

Berlin - Nov. 4 - 09

Dear James -

I send you 'The Patent for Mt. Vernon - and some other papers. The farm embraces other tracts on the South and West, Judge Robins having willed in 1826 4000 acres there extending to Duffield's mill on West, and to Bay shore on South - and his son John to our sorrow needed with Scotland farm, the land on county road, which land his father did get with Scotland and Spalden. You can use the papers, but I want them returned, as we prize the Patent. We have nothing from King or Queen. I have a receipt to Thos. Robins for "Father's Love" and "Spalden" 1749; and the old Full Road was his outlet, and

has been used by farm ever  
since - Don't give it up.

The cedar Linn road was the  
only <sup>counter</sup> road to Snow Hill in  
Judge Robins' day - as proved  
by copy of resurvey of "none-  
such" I have - & my father's  
deed for same at Ed Johnson's  
place. If you don't fence off  
the road you own, P. will get  
an outlet across you, and for-  
bid your crossing him to Lule  
road. That is a better road if  
cut out - a high, dry road.

~~We~~ Try to get P. to agree.

Your cousin W. found that we  
were in the hands of unscrupulous  
lawyers, who were  
bent upon keeping the  
matter in Court - and  
Judge Pearce wrote me the  
case was liable to be return-  
ed to Court of Appeals.

3.  
I send Platt. Mrs. Harrison says  
if you decide to keep it, pay her  
what it is worth to you.

Even that court showed ig-  
norance of facts in saying  
that "John Robins owned a  
tract of land called Mt.  
Vernon he could not deny."

Judge Robins patented  
Mt. Vernon.

Again that court ruled  
that "John R. Turnelle was  
not competent to show  
Fairfield lines because  
he was Guardian for B.  
& Wm. Robins." Now he was  
ordered to "sell the timber  
for benefit of minors" -

How, I ask, was he to sell  
without proving lines?

I say even the higher court  
show gross ignorance, or else  
is under political influence.

on 350 acres

Again Tilghman bought timber,  
before suit; and not being able  
to pay all, gave note for \$4,000.;  
and Loosvine tried to make jury  
think this was value of timber in  
dispute - so they were asking to  
have the amount paid in Court -  
and Court of Appeals back their  
Prayer to allow jury to charge  
interest - so you see if an igno-  
rant jury should go against us.  
The cost on timber would be 4, or 5  
Thousand dollars. And my son with  
these facts, and my broken health  
from 6 years of worry, thought best to  
compromise. You are just as you  
were if suit had been lost. We  
would have been at least \$4,000.  
out of pocket. But I'm surprised  
at other side, and tremble for  
dishonesty. May God be merciful  
to them! Hoping all are  
well. Your cousin

E. A. Robeson