John Monroe)
vs) No.854
T.F.Hicox)

In District Court Pecos County ,Texas

February Term,1911

I,W.C.Douglas,Judge of the District Court of Pecos County,Texas,have this day prepared and do hereby order filed in this case the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:to wit:

FINDINGS OF FACTS

1. Block C4 G.C& S.F.Ry.Co. is composed of 64 surveys .The field notes show that they were all made by R (H?) C.Barton,Deputy Surveyor of Pecos Co,between the 5th and 20th days of October 1881.According to field notes of survey No.4 of this Block,the N.W.corner was marked as follows;Pile of pebbles for the N. E.corner of survey No.3 this Block,from which Capstone Mt.bears South 1500 vrs The N.E.corner is described as "stone mound from which Capstone Mt bears S 19° E,and another Capstone Mt.bears N 70° E.

Corners answering to this description were found on the ground located relatively as shown in sketch of surveyor W.P.Hope.

2. Block Z Texas Central Ry.Co. is composed of 54 surveys .They were made by F.Shadowsky between the 4th and 8th of November 1882.

The beginning calls fod this Block tie on the Block C4.There is no testimony locating this Block on the ground.

3. Block 194 G.C.& S.F.Ry.Co. is composed of 100 surveys the record showing they were made by L.W.Durrell,Deputy surveyor of Pecos Co,between the 17th & 31st days of May 1883.It appears that he made 15 surveys on each of the first six days and ten surveys on the seventh day.The beginning calls of this Block tie on to Block Z GC&SFRyCo.but there is no testimony locating on the ground any of the original land marks called for in the field notes.

Block 178 Texas Central Ry.Co. is composed of 36 surveys,the record showing they were made by L.W.Durrell .Deputy Surveyor of Pecos Co. The first eighteen of these surveys appear to have been made on Nov.21 1882,and the last eighteen made on Nov.22 1882. The beginning call starts at River survey at No.543 in the name of the H.& G.N.Ry.Co. None of the land marks called for by the field notes of this Block were located on the ground by any of the testimony.

4. The River surveys shown on the Map of surveyor Hope were made in the year 1876 by Jacob Kuechler,Deputy surveyor Pecos Co. Survey4of Block C4,G.C. & S.F.Ry.Co. was located on the ground from objects corresponding to the calls for its N.E.& N.W.corners relatively as shown on Hope's Map.Survey 71 I&G.N.RY on the Pecos river was located on the ground relatively as shown in the map of surveyor W.T.Hope,with its nortwest corner marked by a stone mound;there is no call in the field notes for a stone mound at this point. Survey NoM61 I&GNRy. was located on the ground relatively as shown on Hope's map by course and distance from the northwest corner of survey 71 established as aforesaid,and its location verified by a call of its fieldnotes for a road on a mesa. Survey No3 Runnels County School Land was located on the ground by course and distance based on survey 71 and 61,which were located on the ground as aforesaid.All of these locations were made on the ground by Surveyor W.T.Hope and were based on actual runnins as shown by the red lines delineated on his map.The balance of the surveys shown on the map of sur.Hope were platted in by him according to their calls for course and distance based on his actual work on the ground shown by the red lines,and with relation to the aforesaid landmarks.

5. By beginning at the N.E.corner sur.4 Blk C4 GC&SFRy.Co. as found on the ground and running by course and distance and thereby locating surveys 103 & 104 Texas Central Ry.,these two surveys would lie adjoining and immediately south of survey No.3 Runnels Co.School land and would not conflict with surveys 34 and 35 Texas Central Ry.

6. By constructing Block 194 GC&SFRy. based on the calls for the river survey as located on the ground ,surveys 34 & 35 GC&SFRyCo.,Block 194 would lie adjoining and immediately south of survey No.3 Runnels Co.School Land and be in total conflict with surveys 103 & 104.

7.Surveys 103 & 104 being the land sued for by plaintiff are junior surveys to surveys 34 & 35.

8.I am unable to follow the footsteps of the original surveyor in establishing Block 194 GC&SFRy.either in the original locations of any of the sections or in the location of the corrected surveys and I am unable to ascertain the true intention of the original surveyor as to locating this block on the ground.

9.I am unable from the testimony in evidence ,to ascertain the true location on the ground of surveys No.103,104,34,and 35 above referred to.

