

July 13, 1950

Looney, Clark & Moorhead
Attorneys at Law
Brown Building
Austin, Texas

Attention: Mr. R. Dean Moorhead

Gentlemen:

By letter, dated June 23, 1950, you submitted for my consideration a copy of the proposed judgment in Cause No. 3336 in the District Court of Jackson County, styled Wharton County vs. Colorado County.

With their letter, dated June 26, 1950, there was received from Massey, Hodges & Moore, Attorneys at Law, Columbus, Texas, a copy of this proposed judgment with the request that the instrument be signed and returned to them should the boundary description be found to be correct as to technical aspects.

The boundary description has been examined by me and approved as to technical aspects. I have therefore signed the copy of the proposed judgment submitted by Massey, Hodges & Moore, and have returned this instrument to them. I believe my action conforms with the request contained in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

BASCOM GILES, COMMISSIONER
OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE

JC:ow

D89

Quinta

Notes

RECEIVED

FEB 11 1954

REFERRED TO MAP

JOHN A. HANCHER
COUNTY JUDGE, COLORADO COUNTY
COLUMBUS, TEXAS

February 10, 1954

The Honorable Bascom Giles
Commissioners of the General Land Office
The General Land Office
Austin, Texas

Dear Mr. Giles:

In May of 1950 a boundary dispute between Wharton County and Colorado County was tried in the District Court of Jackson County, in Cause No. 3336, styled Wharton County vs. Colorado County, and judgment was rendered in favor of Wharton County. This judgment re-established and located the true boundary line between the two counties in the area between the Colorado River and the San Bernard River, and described such re-established boundary.

I wish to inquire as to whether or not your records have been corrected as to the land in the various surveys in Colorado County along this boundary line, in accordance with such judgment fixing the location of the Colorado County-Wharton County boundary line.

Mr. Henry J. Hajovsky, Tax Assessor-Collector of Colorado County, advises me that the corrections are not indicated in the Supplemental Index to Abstracts issued by the General Land Office.

The judgment directs that the disputed boundary shall be re-surveyed, according to the description of the line as contained in the judgment, and that certified copies of such re-survey field notes and map shall be submitted to the General Land Office. This re-survey has not been made. However, since the judgment itself fixes the boundary line and sets forth a description of same, I believe that your records can be corrected by reference to this judgment.

I will appreciate it if you will advise me as to whether or not your records in this matter have been corrected, and if not, whether they can be corrected by reference to the above mentioned judgment.

Yours truly,

John A. Hancher
John A. Hancher
County Judge

JAH:efs
cc: Mr. Henry J. Hajovsky
Tax Assessor-Collector
Columbus, Texas

- February 26, 1954

Hon. John A. Hancher
County Judge, Colorado County
Columbus, Texas

Dear Judge Hancher:

Thank you for your letter of February 10, 1954, pertaining to the County boundary between Wharton and Colorado Counties. Copy of Cause No. 3336, District Court of Jackson County, Texas, styled Wharton County vs. Colorado County, has been furnished this office by Mr. R. Dean Moorhead of Austin, Texas.

You are advised that the records of this office have not as yet been corrected to conform with the aforementioned judgment and that the abstract volumes have not been altered to conform with same. However, after reviewing the language of the judgment I am of the opinion that our records can be altered at this time. The official County maps in the General Land Office will be altered to conform to said judgment, and the Abstract Clerk will be instructed to correct the abstracts on the following surveys to show each of them to be entirely within Wharton County:

Morris Cumings Survey No. 23; E L & R R Ry. Co. Survey 1; John Linderholm 1/2 section; G. G. Kelley 1/4 section; C. E. Hodson survey No. 18; G H & H Ry. Co. Section 17; A. J. Fry Section 16; G H & H Ry. Co. Section 15; City of San Antonio survey; A. J. Fry Section 10; G H & H Ry. Co. Section 1; Chas. Boyd Section 2; G H & H Ry. Co. Section 3; R. M. Moore Section 4 and C. W. Fritz survey.

Although there is a copy of said judgment in Cause No. 3336, District Court of Jackson County, in this office, it would be appreciated if you would furnish us with a certified copy of said judgment in order that it might be properly filed.

I note that this judgment establishes the boundary line on the now recognized boundary line of individual survey lines. In the event that future surveying in the area reveals that the "now recognized boundary line" of the said individual surveys is not the true

Hon. John A. Hancher

-2-

February 26, 1954

boundary our records will be altered to reflect such fact, if and when the necessary reports are made to this office.

When the abstract volumes have been corrected in this office to conform with said judgment, the County Tax Assessors and Collectors of said counties will be notified.

Trusting this information will be of assistance to you,

Sincerely yours,

BASCOM GILES, COMMISSIONER
OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE

JAS-ewr

cc- Hon. Dorman Nickels
Co. Judge
Wharton, Texas

Looney, Clark & Moorhead
Attn: R. D. Moorhead
Brown Bldg.
Austin, Texas

1a

2

Wharton Co. Line -

cont. 61745