

1  
Supplement to Field Notes of Jackson and  
Wharton County line

Beginning as stated in "Report" of said Co.  
line, from an Iron Post &c

Thence N. 45° W. Through I & G. N. R.R. Co. Sur. Sec 11-600 was-  
to Dave White N. E. Cor. & S. Boundary line of Sec.  
1-S.A. & M.G. R.R. from which its S. E. Cor. (bns-  
E-556 was-

" " " " Through said Sur. 1900 was-to E- Bound- line of  
Sec. 2 of same Co- from which its N. E. Cor. (bns  
N. 556 was-

" " " " Through said Sur. 787 was-to its N. Bound- line  
and to vacant land applied for by B. D. Lerary  
May 1<sup>st</sup> 1886 to H. J. Schley Sr. Co. Sur Wharton Co.  
and Recorded also in Jackson Co.- from which  
the N. E. Cor. of Sec 2 of said Co- (bns- E. 556 as-

" " " " Through said lands applied for by B. D. Lerary  
14150 was-to T. J. Winston S. E. Boundry line  
from which its South Cor. on N. E. line of F.  
Menefee league (bns- S. 45° W. 1086 <sup>2</sup>/<sub>5</sub> was-

" " " " Through said Winston league 5353 was-to  
S. Boundry line of John Dillard league & N  
Boundry line of said Winston- from which their  
respective S. W. & N. W. Cor's (bns. W. 2285 <sup>2</sup>/<sub>5</sub> was-

" " " " Through said J. Dillard lea- 2624 was-to  
West Mustang Creek it being the W- Boundry of  
said Dillard league

" " " " Through Geo House league 5074 <sup>2</sup>/<sub>5</sub> was-to its



- N. Boundary line of The S. E. Cor. of Henry Jump's Pre- from which The N. E. Cor. of said House league Cons - E - 4646 was -
- Thence N. 45° W. with N. E. Boundary line of Henry Jump & Geo W. Jump's preemptions 3580  $\frac{1}{2}$  was - to E. Boundary line of J. T. White's 640 acre Sur. - from which its N. E. Cor. & the S. E. Cor. of E. A. Wilson Pre- Cons - N. 180 was -
- " " " " Through said White's Sur. 249 was - to S. line of said Wilson's Pre- from which its S. E. Cor Cons - E. 173 was -
- " " " " Through said Wilson Pre - 1113 was - to W. Boundary line of said Wilson & E. Boundary line of said J. T. White's Sur. from which the said White's N. E. Cor. & the said Wilson's N. W. Cor. Cons - N. 150 was -
- " " " " Through said J. T. White's Sur. 221  $\frac{1}{2}$  was - to its N. Boundary line from which its N. W. Cor. Cons - E - 149  $\frac{1}{2}$  was - and the S. E. Cor. of Sec. 31 Cons - W. 39 was -
- " " " " Through vacant land (supposed) 56 was - to E. Boundary line of Sec. 31 H & T. C. R. R. Co. - from which its S. E. Cor. Cons - S. 80 was -
- " " " " Through said Sec 31, 2472 was - to E. Boundary line of J. Dunlap Sur. from which its N. E. Cor. Cons - N. 350 was -
- " " " " Through said J. Dunlap Sur. 495  $\frac{1}{2}$  was - to its N. Boundary line & S. Boundary line of J. Rudd, asson. of A. Martin, or Sec. 32 H & T. O. R. R. Sur. from which



The S. W. Cor. of W. J. Wickham & the N. E. Cor  
of J. Dunlap & S. E. Cor. of Said Rudd & Martin  
Crs - E - 350 was -

Thence N. 45° W. Through Said Rudd & Martin or said Sec. 32 Sur. 2337  
was to E. line of J. R. Wickham Sur. from  
which its N. E. Cor. Crs - N. 766 1/2 was - & the  
N. W. Cor. of said Rudd & Martin & Sec. 32 Crs N  
350 was -

" " " " Through said J R Wickham Sur. 1120 was to  
N. Boundary line of said Wickham from which  
its N. W. Cor. Crs - W. 1120 was - & the Golden Rod  
Cr. is E - 260 was - Said Cor. is on E. line of Geo.  
Hall Pre - 556 was - N. of Russell Ward's N. E. Cor.  
on W. side of Little Golden Rod -

" " " " Through vacant land, as per Wharton Co. Map, 810  
was - a Point from which the N. E. Cor. of Geo Hall  
Pre - Crs - S. 7 1/2° W. 610 was - and at 2074 was  
to S. line of Sec 47 of H. & T. J. C. R.R. Co. from which  
the E. Cor. of Sec. 1 Blk 4 I. & G. N. R.R. Co. Crs  
W. 196 was - & the S. W. Cor. of Sec. 47 Crs W. 806 was -

" " " " Through said Sec. 47 - 1141 was - to E. Boundary  
line of Sec 1 Blk 4 I & G. N. R.R. Co. from which  
its N. E. Cor. Crs N. 823 was -

" " " " Through Sec 1 Blk 4 I & G. N. R.R. Co. 1278 was -  
to E Boundary line of Sec. 21 I. & G. N. R.R. Co.

