

Sk. File ~~9~~ 139  
Judgement and  
Surveyor's Report.  
Santanita Grant.  
Hidalgo County.  
June, 17, 1904.

(See office SK 6/17/04  
in drawer)



ESTABLISHING BOUNDARY LINES FOR THE CORRECTION OF SURVEYS 219, 221, 222, 223, 224, 229 & 230 OF LANDS ORIGINALLY GRANTED TO THE TEXAS MEXICAN RAILWAY COMPANY AND NOW OWNED BY E. W. BROWN, TRUSTEE, IN HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS, FEBRUARY, 1908.

I began at an old corner, the N. W. corner of Porcion 57 from which a mesquite marked  $\equiv$  brs. N. 79° E. 23 vs.!

Thence S. 80° 52' E. along the old porcion line, passing many line trees plainly marked, at 1693 vs. passed an old Huisache tree rotted down looked like the one called for in the Original Field Notes for N. W. 58, continued to trace the old line with same bearing at 4950 vs. passed an old post, the N. E. corner of Porcion 59, line leading about S. about W. from this corner, at 6364 vs. passed an old post, the N. E. corner of P. 60, at 5570 vs. set iron pipe for the S. E. corner of Survey 229; Thence N. 8° 59' E. at 1844.3 vs. set a piece of iron pipe for the N. E. corner, and S. W. corner of Survey 231, at 3744.3 vs. set a piece of iron pipe on the South boundary of the Melado grant for the N. W. corner of Survey 231, and N. E. corner of Survey 232; Thence N. 80° 35' W. on the South boundary of the Melado grant 5700 vs. and set piece of iron pipe for the N. E. corner of Survey 221 and N. W. corner of Survey 222; Thence N. 80° 43' W. at 1640 vs. along South boundary of Melado grant set a piece of iron pipe for the N. W. corner of Survey 221, and N. E. corner of Survey 222; Thence along the South boundary of Melado grant at 338.4 vs. set a piece of iron pipe on the South boundary of Melado grant and West line of Porcion 54 for the N. W. corner of Survey 222.

I then began again at the N. W. corner of Porcion No. 57; Thence N. 8° 59' East 409.6 vs. passed an old line tree marked I at 659.7 vs. set post for the N. E. corner of P. 56 at the intersection of the two old North and East lines of P. 56 from which a Mesquite marked  $\equiv$  brs. N. 12° E. 15 vs. another marked  $\equiv$  N. 88° E. 3-1/2 vs. Thence N. 51° 30' W. along the East line of P. 56 passing an old North line of P. 56 passing near the intersection of the old West and North line of Porcion 56, from which a Mesquite marked  $\equiv$  brs. S. 84° W. 11 vs. The West line of Porcion 56 is very plainly marked with old line trees and brs. S. 8° 59' W. I found that the East line of P. 55 has no signs of having been run any further North than the N. W. corner of P. 56; Thence N. 8° 59' E. 2919 vs. set post for the N. E. corner of P. 55; Thence N. 81° 01' W. 1058.4 vs. set post on an old East line of P. 54 for the N. W. corner of P. 55; Thence N. 8° 59' E. along old East line of P. 54 very plainly marked with old line trees at 397-1/2 vs. crossed South boundary line of Melado grant, 895.5 vs. in all set post at intersection of East and North line of P. 54 for the N. E. corner of P. 54 from which a Mesquite blazed brs. N. 81° 59' W. 24.4 vs. another Mesquite blazed brs. S. 81° 37' E. 7.3 vs.; Thence N. 72° 07' W. along the plainly marked line set post 2116.4 vs. for the N. W. corner of P. 53 and N. E. corner of P. 52 from which a Mesquite marked  $\equiv$  brs. N. 71° 25' W. 21 vs. another marked  $\equiv$  brs. S. 26° 45' E. 3 vs.; Thence N. 72° 39' W. at 297 vs. passed the last line tree at about 630 vs. passed the last sign of old cuttings at 915 vs., crossed the West line of Melado grant at 222 vs. set a piece of iron pipe on old East line of P. 50 for the N. W. corner of P. 51.

