

Kansas City mo Feby. 12th 1867

Hon^{ble} L. V. Boggs.

Com^r Indian Affairs

Dear Sir. I write to

Call your Special attention. To a Contest. between
Two adverse Claimants. To a Tract of Land. that
did belong to "Eli Blackhoof a Shawnee Indian"
one of whom Williamson has now a Deed in the Indⁿ
office. from Blackhoof. that he is urging. the approval
of by the Department. The facts are these (of which
you will ^{find} papers in the office. forwarded. 18 months ago
fully setting them forth) on the 3^d day of March. 1860
Eli Blackhoof. sold to Julius Fairfield. his son in Law
the NE 1/4 Sec 23. Tp 12 R 24. for the sum of \$1200. so he paid
3^d of March 1867. for which Fairfield gave his note. & Blackhoof
Executed. a Title Bond. ack^d & Recorded Apr 22^d 1860. to make
Fairfield a Deed. on the payment of the said \$1200. in pursuance
of said purchase. Fairfield went on the Land. Expended in
valuable & lasting improvements as much as \$500. to \$800.
Continued on it for several years. When in the danger of the
Civil war "being on the border" he left for Denver. leaving

a Lessee on the place, to whom he afterwards sold his interest & transferred Title Bond. It so happened in drawing up the Bond, & note, there was an Error, the note was drawn payable on the day of its date 3^d march 1860. Williamson found out the mistake, told Blackhoof his note was outlawed & with that alone before the agt got a deed from Blackhoof to the same Land or $\frac{3}{4}$ of it, for \$500. & has the deed now in the Indian office & is urging its approval. I assert as a fact, that I know, that prior to Williamson buying said Land, he waited on me, to get me to make his deed when I told him explicitly that, the note was not due untill 3^d of march 1867, of which he could satisfy himself by examining the Bond, on Record. But with a full knowledge of the fact, he went on has a deed from B. had it acknowledged before agt Abbott, & with his Certificate & that of Chiefs, sent it on & is now urging its approval at Washington. he afterwards instituted a Suit under his Deed for possession, of the Land, filed a Bill to reform the Bond, & make it agree in date with the note, &c. we filed a cross Bill in answer

alleging the Bond to contain the true date of paymt
also defended. Suit for possession, in both of which
Williamson was beat. the Court decreeing the reformation
of note to conform to the Bond, as true date of paymt
3^d march 1867. Fairfield, Lessee & Assignee is in possession
now the \$1200. purchase money is now in Bank. for Blackhoof
If the Deed from Blackhoof to Williamson, now on file
in your office. Should be approved. It would define
Blackhoof of the difference between \$500. & \$1200.

It would be a gross fraud upon Fairfield &
his Assignee. perpetrated by Williamson with a full
knowledge of the fact. It will involve a long law suit
in which (as I believe) whatever you may do advise to
Fairfield's claim there. Fairfield will compel a
Decree. of Title, in him & that Williamson holds as trustee
for the Equitable owner. If you will look over all the
papers in your office pertaining to this case are
satisfied. you will return. Williamson's Deed without
approval. the party I represent are willing to leave it
to any impartial arbitrator, the Dist Court has

in the County has already decided in favor of our
title & advice to Williamson in his suit already
decided. If you will examine in your office
you will find all the facts referred to in an official
shape. Blackhoof has offered & is now willing to
refund Williamson his money & interest & perfect
title to Fairfield agreeably to his obligation.

Yours Truly J. H. H. H.

Chambers & Co
107 N. 4th St
St. Louis City - Mo.
Sept 18 1867

Call attention to the
condition between the
adverse claimants (the
claimant & the trustee)
(a certain tract of land
in the town of St. Louis
Blackhoof & Chambers
claimant & the trustee
claimant regarding the
same)

Warrant