10.I find that Block 194 GC&SFRy. was originally located by an office survey.

counter 34052

11. I find that the calls of block 194 to tie on to Block Z and its calls to tie on to the river surveys are repugnant to each other and inconsistant, and I am unable to determine which of these calls should be regarded as a mistake of the surveyor.

12. I find that the Plaintiff is the legal owner and holder of the fee simple ttle to survey No 103 Texas central Ry.and that he holds survey No.104 under a contract of purchase from the State of Texas ,in accordance with the school land laws and that he has made his proof of occupancy thereon as required by Law, and that his said sale is in good standing.

13.Defendant is the holder and entitled to the possession of survey No 34 under a contract of purchase from the State of Texas in accordance with the school land laws,and his sale is in good standing.

14.The said Hope map is hereby referred to and made a part hereof.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

1. The burden of proof is upon the Paintiff to establish the location of the two tracts of land sued for upon the ground,and to show that there is no conflict between said surveys and surveys Nos 35 & 35.,the said surveys numbers 34 & 35 being senior surveys.

2. It is presumed that the work of an official surveyor was actually done on the ground ,but the amount of work he certifies to having done within a given time,the character of the work as called for by the field notes and the lack of evidence found on the ground,discrepancies in distance between objects called for and the like,may be sufficient to rebut this presumption.

3. Where there are two theories upon which a survey ,which is not fixed to the ground by any of its calls,can be constructed and one theory shows a conflict between a senior and a junior survey and the other theory shows no conflict between them,and the evidence aided by the presumptions of law furnish no method of following the footsteps of the original surveyor,or for arriving at the intent purpose of the original surveyor,the presumption of law will be resolved in favor of the senior survey,that there is a conflict ,the owner of the junior survey being the plaintiff.

4.Having found as a fact that the location of surveys numbers 34 & 35 and 103 & 104 cannot be located upon the ground from the testimony in evidence and that there is a total conflict between them based on certain calls and no conflict based on other calls which theories are qrreconcilable and the true theory unascertainable from the testimony,I conclude that the Plaintiff shoul take naught by this suit and that the defendant should recover his costs herein.

W.C.Douglas
Judge District Court 63rd Judicial District.

Followed by Clerks certificate

Sketch File 111
Decree
Orig. filed with Bill Sec. 39
County
ss
10-13
Filed
Clerk District Court
By Deputy
File No.
(A-S4-1989)

counter 34053

Alpine Texas
Sept. 28, 1922,

Filed Oct 13-1922

Hon. J.T.Robison
Commissioner General Land Office
Austin Texas.

Dear Sir

At the request of Mr. J.T. Baker, I made a resurvey of certain sections of school land in Block 2 and Blocks 194, 179 and 207, Pecos County, part of the White and Baker Ranch.

The owners wish to patent these surveys and handed me a letter from your office stating that corrected fieldnotes would be required before Patents could be issued, so I made the necessary survey and wrote out, signed , sealed and had recorded the enclosed Corrected fieldnotes for the Surveys in question.

I suggested to Mr.Baker that the various lines run by me on and around thier ranch were sufficient, when approved, to warrant making corrected fieldnotes for all the School Land in thier Pasture, except the fractional sections in 194, abutting on the east line pf Blocks 16 and 17 U.L..

The connections shown on the plat of survey show that these fractional surveys as resurveyed and platted by Mr. Lea on his sketch filed in the General Land Office May 27th. 1911, will not fit the relative position of the Original N.E. Corner 1, Block 16 and Mr. Lea's Hackberry Corner S.E.1 Block 17, on the ground.

Mr. Lea's Plat shows the S.E.Corner 2, Block 17 U.L., as marked by"a large stone mound" marked "S E 2 Blk 17", and I presume he located his S E 1 from this mound.

There would seem to be no way of identifying this rock mound as the original corner, or its position as the original location, except by evidence of witnesses who were in the country at the time the corner was made, as it cannot be reached by course and distance called for from original N.E. 1 Block 16 .

As I understand it the Lea Corrections of these fractional surveys in Block 194,(81, 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 91, 92,)shown in his sketch, have been approved, and the acreage fixed on that basis.

But the calculated acreage as given on his plat, is based on a 1°30' difference in variation and will not fit his location of the Hackberry Corner on the Ground.

I would like instuctions under the above facts as to where I shall locate the west line of the fractional sections in question, where Mr.Lea's plat states that it is, or where his Hackberry corner places it.