After establishing the above lines, I made the surveys and corrected Surveys 219, 221, 222, 223, 224, 229 & 230, and put in all the corners. These lines were run with a variation of 8° 42' E. from the Meridian. All bearing trees mentioned were marked by original Surveyor.

I certify that the above is a correct statement of the work I did in locating the boundary lines.

*S. W. De Wolf*  
Deputy Surveyor, Hidalgo County, Texas.

APPROVED: *E. Grieg*  
County Surveyor Hidalgo County, Texas.



1 The State of Texas  
2 County of Hidalgo ~~County~~ Be it remembered that there-  
3 was begun and holden a regular term of the  
4 Hon. District Court in and for Hidalgo County  
5 Texas, at the Court house thereof in the town of Hi-  
6 dalgo, on this the 2<sup>d</sup> day of October A. D. 1893, it  
7 being the fourth Monday after the first Monday in  
8 September A. D. 1893.

9 Court was opened by proclamation at the  
10 Court house door by the Sheriff. —

11 Present, Hon. J. C. Russell Judge 28<sup>th</sup>  
12 Judicial Dist. Texas,  
13 " John J. Kleiber Dist. Atty 28<sup>th</sup> Jud. Dist. Texas.  
14 " Robas. Champion District Clerk  
15 Hidalgo Co.  
16 John Blossner Sheriff Hidalgo  
17 Co. Texas.

18 And the members of the bar. —

19 Whereupon among others the following proceedings  
20 were had to wit: — \* \* \* \* \*

21 October 6<sup>th</sup> 1893. — \* \* \* \* \*

22 No 147 John McAllen et al

23 vs  
24 Leocadio Treviño =

25 And now on this the 6<sup>th</sup>  
26 day of October A. D. 1893 being a regular day  
27 of this term this cause was reached and called  
28 in its regular order upon the docket, and  
29 thereupon came the respective parties plaintiffs  
30 and defendant in person and by their respective  
31 counsel and announced themselves ready for  
32 trial, and thereupon in open Court, agreeing  
in all things —



1 and consenting thereto it is therefore in consid-  
 2 eration of the premises and of the said agreement  
 3 and consent now here by the Court ordered  
 4 and adjudged, and decreed that the plaintiffs  
 5 John McAllen, Salome McAllen, and John Young  
 6 do now here have and recover of and from the defen-  
 7 dant Leocadio Trevino, all of the land and premi-  
 8 ses, sued for and claimed in plaintiffs petition  
 9 herein, the said lands so adjudged to and reco-  
 10 vered by plaintiffs being bounded and described as  
 11 follows to wit: All that certain tract or grant  
 12 of land lying and being situated in the County  
 13 of Hidalgo and State of Texas, originally granted  
 14 by the Spanish Government in Mexico, to Manuel  
 15 Gomez containing about twenty<sup>two</sup> (22) leagues of  
 16 land more or less, and commonly, generally  
 17 and especially known as and called the San-  
 18 tanita" tract or grant, the said grant being  
 19 Confirmation Number Thirty-nine (39) for the  
 20 County of Cameron under and by virtue of an Act  
 21 of the Legislature of the State of Texas, entitled, "An  
 22 Act to relinquish the right of the State to certain lands  
 23 therein named" approved February 10th 1852, the  
 24 said grant bounded as follows to wit: Beginning  
 25 at the North east corner of the Melado tract a  
 26 part of the "San Salvador del Tule" grant, Juan Jose  
 27 Paez Original Grantee for the Southeast corner of  
 28 this (the Santanita) grant thence with and along  
 29 the west line of the "San Salvador del Tule," grant  
 30 North  $9\frac{1}{2}$  degrees East, (passing old line stone)  
 31 thirty thousand four hundred and seventy-eight  
 32 (30478) varas, for the Northeast corner of this, (the San-



