COPY February 19th, 1925 Mr. J. D. Freeman, Lamesa, Texas. Dear Sir: I have yours of the 14th instant and note what you say with reference to surveys in Block 36, Tawnship 5 North, in Dawson County, and especially with reference to the construction of sureys in that block made by Mr. M. C. Lindsey, former County Surveyor. Surveying in that block has been a source of trouble for a long time as every Surveyor seems to have a different construction or location for the surveys therein. Mr. Lindsey's construction has not been approved by this office, but in view of the statement made by kin in letter of April 29th, 1924, that his construction was acceptable to the la nd owners, several pitents have been issued on field notes made by him under his construction. However these field notes have no ties to any natural ir artificial objects on the ground, which will allow them to shift with the proper construction of the surveys wherever a final adjustment is male. If the land owners are not satisfied with Mr. Lindsey's work it occurs to me that they should get together and have the whole block adjusted under agreement. Otherwise, it will probably have to be settled by the courts. Yours very truly, Comissioner

Country 20592

Clark/c

SK.- File 9-Danson County March 24, 1925 Mr. J. D. Freeman, Lamesa, Texas. Dear Sir: I have yours of the 9th instant, enclosing plat and explanation concerning the location of surveys in Block 36, Township 5 North, T&P Rwy Co, in Dawson County as made by Mr. M. C. Lindsey and the Surveyors at different times, and same duly considered. According to the original field notes of surveys in Plock 36, there seems to be no reason why all sections in that block should not take full measurement. The trouble seems to be due to erroneous construction and surveying by different Surveyors from time to time since the original location, not only in this block, but in the adjoining blocks on the East. If improvements have been made, in accordance with the erroneous surveying, it would now be difficult, if not impossible, to make a survey under proper construction without causing more or less insjury to the owners of such improvements, hence, the suggestion of an adjustment under an agreed survey, as stated in my letter of the 19th ultimo. Referring to that letter, which was in answer to your former inquiry concerning this matter, I find an error or omission of one word which reversed the meaning of what was intended. This error is in the second paragraph which reads - "Mr. Lindsey's construction has been approved by this office," - while it was intended to say that Mr. Lindsey's construction has not been apprived by this office. In view of this error I am enclosing a correction of that letter, including other liner changes, and respectfully call your attention to the last paragraph in same. Yours very truly, Clark/c Enc Counter 20543 Commssioner