

Filed April 18/62.

Joseph Retherford 640 acres

I certify that the  
Map forwarded to your (Court Seal & Office), correctly  
represents this and Surrounding Surveys  
it also correctly represents S Burris and  
all the Surveys between that and J. M  
Carlton

John S Adams does not  
Conflict with M P Barbo refer to the maps.  
S E end Angelina County Sent or marked by me  
on 26<sup>th</sup> ult Given under my hand at  
office on this the 31<sup>st</sup> day of March  
A D 1862

J W Gunn Dist

San Angelina District

Explanatory

I received Yours of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> January last and hereby Submit the following explanatory Statements  
1<sup>st</sup> Joshua Fulcher N<sup>o</sup> 455 The call in the 13<sup>th</sup> Course or line of this Survey is  $611\frac{5}{10}$  and most North Corner M<sup>W</sup> Cornwall is wrong and Should be 1050 and the most North Corner &c. I have changed it So to read upon the record - you will see a line running through the mullen league this Caused the mistake made by Mr Gibson probably <sup>probably</sup> and from his having not the field notes of P Mullin when he made the Cornwall Survey - On the Sketch I send you the M<sup>W</sup> Blyth Survey may extend further down - it may be too large and if run further SE upon the map the distance between P Mullin and Thos Hawks would not be So great - on the Sketch it is too great - there is some discrepancy upon the Sketch between Thos Doyle and M Manally & James Venator - this you can reconcile - Please insert in the 13<sup>th</sup> Course for (N<sup>o</sup> 455 Fulcher) 1050 instead of  $611\frac{5}{10}$  and -

In Yours to Messrs Arnold & Barrat you ask an explanation relative to John F Gilbert N<sup>o</sup> 460

The field notes for Samuel Marshall's 2:258,150 Sgr W Survey makes the distance from the SE cor R Crawford to the SW cor of said Marshall 517 and this call was wrong and was probably inserted without the Surveyor's having found the corner as he passed by it - the connection for J M Solo is wrong - the R Crawford (most North Sur) is too large and

must run a... further south than is - also from our  
field notes - the Gilbert N° 460 does reach the SW corner  
of Rubin Crawford and also the SW corner of S Marshall  
The inclosed sketch correctly represents this and  
adjoining surveys - Austin Vinson, B B Mansorby  
R. G. Bird 122 7/10 acres W. H. Muse Solomon Stern  
is also correctly represented on the within sketch  
H. D. Wright 160 acres I am not prepared to say in  
what way the difference in measurement occurred - from  
Whitwell Craft the length of H. D. Wright would be  
318 vs This more directly shows the length of said Wright's  
North by line - then the South line of John A Lamberson  
may be 248 3/4 vs or the North line of B. J. Thompson  
may be 77 vs too short The measurement is correct at all  
events that is 395 vs is correct - But the sketch  
I send you does not correctly represent this distance  
nor the distance of W Crafts North by line

John Crane 160 acres The connection for Joel Banks  
is wrong the NW corner of Joel Bank's is probably  
the corner which was connected with James M. Carlton's SE cor  
Crane (John) J. Y. Boykin Joel Banks 17m N. G. C.  
Samuel Pate A. G. Johnson of Warren I know to be  
correctly represented on the sketch I send you

John P. Scarborough 160 acres does not conflict with  
A Shields but is correctly represented on the  
map inclosed Charles S. Hunt must be too large  
I do not know whether the NW corner of Hunt and SW cor of Shields

are together or not - but as they were not made by me  
it does not involve upon me to find out

Daniel Bennett 160 acres

This does not conflict with Jose Demasio Barbo -

The SE corner of C Frasier is not near so far from the  
NW corner of Barbo on the ground as it is represented  
upon the Sketch accompanying this letter - I give it  
as a reasonable conclusion that there is an excess in either  
G W Browning's South by line or a considerable change  
in the course of Barbo - I think there is an excess in  
G W Browning's South by and also a small change in  
the course of the N by line of said Survey - if either one  
or both exceed the length called for the opening would be  
increased - I am unable to give the cause of this difference  
but I am prepared to say and do say that neither  
Daniel Bennett nor C. Frasier's 160 acre surveys do  
conflict with Barbo a Both of which include a portion  
of a Survey formerly made for Barnes Murry

James Thompson 160 acres

When I made the Thompson Survey I did not know there was  
a Survey in the name of Goring - but as it is in Conf  
lict nearly all in an old League and is rejected  
by your office I will not delay time with it

John W. Johnson 160 acres  
This Survey is explained by explanation for D Bennett  
and C Frazier It does not conflict with any  
Survey

John Clover 160 acres  
I have changed the length of the last line of this survey  
to 842 ms will you please change the field notes  
of this Survey  
So that the last line will be 842 ms

J. W. Johnson's 160 acres  
This does not conflict with Thomas White and I am  
unable to see what makes you think it does. but it  
begins at the NE corner of a 320 acre survey in the name  
of Wm White - I should have so stated in the field  
notes had I not thought the white field notes void  
Joseph Calvert 160 acres

This does not conflict with the Pulbador League but  
adjoins it on the East the G W Cheatham Survey  
is 480<sup>0</sup> 0<sup>0</sup> 0<sup>0</sup> on the outside of Juan B. Pulbador  
There is no call on the Records for The Richardson League  
if there is such a name on the field notes it is wrong  
and I would here ask you "insert Pulbador in its stead -  
It does I expect conflict with E Steven Goguet but this  
was not lettered upon the map and was supposed by  
me to be invalid

Laben James 160 acres does not conflict with Pulbador  
Explanation for Joseph Calvert applies to this.

ms. 2511 Elizabeth Merren 160 acres  
Does not conflict with Ira Stephenson but adjoins  
it on the West. The Sketch I send you correctly  
represents this. A S Richardson and James Merren  
and also A Davis & Surveys. Refer to the distan-  
ce given by Houston McClure from the S W Cor said  
McClure to the S E corner of a Davis most North Survey.