1 *Sanita*) grant, Thence North Eighty-one (81) degrees  
2 West (passing stone) at Seventeen thousand nine  
3 hundred and fifty seven (17957) varas, to and for  
4 the North west corner of this the (*Sanita*) grant  
5 Thence South nine (9) degrees West, (passing stone)  
6 at thirty-thousand four hundred and seventy eight  
7 (30478) varas to and for the South west corner of  
8 this grant, Thence South Eighty one (81) degrees  
9 East, seventeen thousand six hundred and ninety  
10 three (17963) varas to the place of beginning containing  
11 twenty-one (21) leagues and three thousand two hundred  
12 and thirty-six (3236) acres of land and any  
13 and all pasture fences and other improvements  
14 of any nature thereon situated. The said "*Sanita*"  
15 grant of land now here recovered by and adjudged  
16 to plaintiff including within its limits and  
17 boundaries eight hundred and ninety four (894)  
18 acres of land now enclosed by and within  
19 the post and wire fence pasture of defendant. It  
20 is further now here ordered and adjudged that  
21 plaintiffs have their writs of possession for  
22 all of their said lands and premises specifically  
23 including the said eight hundred and ninety-  
24 four (894) acres, and all fences and other  
25 improvements thereon. It is further ordered  
26 and adjudged that the respective parties plain-  
27 tiffs and defendant pay one equal half ( $\frac{1}{2}$ )  
28 of any and all costs herein incurred for all  
29 of which let execution issue in favor of the  
30 officers of this Court, and of the said respective  
31 parties.  
32



1 The State of Texas  
2 County of Hidalgo I, A. E. Chavez Clerk  
3 of the District Court of Hidalgo County Texas,  
4 do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and  
5 correct copy of the original "Judgment rendered  
6 in case #147 John McAllen et al vs Leocadio  
7 Trevino as the same appears of record in Book  
8 "B" pages 324/325 District Court Minutes of Hidalgo  
9 County Texas

10 Given under my hand and the  
11 seal of said Court, at Office in Hidalgo  
12 Texas this the 2nd day of June A.D. 1904

13 Attest:-

14 By David Gross Deputy — A. E. Chavez  
15 Clerk



Certified Copy

of

Judgment.

---

No 147

John McAllen et al  
vs

Leocadio Trevino

---

8/25

counter 26915

64



1 No 147 John McAllen et al Suit pending in the  
2 vs. District Court of Hidalgo  
3 Leocadio Trevino County Texas

4 W D 1893=

5 In this cause it is now hereby agreed by the respective  
6 parties as follows to wit:-

7 1st That the Plaintiffs are the owners in fee simple  
8 and entitled to the possession of all that certain tract  
9 or grant of land described in their petition herein  
10 known as and called the "Santa Anita" tract  
11 or grant originally granted by the Spanish Government  
12 to Manuel Gomez.

13 2nd. That as to and for the purposes of this suit,  
14 the defendant is the owner in fee simple and en-  
15 titled to the possession of all that certain tract or  
16 grant of land in the petition herein mentioned,  
17 the said tract or grant known as and called "San  
18 Ramon" originally granted by the Spanish Govern-  
19 ment to Julian Garza.

20 3rd That the true and only question at issue  
21 herein is the true common boundary line of the  
22 said "Santa Anita" and "San Ramon" grants  
23 being the western line of the said "Santa Anita" grant  
24 and the East line of the said "San Ramon" grant, as  
25 the same were originally surveyed.

26 4th That either party hereto may read from  
27 the records any instrument that they may wish  
28 to offer in evidence, without the necessity of filing  
29 copies or giving the three days notice thereof required  
30 by Statute.

31 Weller Stayton & Kleberg  
32 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
Wm. P. Dougherty, of Counsel  
for Defts. - - - - -  
counter 26414



1 The State of Texas.

2 County of Hidalgo I, A. E. Chavez, Clerk of  
3 the District Court of Hidalgo County, Texas, do hereby  
4 certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy  
5 of the original "Agreement of Counsel" in case no  
6 147 John McAllen et al vs. Leocadio Trevino now  
7 on file in said Court.

8 Given under my hand and Official  
9 seal, at my office in Hidalgo Texas,  
10 this 2nd day of June A. D. 1904 —

11 A. E. Chavez  
12 Clerk District Court Hidalgo Co., Texas.

13 By David Sloss Deputy. —  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32



Certified Copy=

No 147.=

John McAllen et al  
vs.

Leocadio Trevino -

Agreement of Counsel

Filed March 11 1893

J. L. Dougherty  
Dist clerk

8/25

Counter 26418

12



The State of Texas }  
County of Hidalgo. }

In District Court  
March Term 1893.

