

CONTENTS.

- 1. Application to Surveyor. } 6-10-09.
- 2. Field Notes. } S.L. Hamilton
- 2 1/2 Sur. Sketch. }
- 3. Application to Purchase. }
Surveyors Statement & Aug. 27/09
- 4. Treasurer's Receipt.

4. App to Purv. 11-15-09
 Paid in full for 17 acres -
 11/20/09 Greenwood-

500 11/16/09
 R H Barrow
 Houston

6/11/09

LA 9190

Abst. 1623

Harris

County

SCHOOL LAND

See plat attached to field notes 271
 also in SF. 94338, plat 22 Harris Co.

SOLD TO

Robt H Barrow

11-8-09

RHP

17.7 Acres.

accept Gray \$400

Survey No. 156

11/8/09

Block No.

J. Robinson
 Surveyed for Corn

R. H. Barrow

Houston, Tex.

ACT APRIL 15, 1905

Disclosed on the official map,
 all of vacant
 Corner on map of Harris County
 November 3/1909

Patented Nov. 22, 1909

Mgl.

990 P.H. 609 vol 39

Pat. Original Henry
 11/20/09

Abst. vol. 35

Map 12-11/20/09

Application for Survey.

APPLICATION NO. 156

To George F. Horton, County Surveyor of Harris

County, Texas, ~~xxx~~ District ~~Surveyor~~

~~xxx~~ ~~Land District~~

By virtue of Section 8 of an Act approved April 15, 1905, I hereby apply for a survey of the following described unsurveyed land appropriated to the Public Free School Fund under Chapter 11, Act February 23, 1900, to-wit:

Situated in Harris County, Texas, about 25 1/2 miles N. 65 1/2 W. from the County site. Said tract is bounded as follows:

On the North, East and West by a survey in the name of J.W. Moody, and on the South by a survey in the name Thomas Gary.

I solemnly swear that I desire said land surveyed with the intention of buying it, and that I am not acting in collusion with, or attempting to acquire said land for another person or corporation.

R. H. Barron, Applicant.

(N. B.—Write Name and P. O. Address Distinctly.)

P. O. Houston, Harris county, Texas.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 12th. day of April, A.D. 1909.

R. E. Murrell
Notary Public Harris Co. Texas.

(SEAL MUST NOT BE OMITTED)

I, Geo F Horton County Surveyor of Harris

County, Texas, or Surveyor for

Land District, hereby certify that the above and foregoing application No. 156 was filed for record on the 12th day of April 1909, at 11 o'clock PM. and recorded in Vol. 6 page 208 in my office Harris County, Texas.

Geo F Horton, C Surveyor Harris Co
R E Murrell
Deputy

172

LAND OFFICE

S. F. No. 9190

Application for Survey

Filed June 10 - 1909

J. P. Robinson
Commissioner.

S. L. Hamilton
Clerk.



Plat of Survey No. _____

The State of Texas,

Survey

Harris

County,

No. 156

Blk. _____

District.

Blk. _____

See Plat accompanying. *filed*
herewith & statement by
Cunyo & Co.
D. W. R.

FIELD NOTES of a survey of 17.3

acres of land made for R.H. Barrow

Variation _____

by virtue of his affidavit and application made

before *R.E. Murrell, Notary Public, Harris Co* on the *12th* day

of *April* 1909, and filed with the Surveyor of *Harris* County or Land District,

on the *12th* day of *April* 1909, under Section 8 of an Act approved April 15, 1905,

providing for the sale of the unsurveyed school land appropriated to the Public Free School Fund by an Act approved

February 23, 1900. Said land is situated in *Harris* County, about *25* miles

54 N.W. from County site, and known as survey No. _____, in Block No. _____ beginning at

a stake for the N.W. corner of a survey in the name of Thomas Gary of

160 acres as a homestead :

Thence North 96 3/4 vrs. to a stake for an interior corner of a survey in the name of J.W. Moody;

Thence East with a line of said Moody survey 1000 vrs. ~~xxx~~ to another interior corner of said Moody survey :

Thence South 96 3/4 vrs. to a stake for the N.E. corner of said survey in name of Thomas Gary :

Thence West 1000 vrs. to _____

_____ to the place of beginning.

Bearings marked _____

R.H. Barrow

Surveyed *May 18-19th.* 1909.

Wm. A. Schoenmann

} Chain Carriers

I _____, Surveyor of _____

Texas, do hereby certify that the foregoing survey was made by me on the ground, and according to law; that the limits, boundaries and corners, with the marks, natural and artificial, are truly described in the foregoing Plat and Field Notes, just as I found them on the ground; and they are recorded in my office in Book _____, Page _____

This _____ day of _____ 190_____

Surveyor of _____ Texas.

I, Saml E. Packard, Deputy

Surveyor of Harris County, do solemnly swear that the classification and market value of the land included within the limits of the within field notes is as follows, viz:

Sandy Soil State Character

Agricultural, market value Dry or Watered

Grazing, market value \$ 150/100 Dry or Watered

Kind of Timber None

Market value of Timber

Overflow Swamp

Suitable for Settlement yes

Sworn to and subscribed before me this the 1st day of June 1909

Saml E. Packard
Harris
Texas

Within enclosure of

Improvements owned by

P. O. address of owner of enclosure or improvements is

Surveyor

LAND OFFICE
S. F. No. 9190

FIELD NOTES

Filed June 10 1909

J. J. Robinson Commissioner
S. L. Hamilton Clerk

Approved 11-8- 1909

J. J. Robinson Commissioner

*Disclosed on the official map
all of vacants
Corner on map of Ham Co
November 3/1909
D. von Rosenberg
Patented Nov 22/09
Kestler*

RECEIVED AS STATED

\$ 100

JUN 10 1909

GEO. W. BEAVER
RECEIVER

*010-6-12-09
L. E.*

I Saml. E. Packard, Deputy Surveyor of Harris Texas, do hereby certify that the foregoing survey was made by me on the ground, and according to law; that the limits, boundaries and corners, with the marks, natural and artificial, are truly described in the foregoing Plat and Field Notes, just as I found them on the ground.

This 28th day of May 1909

Saml E Packard
Deputy Surveyor of Harris Texas.

I George F. Horton, County, Surveyor of Harris county, Texas, do hereby certify that I have examined the foregoing Plat and Field Notes and find them correct and that they were made on the ground as stated in the above certificate, and that they are recorded in my office in Book 7, Page 397
This 28th day of May 1909

George F. Horton County Surveyor of Harris county, Texas.


