

University of North Dakota UND Scholarly Commons

Usher Burdick Papers

Elwyn B. Robinson Department of Special Collections

12-2-1952

Letter from Nelson Mason to William Zimmerman Regarding Land Patents, December 2, 1952

Nelson Mason

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.und.edu/burdick-papers

Recommended Citation

Mason, Nelson, "Letter from Nelson Mason to William Zimmerman Regarding Land Patents, December 2, 1952" (1952). *Usher Burdick Papers*. 442.

https://commons.und.edu/burdick-papers/442

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Elwyn B. Robinson Department of Special Collections at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Usher Burdick Papers by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.commons@library.und.edu.

BISMARCK

In re: Fetent 1133027 024787 LUD: SCW Patent 1133570 024831

Mr. William Zimmerman, Jr. Associate Director Bureau of Land Management Department of the Interior Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Zimmerman: A letter from Richland County, N.D. state's attorney reads: "Mr. Junfar, our Register of Deeds, has turned over to me his correspondence with you concerning Government patents on certain lands in Richland County. I have gone over the descriptions outlined in your letter of May 17 and can see reason for funfar's position.

" I assume that these descriptions are intended to describe a strip of lots lying along the S. D. boundary line and within the limits of the old Sisseton and Sabpeton Indian Reservation. If the Register of Deeds indexed these patents in accordance with the present descriptions, they would show up in the Court House records against land which lies one to two miles north of the state boundary line and outside of the Indian Reservation boundary. If you have access to a plat showing the townships of Richland County, I can give you one or two examples to explain Funfar's predicament.

"In one of the Patents you have described Lots 1-2-3-4 in Section 29, Township 129 Range 50 West. If you will look at the plat of Elma Township in Richland County, you will find a Section 29, Township 129, Range 50. This is a fractional section lying along the north boundary line of the Lake Traverse Lands which identifies the former Indian Reservation. This particular Section 29 includes Lots 1-2-7-2, which together have a total acreage of about eighty-five acres. This obviously is not the land you intend to describe. You obviously have in mind those four small lots which total about eight acres and lie immediately south of Section 20, Township 129, Range 50, Lake Traverse Lands, and which torder the state boundary.

"Funfar feels that in order to index these Patents against the land intended to be described, some language will have to be added to the description in the Patent indicating that the property lies in the Lake Traverse Lands area, which is the old Sisseton and Wahpeton Reservation. You may recall that you and I had some correspondence about a similar matter a couple of years ago. In that case the Government Land Office had not indicated in the patent that the property was within the Lake Traverse Lands area. However, in that particular case, there was no duplication of section numbers within the same township and range Congressional township.

"Unless some modification is made in the description in these instruments. the Register of Deeds does not know how he can show them against the property which you are endeavoring to describe. If you have any suggestions, our Register of Deeds will be glad to take whatever steps he can to comply with your wishes.

> "Yours truly, (Signed) Pat Milloy State's Attorney

It is hoped that Mr. Willoy's summary and conclusions may be helpful in getting the legal descriptions in order to justify the issuance of two appropriate

Thanks Asker Sales