

T. H. SEAY,
SURVEYOR.

DISTRICT COMPOSED OF
HOWARD, BORDEN, DAWSON, GLASSCOCK,
LYNN, TERRY AND YOAKUM
COUNTIES.

604

SURVEYOR'S OFFICE,
HOWARD LAND DISTRICT.

BIG SPRINGS, TEXAS, Nov. 7th 1903

Hon. John J. Ferrell Commissioner,
Austin, Texas

Dear Sir

in reply to your favor of October 26 referring to
S. F. 5521-2-3 beg to advise that the discrepancy
to which you refer in the field notes have
been carefully examined and find that the
error is in the Mahany Survey No. 1 S. F. 5025
the Bailey Surveys are correct and it will
be necessary to correct the Mahany Survey
No. 1 which I will gladly do on hearing
your command I hand you herewith a
certified sketch for your examination
and future reference and use there are other
discrepancies to which I beg to call your
attention and think I have made them very
plain in this sketch

I will first call your attention to Survey No. 19 and
20 H. E. & W. D. Ry to Cert No. 600 which I shade
yellow on this sketch are they Valed Surveys they
are properly placed on this sketch if we eliminate
Secondary calls

SURVEYOR'S OFFICE,
HOWARD LAND DISTRICT.

BIG SPRINGS, TEXAS.

190

Surveys No. 19 and 20 H. E. & W. T. Ry. Co. Cert. No. 600 which I shade green on this sketch are properly placed according to field note calls (See Note in Margin of Sketch)

They are evidently valid surveys and should be respected in this position therefore making it necessary to correct Survey No. 1 and 2 Block No. C. C. 41 out of conflict with said Survey No. 20 it may be possible that this green position is a correction of the yellow as it is made about one year later if not than Survey No. 3 Block No. C. C. 41 as made by me for J. T. Bailey will necessarily have to be abandoned as it covers the same ground as No. 19 and 20 with the yellow shade

Also Survey No. 17 & 18 Cert. No. 599 has been placed on the maps and in my former sketches as full sections of 640 acres each Survey No. 17 covering the ground which I have shaded yellow coming and Survey No. 18 covering the ground which I cover on this sketch with both surveys they are placed on this sketch according to

T. H. SEAY,
SURVEYOR.

DISTRICT COMPOSED OF
HOWARD, BORDEN, DAWSON, GLASSCOCK,
LYNN, TERRY AND YOAKUM
COUNTIES.

SURVEYOR'S OFFICE,
HOWARD LAND DISTRICT.

BIG SPRINGS, TEXAS.

190

Corrected field Notes of record in this office which
Makes them 320 acres each so it seems that the
Carmine Shaded Space is unsurveyed School land
and subject to entry and location I beg your
Opinion on all of these points
Yours Very respectfully

T. H. Seay District Surveyor
Howard Land District

P.S. This Sketch will be referred to by me in
future locations some of which is already platted here
on

T. H. S.

Sketch
"A"

Dawson County
Sketch files

Surveyor's explanation
of said sketch
of Dawson Co. sk. files
Keep with said sk. "A"

"A" SKETCH FROM DAWSON COUNTY

Scale = 2000 varas to 1 inch

Nov. 4th 1903

Compiled and drawn by T.H. Seay District Surveyor Howard Land District



Note.
 Survey No. 19 Cert. No. 600
 H.E. & W.T. R.R. Co Shaded yellow
 is placed on this sketch by Corrected
 Field Notes by D.S. Cunningham Surveyor
 of Palo Pinto Land District
 Oct. 20th 1879 its begining call is
 for the N.E. Corner of Survey No. 8
 spears and dots show secondary calls
 Survey No. 20 Alternate of No. 19 is also
 shown
 Survey's No. 19 and 20. H.E. & W.T. R.R. Co.
 Cert. No. 600 and shaded green in this sketch
 is placed by corrected field notes by
 D.S. Cunningham Surveyor of Palo Pinto
 Land District June 2nd 1880 books and arrows
 show field note calls

Surveys No. 17 and 18 H.E. and W.T. R.R. Co. cert. No. 599
 are placed on this sketch by corrected field notes
 by D.S. Cunningham Surveyor of Palo Pinto
 Land District Oct. 20th 1879 books and arrows
 show field note calls
 the space shaded with corners was formerly covered by
 Survey No. 17 cert. No. 599 H.E. & W.T. R.R. Co.
 the corrected field notes being over looked by me
 in my former work and it seems was also over
 looked by the Land office
 Survey No. 3 Block No. CCH1 made by me for S.T. Bailey
 covers the same ground that is covered by
 surveys No. 19 and 20 shaded yellow if they
 are valid the Bailey Survey is void
 surveys No. 19 and 20 which is shaded green are
 evidently valid surveys which will necessitate the
 correction out of conflict the field notes of Survey
 No. 1 and 2 Block No. CCH1
 Survey No. 1 Block No. CCH1 is correctly shown on
 this sketch with the proper distances of the
 East and west lines the distances of these lines
 in field notes being erroneous requiring correction

Filed in Gen. Land Office
 November 19th 1903
 J.T. Robison *chf. clerk &*
Acting Commissioner

By drafting dept:
 Note: The positions shown by
 red traces numbered sects
 X's & dots indicate the correct
 positions of the H.E. & W.T. R.R. surs.
 17 & 18 cert. 599 & surs. 19 & 20
 Cert. 600 N.E. sec colored yellow
 show erroneous position of surs. 19 & 20
 being a duplication of surs. 17 & 18

Supplied 11/21/03
 Correction 11/21/03

I, T.H. Seay District Surveyor of Howard Land District do hereby
 certify that the foregoing sketch shows the correct positions
 of all surveys in Block No. CCH1 as made by me and that the field notes
 of Survey No. 1 of this Block as returned to the General Land Office should
 be corrected so as to conform to this sketch
 Given under my hand at office this 4th day of Nov. 1903
 T.H. Seay District Surveyor
 Howard Land District

See also SF 5521
 showing total positions
 SF above showing
 also SF made in G.L.O. of
 SF 521 which furth
 these various questions raised here in sketch