MAP

OF

DANL SCHIEL AND R. H. BARROW SURVEYS, SHOWING THE CONNECTING LINES BETWEEN THE NW COR. OF THE J. W. MOODY SURVEY AND THE NE COR. OF THE JAS. BREWSTER; ALSO THE CORRECT LOCATION OF THE JACOB DUCKWORTH 2 1/3 LABORS
Surveyed May 18 & 19, 1909
Scale 6000 ft. = 1"
Var. 8° 30' E

Sam'l E. Packard
Deputy Surveyor,
Harris County, Texas.

See Surveyor's explanation
filed with this
E. M. Packard
8/27/09.





S.F. ⁹¹⁹⁰
 File 9190
Harris County,
 School Land.
R. H. Burrow
Sur. Sketch
 Filed June 10 - 1909
J. Robinson
 Comm'r.
J. L. Hensitt
 Clerk.

See connection &
 plot in SF 9433
 2/16/10. Gene Rowley
 Pn'

- * S t a t e m e n t & E x p l a n a t i o n * -

Having been employed by owners of some of the lands East of and adjoining the J.W. Moody survey to try to adjust the lines between the surveys, I have done what I could to that purpose, with results I would now show by and through a sketch and explanation.

In explanation of the sketch and fieldnotes resulting from such efforts I would make some observations, draw some deductions therefrom, present facts obtained by actual survey in the field and express conclusions resultant that to me seem obvious.

The prime purpose of this is to enable owners to re-establish the lines and corners of the said J.W. Moody survey and those of surveys adjoining it as originally made, which have been abandoned by owners of said Moody survey by mistake in late years.

- O b s e r v a t i o n s -

A great many land certificates issued by the several boards of Land Commissioners of the Republic of Texas were obtained by fraud, and have been canceled and held for naught.

Many of such certificates, however, were located and surveys were made by virtue of them before the facts of fraud were discovered: so that much of the land in the state has been covered by two, three or even four locations, and surveys by virtue of such certificates before it was covered by valid certificates and finally patented.

Some of the land covered by the sketch has been so located and surveyed, to wit: the land lying next west of the J.W. Baker survey; the land finally patented in name of Isaac Steel and that next north and west of that survey. The land covered by the Steel survey was first covered by a location and survey by virtue of a certificate in name of Webb Sea: but that certificate not having been approved by "The Traveling Board"; the survey was abandoned and the land left open to location still. But as said Webb Sea survey lies across Cypress creek, and yet the fieldnotes do not call for the creek or for any natural or artificial object at all, I do not insert a copy of the fieldnotes. They are of record in book A, p. 232.

The land was next located by H.W. Bozeman by virtue of two certificates, one for a labor, in name of George White, and one for 320 acres in name of H. Tierwester, and surveys were made and fieldnotes made out as follows substantially, but not at full length, to wit:

George White labor survey, book A, p. 96:

By H.W. Bozeman assignee. On Little Cypress, above Washington Road, Beginning at stake in prairie 402 vs North of Little Cypress, (calling for bearing trees); Thence East 1400 vs to corner, (calling for bearings); Thence South 406 vs cross Little Cypress 5 vs wide, 714.5 vs to corner in prairie; Thence West 1400 vs to corner, (bearing trees); Thence North, 310 cross Little Cypress, 3 vs wide, 714.5 vs to beginning. Made by D. Gregg, and fieldnotes delivered to H.W. Bozeman Oct. 20/40.

H. Tierwester 320-acre survey, book D, p. 62:

By H.W. Bozeman assignee. On Little Cypress West & North & adjoining George White, about 2 miles West of Washington Road. Beginning at stake & mound in pra. for Geo. White's S.W. corner of his labor; Thence West, crossing Cypress at 1050 vs, at 1650 vs to center of said creek; Thence North 918 vs to corner stake, running through center of said creek at a bend; Thence East 3050 vs, crossing a branch at 2790 vs, to stake & mound in prairie; Thence South 204 vs to stk & md in pra. the N.E. corner of said White labor; Thence West with White 1400 vs to N.W. corner in pra; Thence South 714 vs with W. line to beginning, crossing Cyp. at - vs. Sept. 18/39. Made by H. Trott. Oct. 21/40, Delivered to H.W. Bozeman and fee paid.

While these locations were being considered valid the survey in name of Jacob Duckworth was made next East of and adjoining Bozeman's Geo. White labor survey.

Jacob Duckworth survey, book A, p. 226:

Beginning at stk in E. line of Bozeman, 200 vs North of bayou, (bearings); Thence South 2200 vs, passing S.E. corner Bozeman at 510 vs, to corner; Thence East 1060 vs to stk & md; Thence North 2200 vs stk. (bearings) crossing byo at 1300 vs; Thence West 1060 vs to beginning, crossing a gully at 590 vs. May 7/38. H. Trott.

These Bozeman and Duckworth surveys call for crossings of creek, a branch and a gully, so as to make up a series of calls for Natural Objects which must be Exclusively Peculiar to the Correct Position of such surveys, and evidently common to no other position.

Felix C. Hunt survey, book A, p. 348~~8~~:

By assignee M. Parmer by assignee L.W. Brashear Jas. Phelan, On head waters of Cypress creek, about 27 miles N.W. ly from Houston, Beginning at a Willow

- 2 -

having been employed by owner of land
part of and adjoining the U.S. land survey to try to adjust the line
between the survey, I have done what I could to that purpose, with results
I would now show by and through a sketch and explanation.
The explanation of the sketch and relations resulting from such efforts
I would not have been able to give, had some additional bearings, present facts
obtained by actual survey in the field and express conclusions resultant
that to me was obvious.

It is to be noted that the bearings and distances of the line
and corners of the land in question were obtained by actual survey
as originally made, which have been included in the land survey
by mistake in this case.

- 3 -

A great many large certificates issued by the several boards of land
commissioners of the Territory of Texas were obtained by fraud, and have
been cancelled and held for naught.

Many of these certificates, however, were located and surveys were made
by virtue of them before the facts of fraud were discovered; so that much
of the land in the state has been covered by two, three or even four false
titles, and surveys by virtue of such certificates before it was covered by
valid certificates and finally patented.

Some of the land covered by the sketch has been so located and surveyed,
to wit: the land lying west of the U.S. land survey; the land lying
in between the line of land steel and that next north and west of that
survey. The land covered by the steel survey was first covered by a false
title and survey by virtue of a certificate in name of John Doe; but that
certificate has having been approved by the Territory Board; the survey
was abandoned and the land left open to location still. But as said John
Doe survey the survey crosses creek, and yet the certificate do not call
for the creek or for any natural or artificial object at all. I do not in-
clude a part of the land covered by the sketch in this case.

