sales restrictions.

Letters Sent

The letters were sent to Lt. John J. Blades, commanding officer of the Annapolis State Police barracks. Lt. William M.

WA
town

Tw
Sc
De

U
Bel
ford c
selecte
exhibit
in Atla

Dr. C
tenden
and pl
Elemen
wood
display
ing the

Associ
trators

Fish
ners, c
tect
schools
in a fil
a natio

Educ
the cou
school
of nev
school

3 P
At
Thre



the se



6 of 9 matches



Milton h. Miller

Find

Cancel

ate in the 1966 primary.

Mr. use at- re- res ard the the

Miller Won't Run

Councilman Miller, who moved into the 3rd district during his term, indicated he is considering an appointive office, possibly on the state level, and will not run again. Mr. Miller is "not a career councilman." He wants to pursue interests in planning and transportation "in a more concentrated way" than he can on the Council.

He said he would "definitely not" run against Councilman G. Walter Tyrie, Jr., in the 3rd district.

Mrs. mana and f mitte Leona Demo Bisho

F

Sta maint distri stron the co

Obs there cratic Sen