

No 7.

Wm. Tucker, et al.

vs

Choctaw Nation

No 93. (See No 61.)

Central Dist. Court.

No

Dawes Commission.

Proceedings in

N.S. Court,

Glenn-Tucker n.a. No 7.

- + Margaret Goldsbrough, or Margant Goldsbrough
- + Agnes Goldsbrough or Agnes Lavinia Goldsbrough
- + Wm A. Goldsbrough or Wm Alexis Goldsbrough

Urra P. Goldsbrough

- + Emma V. Goldsbrough or Emma Viola Goldsbrough

Nannie Z. Goldsbrough

- + Eliza J. Glenn, or Eliza Glenn

~~John C. Glenn~~

- + Joseph B. Tucker

- + Elizabeth Tucker

- + Edward Tucker

- + Wm W. Tucker, or William W. Tucker

- + Oscar Tucker, or Oscar S. Tucker

- + Joseph S. Tucker

- + Cicie Harris (nee Cicie Tucker) or Cicie Harris

- + Robert P. Tucker

- + James C. Glenn

- + Mary Ida Glenn

- + Pettis L. Glenn

- + Walter J. Glenn

- + Herbert L. Glenn, or Hubert L. Glenn

- + James W. Glenn

- + Tanny Parkinson, or Lanny Parkinson

- + Wm D. Parkinson, or William Day Parkinson

- + Winerva R. Parkinson

- + Andrew J. Parkinson, or Andrew Jackson Parkinson

Glenn-Tucker

- + Tisha B. Parkinson
- + Melvin Parkinson
- + John J. Parkinson, or John P. Parkinson
- + Fanny Chapman, or Fannie Chapman
- + Wm B. Chapman, or William B. Chapman
- + Mattie Chapman
- + Wm Chapman, or William Chapman
- + Etie Chapman
- + Frank Chapman
- + Beulah Chapman
- + Lillie Barnes or Lily Barnes
- + Viola Lightle
- + J. W. Lightle
- + Elizabeth Lightle
- + Lillie Barnes or Lillie Barnes
- + Della R. Lightle or Della Ray Lightle
- + Charles R. Lightle
- + Catherine Hill or Catherine Hill
- + Clementina E. Hill, or Clementina E. Hill
- + Esther M. Hill
- + Elmer Hill
- + Augusta Hill
- + Eunice Hill
- + Leonidas V. Hill, ^{or Fernida V. Hill} ~~or Fernida R. Hill~~
- + Lawrence M. Hill, or Lawrence M. Hill
- + Margaret J. Goforth, or Margaret J. Goforth
- + Wm B. Goforth, or W. B. Goforth
- + Flora Champion or Flora Companion
- + Beulah Champion or Beula Companion

- + Floyd Campion or Floyd Companion
- + Esley M. Goforth, or Esley M. Goforth
- + Margarett E. Choate
- + Wm Choate or William B. Choate
- + Oscar Choate
- + Arthur Choate
- + Ethel Choate
- ~~Marjorie D.~~
- + Edward Tucker
- + Amanda Tucker
- + Marshal Tucker
- + Melvin Tucker
- + Thomas Tucker
- + Letitia Adams, or Letitia N. Adams
- + Julius H. Adams
- + Maudie L. Adams
- + Grace P. Adams
- + Letitia B. Adams
- + Joseph N. Adams or Joseph M. Adams
- + Sarah E. Barnes
- + Daniel M. Barnes
- + James B. Barnes
- + Barnes (wife of James B. Barnes)
- + J. R. Barnes or H. R. Barnes
- + J. A. Barnes
- + Lillie E. Loyd or Lily E. Loyd
- + Nora B. Barnes
- + J. E. Barnes
- + John R. Barnes

- + James C. Loyd
- + Alfred B. ~~Barnes~~ Barnes
- ~~James C. Barnes~~
- + Margarett A. Hulsey
- + H. L. Hulsey or Henry Hulsey
- + C. B. Hulsey, or Charles Hulsey
- + Wm J. Hulsey, or Joseph Hulsey
- + Almedia A. Thompson (ne Almedia A. Hulsey) ^{or Almedia Hulsey}
- + Cora Hulsey
- + Harlis Hulsey, or Harless Hulsey
- + Mary Barnes
- + Joseph B. Barnes, or Joseph Barnes
- + Ira Barnes
- + Eva Barnes
- + Charles Barnes
- + Robert Barnes
- + Robert Barnes
- + Barnes (wife of Robert Barnes)
- + Robert M. Barnes
- + Emma Barnes
- + Mary Wells Barnes
- + Wm Edward Barnes, or William Edward Barnes
- + Joseph M. Barnes, or Joseph Martin Barnes
- + Neomi Ethel Barnes, or Naomi Ethel Barnes
- + Nancy Dyer
- + Wm Dyer or William Dyer
- + Joseph Goforth
- + Maudie Dyer
- + Bonnie Dyer

- + Roy Dyer
- + Willie Dyer
- + Amanda McCall
- + Robert McCall
- + Ida A. McCall
- + Ella U. McCall
- + Mary E. Wolfington
- + Alfred R. Wolfington
- + Bertha Wolfington
- + Josephine Davis, or Joseph Davis
- + Lee Davis
- + Alice Davis
- + Amanda Davis

In the United States Court at South
McAlester, Central Judicial District of
The Indian Territory.