A S Richardson 160 acres  
Does not conflict with A Davis but partly adjoins  
it on the East as you see indicated on the Sketch.  
On the old Map, Houston McClure and Ira Stephenson  
were given a wrong course. By connecting  
McClure with (293  $\frac{2}{3}$  acres) A Davis according to the  
calls in McClure's field notes the Richardson Survey  
becomes reconcilable with J N Merren.

James, N, Merren 100 acres is explained  
by the above and the accompanying Sketch.

Joseph C Worden 160 acres  
The call in the Mathis field notes is wrong. I suppose the  
Surveyor found an old corner which he thought it was  
the Needham corner. But Needham's North corner was  
not made until I made it for the R R Goodloe  
Survey. J. C. Worden does not conflict with the Mathis  
Survey but corners on the S W by line of it as you see  
in Sketch. The S E by line of Mullin is a little too long,  
which is the reason of the seeming conflict with W B Mathis.

London 1830  
The second line of this Survey is 188 rods the SE corner of said Survey <sup>see Mitchel</sup> which please insert in the field notes of <sup>say Berry</sup> the first line is 274 rods upon the ground, and the other <sup>Statement</sup> for Wm Mitchel is wrong - See if there is not a certificate in relation to this on the field notes of said Berry

James L Windham 160 acres  
The Survey in the name of H Lawler has been abandoned by said Lawler and probably forfeited for non payment of fees

John Allison 600 acres  
may be on the Mausola Grant - as I do not know where that Survey is this grant is not on the maps nor its field notes in the office (Aug Dist-) neither is those of Jose Lucubich Johnston Parner Jane Milton Garrett  $\frac{1}{4}$  League If these Grants are considered valid by your office please forward the abovenamed field notes taking the County for the fees for transcribing them

G. W. Muse 160 acres  
according to the Bush Survey as now shown by the maps this Survey is entirely on the inside of Bush but when running this and Wm Absher's Survey I found no old line suitable for West by of Bush

William Absher 145 acres  
It bounded on the North by a Emulation claim in the name of M Rowan but of course he can not hold the Vacant Land by Emulation and as I will probably get no pay for Surveying the Absher claim I will not correct it till the fees are secured

Thomas J Strong Margaret Stanley

A. J. Fitzgerald 320 acres Thomas J. Still  
I will postpone until I make some examinations  
upon the ground Samuel Bell 2 surveys were  
not made by me neither was John B. Smith nor  
Evi McDaniel  
L. B. Davis 161 acres

W. G. Langs 230 $\frac{1}{2}$  acre survey Begins 600 rods  
West from the SE corner of Susanna Martin's Survey -  
The NW cor of Lang is also the SW corner S. Martin  
Refer to Thos Hubbard's 160 acre Survey. The Davis Survey  
is correct

James Bridges 177 acres (most E  
Sur), begins 508 rods N 45 E from the most West corner  
of a 320 acre survey in the name of A. Young, at the  
most West NE corner of said Young

This connection makes the line of said Young  
508 rods when the field notes call for 610 rods a differen-  
ce of 102 rods therefore some lines of A. Young are too  
short others too long - the James Bridges A. M. Scarborough  
Survey conflicts with James Bridges I will remove this  
at a future time - Bridges is the older of the two and is  
therefore <sup>sufficiently</sup> correct John F. Gilbert N<sup>o</sup> 459 is cor-  
rected by the preceding connection for James Bridges





Number 26<sup>th</sup> February 1862  
Civil Land office  
Austin City Texas

Dear Sir inclosed you  
will find a map of the SE end of Augusta County  
as drawn from the records of my office which is tolera-  
bly correct. The S, D Burks' preemption is correctly  
represented. The M Sanders is correctly represented with  
the Survey with which it connects also with M S Roberts  
Rutherford Talbot and heirs James Stepp - James W  
Cherry & John M Gunnis is probably further NE on the  
ground than is here represented. But I do not know  
this to be the case - I don't know E Latham most  
East Sur to adjoin Samuel Burris. But according  
to the connection of S<sup>a</sup> Burris with the NE corner of  
Thomas Howard's preemption Survey it is correctly represented.  
I do said connection given by James Gibson Deputy  
Surveyor - I do not know E. Stanley 160 acres to be in  
Conflict with S W Blount - I have through mistake  
made the S. J. Stanley League about 100 or too long  
I was told by an old citizen that the E Doucho &  
E<sup>a</sup> Roberson Surveys do Conflict with upon the ground  
But I have not yet had an opportunity to find out by  
examination upon the ground. Respectfully Yours

filed March 12/62.

File No.

Angelina County

March 12. / 1862.

G. W. Gamm

8

9c

11

COUNTER # 13019



Baro

Wm. C. ...  
C. ...

...

...

...

St. ...  
...

...

Scale 2000 varas = 1 mile

March 12th, 1862

COUNTY #  
1860

File 16.04  
Angelina County

March 12/1862.

Large area in S.E. part of  
County. Center about 19 Mi  
S. 45° E Lufkin.