The land next located by W. W. Bosman by virtue of two certificates
one for a labor, in name of George White, and one for 20 acres in name of
H. T. Bosman, and surveys were made and field notes made out as follows and
entirely, but not at all length, to wit:

George White labor survey, book A, p. 22;
W. W. Bosman claims, on Little Cypress, above Washington Road,
beginning at stake in prairie 408 vs North of Little Cypress (calling
for bearing trees); thence East 1400 vs to corner (calling for bearing);
thence South 408 vs cross Little Cypress 2 vs wide, 714.5 vs to corner in
prairie; thence East 1400 vs to corner (bearing trees); thence North 110
cross Little Cypress 2 vs wide, 714.5 vs to beginning. Made by D. Gregg, and
field notes delivered to W. W. Bosman Oct. 20/50.

H. T. Bosman 20-acre survey, book D, p. 22;
W. W. Bosman claims, on Little Cypress West a North & adjoining
George White, about 2 miles West of Washington Road, beginning at stake
found in prairie for Geo. White's S.W. corner of his labor; thence West
crossing Cypress at 1030 vs, at 1450 vs to center of said creek; thence
North 10 vs to corner stake, running through center of said creek at a
point; thence East 500 vs, crossing a branch at 870 vs, to stake 2 found
in prairie; thence South 104 vs to the U.S. corner of said
labor; thence East 100 vs to the S.W. corner in prairie; thence
North 10 vs with line to beginning, crossing Cypress - vs South,
made by H. T. Bosman, Oct. 21/50, delivered to W. W. Bosman and the said
H. T. Bosman.

These locations were being considered valid the survey in name
of Jacob Bosman was made next east of and adjoining Bosman's Geo. White
labor survey.

Jacob Bosman survey, book A, p. 22;
beginning at stake in a line of Bosman, 200 vs North of prairie (bearing);
thence South 200 vs bearing 2.7 corner Bosman at 210 vs to corner; thence
East 1000 vs to stake; thence North 200 vs to beginning (bearing) crossing
creek at 1300 vs; thence West 1000 vs to beginning, crossing a gully at 200
vs, by W. W. Bosman, H. T. Bosman.

These Bosman and Bosman surveys call for crossings of creek, a branch
and a gully, so as to make up a series of calls for natural objects which
must be exclusively peculiar to the corner position of such surveys, and
entirely common to no other position.

John Bosman survey, book A, p. 22;
beginning at stake in a line of Bosman, 200 vs North of prairie (bearing);
thence South 200 vs bearing 2.7 corner Bosman at 210 vs to corner; thence
East 1000 vs to stake; thence North 200 vs to beginning (bearing) crossing
creek at 1300 vs; thence West 1000 vs to beginning, crossing a gully at 200
vs, by W. W. Bosman, H. T. Bosman.

5 F 9190

Tree at edge of Bayou "M" ; Thence North 3125 vs to sk & md pra ; Thence East 3200 vs to sk & md in pra ; Thence South 3125 vs to sk & md in pra, crossing bayou ; Thence West 3200 vs to beginning. Made since 1st. Feb. 33. Oct. 12/41. C.H. Bringham.

This survey is well and firmly fixed on the ground by peculiar connection with Big Cypress creek and a Willow Tree at S.W. corner, which tree and connection with creek are more fully described in fieldnotes of surveys in names of Askin, Reed and others, with which point said surveys are connected and held. Said Hunt survey has been abandoned, and the land covered by sundry small surveys.

J.W. Baker survey, book A, p. 323 :

By Archibald Wynns assignee, Beginning 500 vs South of I.W. Brashear's N.E. corner stake ; Thence South, passing his S.E. corner, 3965 1/2 vs to sk & md ; Thence East 2900 vs for 3rd. corner ; Thence North 3965 1/2 vs to 4th. corner sk & md ; Thence West 2900 vs to beginning. Var. 2.45. Mar. 9/40. J.W. Henderson.

As this survey lies across Big Cypress creek, and yet calls for nothing but the Brashear survey, by which it might be fixed on the ground and identified, it was doubtless "an office survey", and will ever depend on its connection with said Brashear, or Hunt survey for "anchorage" on the ground. It is plain that the Hunt survey above is called for in these Baker fieldnotes as "I.W. Brashear's survey" from the fact that Brashear appeared to own the Hunt certificate at the date of making Baker fieldnotes, and from the custom of surveyors of calling for surveys in names of assignees instead of original grantees. But it seems that Phelan bought it of Brashear.

A. Hillegeist survey, book K, p. 29 ;

Beginning at S.W. corner J. Duckworth's survey, (the lower survey) ; Thence East 1432.5 vs to A. Hillegeist's N.W. corner ; Thence South 630.5 vs to sk in pra ; Thence West 1432.5 vs to sk in pra ; Thence North 630.5 vs to beginning. Nov. 13/55. H.W. Stamme.

Chas. Welsch survey, book K, p. 31 ;

Bgng at S.W. corner of A. Hillegeist's survey ; Thence West 1032 vs to sk in pra ; Thence South 875 vs to sk in pra ; Thence East 1032 vs to sk in pra ; Thence North 875 vs to bgng. Nov. 13/55. H.W. Stamme.

H. Raaz survey, book K, p. 33 ;

Bgng at C. Welsch's N.E. corner & A. Hillegeist's S.W. corner ; Thence West 365 vs to sk in pra ; Thence North 2707 vs to sk on Cypress ; Thence down said creek to West line of Duckworth's survey ; Thence South with Duckworth & Hillegeist to bgng. Nov. 13/55. H.W. Stamme.

Aug. Froelich survey, book K, p. 35 ;

Bgng at C. Welsch's N.W. corner ; Thence North 1354 vs to sk in pra ; Thence East 667 vs to sk in W. line of Raaz survey ; Thence South 1354 vs to S.W. corner Raaz survey on N. line of Welsch's survey ; Thence West 667 vs to bgng. Nov. 13/55. H.W. Stamme.

Michel Bey survey, book K, p. 37 ;

Bgng at upper corner Raaz survey on creek ; Thence South 1350 vs to N.E. corner Froelich's survey ; Thence West 667 vs to N.W. corner same ; Thence North 1500 vs to corner in creek, and down same to bgng. Nov. 13/55. H.W. Stamme.

Aug. Wendt survey, book K, p. 41-2 :

Bgng 323 1/3 vs West of H. Bey's upper corner on Cypress ; Thence South 3726 vs to sk in pra ; Thence West 331 vs to sk in pra ; Thence North 3726 vs to sk on Little Cypress running east ; Thence down same to beginning. Jany. 29/56. H.W. Stamme.

The sketch on record with these fieldnotes by Stamme shows a survey lying west of Bey & Froelich surveys and east of Wendt survey marked "S.H.", and shows south line of Wendt an extension of the line between Raaz and Froelich surveys on the north and the Welsch on south.