In the matter of Joseph B. Glenn, et al
Claimants to Citizenship, Appellants,

vs.

Petition.

Choctaw Tribenof Indians, Appellees.

Come now the following named petitioners, and present this their
joint petition and respectfully show to the court the following, to-
wit:-

(1) That your petitioner Joseph B. Glenn is a one eighth Choctaw In-
dian and seven eighths white man, and that he is the lawful descen-
dant and son of Dave Glenn, deceased, who was a one fourth Choctaw
i-Indian and who was the legal descendant and son of Abigail Glenn
deceased. That your petitioner Nevada E. Glenn is a white woman and
is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Joseph B.

Glenn and that Jane E. Glenn and William B. Glenn are the lawful
and minor children of the aforesaid Joseph B. Glenn and Nevada E.
Glenn.

(2) That your petitioner Margaret A. Edmiston is a one eighth Choct-
aw Indian and seven eighths white woman, and that is the lawful des-
cendant and daughter of Margaret Tucker deceased, who was a one fo-
urt Choctaw Indian, and who was the legal descendant and daughter of
the aforesaid Abigail Glenn. That your petitioner Leonidas C. Edmi-
ston is a white man and is lawfully married to and living with the
aforesaid Margaret A. Edmiston, and that Luther Edmiston is the law-
ful and minor child of the aforesaid Margaret A. Edmiston and Leon-
idas C. Edmiston.

(3) That your petitioner Benjamin F. Edmiston is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian, and fifteen sixteenths white man, and that he is the lawful descendant and son of the aforesaid Margaret A. Edmiston.

That your petitioner Lou Edmiston is a white woman, and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Benjamin F. Edmiston, and that Tony Edmiston is the lawful and minor child of the aforesaid Benjamin F. Edmiston and Lou Edmiston.

(4) That your petitioner, Mollie T. Ratterree is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenth white woman, and that she is the lawful descendant and daughter of the aforesaid Margaret A. Edmiston.

That your petitioner Thomas N. Ratterree is a white man, and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Mollie T. Ratterree, and that Ethel Ratterree and Medda Ratterree are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid Mollie T. Ratterree and Thomas N. Ratterree.

(5) That your petitioner, Martha Collins is a one thirty second Choctaw Indian and thirty one thirty seconds white woman, and that she is the lawful descendant and daughter of Edward Barnes, who was a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and who the lawful son and descendant of Polly Barnes, who was a one eighth Choctaw Indian and who was a one eighth Choctaw Indian and who was the lawful descendant and daughter of the aforesaid Margaret Tucker. That your petitioner, Hayden Collins is a white man, and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Martha Collins, and that James A. Collins is the lawful and minor child of the aforesaid Martha Collins and Hayden Collins.

(6) That your petitioner, William E. Barnes, is a one thirty second Choctaw Indian and thirty one thirtiyyseconds white man, and that he is the lawful descendant and son of Luke Barnes, who was a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian, and who was the lawful child and son of the above named Polly Barnes. That your petitioner, Mary Barnes, is a white woman, and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid William E. Barnes, and that Sherman Barnes is the lawful and minor child

minor child of the aforesaid William E. Barnes and Mary Barnes.

(7) That your petitioner Lillie Ann Stephens is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian, and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and that she was the lawful descendant and daughter of Elizabeth Martindale, who was a one eighth Choctaw Indian, and who was the lawful child and descendant of John Tucker and Margaret Tucker, each of whom was a one eighth Choctaw Indian, and that the said John Tucker was the lawful child and descendant of Abigail Glenn, and that the first mentioned Margaret Tucker, who was a one fourth Indian and who was the lawful child and descendant of Elizabeth Tucker, who was a one fourth Choctaw Indian, and who was the lawful child and descendant of Abigail Glenn, That your petitioner W. S. Stephens is a white man, and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Lillie Ann Stephens, and that Nannie L. Stephens, William F. Stephens, Harriet S. Stephens, Gertie Stephens, Charles A. Stephens, Lillion Stephens and Nancy E. Stephens are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid Lillie Ann Stephens and W. S. stephens.

(8) That your petitioner, L. D. Martindale is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white man, and that he is the lawful descendant and son of the aforesaid Elizabeth Martindale. That your petitioner Jeannette Martindale is a white woman and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid L. D. Martindale and that Martha A. Martindale, Albert W. Martindle, Leonidas Martindale, Willie L. Martindale, James A. Martindale and Johnnie J. Martindale, are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid L. D. Martindale and Jeannette Martindle.