The East line of the U.L. Blocks will of course run from well defined N E 1 Block 16, to the rock mound S E 2 Block 17. If ~~XXXX~~ competent evidence can be found to establish its identity, which I doubt,. Other wise the line would run South at a variation to be determined by the reading on the three mountain bearings at N E 1 Block 16.

Should the fractional surveys extend to this east line of the U.L.Blocks, regardless of the Lea Corrections?.

Will you kindly instruct me as to the proper construction of these fractional surveys under the premisses

I am forwarding corrected fieldnotes for only the Surveys they wish to patent, but will make out and forward corrected fieldnotes for balance of the square state surveys in a short time, and I think they wish to do whatever you may consider necessary, to determine the west line and areas of the fractional sections in Block 194.

Respectfully

R.E.Dod

R.E.Dod.
Licensed Land Surveyor.

P.S. You will find in this report a recapitulation of some matters of detail, statements of fact, and discussion of questions already presented in my reports of earlier surveys, but I have repeated them here for the information of the owners who have not had access to those reports.

counter 34054

Report of a Re-survey
of certain Sections of land in Block Z, Block 194, Block 179
and Block 207, Pecos County Texas.
By R.S.Dod , Licensed Land Surveyor.

Object of the Survey.

To find and make corrected fieldnotes for the actual boundaries of certain sections.of State School Land in the Blocks in question, as determined by the calls in the original fieldnotes of these surveys.

Authority for Survey.

Request by the owners of the lands, for a resurvey, made to me as Licensed Land Surveyor of Texas, based on a letter from the General Land Office requiring corrected fieldnotes for the surveys in question, before Patents could issue.

Data for the Survey.

(1) Blue Print of Official County Map of Pecos County.

(2) Working sketch of Block Z and part of Block 194, Block 178, and Block C4, kindly furnished by the General Land Office.

(3) Working sketch of Block C4 compiled by me from Surveyors Records of Pecos County.

(4) Working sketch of Block 12 H&GN compiled by me from the records of the Surveyors Office Pecos County.

(5) Fieldnotes of Surveys in Blocks 179 and 207, transcribed from records of Surveyors Office Pecos County.

(6) Plat of a survey of fractional sections in west part of 194, and U.L.Blocks 16 and 17, by A.N.Lea County Surveyor Pecos County, filed in General Land Office May 27th., 1911.

(7) Plat and Report of a survey connecting Block Z and C4, and 194, made by me as State Surveyor, in May 1917, for Ira G. Yates, and reported to and approved by the General Land Office.

(8) Plat and report of a survey made by me as Licensed Land Surveyor and duly filed in the General Land Office, showing surveys in Block 194 East and North of Block Z.

(9) Fieldnotes of a line of connection run by me from original N E 33 Z to the N E 1 Block 16 U.L.

Method of Survey.

The course of lines in various Blocks were found by retracing the original surveyor from one identified ~~corner~~ original corner to another or by the angular measurements given to mountain bearings from original corners.

This course was held by transit and checked by needle.

Distance.

The surface of the country to be surveyed consists of alternate hill and valley. The hills are limestone with precipitous slopes and cut by deep canyons. The bluff and rim rock of the mesa topped hills are often impassable for long distances, except where a trail has been worked out. The mesa in general is some 300 to 500 feet above the valley. It would be physically impossible to chain along the lines among the hills, frequent offsets would have to be made and the chain broken on the slopes, a tedious and slow progress liable to error.

Stadia measurement was used, wires tested at start and finish of the work. A target rod set from the instrument and read and booked by rodman, was used as front rod, and a self reading rod, read and booked at the instrument, was used as back rod . A double level was used with the front rod to preserve perpendicular and a plumb with the back rod.

All slopes over 2° were read on the vertical circle and rod readings reduced to horizontal.

Each distance was read twice and front and back readings checked from time to time.

Preliminary Examination of Fieldnotes.

On looking over original fieldnotes of ~~XXXXX~~ Surveys in Block Z, we note that it was surveyed by G. Shadowsky, in 1882, and calls to begin at the N W corner Survey 3 Block C4, giving 2 mountain bearings called for in the original fieldnotes of said survey 3. Thence it runs in a connected chain of surveys, but no marked corners are called for except a rock mound at N E corner 33 and N W corner 33 on its north line. But it calls to connect along its south line with the north line of Block C4. The east line of Block Z will then run north from N W 3 C4 at the variation required by the 2 mountain bearings, and the north line of Block Z will run east and west from original N E 33 (if found) at the same variation found at the initial corner and the N E corner of Block Z will be the intersection of

2B3

counter 34055

this ~~the~~north line with the east line regardless of distance.