H. Raaz survey, corrected & enlarged, book K, p. 58 ;

Bgng at sk on S. bnk Cypress creek ; Thence South 2707 vs to sk in pra ; Thence West 585 vs to sk in pra ; Thence South 950 vs sk in pra ; Thence East 950 vs sk in pra ; Thence North 950 sk in pra. Hirsch's S.W. corner, 1573 vs Duckworth's S.W. corner, 3600 vs to sk on S. bnk Cypress ; Thence up creek to bgng. Nov. 13/56. S.C. West.

Chas. Zube survey, book K, p. 60 :

Bgng at S.W. corner A. Froelich survey ; Thence North 2400 vs to sk in Bey's W. line ; Thence West 376 vs to sk in pra ; Thence South 2400 vs to sk in pra ; Thence East 376 vs to bgng. Nov. 17/56. S.C. West.

Jose de J. Rodriguez survey, book E, p. 112 :

In 1857 one, Hedgoxe, by virtue of certificate in name of Rodriguez, applied for a survey of land covered by Baker survey from corner to corner and line by line, as though he supposed said Baker location of the land was void. Survey was accordingly made with fieldnotes, abridged, as follows :

Bgng at post in W. line G. Ayres and E. line Baker surveys ; Thence North with

East line of Baker, and West line of Ayres and Merritt surveys, at 3006 vs center Railroad, at 5010 Washington Road, in all 7098 vs to N.E. corner of this survey, 790 vs West & 660 vs South of S.E. corner White's labor, Tall Pine on Little Cyp. "H" N. 78 W., and many other brgs; Thence West, at 2320 vs crossed Pine Gully, 2510 Washington Road, 2680 Ditch, in all 2900 vs to N.W. corner of this survey, Tall Pine on Little Cypress 30" "H" standing about 60 vs below mouth of Pine Gully, brs. N. 52 E. 790 vs, and other brgs; Thence South with W. line of Baker, at 2862 vs cross Railroad, at 7575 vs enter Timber, at 7580 B.O. 12" in line, 7590 B.O. 14" "H"; 7626 N. bnk Cyp. 4 vs wide, 7634 vs pra, in all 8965.5 vs to S.W. corner, brgs; Thence East 2900 vs to S.E. corner, brgs; Thence North 1610 vs small Persimmon in line, 1616 S. bnk Cyp. 8 vs wide, and into a thicket, 1672 pra. 1872 to bgng, closed Mar. 7/57. S.C. West.

This survey seems to follow side lines of said Baker survey, but does not call to follow north or south line of said survey, or to corner with it at all, and does not.

J.W. Moody survey, book E, p. 144 :
Bgng at the N.W. corner of Brewster; Thence East 580 vs to S.W. corner of W.E. Howth, P.O. 12" "X" N. 30 W. 52 vs; Thence North, at 888 vs cross Railroad, at 1625 vs a pond, in all 1901 vs to W.E. Howth's N.W. corner; Thence West 2095 vs to corner in pra; Thence North 1304 vs to S. line Raaz survey; Thence West 568 vs to S.W. corner same; Thence North 950 vs to N.W. corner same; Thence West 728 vs to sk Aug. Wendt's S.W. corner; Thence North 1660 vs to S. line Duckworth; Thence West 480 vs to S.W. corner same; Thence North 1625 vs to sk, Pin O. 20" "X" North 72 vs, 355 vs south of Cyp. cr. & 40 vs south of S.E. corner of Geo. White labor, being S. line of Webb Sea; Thence West 2665 vs cross Cyp. two Sycamores "X" 3 vs above line growing together at the ground, 3470 vs cross Cyp. cr. in all 3690 vs corner, Large Pine on S. bnk Cyp. "H" S. 77.30 E. 597 vs; Thence Sth 620 vs to J.W. Baker's N.W. corner in E. line Wm. McCamm; Thence East 2900 vs N.E. corner Baker; Thence South 4265 vs to M. Merritt's N.W. corner; Thence East 1901 vs to N.E. corner same; Thence South 2800 vs to A. Robert's N.W. corner labor; Thence East 1000 vs to N.E. corner labor; Thence North 400 vs to N.W. corner J.E. Gregory's survey; Thence East 1000 vs to N.E. corner same; Thence South 145 vs to bgng. Nov. 15/58. D. Gregg.

Geo. Dedrich survey, book E, p. 149 :
Bgng at N.W. corner J.W. Moody survey, Large Pine on Little Cypress "H" S. 77.30 E. 597 vs; Thence East, at 220 vs cross Cyp, 650 vs sk, Hack-berry "XXX" on N. bnk Cyp. South 80 vs; Thence North 1000 vs corner, said Pine S. 3 W., being N.W. corner of 320-acre survey in name of H. Tierwester; Thnc East with it 1004 vs to corner, etc. etc. etc. around to bgng. The said survey appears to have been covered. D. Gregg. Made Feb. 15/59.

Horace Biglow survey, book E, 180 :
For some reason said Bozeman surveys were abandoned, and the land was next located by virtue of a certificate in name of Horace Biglow as follows: Beginning at Pine Knot, whence Geo. Robert's House brs, N. 27 W.; Thence West 3050 vs sk, Large Pine on Little Cyp. "H" S. 3 W.; Thence South 1000 vs to S.E. corner Geo. Dedrich survey, Hack-berry "XXX" South 80 vs; Thence East, 380 vs cross bayou, 3050 vs with Moody, to N.E. corner, Pin O. 20" "X" North 72 vs; Thence North, 355 vs cross Cyp. 1000 vs to bgng. D. Gregg. April 10/60.

Chas. Zube survey, corrected, but not recorded, and ptd.
Bgng at N.W. corner M. Bey in creek; Thence South at 1509 vs corner said Bey & Froelich surveys, 2863 vs to sk in large pond for S.W. corner said Froelich survey; Thence West 376 vs to sk in N. line of Moody's survey; Thence North 1356 vs to S. line Duckworth survey; Thence East 345 vs to S.E. corner same; Thence North 1230 vs to middle of creek; Thence S. 53. 15 E. 39 vs to bgng. Patented Apr. 16/69. Vol. 37/483.

It seems evident that several of the foregoing surveys were actually made on the ground, and that marks were ~~marked on the ground~~ made by which said surveys might be identified. It seems evident also that the fieldnotes of some of the later surveys were made out in part by platting and by calculations based upon some of said former surveys, and that some of such fieldnotes are seriously erroneous and should not have been patented at all.