(9) That your petitioner, Julia Baker, is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian, and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and that she is the lawful descendant of the aforesaid Elizabeth Martindale. That your petitioner, George W. Baker is a white man, and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Julia Baker.

(10) That your petitioner W. W. Sappington is a white man, and that he is lawfully married to Elizabeth Sappington, deceased, formerly Mrs. Elizabeth Martindale nee Tucker, who was a one eighth Choctaw Indian as above set forth, and that Charley R. Sappington and Eliza Sappington are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid, W.W. Sappington and Elizabeth Sappington, deceased.

(11) That your petitioner, John F. Glenn is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white man, and that he is the lawful descendant and son of the above mentioned, Joseph B. Glenn. That your petitioner, Nora Glenn is a white woman and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid, John F. Glenn.

(12) That your petitioner _____ Baggs is a one sixteenth Choctaw woman and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and that she is the lawful descendant and daughter of the aforesaid, Joseph B. Glenn. That your petitioner, John Baggs is a white man and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid _____ Baggs, and that _____ Baggs and _____ Baggs _____ Baggs are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid _____ Baggs and John Baggs.

(13) That your petitioner, _____ Brown is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and that she is the lawful descendant and daughter of the aforesaid, Joseph B. Glenn. That your petitioner Ody Brown is a white man and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid _____ HBrown, and that _____ Brown _____ Brown _____ Brown are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid _____ Brown and Ody Brown.

(14) That your petitioners Martha Ann French and Juda French, by their next friend Joseph B. Glenn, respectfully show that they are one sixteenth Choctaw Indians and fifteen sixteenths white children. That they are the lawful and minor children of Margaret French, deceased, and Pat French deceased, and that the aforesaid Margaret French was a one eighth Choctaw Indian and was the lawful descendant and daughter of the aforesaid Dave Glenn.

(15) That your petitioner, A. Frank Glenn is a one eighth Choctaw Indian and seven eighths white man, and that he is the lawful descendant and son of the aforesaid Dave Glenn. That your petitioner, Mandy Glenn is a white woman, and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid A. Frank Glenn, and that Annie B. Glenn and Sarah E. E. Glenn and Charlie S. Glenn are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid A. Frank Glenn, and Mandy Glenn.

(16) That your petitioner Charles A. Glenn is a one eighth Choctaw Indian and seven eighths white man/and that he is the lawful descendant and son of the aforesaid Dave Glenn. That your petitioners, James Glenn, Martha D. Glenn, Dave Glenn, Jr., Margaret S. Glenn, Levi F. Glenn and Ely H. Glenn are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid Charles A. Glenn.

(17) That your petitioner, William Tucker, is a one eighth Choctaw Indian and seven eighths white man, and that he is the lawful descendant and son of Polly or Mary Haggard, who was a one fourth Choctaw Indian and who was the lawful descendant and daughter of the aforesaid Abigail Glenn. That James Tucker is the lawful and minor son of the aforesaid William Tucker.

(18) That your petitioner, George Tucker, is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white man, and that he is the lawful descendant and son of the aforesaid William Tucker. That your petitioner William Tucker, Jr., is the minor child of the aforesaid George Tucker.

(19) That your petitioner, James Haggard, is a one eighth Choctaw Indian and seven eighths white man, and that he is the lawful descendant and son of the aforesaid Polly or Mary Haggard, deceased. That your petitioner William Haggard is the minor child of the aforesaid James Haggard.

(20) That your petitioner, Joseph Haggard, is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white man and that he is the lawful descendant and son of the aforesaid James Haggard. That your pe-

petitioner _____ Haggard is a white woman and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Joseph Haggard and that _____

_____ Haggard is a white woman and is lawfully married and living with the aforesaid, Joseph Haggard, and that _____ Haggard and _____ Haggard are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid Joseph Haggard and _____ Haggard.

(21) That your petitioner, Margaret M. Baker is a white woman and was lawfully married to John Haggard, deceased. That the said John Haggard was a one eighth Choctaw Indian and seven eighths white man, and was the lawful descendant and son of the aforesaid Polly or Mary Haggard. That your petitioners, John R. Haggard, Lewis R. Haggard, Louemma G. Haggard, are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid Margaret M. Baker and John Haggard deceased.

(22) That your petitioner, Endy Hailey, is a white woman and was lawfully married to Henry Haggard, deceased. That the aforesaid, Henry Haggard was the lawful descendant of and son of the aforesaid Polly or Mary Haggard, and was a one eighth Choctaw Indian and seven eighths white man. That your petitioner John Haggard is the minor child of the aforesaid Endy Hailey and John Haggard, deceased.