The south line of Block Z will be the North line of Block C4, run west from N W 3 C4, as no other marked corners are called for on the north boundary line of Block C4 west of survey 3.

The distance between N E 33 east to intersection with line north from N W 3C4 will (if excessive) be prorated between surveys .

The distance west from N E 33 (N W 33 not being found) will run west course and distance as called for, as no original marked corner is called for in Z or C4, west of meridian through NE 33.

The distance north from N W 3 C4 on east line Z to north line Z will (if excessive) be prorated among surveys along east line and same distance will extend west through the Block, as all the land between the original S E 2 Z and N E 33Z was, by the action of the ~~xxxxxxx~~ original surveyor, and acceptance of ~~this~~ his corners by the State, segregated from the Public Domain for the 54 surveys made by virtue of the certificates issued for the surveys now in Block Z.

Block 194, according to its fieldnotes, was surveyed by L.W.Durrell in May 1883 and calls to begin at the N E corner 15 Block Z, and runs in a connected chain of surveys, but no marked corners are noted in the original fieldnotes. We note that the surveys along the east line of Block Z, call for the Block Z corners , E.G, N W 5 194 calls for N E 11 Z, NW 7 194 calls for N E 10 Z, N W 13 calls for N E 6 Z, making the course and distance of surveys on east line of Block Z the course and distance of the adjacent surveys in 194.

Block 178 was surveyed by L.W.Durrell in November 1882 (same surveyor) and survey 19, 194 calls for N W 32 178, survey 20 194 calls for N W 33 178, showing that the surveys in 194 are attached to and depend on Block 178.

There are no marked corners called for in Block 178, but on its south ~~line~~ boundary line it calls for corners in Blocks C3 and C4, and the original fieldnotes of survey 22, 178 calls for its S W corner to be the same as S E corner of 4 in Block C4.

The width east and west of ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ tiers of surveys in Block 178 and 194 under their original calls will depend on the width of surveys in C3 and C4 and actual measurement from corner to corner in C4 gives 1943 varas as the width east and west of Survey 3 C4.

Hence the tier of surveys in Block 194 lying on the east of Block Z will be 1943 varas wide, ~~also~~ Surveys in Block 194 along the North line of Block Z will take thier course and distance east and west from surveys in Block Z , but will run north the distance called for , 1900 varas, as there are no corners or connections called for to change their course and distance.

Block 207 and Block 179 were also surveyed by Mr. Durrell and have no marked corners but call to connect with Blocks Z and C4.

The calls to connect with Block Z will prevail over the calls for corners in C4 as C4 takes course and distance west from N W 3, while Z takes distance west from NW 3 to N E 33. Actual survey shows this to be in excess 15 varas to the mile, while C4 runs the even mile, so corners in Z west of 33 will be 60 varas west of corners in C4 and Z's own corner will hold over the call for another survey in another Block.

So that Block Z and Blocks 179 and 207 can and do reach north line Block C4 but 179 and 207 cannot comply with calls for Block Z and calls for corners in C4, as the calls are contradictory in fact. Hence we must retain the more reasonable call and as the call for C4 corners would cause a conflict between Blocks 179 and 207 and Block Z, and as the calls for Block Z and the relative position of 179 and 207 and Block Z on Map show no such conflict, we reject the call for C4 corners and take course and distance for 179 and 207 from the calls for Block Z.

Block 194 runs along the north line of Block Z and 207 and then runs south with west line of Blocks 207 and 179 calling for thier corners.

The west line of Block 194 is here the east line of the University Blocks 16 and 17. The N E corner of 1 Block 16 U.L. is well identified by 3 mountain bearings. And the S E corner of 2 Block 17 U.L. calls for a rock mound.

Wherever the east line of the University Block falls will be the west line of 194.

