

Statement

Gen^l Land Office
July 2nd 1869.

The sketch and explanation of the County Surveyor of Guadalupe County in regard to Thos Casys, A Reup and John Wells surveys has been carefully ^{re}examined and compared with the fieldnotes of the surrounding surveys.

The sketch returned does not correspond in several points with the ^{of the surveys represented} calls of the fieldnotes. As stated ^{some time} before, the Office believes, that the error arises from W^m J. Ragsdalis' ^{survey, which does not close and} whose S.W. corner lies on the Egnaurizar East line, while his N.W. corner ^{still calling for the Egnaurizar} (ties some distance from it ~~as~~ ^{and} the Survey does not close) ⁱⁿ but the sketch shows it as closing ^{and} in conflict with Solomon Barnes league, which cannot be ^{the case} as the corners of Ragsdalis' survey agree with the corresponding corners of John Jones Solomon Barnes and Marjita Chirino. ^(it will exactly reach the East line of Egnaurizar)

The N. line of John Jones is marked in the sketch as 8677 ors long ^(which is in so far remarkable as it ~~is~~ ^{is} with this length exactly reach) while his fieldnotes call only for 8000 ors, ~~and~~ As the sketch leaves the other lines of the same length, ~~has~~ called for in the fieldnotes, the survey would not close with the length given.

The lengths of the lines of the leagues fronting on the San Marcos river differ in some instances considerably from their fieldnotes, (for example the N. line of Geo Allen 6460 ors instead of 5850 ors and the W. line of Fulcher 5217 ors instead of 5000. a difference of 610 ors) without accounting in their statement for said difference.

In establishing the Henderson survey N^o 55, the Surveyor commences at a corner shown him as the Henderson N.E corner, and established by running from Egnaurizar's corner North (2200 ors) and East 3387 ors, by doing so, the Surveyor did not reach the real Henderson corner by about 677 ors (see difference mentioned above in the Jones line) and ^{it} establishes the Henderson survey, where it is shown in red dotted lines on the accompanying sketch, leaving a vacancy along the N.W. line and S.W. line of Andrew Mitchell and claimed as such by the Surveyor counter 27683.

That said Vacancy cannot exist, is at once ~~clear~~ evident, if the field notes of Chas Henderson and A. Mitchell are compared. Henderson's beginning corner is ~~then~~ the W. corner of Andrew Mitchell, the bearing trees in both surveys agreeing, and the only connection it has with the Esnavizay grant is a ~~finding~~ (though erroneous) call for his S. E. corner.

As the bearing trees of the E. corner of Henderson agree with those of the W. corner of Mitchell, the bearings of the ~~W. corner~~ Perkins survey with ^{those of} the S. corner of Mitchell and W. corner of Cowan, and the bearings of J. T. Murphy with those of the corresponding corners of Cowan's, Kellers and John Jones' surveys, how can a vacancy exist along the S. W. line of Andrew Mitchell and Jas. P. Cowan. surveys?

The Surveyor's statement contains no proof of a vacancy along the S. W. line of Andrew Mitchell, except the finding of two Cottonwood stumps on Cottonwood Creek, which might be the corners of surveys N^o. 4 and N^o. 5. In hunting up and down the Creek other stumps might be found ~~and~~ ^{as} likely to be the corners, therefore this evidence cannot be admitted. H. 1122

But the whole mystery is ^{solved} by starting from the corner erroneously established for the S. E. corner of the Henderson survey, then the vacancy, as claimed, would exist and also the distance from said corner N 50° E to the J. W. Wilson survey would be greater than called for in the intermediate surveys.

As there are bearing trees given to the West, and S. corner of Andrew Mitchell's survey and also to the South corner of survey N^o. 2, ^{and} the East corner of ~~N^o. 4~~ and the South corner of N^o. 5. the Surveyor may easily test this point on the ground.

In regard to the vacancy claimed between Fulcher and Mitchell, and between Cowan and Campbell future investigation must decide. The Surveyor adopts the West corner of Pettus and ^{the} Chotwell corner as identical, and starting from this point with the courses and distances given in the ^(Allen) Campbell and Fulcher fieldnotes on one side, and the Chotwell, Keller, Cowan and Mitchell fieldnotes on the other side, no vacancy could exist; ~~as it~~ it is therefore necessary to find the original corners (not corners established by the parties owning the land) and ~~to see~~ if found, to run connecting lines between them, and send a properly certified statement to this Office. Only vacancies established in this way will be recognized as subject to location

C. W. Preller.

Guadalupe ~~6~~ 12

CW Pressler's statement
in re, to the Thos Casey
et al Sur,

Dated July 2, 1869.

counter 29686

f3