

17

Sk. File No. 17.

Angelina County

Contents:

No. 17.

No. 17.(a)

82
542

OFFICE OF

The Eastern Texas Rail Road Co.

Nacogdoches August 11th 1863Hon. J. C. Bush
Comr. Gen. Confed. S.
Sr.

Upon my arrival at home from the Army a few days I found your Letter of the 24th March last to Wm G. Lany on the subject of placing on the Map, of Angelina County the Grant of Land to Vicente Micheli. The statement in the first page of your Letter are correct being made from the Records before you and your comment thereon value you make it seems however from the description of boundaries that Vicente Micheli did own himself a tract of Land adjoining the Grant of Pedro de Lara ("El Goyate") & that his title, usually Don Manuel Salcedo includes all his Land, his former possession and also the Estancia Goyate Grant" is in part correct. In as much as Vicente Micheli did own another tract of Land acquired from El Lijo del Indo which is called for in the Pedro de Lara Grant "towards the South to the Lagunitas which serves as a line and boundary with the Lands of Vicente Micheli" the Grant of Micheli lay about where

the full title ~~is~~ Amery's, and extended Westward
beyond the Pecos - therefore you are mistaken when
you state "that the title of Gen Manuel Galledo includes
all his lands etc." It embraces only that portion of the
Pedro de Lara grant conveyed by him to his son in law
Estevan Goquiste, and by the latter conveyed to Vicente
Mickeli.

Full notes of a resurvey by W G Laws of a part
of the Pedro de Lara grant were filed in your office May
19th 1857 according to which that part of the Pedro de Lara
Grant reserved by him in his sale to his son in law
Estevan Goquiste was placed on the Map of Angelina
County - this part of the Pedro de Lara ^{Grant} was never
reserved by the Son in Law & Goquiste either by pur-
chase or as an inheritance and was sold by him
to Miss Barn & Clarendon as you will see by the
enclosed copy taken from the Records of this County.
and "the full notes of resurvey of (that part of
the Pedro de Lara ^{Grant} sold by him to Estevan Goquiste and
by the latter to Vicente Mickeli) " Vicente Mickeli grant
(just recd) describes Lands East and adjoining
that part of the Pedro de Lara reserved by him
in his sale to the Son in Law & Goquiste and
afterwards sold by the latter to Barn and

Davensport. Therefore the full notes of the Vicente
Mickeli Grant do not conflict with the Estevan
Goquiste Grant as mapped in Angelina County Map.

You say " in the description of boundaries the
original Grant of Pedro de Lara calls to join in the
East from Lucutiechi - The Grant of San Lucutiechi calls
to join in the West Estevan Goquiste that is Pedro de Lara's
(original Grant) which is true but you must bear
in mind that the de Lara Grant was subdivided
and one portion conveyed to Vicente Mickeli by Estevan
Goquiste. ~~and the~~ now sought to have mapped the other
portion conveyed by the same person to Barn & Davenport
which has been mapped - Therefore the resurvey made
by Vicente Mickeli does not lie on the Land titled to
San Lucutiechi - but adjoins it, and it is well known
that the Domingo Beck is the boundary of the two Grants.

If you will bear in mind the subdivision of the
Pedro de Lara Grant and take the calls of adjoining
Grants, you will find that it is possible to place the
Vicente Mickeli Grant East and adjoining that
part of the de Lara (& Goquiste) Grant that is mapped
without coming in Conflict with other Grants.

I suppose that the original paper of
Mickeli's title Grant includes all El Rio del Surdo.

Angelina Co.
James G. Arnold
letter

regarding the mapping
of Clement Michel's
Grant.

5 M. N. Lefort

Filed August 21, 1863.

The explanation contained herein
regards the locality of Monroe's Michel
Point being in no way conflicting, but
entirely in conformity with the docu-
ments on file here, are regarded
insufficient to plot the Vicente Motte
between E. Agout and Free
Encumbered.

We find however
the following objections against
the first border:

- 1) The meanders of Angelina River are
not given.
- 2) The West side of this grant is bounded
by the East side of E. Agout, but the
fieldnotes call for this highway more
narrow. The same, stated E. Agout,
each boundary is a straight line
running N. 85° E. 12100 m. One
of the boundaries thus given would
be wrong.

Nothing of Clement Michel's
grant is therefore again suggested
until fieldnotes are completed
and corrected, or the disagreement
with E. Agout explained.

August. 29, 1863. J. G. Arnold