No.147. John McAllen et. al. vs. Leocadio Trevino.

Report of Surveyors.

To the Honorable John C. Russell,

Judge of the 28th. Judicial Dist.

Sir:-

In compliance with an order of your Court made and entered at the October Term 1892 and delivered to us on the 20th. day of January 1893, we beg leave to state that we have made the necessary surveys, and to submit our report as follows, to-wit,

First. We examined the records of Hidalgo County and obtained certified copies of all documents and maps, that could be likely to assist us in making the surveys required.

Second. By not finding all we needed in that County, we sent to Starr and Cameron Counties and obtained certified copies from the records, of such as contained reference to question at issue, a list of these documents and map we now here give and shall herein refer to as exhibits by their respective numbers: that is to say: Exhibit (1) one= Certified copy of field notes of original grant from the Crown of Spain to Manuel Gomez of a tract called "Santanita" surveyed July 1798.

Exhibit "2" = Certified copy of field notes of survey of original grant to Julian Farias called "San Ramon" Surveyed March 1808.

Exhibit "3" = Certified copy of original grant from the Crown of Spain to Francisco Farias of four leagues called "Santa Cruz" Surveyed in March 1808.

Exhibit "4" = Certified copy of Patent from the State of Texas to the heirs of Manuel Gomez of a tract called Santanita, dated Oct. 31 1881.

Exhibit "5" = Certified copy of Patent from the State of Texas to the heirs of J. Farias of a tract called "San Ramon", dated Mch. 23 1883.

1 B. Exhibit "6" = Certified copy of resurvey of the tract called



"San Ramon" by Andres Salinas Co. Surveyor Hidalgo County dated Dec. 17 1882.

Exhibit "7" = Certified copy of a resurvey of tract called "Santa Cruz" originally granted by the Crown of Spain to Francisco Farias, made by Trimble Co. Surveyor of Starr Co. in October 1853.

Exhibit "8" = Certified copy of a resurvey of the "Santa Cruz" tract Francisco Farias grantee, made by M. Van Merrick in May 1875.

Exhibit "9" = Certified copy of another resurvey of same by same, August 7th. 1877.

Exhibit "10" = Certified copy of a resurvey of the tract called "San Jose" made for the heirs of Alejandro Farias, by M. Van Merrick in December 1874.

Exhibit "11" = Certified copy of original field notes of the Survey of a tract for Jose Antonio Morales by Antonio Canales Surveyor for the Mexican Government, made November 29th. 1835: Survey called "El Venadito".

Exhibit "12" = Certified copy of a resurvey of " El Venadito" in name of Jose Antonio Morales by J. C. Eivet Dec. 1879.

Exhibit "13" = Certified copy of Patent from the State of Texas to the heirs of Guadalupe Sanches of a tract called "La Rucia" dated Sept. 22nd. 1882.

Exhibit "14" = Map showing all the land marks found, and all plats of the surveys called for in the above exhibits.

These fourteen exhibits are filed with and made a part of this report.

No original or copy of an original grant to Alejandro Farias of the tract called "San Jose" could be found, but the originals of exhibits "2 " and "3", "San Ramon" and "Santa Cruz" both show by their maps, which are identical that the tract called "San Jose" lay between them and contiguous to both and between parallel lines.

Finding from the above exhibits that the "Santanita" survey was the oldest, we began our surveys on its East boundary line, which is also the West boundary line of a large survey in the



name of J. J. Balli, called "San Salvador del Tule", at a rock known to one of your surveyors for many years and identified also by the County Surveyor of Hidalgo as being at the place called the "Palo clavado" on the dividing line of said two tracts, and called for in exhibit (1) one.

Thence, following the line of said two original grants, which is also the line of Patent survey of "Santanita" exhibit(4), on a course of N. nine degrees thirty minutes E. with the variation of the needle corrected for 8° 30' E. and passing various land marks, we arrived at a point in open prairie, ( which we deemed most convenient for a cross line). 25, 677 varas from the S. E. corner of the Patent survey (Ex. 4).