Mr. A.N.Lea shows his location of this east line and gives his S E corner 1 Block 17 marked by a Hackberry bearing tree. (See his Sketch May 27 1911)

His figures for the fractional surveys in 194 show that he places this east line of the U.L. as running 1°30' less variation than lines in Block Z, presumably based on the call of Shadowsky for a variation of 11° E in Block Z, and the call for 9°30' E by the surveyor of the U.L.Blocks.

This might be a valid basis for the divergance of two lines run by the same man with the same instrument at the same time. But we cannot tell whether part of the difference may not have been instrumental, local or temporal.

counter 39056

But we have positive data as to the reading of the course of the original U L lines in the three mountain bearings and in the absence of positive identification of the rockmnd at S E 217, which could have been moved at any time since first placed (if placed at all) by the original surveyor, the course given by these bearings would be the course of the East line of the U L lands.

As this question was not material to the object of the present survey, we connected our work with the original N.E.1 BLK 16 and Lea's S.E.1 BLK 17 and made no further attempts to settle the matter.

Connection was also made to iron pipes marking the corner of the resurvey of certain river sections in Blk 12 H&GN Rwy CO. adjacent to Blk 194 xxxx on the north, as a check on the corrections made of certain of these surveys by Mr. Lea.

History of the Survey.

In May 1917, I was making a resurvey of sections in 194, and had to determine the true position of the N.E. cor of Blk Z from which it starts.

We went to a rock mnd on the ridge S.E. of Mr. Perry's house and found a mound of 5 rocks one marked "Friend". From this mnd we found the two mt. bearings stood as called for in original fieldnotes N.W. 3 C 4 and S.E. 2 Z, but in notes of S.E.2 Z a 3rd bearing "Capstone mnt bears S 1500 vrs" is inserted, which bearing belongs to N.E. cor sur 3. These bearings required a needle reading of 10° 42' E. We ran north making each mile for 8 miles. We then xxx went to the N.E. cor 33 shown us by Mr. Baker who had been there with Mr. Lea. This corner had been searched for by Mr. Lea, but had not been found until a short time before we went to it. Judge Williams of Fort Stockton also failed to find it.

Mr. Lea finally found a large old rock mnd which stands on the south side of the rockyhill across a deep rough canyon; it can be plainly seen from the mesa 1500 vrs south and from the bluff some 200 vrs nearer. The line north runs along the side of the hill and reaches the valley at about 600 vrs. It is an out of the way place where no one would be likely to disturb it and the hill side is so rocky that one might pass close by with out noticing it. IT is 60 vrs West and 106.6 vrs North of the course and distance from N.W.3 C4

The fact that an old undisturbed rock mnd was found so near the right place and no other mnd near it, is a strong presumption in its favor. Mr. Lea built up the mnd and placed a square white rock ontop with the number of the survey cut in it.

We set over this mnd and at once it was apparent that one could not run East as the point of a mesa running out North has an almost perpendicular bluff 150 to 200 feet high.

Turning west we ran a traverse to a point 1900 vrs West. This reached the foot of a steep rocky hill covered with loose rock and subject to wash, at the head of the canyon opening North. We searched for the N.W. cor 33 but did not find any mnd, though we found several piles of rocks that at first looked as if they might be ~~certified~~ artificial mnds.

We started back, climbing a trail up the bluff on the East side of this canyon, and in riding South came to a large flat mnd of lime rock lying on a limestone ledge. Measuring back to our 1900 vr point in the valley showed that this mnd was 1782 vrs west and 169.5 vrs South of N.E.33 above described.

We now went round to the point of mesa East of N.E.33 and ran East to the intersection of the line North from N.W.3 C 4, and there marked a cor for xxx N.W.1 BLK 194, finding an excess innorthing of 106.6 vrs xxx or 13.3 per mile.

On this survey (1917) we set the N.W. cor 5 and ran East to the Pecos River.

Then on South to the original S.E. cor sur 1 C3 and back West connecting with Barton's row of original corners through C3 and C4.

This survey showed 1943 vrs width of ~~the~~ surveys in Blk 194 and was approved by the General Land Office.

In 1921 we went to the N.E. cor sur 6. 3 miles North of N.W.3 C4 marked on a former survey, moved 39.9 vrs north for excess and set corner and took bearings. Our bearings taken in 1919 at 10° 42' E now ~~xxx~~ required 10° 56' E from our cor. Mr. Lea's N.E.6 bears S 30° 25' W 93 vrs.

We turned East and at 51 varas ran over a recent rckmnd, on 1943 vrs set S.E.12 BLK 194 at S.E cor of pasture.