By correction and enlargement the Raaz survey was made to cover as much land, but in a square form, as had been covered by the Welsh survey, and nearly all of said Welsh survey, which had then been abandoned. See sketch in N.W. corner of main sketch herewith. This addition to Raaz survey appeared to extend West with S. line of Froelich to within 82 vs of S.W. corner of same: so that it would appear to be 82 plus 323 vs - for "S.H" survey - plus 331 vs - for Wendt survey, from N.W. corner of Raaz addition West to S.W. corner of said Wendt survey, which is 736 vs. It seems that in trying to determine this distance some years later the surveyor used two distances of 323 vs each, plus the said 82 vs, by which it appears to be 728 vs

instead of 736, or 8 vs different.

- * Calls of the Moody survey critically examined * -

In my effort to run out the Moody survey according to calls in fieldnotes thereof for objects as well as for courses and distances I found as follows, to wit :

- (1) What I think is the Root of the Original Bearing Tree at the S.E. corner of the survey. A little sappling standing where the Original tree should have stood ;
- (2) That the East line of the survey is Well Marked about 300 vs through prairie timber between said corner and the railroad ;
- (3) That said line crosses the Railroad at 888 vs as in Moody fieldnotes it is called for ;
- (4) That said line passes through a prairie pond at 1625 vs as in Moody fieldnotes it is called for. The fieldnotes of the Howth survey call for neither of these objects. I find also that it takes a greater variation to follow this line than it takes to follow Howth lines as claimed. At 1901 vs found nothing original.
- (5) Running West 2095 vs I find an Old Cypress stake in proper place for corner of Moody survey and section No. 1, H.T. & B.R.R. Co. when using the variation necessary to follow the said marked line above ;
- (6) Running North 1304, West 388 and North 950 vs to and with Raaz survey, I observe first, that Raaz survey called for belongs to a block of surveys made by one, Stamme on and south of Little Cypress creek, not a line or corner of which appears to have been marked, and which surveys seem to have been afloat ever since their making. Said Raaz survey appears to have been in about the position in which it is called for, at the time it was called for there, but it has been held to its connection with the lower Duckworth survey instead of to its connection with the Welsh survey, and has been established accordingly about a half mile East of where it was when Moody survey was made ;
- (7) Running West 728 vs to S.W. corner of the Wendt survey, North 1660 vs to S. line of Duckworth survey and West 480 vs to S.W. corner of same, I observe that said Wendt survey also belongs to said block of surveys made by said Stamme, the corners and lines of none of which were marked ; that said Wendt survey appears to have had Two Positions if in fact it ever had one at all. That is to say, space was left for a survey of 160 acres, if survey was not actually made of it, 323 vs wide, next west of the Froelich and Bey surveys; and the Wendt survey appears to have been next west of said space, 331 vs wide. This position I would call "the eastern position". The said space left for a survey appears to have been covered later by the Zube survey together with a strip 53 vs wide of the Wendt survey, the Wendt being void. This Zube survey as patented, makes such a connection with the upper Duckworth survey, which was well defined and fixed on the ground, as shows said Froelich, Bey and Wendt surveys about 385 vs West of what I called above "the eastern position"; and this Western position doubtless was the one taken by the surveyor in making the Moody survey and adopted as correct.
- (8) If calls of Moody fieldnotes be reversed, and run from S.E. corner of Geo. White labor South to S.W. corner, and East, from S.W. corner Duckworth, 480 vs the distance does not quite reach the West line of the said Wendt survey when placed as per "western position" last above given : so that said Western position of said Wendt survey seems further to have been adopted by the surveyor making the Moody survey.
- (9) Running North with West line of Duckworth 1625 vs to point in line of Webb Sea survey, 40 vs South of S.E. corner of White labor, I observe that the surveyor of Moody stops at south line of the Sea survey as though it were valid, and yet connects the Moody survey with the corner of the White labor survey to fix his Moody corner. This corner of Moody I find is held to a definite position on the ground by connection with the creek, the branch and the gully called for in fieldnotes of White, Tierwester and Duckworth surveys, and is firmly fixed by those unchanging, Natural Objects, although the line and bearing trees are all gone, except the Lone Pine below mouth of Pine gully : but this old Pine still stands as monument to many of the old surveys lying within several miles around it.
- (10) Running West from S.E. corner of the White labor, I observe that it is 1400 vs - for S. line of said White survey - plus 1050 vs - call of Tierwestern = 2450 vs to first crossing of creek ; that it is 1400 vs - for S. line White - plus 1650 - S. line Tierwester - = 3050 vs to second crossing of creek. And I find (a) that the North line of Moody survey crossed creek first time at 2469 vs, only 19 vs in excess of call of Tierwester survey, and (b) that said line crosses creek second time at 3086 vs, or only

- - - Call of the Moody survey critically examined -

in my effort to run out the Moody survey according to calls in field notes thereof for objects as well as for courses and distances I found

as follows, to wit :

(1) That I think is the foot of the Original Bearing Tree at the S.E. corner of the survey. A little sapling standing where the Original tree should have stood :

(2) That the East line of the survey is well marked about 300 vs through prairie timber between said corner and the railroad :

(3) That said line crosses the railroad at 388 vs as in Moody's field notes :

(4) That said line passes through a prairie pond at 1828 vs as in Moody's field notes it is called for. The distance of the North survey call for

neither of these objects. I find also that it takes a greater variation to follow this line than it takes to follow North lines as claimed. At 1891

vs found nothing original.

(5) Running West 3088 vs I find an Old Cypress stake in proper place for corner of Moody survey and section No. 1, N. 1/2 S. R. Co. when using the variation necessary to follow the said marked line above :

(6) Running North 1504, West 388 and North 980 vs to and with Reas survey. I observe first that Reas survey called for belongs to a block of surveys

made by one, Stamm or, and south of little Cypress creek, not a line or corner of which appears to have been marked, and which surveys seem to have

been almost ever since their making. Said Reas survey appears to have been in about the position in which it is called for, at the time it was called

for there, but it has been held to its connection with the lower Dickworth survey instead of to its connection with the Reas survey, and has been

established accordingly about a half mile East of where it was when Moody survey was made :

(7) Running West 888 vs to S.W. corner of the Wandt survey, North 1880 vs to S.W. corner of Dickworth survey and West 480 vs to S.W. corner of same. I observe

that said Wandt survey also belongs to said block of surveys made by Stamm, the corners and lines of none of which were marked ; that said

Wandt survey appears to have had two positions in fact it ever had one at all. That is to say, space was left for a survey of 180 acres, 12 survey

was not actually made of it, 388 vs wide, next west of the Froelich and Boy surveys, and the Wandt survey appears to have been next west of said space,

381 vs wide. This position I would call "the eastern position." The said space left for a survey appears to have been covered later by the Wandt

survey together with a strip 88 vs wide of the Wandt survey, the Wandt being void. This strip survey as patented, makes such a connection with the

upper Dickworth survey, which was well defined and fixed on the ground, as shows said Froelich, Boy and Wandt surveys about 388 vs East of what I

called above "the eastern position," and this eastern position doubtless was the one taken by the surveyor in making the Moody survey and adopted as

correct.