Thence we measured the width of the Santanita tract, on a course at right angles to its East boundary, which width according to its field notes of exhibit(1)one should be 17,650 varas. In making this measurement, we found at 17,096 varas a wire fence of the Santanita pasture, at 17,233 varas we found the wire fence of Leocadio Trevino claimed by him to be on the E. line of patent survey of the San Ramon tract (Exhibit 5) but 417 varas short of the width of the Santanita tract either as granted or as patented, and <sup>at</sup> 17,848 varas we found the patent line of Santanita as run by Andres Salinas. Exhibit "4". We struck this line at a place called "Chapotito" which is a depression or dry lake bed, Thence along the said patent line to the N. W. corner of the survey as patented, at which is a stone, mkd. "J" on accompanying map is 4742 varas.

And from <sup>the</sup> place where we crossed the fence of Leocadio Trevino, we measured N. 9° E. 3980 varas to a stone called by him the "Rosario Corner" which we have marked "U" on the map.

From the point on the patent line at the "Chapotito" we set out to search for land marks to the South, measuring along Santanita patent line on a course of S. 9° W. var. 8° 30' E. and at 6, 050 varas we came to a very old but still plainly distinguish-  
3 B. able road, at 6,207 varas we found a large flat stone which bore



evidences of having been buried a long time and recently dug up and laid on the ground on the patent line, at 7360 varas we came to another old road, and 9300 varas we came to the border of a depression in which was a small lake of black and muddy water, though the soil of the surrounding country is red. This we took to be the "Agua negra" mentioned in Exhibit 1 one and in the old title, which called for a marked tree at this lake. The place still bears the name of "Agua negra". We were informed by Andres Salinas and Hilario Villareal that within their memories, there had been a large marked mesquit tree near this lake with a stone at its foot, but that the tree had been burned and the place afterwards called "La Pita" from the fact of a single tree of that name, ( in english cabbage tree or spanish dagger ) standing near the stone. After diligent search in the thickets about the lake we found this stone and we marked its location on our map with the letter "B". There was a decayed Pita lying on the ground near it, and by digging around the stone we discovered the charred remains of a stump. There being no other lake either on a magnetic or true meridian within a thousand varas of this lake, and all the evidence whether natural, oral or written, tending to show the same, we concluded that this stone is on the true western boundary of the Santanita tract as original granted to Manuel Gomez, it is 68 varas N. 81° W. from the W. line of the survey of Santanita as patented.

(See point marked "B" exhibit 14. )

From this stone on a course S. 9° W. at a distance of 6700 varas we came to the S. boundary of the survey of "San Ramon" as patented, at a point 592 varas N. 80 1/2 ° W. from its S. E. corner, which we also found, and it is 524 varas inside the Santanita pasture fence. This corner is marked V on the map.

In this neighborhood there are several small elevations known as "Los cerritos", the ones known more specifically as "Los cerritos de Santa Clara" being a little to south of the corner as marked

(See exhibit 2 for cerritos).



There being no other land marks here we examined exhibits "2" and "3", and the originals in the hands of Hilario Villareal and Ramon Salinas respectively, and finding from them that the three brothers Julian, Alejandro and Francisco Farias, were granted the three tracts "San Ramon", "San Jose" and "Santa Cruz" respectively and the same were surveyed for them in the same month of the year 1808 consecutively beginning with "San Ramon" and starting from the West boundary of "Santanita" which had been previously surveyed, we went to the N. W. corner of the "San Jose" and N. E. corner of the "Santa Cruz" grants which we found marked by a stone and mortar monument. This monument or land mark is near the "Purissima" ranch owned by Gavino Lopez and we indicated it ~~by~~ on our map by the letter "C". From this point the lines of the two surveys as indicated by the fences, run on different courses; that of "Santa Cruz" being N. 80° W. and that of "San Jose" S. 88 1/2° E. This monument and some loose stones around it had been covered with sand for many years until the winds removed the sand and disclosed it.