Thence we ran North 1913.3 to the mile, marking corner, to N.E.5 194 where we checked on our 1917 line from the west. Here we found Lea's cor xx N 43° 45' E 55.2 vrs.

Thence we ran north 1913.3 varas and set cor for N.E.C. On north 1913. varas set cor for N.E.1 Blk 194, On north 1900 varas and set corner for N.E. 42 Blk 194.

Here we turned West and ran 1943 varas and made cor for N.W.42, turned south and ran to the top of the rise where we could check on point of hill run over by our line north run in 1917.

Returning to the N.W.cor 42 we ran on west 1915 varas to N.W.43,on west 1915 varas to N.W.cor 44 and set rock mound 30 varas east for bearing,on a little rocky hill covered with Lechuguilla.

On West at 1657 varas set mound for old S.W.cor 65 (changed by corrected patent).Here we turned N 11°45'E and ran 1402 varas,~~xxxx~~ to south line sur 30 Blk 12 H.& G.N.Ry.Co.Then N 78°15'W along this south line to the S.W.cor. Thence N 11°45'E 298 varas to an iron pipe marked "S.E.29" for S.E.cor sur 29 Blk 12.

~~Ex~~ Returning to our S.W.65 we ran west 2169 varas and set the N.W.cor sur 48 Blk 194.

We then went to the original N.E.cor sur 33 above described and ran north checking on our N.W.cor 48.

From this N.W.cor sur 48 Blk 194 we ran N 45° W 2688 varas and set the N.W.cor 50. Thence West 1900 varas and set mound for the N.E.cor sur 54.

Thence we ran N 45° W 1589 varas ,passing an iron pipe near the corner of a fence,Pipe marked "S.W.23",713 varas north and 884 varas west of our N.E. 54.

We then ran west 776 varas to a point on the east line of sur 55,turned north and ran to a point on pasture fence 1527 varas north of the N.E.cor 55.

Thence we ran along the fence S 89°20'W ,at about 3200 varas we found an iron pipe pulled up and leaning against a fence post some 300 varas south of where the fieldnotes would place it.At 4702 varas we reached a cross fence running S 12°15'W,and 100 varas south reached a point from which a rock-capped peak bears S 46° E (as called for),a rock bluff,or point of hill bears S 45° W(as called for) ,and another rock-capped peak bears S 26° W.(call is S 25° E).Here we set a cedar stake as the approximate location of N.E.1 Blk 16 U.L.according to the bearings given in its field notes.But on leaving this point and driving west,on looking back,we could see a prominent boulder or 'projection'of rock that had been hid by the point of bluff taken for the S 45° W bearing.By moving some 10 to 15 varas S 46° E from our cedar stake This projecting boulder would be seen and all three calls be satisfied.This location of the N.E.cor of the U.L.Block is shown on the Plat of our survey.

On the recent survey made to ascertain the true location and metes and bounds of surveys to be patented,we went to the large limestone mound noted above as 1782 varas west and 169.5 varas south from N.E.33 Blk Z.

From this mound we ran west with a magnetic variation of 10°54'E,which was found to be required by readings on points taken in the former survey.

At 2018 varas west we turned north and ran 169.5 varas and set mound for N.W.48 Blk Z.

Thence West at 1900 varas set mound for N.W.49 Blk.Z,the N.W.corner of the Block.

Thence West 1900 varas set mound for N.W.cor sur 6 Blk 207. On west 1900 varas set mound for N.W.85 Blk 194.On west at 970 varas we turned north and ran to the edge of the bluff hoping to see and check on the corner of the pasture fence near N.E.1 Blk 16,but it was not visible.On west at 1672 varas reached the old fence supposed to be on the University Block line.

Returning to our N.W.6 Blk 207,we ran south,at 642 varas passed 99 varas east of U.S.G.S.Bench mark and triangulation point,on south 1913.3 varas in all, to a point in a small deep canyon ,near the head,and marked an X on the south bluff of canyon 32 varas south of the point for S.W.cor sur 6.

Thence South ,off the mesa and down a long draw,at 1913.3 varas set mound for N.W.cor sur 4 Blk 207.

Thence South ,at 1690 varas cross Old Spanish Trail Highway,1913.3 varas in all, to a point on the north slope of a hill near the foot,and set mound for N.E.cor sur 90 Blk 194.