(8) If call of Moody field notes be reversed, and run from S.E. corner of Geo. White labor South to S.W. corner, and East, from S.W. corner Dickworth,

480 vs the distance does not quite reach the West line of the said Wandt survey when placed as per "western position" last above given ; so that said

Western position of said Wandt survey seems further to have been adopted by the surveyor making the Moody survey.

(9) Running West with West line of Dickworth 1828 vs to point in line of West 388 survey, 40 vs South of S.E. corner of White labor, I observe that

the surveyor of Moody stops at south line of the 388 survey as though it were valid, and yet connects the Moody survey with the corner of the White

labor survey to fix his Moody corner. This corner of Moody I find is held to a definite position on the ground by connection with the creek, the branch

and the gully called for in field notes of White, Terwester and Dickworth surveys, and is firmly fixed by those unchanging, Natural Objects, although

the line and bearing trees are all gone, except the lone Pine below mouth of Pine Gully ; but this old Pine still stands as monument to many of the

old surveys lying within several miles around it.

(10) Running West from S.E. corner of the White labor, I observe that it is 1400 vs - for a line of said White survey - plus 1080 vs - call of Ter-

westers 2480 vs to first crossing of creek ; that it is 1400 vs - for 3. line White - plus 1880 - 3. line Terwester - = 3280 vs to second cross-

ing of creek. And I find (a) that the North line of Moody survey crossed creek first time at 2588 vs, only 18 vs in excess of call of Terwester

survey, and (b) that said line crosses creek second time at 3088 vs, or only

57 9190

36 vs in excess of call of Tierwester survey. And I find that it is 3491 vs to the N.W. corner of the Moody survey as set and witnessed by the Lone Pine, and held by all parties concerned in the corner.

(11) I observe that serious mistake was made by surveyors as to the creek crossings last above mentioned, and that confusion and conflict have resulted therefrom. The Tierwester fieldnotes call to cross creek at 1050 vs, and to corner in creek at 1650 vs. This shows Two Things clearly, that, although so clearly shown, have been strangely ignored, to wit: 1st. that the distance between the creek crossings is 600 vs instead of 810 vs, as late surveys indicate, and 2nd. that Tierwester survey Corners in the Creek, instead of 360 vs west of first crossing and 430 vs east of the second, as late surveys indicate. The Dedrich survey calls to run East from beginning corner, cross creek at 220 vs and go on beyond it 430 vs to corner. It does not call directly for the S.W. corner of Tierwester here, but calls to run north to the N.W. corner of it, which is equal to a call here for S.W. corner as far as east and west positions are concerned. Now the Tierwester calls to corner in creek, from which corner it calls to run in a bend of the creek north, and I find that it corners in the creek where the Dedrich survey crosses it, from which corner it runs North in a bend of creek: so that the Dedrich survey runs in conflict with said Tierwester survey as far as it extends beyond the S.W. corner of said Tierwester survey in the creek. This would appear to be 430 vs: but it is 405 vs from S.W. corner of Dedrich east to creek crossing, instead of 220, so that the conflict is $650 - 405 = 245$ vs, only. As the Tierwester certificate was void, this conflict is harmless as to Dedrich survey, but it is hurtful as to the Steel survey, in that it caused that survey to be laid in conflict with said Dedrich survey. This conflict is equal to the excessive distance from S.W. corner of Dedrich east to creek plus distance the Dedrich runs beyond creek, which is in all about 433 vs. The land lost to the Steel survey by this conflict cannot be made up by moving the said Steel survey East in conflict with the Duckworth survey, as has been tried. The Steel will lose it.

(12) Running South from N.W. corner of Moody survey 620 vs to N.W. corner of Baker survey, I observe that by the fieldnotes of the Rodriguez survey its N.E. corner was UOP vs West and 660 vs South of the S.E. corner of the Geo. White labor survey, or 660 vs south of the S. line of said labor. I further observe that the Moody survey stops at S. line of Webb Sea survey, 40 vs south of S. line of White survey, and follows said line of Sea survey, so that it is $660 - 40 = 620$ vs from S. line of Sea survey south to north line and corners of said Rodriguez survey. From the fact that the Rodriguez survey appeared to cover exactly the same land that the Baker covered; from the fact that said Baker survey was difficult of identification, while the Rodriguez survey was easy, and from the further fact that all these calls agree exactly with calls in fieldnotes of said Rodriguez survey, and do not agree with calls in fieldnotes of the Baker survey, it appears plain that the Rodriguez survey was the survey that the surveyor making the Moody survey found, identified and connected the Moody survey with, rather than with the Baker survey, and that the name Rodriguez should be substituted for Baker wherever Baker is used in Moody fieldnotes.

(13) Running East with N. line of Baker survey 2900 vs to N.E. corner same, I observe that the N. line of Moody survey was evidently made up of two calls in fieldnotes of the Rodriguez survey, to wit: 790 - the distance West from S.E. corner of White labor to point north of N.E. corner of Rodriguez survey - plus 2900 vs - the length of N. line of said Rodriguez survey, = 3690 vs. As already shown, that line was cut about 199 vs short of that length by connection with Lone Pine bearing tree. So that 2900 vs east from last mentioned corner of Moody survey will pass N.E. corner of the Rodriguez survey as far as the N. line of Moody is short, to wit: about 199 vs. But as the East line of Baker and East line of Rodriguez surveys are one and the same, and was doubtless identified by the surveyor making the Moody survey, this interior corner of the Moody survey should be at the N.E. corner of said Rodriguez survey, where the two lines intersect each other.

(14) Running South with Baker 4265 vs to N.W. corner of Merritt survey, I think that the Moody should follow the East line of Rodriguez survey till it reaches the N.E. corner of Baker survey, then follow said Baker line to N.W. corner of Merritt survey, and then follow all other lines called for, on to the beginning of the said Moody survey.

(15) I find that it takes a greater variation to follow lines of said Rodriguez and Baker surveys than it takes to follow lines of surveys below the Moody survey on Big & Little Cypress creeks, and that such variation is about the same that it takes to follow the first East line of the said Moody survey, to wit: 9⁰²⁷. Respectfully submitted.