(23) That your petitioner, Georgie Ann Wilkerson, is a one thirty second Choctaw Indian and thirty one thirty seconds white woman and is the lawful descendant and daughter of Robert Tucker, deceased, who was a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and who was the lawful descendant and son of Julia Ann Tucker who was a one eighth Choctaw Indian and who was the lawful daughter and descendant of Johnathan Glenn, who was a one fourth Choctaw Indian and who was the lawful son of the aforesaid Abigail Glenn. That your petitioner, Andy C. Wilkerson is a white man and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Georgeann Wilkerson, and that Florence I. M. Wilkerson is the lawful and minor child of the aforesaid Georgia Ann Wilkerson and Andy C. Wilkerson.

(24) That your petitioner, James McCall is a one thirty second Choctaw Indian

taw Indian and thirty one thirty seconds white man, and that he is the lawful descendant and son of Mandy McCall who was a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and who was the lawful daughter of Francis Barnes who was a one eighth Choctaw Indina and who was the lawful child and descendant of the before mentioned Elizabeth Tucker. That your petitioner, Pruda A. McCall is a white woman and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid James McCall, and that Merty McCall John McCall, and Darthula McCall are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid James McCall and Pruda A. McCall.

(25) That your petitioner, Lafayette F. Barnes is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white man, and that he is the lawful descendant and son of the aforesaid Francis Barnes. That Emiline Barnes is a white woman and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Lafayette F. Barnes, and that Lettie L. Barnes, William W. Barnes, Nancy E. Barnes, Lindsey F. Barnes and Mary Barnes are the lawful children and minors of the aforesaid Lafayette F. Barnes and Emiline Barnes.

(26) That your petitioner, Lucinda Mathewa, is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and is the lawful descendant and daughter of the before mentioned Elixabeth Martindale. That your petitioner, T. M. Mathews is a white man and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Lucinda Mathews, and that John Mathews is the lawful child and minor of the aforesaid Lucinda Mathews and T. M. Mathews.

(27) That your petitioner, Mary W. Williams, is a one eighth Choctaw Indian, and the legal descendant and daughter of the before mentioned John Tucker and Margaret Tucker. That your petitioner, Robert L. Williams is a white man and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Mary W. Williams, and that John R. Williams, Charley Williams and Jessie Williams and Margaret A. King nee Williams are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid Mary W. Williams and Robert L. Williams.

(28) That your petitioner, Margaret A. King is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and that she is the

the lawful descendant and daughter of the aforesaid Mary W. Williams. That your petitioner, Walter J. King is a white man and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Margaret A. King.

(29) That your petitioner, Margaret E. Rhoads is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman and was the legal descendant and daughter of the before mentioned Francis Barns. That your petitioner, Charles Rhoads is a white man and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Margaret E. Rhoads, and that Alexander Rhodes, Nancy P. Rhoades, Mandy E. Rhodes and Mary A. Pate nee Rhodes are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid Margaret E. Rhodes and Charles Rhoads.

(30) That your petitioner, Mary A. Pate, is a one thirty second Choctaw Indian and thirty one thirty seconds white woman and is the lawful daughter of the aforesaid Margaret E. Rhodes. That your petitioner, Thomas Pate is a white man and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Mary A. Pate.

(31) That your petitioner, Sarah E. Keith is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and that she is the lawful daughter of the before mentioned Margaret A. Edmiston. That your petitioner, James B. Keith is a white man and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Sarah E. Keith, and that Della M. Keith and Arthur Keith are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid Sarah E. Keith and James B. Keith.

(32) That your petitioner, Edward W. Edmiston is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white man and is lawfully married and is the lawful son of the aforesaid Margaret A. Edmiston. That your petitioner, Jennie Edmiston is a white woman and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Edward W. Edmiston.

(33) That your petitioner, Rosa V. Keef is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman and is the lawful daughter of the aforesaid Margaret A. Edmiston. That your petitioner, William H. Keef, is a white man and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Rosa V. Keef, and that Thomas N. Keef and

Mary M. Keef are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid Rosa V. Keef and William H. Keef.

(34) That your petitioner, Margaret A. Kimmel, is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and that she is the lawful daughter of the aforesaid Margaret A. Edmiston. That your petitioner, David . Kimmel is a white man and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Margaret A. Kimmel.

(35) That your petitioner, Florence M. King is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and that she is the lawful daughter of the aforesaid Margaret A. Edmiston. That your petitioner Luther King is a white man and is lawfully married to and living with the aforesaid Florence M. King and that Elmer H. King is the lawful and minor child of the aforesaid Florence M. King and Luther King.

(36) That your petitioner, Edward W. Barnes is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white man, and that he is the lawful descendant and son of Mary Barnes, who was a one eighth Choctaw Indian and was the lawful descendant and daughter of the before mentioned Margaret Tucker. That your petitioners, Charles A. Barnes, John L. Barnes, James R. Barnes, Silas Lee Barnes, Joseph F. Barnes, Ada F. Barnes, Thomas R. Barnes, Lucinda I. Barnes and Maggie M. Barnes are the lawful children of the aforesaid Edward Barnes.