From this monument we ran South to find certain marked tree indicated on the maps of the San Ramon and Santa Cruz which maps are identical, and at a distance from the corner of 5, 518 varas we found a very old mesquite tree with old marks, and a stone at its foot, standing on the North side of the old Salt Lake road which is still plainly discernible. This tree is indicated on the map by the letter "D" and has been known as a line tree between the two tracts from time immemorial, and Don Ramon Salinas declared that his wife's ancestor had shown it to him as such, said ancestor having been present at the original survey. <sup>h</sup> These two stones and tree marked "C" and "D" being fixed points on one line, we found the exact course between them, to be N. 9° East, with a correction of the variation of the needle of 8° 30' East. This course we adopted as the right one to use for this surveys at this time, and all our lines are run parallel or at right angles to it.

5 B.

We consider that this course represents the magnetic meridian



at the time of the original surveys and as an additional proof of its being the correct thing to do, we cite the language of the Surveyor of the Venadito tract Don Antonio Canales who says (See exhibit 11, ) that he ran the lines of the "Venadito" on magnetic courses to conform to those of the three Farias tracts.

From the line tree "D" we returned to a point (indicated on the map by the letters "X" ~~→~~ "X") 518 varas from it and 5,000 varas S. 9° W. from the stones marked "C" and thence ran a mile of 5,350 varas on a course of S. 81° E. and ~~said~~ set a stake, which is indicated on the map by letter "F". We then went to the San Ramon ranch and found a stone at the base of an old mesquite which we mark on the map with the letter "E". This stone is on the west side of the depression in which the old San Ramon wells and ranch are situated and also on the N. side of the old road before mentioned. We were informed by Don Julian Casas and other old residents that this stone "E" was on the original line between the "San Ramon" and "San Jose" tracts and the original field notes (See exhibit "2") call for point west of and near to the ranch of San Ramon. From this stone we ran N. 9° E. to stake "F" which we find to be at the N. W. corner of the San Ramon tract, as being on the E. boundary of the San Jose tract and 5,000 varas S. 9° W. from its true N. E. corner. If this line ~~is~~ ( E to F ) is extended 388 varas further, it will reach a stone, mkd. "H" on the map, which has the appearance of being not many years in place and which is claimed to be the N. W. corner of San Ramon and is so patented, being 6380 varas N. 81° W. from the so-called "Rosario" ~~s~~ stone (mkd. U on map) But from the old land marks this stone can not be reached by <sup>the</sup> calls in the old titles.

68. From stake "F" we measured S. 81° E. (crossing several fences) 5,674 varas to a point on the line running N. 9° E. from the stone at the Aguanegra lake which we indicate on our map (Exhibit 14) by the letter "G" and which we find to be the true N. E. corner of the San Ramon tract. It is 68 varas N. 81° W. from the line of the patent survey of Santanita and is in a thicket of small



mesquites and is 1177 varas S. 9° W. from the true N. W. corner of the Santanita tract, which we have designated on the map by the letter "K".

The above measurements show, that, from the point mkd. X X to the stake "F" is 5,350 varas which is 350 varas more than the width of the San Jose tract as original granted; that from the point "F" (stake) to the point "G", which we consider to be the true corner of the "San Ramon" tract, is 5674 varas which is an excess of 674 varas over the width of that tract as called for in the original field notes, and that from the stone "A" to the stone "B" is 17832 varas which is an excess of 182 varas over the call in the original grant of the Santanita tract. We find that the N. W. corner of the Santanita tract is at the distance of 10,850 varas or "217 cordels" from the old Salt lake road as called for in the original field notes of Santanita. These original field notes also call for a marked mesquite at the ~~xxx~~ N. W. corner which the surveyor named "El Rosario" and which was situated a little to the north of a mott of small mesquites. No tree of any considerable size *or age* was found but a mott of small mesquites exists and the dividing line of the two tracts runs through it.

There are several stones in the vicinity of the N. W. corner of Santanita point "K".

1st. Stone mkd. "J" on map, which was set by Andres Salinas in 1882 for the N. W. corner of Santanita as patented. This stone is S. 28 1/2 ° E. 112 varas from the corner as found by us at "K".

2nd. A stone marked "I" on map, which is S. 9° W. 695 varas from stone "J". It is at a fence and was lately placed by Leocadio Salinas as a private land mark, and his fence from this stone runs N. 81° W.

