

1152.

APPROVAL, BONDS OF WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, MONROE COUNTY
OHIO—\$8,000.00.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, October 14, 1927.

Retirement Board, State Teachers' Retirement System, Columbus, Ohio.

1153.

DISAPPROVAL, ABSTRACT OF TITLE TO LAND IN THE VILLAGE OF
POINT PLEASANT, CLERMONT COUNTY, OHIO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, October 15, 1927.

HON. GEORGE F. SCHLESINGER, *Director of Highways and Public Works, Columbus, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR:—You have submitted an abstract of title, certified under date of September 20, 1927, by N. G. Cover, abstractor of Batavia, Ohio, which is accompanied by an encumbrance estimate and a deed, all covering Inlot 28, Fraction Lot No. 28 and 20 feet off of Fraction Lot No. 29, fronting on Indian Street and adjoining Fraction Lot No. 28, being all the remaining portion of said Fraction Lot No. 29, not conveyed by James M. Thompson to M. C. Hirsch by deed of December 22, 1856, all of which property is in the Village of Point Pleasant, Clermont County, Ohio, standing in the name of Lawyer W. and Loretta Clark.

An examination of the abstract of title discloses the following:

1. The property is a part of a survey in 1788 for Lawrence Butler in Military Warrant No. 199, but there is no patent of record to Lawrence Butler, and, in fact, there is no patent of record from the Government covering this land.

2. Nancy H. Thompson acquired the property under consideration in 1855. In 1857 she deeded Lot No. 28 and Fraction Lot No. 28 to J. M. Thompson. Nevertheless, James M. Thompson in 1863 conveyed to Thomas Peterson Lot No. 28, Fraction Lot No. 28 and 20 feet off of Fraction Lot No. 29, without ever having acquired the title to Fraction Lot No. 29 from Nancy Thompson, so far as is disclosed by the abstract. The abstractor says, that after diligent search, he is unable to find where Nancy Thompson or her representatives ever conveyed Fraction Lot No. 29. I suggest that affidavits be secured showing that James M. Thompson and his successors acquired title by adverse possession, if such be the fact; or that other evidence of title be obtained if possible.

3. In 1875, a group of persons, mainly of the Peterson family and recited in the caption of the abstractor's notes to be the heirs-at-law of Thomas Peterson, conveyed the property under consideration to James Peterson. No data is found in the abstract respecting the death of Thomas Peterson or the administration of his estate. It is