Thence South 1913.3 varas set mound for N.W.4 Blk 179. Here we turned West and ran 1900 varas and set mnd for ~~xxE~~.N.E.cor sur 92 Blk 194.

On West 1539 varas to point on pasture fence supposed to be on the east line of the University Block, Thence S 1° E along this fence,427 varas,thence S 1° 10'W 238 varas to a large rock mound on west side of a road from which a hackberry marked X bears S 63° 45' W 8 varas,shown us by Mr.Baker as Lea's corner for S.E.1 Blk 17 U.L.

Returning to our N.W.4 Blk 179,we ran south and set a mound for N.W.2 Blk 179 at 1913.3 varas.On south 950.4 varas set stake and mound for S.W. cor.of the north half of sd sur 2.

Mr.Bakers records show that the north half of sur 2 Blk 179 and of sur 2 Blk 207 were purchased first,so following instructions of your Office,we gave the north half its 320 acres and placed the excess in the south halves.

Thence East 1900 varas and set corner.Turned south and ran 963 varas and set mound for S.E.2 Blk 179 and S.W.2 Blk 207.On south 1913.3 varas to a point in north line of Blk C 4 due west of original N.W.cor sur 3 in same Block. Here we were shown Mr.Lea's corner which was 24 varas south and 24 varas east of our point.

We returned to N.W.cor of N 1/2 of sur 2 Blk 179,and ran east 3800 varas

counter 34058

turned north and ran 950.4 varas and set mound for N.E.cor sur 42 Blk Z. Here we found two rock mounds ,one S 8° E 191 varas,the other S 12°20'E 123 varas.

Thence we ran east 1900 varas and set mound for N.W.26 and S.E.38 Blk Z. Here we found a rock mound S 17°20'E 178 varas.

Thence we ran north and at 1913.3 varas set mound for S.W.28 BlkZ.near ~~XXX~~North foot of sharp back bone ridge 160 feet high.

Thence north ,at 365 top of ridge about 8 varas east of a stone monument 5 feet high,or north at 1302 varas cross C.ST.Highway,1913.3 varas in all set mound for S.E.cor sur 36 Blk Z .Here we found a rock mound S8°40'E 146 varas.

Thence North 3826 varas ,along a brushy valley or draw,and set mound for N.W.cor sur 30 Blk Z .Here we found a rock mound S 9°10'W 131 varas.

As we were so near the N.E.cor 33 we decided to run on the two miles and check on the run.We ran 3824 varas north to a point 2 varas east of the rock mound before described as the N.E.cor of 33 Z.

Returning to our S.E.cor 36 Z.we turned west and ran 1900 varas and set mound for N.E.44 BlkZ .On west 1900 varas set mound for S.E.52 Blk Z. Here we found a rock mound marked "S.E.52 T" S 12°05'W 140 varas. (Mr.Lea told me he had run from some Tarver corners in Blk Z,and this "T" mound may be a Tarver corner.)

Returning to our S.E.cor 36 we ran N 45° E 2705.3 varas and east 2 varas and set mound for N.W.cor sur 20 Blk Z.

Thence we ran east 1915 varas and set mound for S.W.12 Blk Z.

This placed at least one corner on each of the surveys to be patented except sur 54.

In making field notes for south 1/2 of 10 Blk Z ,we placed the excess in the north half as the south half was the first purchase.

Survey 44 was purchased as two half sections but we made the field notes for the whole section as both halves are to be patented.

I believe the above report and plat states all the facts developed by the survey and gives the basis on which the corrected field notes are made.

If any further details or explanation are required for the understanding of the facts presented,or any corrections required in the notes offered, please advise me and I will attend to the matter at once.

All which is respectfully submitted for your consideration.

Respectfully

R.S. Dod

R.S.Dod
Licensed Land Surveyor.

Filed in the General Land Office,
Austin, Texas, October 13th 1922.

J.T. Robison, Comr.
S.C. Clark
Clk.

counter 34059

File No. Sketch File 111
Pecos County
Orig'ly filed with Rd Sk. 59
Filed 10-13 19 22
GAURY MAURO Comty Clk
By Douglas Howard (4.24.1987)

Keep With
Pecos County Rolled Sketch 59
Report By R.S. Dod & Ect.
Filed Oct. 13, 1922

counter 34060

See Parcel