(37) That your petitioner, Sarah W. George, is a one thirty second Choctaw Indian and thirty one thirty seconds white woman, and is the lawful daughter of the aforesaid Edward W. Barnes.

(38) That your petitioner, Albert W. Barnes, is a one thirty second Choctaw Indian and thirty one thirty seconds white man, and is the lawful son of the aforesaid Edward W. Barnes, and that Grover L. Barnes and Lillie E. Barnes are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid Albert W. Barnes.

(39) That your petitioner, James B. Tucker, is a one eighth Choctaw Indian and seven eighths white man and is the lawful descendant

and son of the before mentioned John and Margaret Tucker, and that Darthula Tucker, Artala Tucker, Venelia Tucker, John B. Tucker, and Laura Tucker are the lawful children of the aforesaid James B. Tucker.

(40) That your petitioner, Lewis M. Barnes is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white man, and is the lawful descendant and son of Sallie E. Barnes, deceased, who was the lawful daughter of the before mentioned Margaret Tucker, and that Austin Barnes and Donie Barnes are the lawful children and minors of the aforesaid Lewis M. Barnes.

(41) That your petitioner, D. M. Barnes, is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white man, and is the lawful descendant and son of the aforesaid Sallie E. Barnes.

(42) That your petitioner, J. C. Barnes, is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white man, and is the lawful descendant and son of the aforesaid Sallie E. Barnes, and that Flossie Barnes and Bartie Barnes are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid J. C. Barnes.

(43) That your petitioner, E. Z. Barnes is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian, and fifteen sixteenths white man, and is the lawful descendant and son of the aforesaid Sallie E. Barnes, and that C. F. Barnes, L.M. Barnes, and J. S. Barnes are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid E.Z. Barnes.

(44) That your petitioner, Patia Gear is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and is the lawful descendant and daughter of the aforesaid Sallie E. Barnes, and that Ella M. Gear, Lewis Gear and Zeno B. Gear are the lawful children and minors of the aforesaid Patia Gear.

(45) That your petitioner, George W. Stephens, is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and is the lawful son of Catherine Stephens, now Catherine Clomner, who is a one eighth Choctaw Indian, and who was the lawful daughter of James Glenn

deceased, who was a one fourth Choctaw Indian and who was the lawful descendant and son of the before mentioned Abigail Glenn. That your petitioners, William Henry Stephens and George Bryan Stephens are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid George W. Stephens.

(46) That your petitioner, Catherine Clomner, is a one eighth Choctaw Indian and seven eighths white woman, and is the lawful descendant and daughter of the above named, James Glenn, and that Sam Stephens is the lawful and minor child of the aforesaid Catherine Clomner by her former husband.

(47) That your petitioner, Martha Simpkins, formerly Martha Johnson nee Stephens is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and is the lawful daughter of the aforesaid Catherine Clomner, and that John Johnson, Minnie Johnson, Nathan Johnson, George Simpkins, Laura Simpkins and Dhester Simpkins are the lawful children of the aforesaid Martha Simpkins.

(48) That your petitioner, Lucy Boon nee Johnson, is a one thirty second Choctaw Indian and thirty three thirty seconds white woman, and is the lawful daughter of the aforesaid Martha Simpkins.

(49) That your petitioner, Mary J. Smith is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and is the lawful descendant and daughter of the before mentioned Mary Barnes, and that Mary E. Smith, William H. Smith, B. F. Smith, Sadie Ann Smith, Ida Smith, Ivan Smith and Jane Smith are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid Mary J. Smith.

(50) That your petitioner, Lena R. Armstead is a one thirty second Choctaw Indian and thirty one thirty seconds white woman, and is the lawful daughter of the aforesaid Mary J. Smith and that Mamie Armstead is the lawful and minor child of the aforesaid Lena R. Armstead.

(51) That your petitioner, Elizabeth W. Smith is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman and is the lawful descendant and daughter of the before mentioned Mary Barnes, and that Melvin Smith, Bert Smith, Ophelia Smith, Elgadia Smith, Thomas V. Smith, Della Smith and Boss Smith are the lawful children of the aforesaid Elizabeth Smith.

(52) That your petitioner, Calvin Smith is a one thirty second Choctaw Indian and thirty one thirty seconds white man, and is the lawful son of the aforesaid Elizabeth W. Smith, and that James G. Smith is the lawful and minor child of the aforesaid Calvin Smith.

(53) That your petitioner, Ola Howard is a one thirty second Choctaw Indian and three thirty seconds white woman, and that she is the lawful daughter of the aforesaid Elizabeth W. Smith and that Oscar Howard and Leonard Howard are the lawful and minor children of the aforesaid Ola Howard.

(54) That your petitioner, George W. Barnes is a one thirty second Choctaw Indian and thirty one thirty seconds white man and is the lawful descendant and son of the before mentioned Luke Barnes.

