



Mason 24

~~Sept~~ Sept 3 1901

Gen Charles Rosen Com of Gen Land office
 I submit the above plat and explanation of which
 I wish you to examine and give me your ruling
 on conclusion of the matter By referring to the map of
 this county you will observe that said map shows
 a vacancy south from nos 304 303 301 302 & 56
 and north of nos 393 John H Gibson & H7 Gasmen
 115 G.C. & S.F. R.R. Co. 116 parties have made fine in
 said vacancy and insist that said vacancy
 exist simply because the Co map shows it and
 I have been in the field and made a careful
 examination on the ground and can not find
 any vacancy except a strip of 48 run well between
 survey no H7 & 115 but find a conflict of nos 116 & 115
 with 304 303 & 301. I find the SE corner of 56
 a well defined corner with a 20.20 N 76 1/2 E 19 m a
 20.12 S 48 E 19 m which I identify as the true corner
 393 J.H. Gibson call to corner with SE corner of 116
 there was for said SE corner of 56 19 m I find the
 SW corner of 56 for in which I find a 20 ft run N 72
 E 30 ^m a 20 about 10 in to S 20 E 162 m N 89
 there in said line N 89 W as I find that to be the
 bearing of said line as marked on the ground at 1900
 run a part for SW corner of no 302 could not find

any bearing for said corner to wit a 207 in N 33 E 11
 a Magnet 4 in N 21 E 18 1/2 in 2nd to be found
 there was at 526 am I find on said line the N W cor
 of S W 47 5 a corner for which a spar with oak 8 in dia
 with 31 E 10 m a spar with oak 6 in dia 225 E 9 1/2 m
 mark off at 1900 on the west side for S W cor of No 301
 I find no bearing there the same being the S E cor of S W 20
 303 there was at 1900 m to the west side for 303 I find
 no bearing there in the same call going west for S W cor
 304 at 1110 m the west line of S W 115 E line
 of No 114 381 m south of the N W cor of No 115
 Now the difficulty that the parties claim that as there can be
 no corner found in the ground for No 301 & 303 & 304
 there said survey can only come south 1900 m while I
 think that No 56 has 2 good south corners and all
 the other survey lines in continuing west to 56 that they
 will hold to that line to a certainty what the distance
 of the N line of Section was N 4 South & west to the
 S W cor of 947 a c H 7 1/2 S E cor of 948 which is
 a well established corner on Row South 1960 m
 to the N line of 47 and find only 400 of 60 m
 please give this matter attention as soon as possible
 as I declined to make the survey until I submitted
 a statement to you as I find the facts in the
 ground and if you for an examination directed
 other wise in would make the same if you
 will examine the call on west line of No 47 & E Bar
 of 115 47 call 1165 m to south line of 301 & 115
 call 1534 m for same line with N S line of 301 which
 could not be true with both same

Respectfully

Prudence Holland
 Co Surveyor

Co Surveyor

Judge Holland's let-
 ter in re, to supposed va-
 cancy about 10 mi-
 N 55 W. fr. Mason Co.

John D. Temple
 Sheriff

Sept 13th 1901
 L. A. Officer

Attest in Court

About 10 miles N 55 W from Row

Sketch filed 18. # 18-
 Mason Co.