Aug. 5/09,

A. H. Barnow,

25 vs in excess of call of Wester survey. And I find that it is 2401
 vs to the N.W. corner of the Moody survey as set and witnessed by the Jones
 Pine, and held by all parties concerned in the corner.
 (11) I observe that serious mistake was made by surveyors as to the creek
 crossing last above mentioned, and that confusion and conflict have re-
 sulted therefrom. The Wester survey call to cross creek at 1080
 vs, and to corner in creek at 1050 vs. This shows two things clearly, that
 although so clearly shown, have been strangely ignored, to wit: 1st. This
 the distance between the creek crossings is 300 vs instead of 310 vs, as
 late survey indicates, and 2nd. that Wester survey corner in the creek
 instead of 300 vs west of first crossing and 450 vs east of the second, as
 late survey indicates. The Wester survey of 1850 vs was beyond it 450 vs to corner.
 It does not call directly for the N.W. corner of Wester here, but calls
 to run north to the N.W. corner of it, which is equal to a call here for
 the corner as far as east and west positions are concerned. Now the 1850-
 vs call to corner in creek, from which corner it calls to run in a band
 of the creek north, and I find that it corner in the creek where the DeBich
 survey crosses it, from which corner it runs north in a band of creek: so
 that the DeBich survey runs in conflict with said Wester survey as
 far as it extends beyond the S.W. corner of said Wester survey in the
 creek. This would appear to be 450 vs: but it is 400 vs. The S.W. corner
 of DeBich east to creek crossing instead of 300, so that the conflict is
 500 - 400 = 100 vs. only. As the Wester conflict was void, this con-
 flict is harmless as to DeBich survey, but it is harmful as to the Steel
 survey, in that it caused that survey to be laid in conflict with said DeB-
 ich survey. This conflict is equal to the excessive distance from S.W. cor-
 ner of DeBich east to creek plus distance the DeBich runs beyond creek,
 which is in all about 425 vs. The land lost to the Steel survey by this
 conflict cannot be made up by moving the said Steel survey east in con-
 flict with the DeBich survey, as has been tried. The Steel will lose it.
 (12) Running South from N.W. corner of Moody survey 230 vs to N.E. corner
 of Baker survey. I observe that by the fieldnotes of the Baker survey
 200 vs is run south of the N.W. corner of the Baker survey, and that the
 200 vs Labor survey, or 200 vs south of the S. line of said labor. I fur-
 ther observe that the Moody survey stops at S. line of 200 vs survey, 40
 vs south of S. line of Baker survey, and follows said line of 200 vs survey, so
 that it is 200 - 40 = 160 vs from S. line of 200 vs survey south to north line
 and corners of said Baker survey. From the fact that the Baker survey
 appeared to cover exactly the same land that the Baker covered;
 from the fact that said Baker survey was difficult of identification, while
 the Baker survey was easy, and from the further fact that all these
 calls agree exactly with calls in fieldnotes of said Baker survey, and
 do not agree with calls in fieldnotes of the Baker survey, it appears plain
 that the Baker survey was the survey that the surveyor making the
 Moody survey found, identified and connected the Moody survey with, rather
 than with the Baker survey, and that the name Baker should be substi-
 tuted for Baker wherever Baker is used in Moody fieldnotes.
 (13) Running East with N. line of Baker survey 200 vs to N.E. corner same,
 I observe that the N. line of Moody survey was evidently made up of two
 calls in fieldnotes of the Baker survey, to wit: 700 - the distance
 east from S.E. corner of White labor to point north of N.E. corner of Rod-
 riguez survey - plus 2000 vs - the length of N. line of said Rodriguez
 survey. As already shown, that line was out about 100 vs short of
 that length by connection with lone pine bearing tree. So that 2000 vs east
 from last mentioned corner of Moody survey will use N.E. corner of the
 Rodriguez survey as far as the N. line of Moody is short, so without 100
 vs. But as the last line of Baker and East line of Rodriguez surveys are
 one and the same, and was doubtless identified by the surveyor making the
 Moody survey, this interior corner of the Moody survey should be at the
 N.E. corner of said Rodriguez survey, where the two lines intersect each
 other.
 (14) Running South with Baker 435 vs to N.E. corner of Kewitt survey. I
 think that the Moody should follow the East line of Rodriguez survey till
 it reaches the N.E. corner of Baker survey, then follow said Baker line to
 N.W. corner of Kewitt survey, and then follow all other lines called for,
 on to the beginning of the said Moody survey.
 (15) I find that it takes a greater variation to follow lines of said
 Rodriguez and Baker surveys than it takes to follow lines of surveyors pa-
 low the Moody survey on Big Little Cypress creeks, and that such varia-
 tion is about the same that it takes to follow the first East line of the
 said Moody survey, to wit: 0. Respectfully submitted.

579190

Wm. H. ...
 July 27 07

The State of Texas *
County of Harris *

I, Samuel E. Packard, Deputy County Surveyor

of Harris County, Texas, do hereby certify that

I have examined the foregoing statement and explanation carefully, and I find the statement to be accurately true, the explanation to be clear and the conclusions logical and fair to all concerned, from the facts in the case.

This 12th day of August A.D. 1909.

Samuel E. Packard

Deputy County Surveyor, Harris Co. Texas.

I, Geo. F. Horton, County Surveyor of Harris county, Texas, hereby approve the above certificate.

This 12th day of Aug. 1909.

Geo. F. Horton

County Surveyor, Harris County, Texas.

(Handwritten notes and signatures in the left margin, including the number '100' and various illegible scribbles.)

(Handwritten circled letter 'a')

(Handwritten 'C5' in the bottom left corner.)

24

3

File No. SF 9190

Harris County

School Land
R. B. Barrow & others

Survey Statement &c

Filed August 27/1909

J. T. Robison
Com'r.

P. L. Hamilton
File Clerk. *per Clerk*

James E. Gorman

[Signature]

The State of Texas
County of Harris
I, James E. Gorman, Deputy County Surveyor
of Harris County, Texas, do hereby certify that

and that to all concerned, from the facts in the
and that to all concerned, from the facts in the

County Surveyor of Harris County, Texas, hereby

County Surveyor, Harris County, Texas.

APPLICATION AND OBLIGATION TO PURCHASE SCHOOL LAND WITHOUT SETTLEMENT

Houston, Texas, Nov. 12th 1909

To the Commissioner of the General Land Office, Austin, Texas:

I hereby apply to purchase under the provisions of the Act of May 16, 1907, relating to the sale of school land without settlement and the reservation of minerals, the following land or timber, or both, situated in Harris County, Texas, about See field notes in file miles (give course) 2 1/2 miles in from the county site; and I agree to pay for said land ~~or timber, or both~~, the price specified below:

SECTION	BLOCK	TOWNSHIP	CERTIFICATE	GRANTEE	ACRES	PRICE PER ACRE		CLASSIFICATION
						LAND	TIMBER	
<u>156</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>R. H. Barrow</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>4.00</u>		<u>Grazing</u>

I am over twenty-one years of age. (One under twenty-one years of age may purchase for cash.)