(55) That your petitioner, Kizzie Hughie, is a one eighth Choctaw Indian and seven eighths white woman, and is the lawful descendant and daughter of the before mentioned James Glenn.

(56) That your petitioner, Elvina F. Jennings is a one sixteenth Choctaw Indian and fifteen sixteenths white woman, and is the lawful daughter of the aforesaid Kizzie Hughie, and that Robert I. Jennings, Joe, Jennings, Zack B. Jennings, Virge Jennings, Ellis Jennings, Daisy Jennings, Lillie Jennings, Paul Jennings, and Opie Jennings are the lawful children of the aforesaid Elvina F. Jennings.

Your petitioners further show that the aforesaid Abigail Glenn was a one half Choctaw Indian and one half Cherokee Indian and white blood, and that she lived, during the year 1833 and long prior to said time among the Choctaw Indians and was during said time a member of the said tribe of Indians, and was recognized by the proper authorities of the said Indians as a member of the said Tribe, and was recognized by the proper authorities of the said tribe, and did enjoy all the rights of the said Indians. That she did during her life claim and maintain her citizenship or membership in the said Tribe of Indians, and that the other Indian ancestors of your petitioners, and your petitioners have at all times endeavored to keep up and maintain their citizenship or membership in the said Tribe of Indians, but that the said Indians and the constituted authorities

and agents of the said Indians have wrongfully and unlawfully denied and refused to allow your petitioners the rights of citizenship in the aforesaid tribe of Indians. That by reason of the aforesaid wrongful acts on the part of the authorities and agents of the said Indians, Your petitioners with only their blood could not and did not marry according to the usages and laws of the said Tribe of Indians.

Your petitioners aver that according to the usages, customs and laws of the aforesaid Tribe of Indians and according to the treaties executed by and between the aforesaid Tribe of Indians and the United States, and according to the grant executed by the United States, to the Choctaw people and their descendants of the land or country now known as the Choctaw Nation, and according to the laws of the United States, they are entitled to enrollment as members of the Choctaw Tribe of Indians.

Your petitioners further show that they and each of them made application according to law to the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes for enrollment as members of the Choctaw Tribe of Indians, and that the said applications were denied by the said Commission within the last 60 days. That said Commission failed and refused to state or give any reason or grounds for denying the said applications.

Your petitioners aver that the said Commission erred:

FIRST. In refusing to allow appellants or their attorneys to see or examine the pleas or answers tendered by the Choctaw Tribe of Indians to the petitions of appellants.

SECOND. In refusing to allow appellants to file a reply to the pleas or answers of the Choctaw Tribe of Indians to the petitions of appellants.

THIRD. In refusing to issue process for witnesses or to send for persons or papers when requested to do so by appellants.

FOURTH. In denying appellants the right of trial of their claims by a competent jury.

FIFTH. In refusing to allow appellants the right to be present in

person or by attorney during the trial and determination of their claims.

SIXTH. In refusing to allow appellants to introduce proof in rebuttal.

SEVENTH. In denying the applications of appellants contrary to law and contrary to the proof adduced in the hearing of the said claims.

Wherefore, the premises considered, appellants pray that they be allowed an appeal to this Honorable Court from the decision of the aforesaid Commission, and for a trial of their claims de-novo, and for a judgment of this Honorable Court ordering and directing that your petitioners be enrolled as members of the Choctaw Tribe of Indians.

John W. Black.

Brewer & Hale

Wilkinson & Wilkinson,

Attorneys for Appellants.

records for such judgment and has been unable to discover the same, but that the act of the Choctaw Council approving the report of the said Citizenship Committee and denying the claims of the said parties to citizenship in said Nation is contained and befound in the acts and laws of the Choctaw Nation passed at the regular session of the General Council of said Choctaw Nation from October, 6, to November, 7, 1884 inclusive, which said particular act of the Choctaw Council is to be found upon pages 39 and 40 of the said acts, a copy of which said acts is attached hereto, made part hereof, and marked "Exhibit A", which said Judgment has never been reversed, or set aside.

And defendent further says that all the plaintiffs in this cause claim their rights through the said Abigail Rogers, and allege in their petition that such Choctaw blood as they may have, if any, comes through and from the said Abigail Rogers, and from no other person; and that all of the plaintiffs in this action are descendants of the said Abigail Rogers.

Wherefore defendent says that these plaintiffs are barred and precluded from asserting any rights or claims to Choctaw citizenship for the reason that judgment has heretofore been rendered in this matter by the council of the Choctaw Nation set out.

Choctaw Nation by

Indian Territory))
Central District))ss.

Stuart & Gordon its Att's

J.H.Gordon, one of the attorneys of the defendent aforesaid, being first duly sworn, upon oath states that he has read the foregoing answer, and that the statement therein contained are true as he verily believes.

6 J. H. Gordon

Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 13th day of January, 1899.