3rd. From this stone "I" S. 75° E. following line of fence at a distance of 643 varas is another stone mkd. "U" on map and has been referred to above in this report. It is claimed by L. Trevino as the N. E. corner of the San Ramon tract and is at the corner of the survey of that tract as patented. The stone does not have



the appearance of having been placed in its present position in the early part of <sup>the</sup> century.

The survey of the tract called "La Rucia" a junior grant in name of Guadalupe Sanchez (exhibit 13) also calls for a stone at this point, but that survey conflicts with that of the Santanita as shown by our exhibit (14). But by running a line from the stone "U" on a course S. 88° 45' E. at a distance of 6347 varas we came to a stone which we designate by the letter "T" on map, which is on the north boundary of the Santanita tract and it is also said to be at the S. E. <sup>corner</sup> of the "Rucia" tract.

After making the above surveys, and the necessary calculations we find that, to conform to original survey and the land marks, on the ground, the field notes of the Santanita tract as granted to Manuel Gomez should read thus:= "Beginning at the N. E. corner of the "Melado" for S. E. corner of this survey and running thence with line of the San Salvador del Tule grant in name of Juan Jose Balli, (said beginning point being marked "0" on map) Thence N. 9 1/2° E. passing old stone at "A" 30,478 varas to point "N" for N. E. <sup>corner</sup> Thence N. 81° W. passing stone at "T" 17,957 varas to point "K" N. W. corner. Thence S. 9° W. passing stone at "B" 30,478 varas to point "P" for S. W. corner. Thence S. 81° E. 17,693 vs. to place of beginning". Containing 21 leagues and 3,236 acres, which is 1022 acres more than called for in the patent to said tract.

We further more find that, from the lands marks & as before, the field notes of the "San Ramon" tract as original granted to Julian Farias should read thus:=="Beginning the N. E. corner of tract at point "G" on west line of "Santanita" marked "KP" on map and following said line S. 9° W. passing stone at "B" 20,000 varas to point "M" a little to the west of the "Cerritos". Thence N. 81° W. 5674 varas to point "L" for S. W. corner. Thence N. 9° E. passing through stone "E" 20,000 varas to point "F" for N. W. corner, Thence S. 81° E. 5674 varas to the beginning at "G" Containing 4 leagues and 2387 <sup>acres</sup> which is 2387<sub>^</sub> over the 4 leagues as originally granted. We also find that the patent survey of this tract



as marked in solid yellow on map contains 2835 acres over the 4 leagues as originally granted.

We find that omitting the triangle " X Y Z " from the survey as given in above field notes, there <sup>w</sup>ould still remain 404 more acres in the San Ramon tract than called for in its original title.

We find further that the space between line of the San Ramon as given above and the east line of the patent is 2299 acres, and of this space 894 acres are inside of Leocadio Trevino's pasture.

We have the honor to be

Very respectfully,

J. J. Cocke

Jno. J. Hord.

SURVEYORS.

Brownsville, Texas March 4th. 1893.

The State of Texas, }  
County of Cameron. } Sworn to and subscribed before me, this  
4th. day of March A. D. 1893.

Louis Kowalski.

Clk. Dist. Ct. Cameron Co. Tex.



C194—CERTIFICATE OF TRUE COPY OF PAPERS ON FILE.

DORSEY PRINTING COMPANY, STATIONERS, DALLAS.—1653—Class C

THE STATE OF TEXAS, }  
County of Hidalgo }  
of the District Court of Hidalgo County, Texas, do hereby certify that the  
foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original Surveyor's Report, in case  
#147, John McAllen et al vs. Leocadio Trevino  
now on file in said Court.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL, At my office in Hidalgo Texas,  
this 2nd day of June A.D. 1904

[L.S.]

A. E. Chavez  
Clerk Hidalgo Co., Texas  
By David Sloss Deputy



Hidalgo Co  
SK. File #9

- No 147. -

Surveyor's Report. —

John Mc Allen et al  
1 vol.

Leocadio Treviño

---

Filed March 10th 1893.

J. L. Daugherty  
Clk. Dist. Ct. Hidalgo Co Tex.

---

Compared,

He

\$5<sup>00</sup><sub>00</sub>

---

\$500

Counter 26428

10 B.