" " " " Through Sections 21, 25, 20 & 19 of said I & G. N. R.R. Co.  
and also through preemption claims, as shown by Whar  
ton Co. Map, which are in conflict with said R.R. Sec's



4493 vas- to S. boundary line of Mrs Mary Ann Whitney's Sur. No 2 - from which to S.W. Cor. Bns. W. 1230 vas-

Thence N. 45° W. Through said Sec. No 2, 1790 vas- to The E. boundary of No. 1 same Sur. from which to N. E. Cor. Bns. N. 670 vas-

" " " " Through said Sec 1 same Sur. 950 vas- to S. boundary line of Sec 4 same Sur. from which to S. W. Cor. Bns. W. 1313 vas-

" " " " Through said Sec. 4, 1243 vas- to N. boundary line of same 7 to S. boundary line of Sec 11, H. T. & B. R. R. Co. from which to N. W. Bns. S. 85° W 700 vas-

" " " " Through said Sec. 11., 990 vas- to N. Cor. of Jackson County from which the N. E. Cor. of Archibald S. White league & the N. W. Cor. of Sec. 4, Mrs. M. A. Whitney Sur. Bns. S. 13° E- 700 vas- Making whole distance from Matagorda Co. Cor. to Lavaca Co. line 55888 vas- or 29 miles 788 vas-

I hereby Certify that the above Supplement to the Field Notes of Jackson and Wharton Co. line are true and correct - Witness my hand this 14<sup>th</sup> day of January A. D. 1888

P. P. Pertram,  
Co. Sur. J. C. S.

Filed in the General Land Office January 18<sup>th</sup> 1888.  
Abstract corrected and a Copy for'd Conch.  
Jan'y 24/88 G. M. Beaumont

3  
Jackson Co. Bdry. line  
1A



11480

Edna, Jackson Co. Tex. Jan. 14<sup>th</sup> 1888-

R. M. Hall Esqr.

Comr. General Land Office

Austin Tex.

Dear Sir:

The Enclosed "Supplement to the Field Notes of Jackson and Wharton Co. line" I hope will be satisfactory - The actual establishment of a Survey when it is in Conflict with others By Map or Field Notes I do not Consider it our province to settle. When the Comr. of General Land Office, instructs which Survey has the preference then that question can be settled - You will notice that all or nearly all Surveys along the said Co. line (according to our Co. Map) are wrong as to their position with the said Co line. The fact that the Co line was unknown to Surveyors locating Certificates, has had, no doubt a good deal to do with it - All Old Established lines of Surveys I found, to wit: Dave White, 2. D. Murphys, on Caranekmas, Winston Lea - F. M. M. P. Lea, John Dillard Lea, Geo. Houser Lea - J. D. Wallace Lea, J. T. White Sur., Wilson Pr., Russell Ward Sur., Geo. H. Hall Pr., J. R. Wickham Sur, A. S. White Lea & others - The Morris & Cummings Surveys in Jackson & Wharton Co.'s leave a vacancy between them, and I can not tell how it will be cut up by its Surveyor, Our Co. is anxious to have the land



Which justly belongs to her for Taxation & which she has been deprived of for the last 25 yrs - on account of the Maps being made wrong - The Old Co. line which was run by the Order of Wharton Co. Court & Surveyed by J. S. Collingworth - I found & traced with the results as the Map and Field Notes Shows in our Report - Your letter to our Com<sup>r</sup> Court of the 25<sup>th</sup> October 1887 in which you request more data in regard to surveys before you can correct the Abstracts - If the Report, Map & this enclosed Supplement is not sufficient - Please let me know what more is required & I will try to do it.

Yours Very Respectfully  
P. P. Putnam, Co. Sur.  
J. C. J.

P.S.

Can not the Assessor & Co. Sur. make out a Statement of the Abstract &c under the laws of 1885 - or is it too late?

Yours Resply<sup>g</sup>

P. P. P.

According to supplement the Co line between the Counties of Jackson and Wharton has been applied, approved and Abstract corrected, a Copy of which has this day been forwarded the Com<sup>r</sup> of Pub Accts - corresponding corrections will appear in the next supplement.

Filed in the General Land  
Office January 18/88.

E. W. Taylor

Putnam

Jackson Co. Bdry. Line 15

Chief Clerk.