Bertha L. Frederick,

Notary Public.

93 Glenn-Tucker, et al,

vs.

Choctaw Nation.

Come now Appellants and move the court to require Appellee herein be required to make their answer herein filed more specific and certain in this. That Appellees be required to specifically deny the material facts pleaded by Appellants herein as grounds for their appeal and claim of citizenship herein and not rely on a general denial that Appellants are citizens of the Choctaw Nation and entitled to enrollment.

T. N. Foster,

Attorney for Appellants.

(6)

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT, INDIAN TERRITORY.

Jos. B. Glenn, et al-----Plaintiffs.

vs-----M O T I O N.

The Choctaw Nation-----Defendant.

Comes the above named plaintiffs and moves the court to require defendant to make its answer and supplemental answer more definite and certain in this:

First. To file one answer including all of the allegations contained in its original answer and all of the allegations contained in its supplemental answer which it desires to include within its answer so that this plaintiff may know and understand the allegations relied upon by the defendant and so as to avoid confusion from a number of instruments purporting to be answers.

Second. To plead the laws of the Choctaw ⁿNation authorizing and empowering the Choctaw Citizenship Committee referred to in defendant's supplemental answer to pass upon and decide citizenship controversies such as are raised by the pleadings in this cause.

Third. To file a copy of the application made by the parties named in the supplemental answer to the ^Choctaw Citizenship Committee.

Fourth. To set out the names of the "various other parties" who joined the parties mentioned in the aforesaid supplemental answer in an application to the aforesaid Choctaw ^Citizenship Committee".

Fifth. To state whether the aforesaid Citizenship Committee rendered the alleged adverse opinion or a judgment against the parties mentioned in the aforesaid supplemental answer in writing or verbally, and if in writing, to file a copy of said opinion or judgment or report.

Phil Brewer and James Hale and

S.I. Wilkinson
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

(7)

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT, INDIAN TERRITORY.

Joseph B. Glenn, et al-----Plaintiffs.

vs-----Demurrer to answer and supplemental answer.

The Choctaw Nation-----Defendant.

-----o-----

Come the above named plaintiffs and demur to the answer filed by defendant with the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians on the 9th day of October, 1896, and to the supplemental answer filed on the 13th day of January, 1899 in the aforesaid United States Court, for the reason that the said answers do not state facts sufficient to constitute a defense to plaintiff's cause of action or claim to citizenship in the Choctaw Nation or Indians.

Plaintiffs demur specially to the statements contained in paragraph "Fifth" of the answer filed by the defendant with the aforesaid Commission, because said statements do not state any defenses, and is not defensive matter as to the claims and contentions set forth in plaintiffs complaint.

also

Plaintiffs demur specially to the facts and statements set forth in paragraph numbered (8). In the answer filed by defendant with aforesaid Commission, because said statements do not constitute a defense to plaintiff's claims and contentions set forth in their complaint, and because the said statements are too vague and not sufficiently certain and definite to constitute a defense or plea of Res Judicata to plaintiff's complaint.

Plaintiffs also demur specially to the supplemental answer above referred to, because the said instrument was not filed with the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes before whom this cause was instituted and cannot be considered as a defense in this cause, the same having been filed in the United States Court for the Central District of the Indian Territory, at South McAlester, to which Court

(8)

this cause was brought by appeal.

Plaintiffs also further specially demur to the aforesaid supplemental answer because the facts set forth in the aforesaid supplemental answer do not constitute a defense to the Cause of action or claims set forth in said supplemental answer are too vague and indefinite and uncertain to constitute a defense to plaintiffs complaint.

Phillip Brewer &

Samuel Wilkinson.

Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

By leave of the Court - October 9th

Judge's notes in "No. 61, April, 1st, 1898. Motion for leave to file a motion as of October, 9th, 1897, to strike out certain paragraphs of Defendant's answer. Motion allowed without objection.

April, 1st, 1898.

All orders heretofore entered in this case are vacated and set aside.

Glenn - Tucker et al

said.

^{vs}
C^o N

ALL
Matters heretofore entered in this case are vacated and set
aside.

April, 1st, 1898.

Glenn's answer. Motion allowed without objection.

File a motion as of October, 8th, 1897, to strike out certain para-

Judge's notes in "No. 61, April, 1st, 1898." Motion for leave to

Proceedings
U. S. Court

(1)

In The United States Court At South McAlester, Central
District Of The Indian Territory.

Joseph B. Glenn, Et Al,

Plaintiffss,

vs.

The Choctaw Nation,

Defendent.

Reply To Answer And Supple-
mental Answer.

-----O-----

Come the above named plaintiffs and for reply to defendant's answer filed before the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians and to the supplemental answer filed by defendant in the United States Court in this case say:

They deny that these plaintiffs made application to the Choctaw Citizenship Committee as alleged in defendant's supplemental answer and deny that said Committee was a legal tribunal authorized by the laws of the Choctaw Nation and of the United States to pass upon the rights of persons claiming citizenship in the Choctaw Nation.

