

Philip van Cortlandt (One of his Britannic Majesty's Council for the Province of New York) On the 1st of August 1746 made & published his Last Will and Testament - By which Among other things, he devised to his son Pierre (as by Reference to the extract herewith sent) South Lot Number One of the Manor of Cortlandt - He departed this life about the year 1748 leaving his sons Stephen and Pierre surviving him - Pierre went into the possession of the Lands so devised to him -

Pierre (The late Lieutenant Governor) on the 5th day of December 1805 made and published his Last Will and Testament in due form of Law to prob. Real Estate and on the 1st day of March 1811 he duly made and published a Codicil to his said Will by which he devised to his son Pierre, all the Land and waters mentioned in the said Codicil Reference to the Codicil to the Will, appears - to his son Pierre in fee simple -

Let Gov^r Pierre van Cortlandt. departed this life May 1st 1814 leaving his sons Philip & Pierre and Three Daughters. At the time of his death his son Philip was in possession of that part of the farm in the said Codicil mentioned and devised to his son Pierre and continued so up to the time of his death claiming Title thereto - and by his Last Will and Testament devised the same to his Brother Pierre with holding from him the possession thereof untill 1836 -

What Estate did Lt. Gov^r Pierre van Cortlandt take in the said Farm at Croton River under the will of his Father Philip van Cortlandt after the passing the Acts abolishing Entails? Did not his Estate

become a fee simple absolute in the said premises?
Q. Does not George Quire have Cortlandt under the
leasehold to his father's will take the said farm
in fee simple? —

George Chiles has Cortlandt the son of John Quire
Quire has Cortlandt since the 2^d day of October
1831 - leaving no legal issue —

If the description by entail under the will
of Chiles has Cortlandt (the land was devised)
by the Act abolishing entails — what estate had
the late George Chiles has Cortlandt in the farm at
Cortlandt since under the will of his Grand father
the late Chiles has Cortlandt or rather the late
John Quire has Cortlandt —

It is intended that the Act for abolishing entails ~~shall~~
not give the late John Quire has Cortlandt the farm at
Cortlandt in fee simple — Now the leasehold to George
Chiles has Cortlandt will prevent that his nephew Chiles
"John Wight and family have the possession and occupation
of my house and farm whereon I now reside and receive the
profits thereof until the year 1836" give John Wight
just right that he can use the said farm to the injury
thereof by suffering it to be tiled on houses by every
who wishes to do it? —

Does John Wight obligate to keep up the dikes around
the meadows which are a part of the said farm whereon the
water makes a breach through them to the great injury
and ruin of the meadows, for by suffering the river water
to remain on them during the past year and bring them
back to a state of nature & worse —

How can George Quire have Cortlandt come Chiles
has Wight to receive the dikes around the meadows which
are already much injured & if suffered to remain in the
state, from the water lying on them, the meadows will
be entirely ruined or it respects the fresh grass ~~which~~
before the year 1836 — Or whether John Quire has Cortlandt
can prevent John Wight allowing water to fill the said
farm or houses to the injury thereof? Consider that claims of the
leasehold to the will of George Chiles has Cortlandt preventing his
nephew John Wight and family to have the possession and
occupation thereof and receiving the profits until the year 1836 —
If John Quire has Cortlandt has the right of preventing
the farm to be so injured & misused — What is his remedy
against John Wight? —

Questions
Asked to be
answered

Genl. V. Gorkhandt -