



OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF ILLINOIS
May 28, 1996

Jim Ryan
ATTORNEY GENERAL

I - 96-028

COMPATIBILITY OF OFFICES:
County Board Member and
School Board Member;
County Board Member and
Deputy Coroner; County
Board Member and Deputy Sheriff

Honorable Terry C. Kaid
State's Attorney, Wabash County
Wabash County Courthouse
401 Market Street
Mt. Carmel, Illinois 62863

Dear Mr. Kaid:

I have your letter wherein you inquire whether one person may serve simultaneously in the offices of: 1) county board member and school board member; 2) county board member and deputy coroner; and 3) county board member and deputy sheriff. Because of the nature of your inquiry, I do not believe that the issuance of an official opinion of the Attorney General is necessary. I will, however, comment informally upon the questions you have raised.

Your first inquiry concerns potential incompatibility in the offices of county board member and school board member. The common law doctrine of incompatibility of offices precludes simultaneous tenure in two offices where the constitution or a statute specifically prohibits the occupant of either office from holding the other, or where the duties of the two offices conflict so that the holder of one cannot, in every instance, properly and faithfully perform all of the duties of the other. (People ex rel. Fitzsimmons v. Swailes (1984), 101 Ill. 2d 458, 465; Rogers v. Village of Tinley Park (1983), 116 Ill. App. 3d 437, 440-41; People ex rel. Myers v. Haas (1908), 145 Ill. App.

Honorable Terry Kaid - 2.

283, 286.) There are no constitutional or statutory provisions which expressly prohibit simultaneous tenure in the offices of county board member and school board member. Therefore, the issue is whether a conflict in duties could arise if one person were to occupy both offices simultaneously.

In opinion No. 93-011 (Ill. Att'y Gen. Op. No. 93-011, issued May 25, 1993), a copy of which I have enclosed for your review, Attorney General Burriss concluded that the office of county board member is incompatible with that of school board member. He noted therein that one potential area of conflict relates to the several instances in which contracts or agreements are authorized between a county and a school district. (See, e.g., 55 ILCS 5/3-6036, 5/5-1060 (West 1994); 55 ILCS 90/10 (West 1994); 105 ILCS 5/29-16 (West 1994).) Another potential conflict in duties arises with respect to the allocation of revenue sharing funds under section 3 of the State Revenue Sharing Act (30 ILCS 115/3 (West 1994)). These potential conflicts were deemed sufficient to render the offices of county board member and school board member incompatible.

In reviewing the provisions of the Counties Code (55 ILCS 5/1-1001 et seq. (West 1994)) and the School Code (105 ILCS 5/1-1 et seq. (West 1994)), and the pertinent cases decided thereunder, it appears that the reasoning of opinion No. 93-011 is still valid. Consequently, the offices of county board member and school board member are incompatible under the common law doctrine of incompatibility of offices.

This issue cannot be concluded at this point, however. Since incompatibility is a common law doctrine, it may be modified or superseded legislatively. Shortly after opinion No. 93-011 was issued, the General Assembly enacted Public Act 88-471, effective September 1, 1993, which added section 1.2 to the Public Officer Prohibited Activities Act (50 ILCS 105/1.2 (West 1994)). Under section 1.2 of the Act, persons in a county having fewer than 40,000 inhabitants are expressly permitted to hold the offices of county board member and school board member simultaneously. According to 1990 Federal census figures, the population of Wabash County is 13,111 inhabitants. (Illinois Blue Book 424 (1993-94).) Consequently, in this instance, it appears that one person may hold the offices of county board member and school board member in Wabash county simultaneously, notwithstanding that those offices may be incompatible at common law.

You have also asked whether one person may serve simultaneously as a county board member and a deputy coroner in circumstances in which the deputy coroner does not receive a

salary, but is reimbursed for mileage and other expenses. There are no constitutional or statutory provisions which expressly prohibit simultaneous tenure in the offices of county board member and deputy coroner. Therefore, the issue is whether a conflict in duties could arise if one person were to occupy both offices simultaneously.

In People ex rel. Teros v. Verbeck (1987), 155 Ill. App. 3d 81, the court was asked to determine whether one person could hold the offices of county board member and deputy coroner simultaneously. In reaching its conclusion that the offices of county board member and deputy coroner are incompatible, the court noted:

" * * *

* * *Common law incompatibility may be established where defendant in one position has authority to act upon the appointment, salary and budget of his superior in a second position. (People ex rel. Fitzsimmons v. Swailes (1984), 101 Ill. 2d 458, 463 N.E.2d 431.) In the present case, it is undisputed that the county board is charged with the duty to fix the compensation of the county coroner within statutory limitations (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1985, ch. 53, par. 37a.1 [55 ILCS 5/4-6002 (West 1994)]) and to provide for reasonable and necessary operating expenses for the coroner's office (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1985, ch. 34, par. 432 [55 ILCS 5/5-1106 (West 1994)]). It is further undisputed that the deputy coroner's compensation is fixed by the coroner, subject to budgetary limitations established by the county board. (Ill. Rev. Stat. 1985, ch. 31, par. 1.2 [55 ILCS 5/3-3003 (West 1994)].) Thus, under the statutory scheme, defendant's two offices are fiscally incompatible since defendant as a member of the county board has authority to act upon the salary and budget of the county coroner who, in turn, determines defendant's salary as deputy coroner. The potential for influencing his superior's salary and budget and, ultimately, his own salary, without more, renders defendant's offices incompatible.