For the purpose of securing said land I hereby represent that I am buying it for agricultural or grazing purposes only, and if it is classed as mineral land the sale to me is upon the express condition that the minerals therein shall be and are reserved to the fund to which the land belongs, and to all of which I agree. I have remitted to the State Treasurer, Austin, Texas, the sum of \$ 68.00 Sixty Eight Dollars as the full cash payment therefor, and subscribe to the following oath, to wit:

(Insert whether "full" or "one-fortieth.")

I, R. H. Barrow, do solemnly swear that I desire the land for my own benefit and not for any other person or corporation.

R. H. Barrow

Applicant.

Postoffice _____

Sworn to and subscribed before me, this the 12th day of November A.D., 1909

R. E. Murrell

Notary Public Harris County, Texas.
(Officer must not omit seal.)

NOTE.—If applicant pays all cash he should tear off the obligation below.

~~OBLIGATION~~

~~§ _____ School lands~~

For value received, I, the undersigned, do promise to pay to the State of Texas the sum of _____ Dollars, with interest thereon as hereinafter specified, the same being for balance of purchase money for the following described tract of land, purchased by me, this day, of the State of Texas, in accordance with the provisions of Title LXXXVII, Chapter 12A, of the Revised Civil Statutes of 1895, and the amendments thereto by the Act of May 19, 1897, and the acts relating to the sale and lease of Public Free School and Asylum lands, approved April 19, 1901, April 15, 1905, and May 16, 1907, to wit: _____ of Section No. _____, Block _____, Township _____ Certificate _____, Grantee _____, situated in _____ County, Texas.

The annual interest of five per cent upon all unpaid principal, together with one-fortieth of the original principal, I am to pay or cause to be paid to the State Treasurer, at Austin, Travis County, Texas, on or before the 1st day of each November thereafter, until the whole purchase money is paid. And it is expressly understood that I am to comply strictly with all the conditions, limitations and requirements, and am subject to and accept all the penalties contained and prescribed in the above recited acts.

Witness my hand, this _____ day of _____, 190_____

Postoffice _____

SF 9, 190
File No. 9, 190

Harris County,

R. H. Barrow
Appl. and Oblig.

Filed 11-15- 1909

J. S. Stacker
Commissioner.

J. A. Hutchins
File Clerk.

124/14 No.

APPLICATION OF

R. H. Barrow

P. O. Houston - Texas
218. M. Houston Ave

WITHOUT SETTLEMENT

Survey No.	Certificate	GRANTEE
<u>156</u>		
Block	Township	

In Harris County

Filed Nov 15 1909

J. S. Stacker
Commissioner General Land Office.

Awarded Nov 17 1909

Rejected 190.....

J. S. Stacker
Commissioner General Land Office.

Boll.....
 Class.....
 Appr'm't.....
 Appl'n.....
 Obligation.....
 Seal.....
 Map.....
 Lease.....
 On Market.....



RECEIVED \$ 680
NOV 15 1909 am
REFERRED TO ACCOUNTS
PAGE..... LINE.....

500 Pat Fee
11/15/09
R. H. Barrow



General Land Office

State of Texas

November 8, 1909.

Austin

JOHN J. TERRELL, COMMISSIONER

J. T. ROBISON, CHIEF CLERK

Mr. R. H. Barrow,
Houston, Texas.

Dear Sir:-

Harris

Your application to the county surveyor of
county, for a survey of land under Section 8 of the Act of April 15, 1905,
together with the field notes for Survey No. ²⁵⁶, Block No. ¹⁰,
acres, has been examined and the field notes approved.

Grazing

\$4.00 The land is classified as _____ and valued at
per acre, and is subject to sale to you upon the following terms,

to wit:

The land is subject to sale to you for cash only. When
you make your application to purchase this land for cash only, and
send same to this office you must at the same time send the aggregate
price of the land as full cash payment thereon, and send to this
office a patent fee of \$5.00. You should send patent fees separate
from the payment.

Enclosed herewith is a blank for application to purchase this
land. To avoid delays, mistakes and correspondence you are urged to
fill every blank space in making out the application to purchase. Under
the law you will have SIXTY DAYS from this date within which to file your
application to purchase in this office.

In writing about this matter please refer to S. F. No. 9190.

Very respectfully,

Nolen

Commissioner.

File 9190

5F 9190

General Land Office

November 8, 1902

State of Texas



Mr. R. H. Barrow,
Houston, Texas.

Harris

Your application to the county surveyor of
county, for a surveyed land under Section 8 of the Act of April 15, 1902,
together with the field notes for survey No. [redacted] Block No. [redacted]
acres, has been examined and the field notes approved.

Granting

The land is classified as [redacted] and valued at [redacted]
per acre, and is subject to sale to you upon the following terms:

The land is subject to sale to you for cash only. When
you make your application to purchase this land for cash only, and
send same to this office you must at the same time send [redacted]
price of the land as full cash payment thereon, and send to this
office a patent fee of \$5.00. You should send patent fees separate
from the payment.

Enclosed herewith is a blank for application to purchase this
land. To avoid delay, mistakes and correspondence you are urged to
fill every blank space in making out the application to purchase. Under
the law you will have SIXTY DAYS from this date within which to file your
application to purchase in this office.

In writing about this matter please refer to S. F. No. 9190.

Very respectfully,

John

Commissioner.

3F-9190

LEDGER 90PAGE 466

Duplicate Award and Receipt

FILE NO. 89 9190GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
AUSTIN, TEXAS.Date of Award Nov 17, 1909

WHEREAS,

R. H. Barrow
Houston, Texas, has, in the manner and form prescribed
 by law, filed in this office an application and obligation to purchase the following land, to-wit:

Section	Block	Township	Certificate	GRANTEE	Acres	Price	County
<u>156</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>89 9190</u>	<u>R. H. Barrow</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>4⁰⁰</u>	<u>Harris</u>

Date of Sale Nov 15/09

And the State having received \$ 68⁰⁰ as first cash
 payment thereon, I do hereby award to said applicant the survey of
 land described above.

Amount of Note XRate of Interest X per cent.

SCHOOL LAND.

J. H. Stalder
Acty Commissioner General Land Office.

Duplicate Award and Receipt

File No. *919*

LEDGER *90*

PAGE *110*

GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
AUSTIN, TEXAS.

Date of Award

19

WHEREAS,

of _____, Texas, has, in the manner and form prescribed
by law, filed in this office an application and obligation to purchase the following land, to-wit:

Section	Block	Township	Certificate	GRANTEE	Acres	Price	County
<i>130</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>W. H. ...</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>...</i>	<i>...</i>

Date of Sale

Amount of Note

Rate of Interest
per cent.

And the State having received \$ _____
payment thereon, I do hereby award to said applicant the survey of
land described above.

Commissioner General Land Office

SCHOOL LAND.

919
FS
2