* * *

"

Honorable Terry Kaid - 4.

(People ex rel. Teros v. Verbeck (1987), 155
Ill. App. 3d at 83-4.)

Based upon the foregoing, it is clear that each fiscal year a county board must consider and provide that amount of funding which it considers to be reasonably necessary for the coroner to procure equipment, materials and services, which includes an appropriation for personal services. While you have indicated in your letter that the deputy coroner who is the focus of your inquiry does not currently receive any compensation for his services, there is no requirement that this policy must continue. Thus, a county board member who also serves as a deputy coroner would be called upon to vote upon the budget from which his compensation, if any, would be paid. This creates competing duties of loyalty. Consequently, it does not appear that a county board member may serve as a deputy coroner, even in those circumstances in which the deputy coroner does not receive compensation for carrying out his duties.

Lastly, you have inquired whether one person may serve simultaneously as a county board member and a deputy sheriff in those instances in which the deputy sheriff does not receive a salary for his services, but is reimbursed for mileage and other expenses. There are no constitutional or statutory provision which expressly prohibit simultaneous tenure in the offices of county board member and deputy county sheriff. Therefore, the issue again becomes whether a conflict in duties could arise if one person were to occupy both offices simultaneously.

In Rogers v. Village of Tinley Park (1983), 116 Ill. App. 3d 437, the court was asked to determine whether the offices of village trustee and municipal police officer were incompatible. In reaching its conclusion that one person could not serve simultaneously in those two offices, the court reviewed the elements of the doctrine of common law incompatibility:

" * * *

'It is to be found in the character of the offices and their relationship to each other, in the subordination of the one to the other, and in the nature of the duties and functions which attach to them.

Incompatibility of offices exist where there is a conflict in the duties of the offices, so that the performance of the duties of the one interferes with the performance of the duties of the other. They

are generally considered incompatible where such duties and functions are inherently inconsistent and repugnant, so that because of the contrariety and antagonism which would result from the attempt of one person to discharge faithfully, impartially, and efficiently the duties of both offices, considerations of public policy render it improper for an incumbent to retain both.

At common law, it is not an essential element of incompatibility of offices that the clash of duty should exist in all or in the greater part of the official functions. If one office is superior to the other in some of its principal or important duties, so that the exercise of such duties may conflict, to the public detriment, with the exercise of other important duties in the subordinate office, then the offices are incompatible.'

* * *

"

(Rogers v. Village of Tinley Park (1983), 116 Ill. App. 3d at 441.)

A review of the provisions of the Counties Code (55 ILCS 5/1-1001 et seq. (West 1994)) indicates that the county board is authorized to establish the number of deputy sheriffs to be appointed. (55 ILCS 5/3-6008 (West 1994).) In this regard, a county board member who also serves as a deputy sheriff would be called upon to determine whether his position as a deputy sheriff was necessary for the proper functioning of county government. This creates competing interests and divided loyalties which could hamper a county board member in the full and faithful performance of his duties.

In addition to determining the number of deputy sheriffs the county will employ, the county board is also charged with the duty to fix the compensation of the county sheriff, within statutory limitations (55 ILCS 5/4-6003 (West 1994)), and to provide for reasonable and necessary operating expenses for the sheriff's office (55 ILCS 5/5-1106 (West 1994)). As discussed supra, a county board member who also serves as a deputy sheriff would be required, when voting upon the budget of the county sheriff, to act annually upon the budget from which the sheriff's personal service contracts are satisfied. Thus, a county board member simultaneously serving as a deputy sheriff could create the appearance as well as the actuality of competing

Honorable Terry Kaid - 6.

interests and divided loyalties which could hamper a county board member in the full and faithful performance of his duties. Consequently, it does not appear that one person may serve simultaneously as a county board member and a deputy county sheriff.

I would further note that you have inquired whether any potential conflict in duties which may exist could be resolved by the county board member in question refraining from participation in matters brought before the county board which involve the school district, the county coroner's office or the county sheriff's office, respectively. Our courts have consistently held that abstention will not avoid application of the doctrine of incompatibility of offices. (People ex rel. Teros v. Verbeck (1987), 155 Ill. App. 3d 81, 84; Rogers v. Village of Tinley Park (1983), 116 Ill. App. 3d 437.) Moreover, the court in Rogers v. Village of Tinley Park noted that "[t]he common law doctrine of incompatibility * * * insure[s] that there be the appearance as well as the actuality of impartiality and undivided loyalty." (116 Ill. App. 3d at 442 quoting O'Connor v. Calandrillo (1971), 285 A.2d 275, aff'd, 296 A.2d 326 (1972), cert. denied, 299 A.2d 727 (1973), cert. denied, 93 S.Ct. 2775 (1973).) Therefore, it does not appear that abstention from participation will resolve a conflict of interest or a conflict in duties.

This is not an official opinion of the Attorney General. If we may be of further assistance, please advise.

Very truly yours,



MICHAEL J. LUKE
Senior Assistant Attorney General
Bureau Chief, Opinions

MJL:LP:dn