These plaintiffs state that they are not informed and have not sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to what the claim of the parties mentioned in defendant's supplemental answer were before the Citizenship Committee mentioned therein, and these plaintiff therefore deny that said parties mentioned in defendant's supplemental answer claimed their rights to citizenship through Abigail Rogers, through whom plaintiffs claim their rights to citizenship, and they deny that said parties or any of them mentioned in defendant's supplemental answer are the plaintiffs in this action.

These plaintiffs deny that said Choctaw Citizenship Committee decided that these plaintiffs had no right to citizenship in the Choctaw Nation; they deny that their claim to citizenship was by such Committee in the said Month of November, 1884, or at any other time

rejected and that thereafter, on the 6th day of November, 1884, or upon any other date said cause was then brought before the council of the Choctaw Nation and the judgment of said Citizenship Committee was by said Counsel approved and confirmed; these plaintiffs deny that a judgment was rendered by said Choctaw Counsel against these plaintiffs, either formal or otherwise, and deny that a judgment of said Citizenship Committee or of said Choctaw Counsel against these plaintiffs exists upon the record of the said Choctaw Nation, either formal or otherwise.

These plaintiffs deny that the matters found on page 39 and 40 of a pamphlet filed as an "Exhibit A" to the supplemental answer of the defendant, is an act of the Choctaw Council or is a judgment or determination of said Choctaw Council of the rights of these plaintiffs to citizenship.

These plaintiffs admit that they claim their Choctaw blood through a maternal ancestress by the name of Abigail Rogers, but deny that the so called act or judgment of the Choctaw Council filed as an exhibit to defendant's supplemental answer herein shows that the parties, or any of them, named therein claimed their right to citizenship in the Choctaw Nation through the blood of Abigail Rogers, the ancestress of these plaintiffs, or were descendants of the said Abigail Rogers.

Phillip Brewer

Samuel A. Wilkinson

Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

I, S. A. Wilkinson, one of the attorneys for the above named plaintiffs, do solemnly swear that the facts set forth in the foregoing reply are true as I verily believe.

Samuel A. Wilkinson.

Subscribed and sworn to

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 13th day of January, 1899.

E. J. Fannin, Clerk.

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT, CENTRAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT,
INDIAN TERRITORY, AT SOUTH McALESTER.

No. 93.

Glenn-Tucker, et al,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MOTION.

Choctaw Nation,

Defendant.

Now come Appellants, Glenn-Tucker, et al, by T. N. Foster, their Attorney, and move the Court to enter the following order, vacating and setting aside all former orders and judgments in this cause, viz:

"No. 93.

Glenn-Tucker, et al,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

Choctaw Nation

Defendants.

Now on this day the Honorable Wm. H.H. Clayton, being disqualified in this cause, and said cause having been heretofore submitted to the Honorable Wm. M. Springer, United States Judge for the Northern District of the Indian Territory, and now presiding-

It is ordered that all previous orders in this cause, be and the same are hereby vacated, set aside and held for naught.

And it appearing to the Court, that the foregoing order was made and announced from the bench by said Judge, on the 1st, day of April 1898, being one of the Term days of the September, 1897 Term of this Court, but has not been entered of record, it is ordered that the same be entered as of that date".

And for ground of said motion Appellants show to the Court, that upon said 1st, day of April, 1898, this cause, together with the cause of Joseph B. Glenn, et al, vs. The Choctaw Nation, No. 61, which is a companion case to this cause, and founded upon claim of descent from one Abigail Rogers, as the common ancestress of the claimants by blood in both of said causes, was pending before this Court upon motion to set aside and vacate judgments therein before rendered in both said causes, and at which said time said Honorable

announced the same order in both said causes, which said order was in words and figures, as above set forth, except as to the last paragraph of said order, directing the entry thereof to be made nunc pro tunc, entered by the Clerk of this Court, in the cause of Joseph B. Glenn, et al, vs. Choctaw Nation, No. 61, but that no entries whatever were made in this cause during said term by said Clerk.

T. N. Foster,

Attorney for Appellants.

T. N. Foster, being duly sworn says that the matters and things stated in the above and foregoing motion are true as stated.

T. N. Foster.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 11th, day of January, 1899.

Frank S. Genung,

SEAL.

Notary Public.

In The United States Court, Central District, Indian Territory.

Joseph B. Glenn, et al,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

Petition For An Appeal.

The Choctaw Nation,

Defendent.

-----O-----

Come the above named plaintiff, Joseph B. Glenn, et al, and move the Court to grant them an appeal from the decree rendered in this Court in the above styled cause on the 13th day of January, 1899, to the Supreme Court of the United States of America holden at the City of Washington, in the District of Columbia for the reasons set forth in the assignment of errors filed herewith.

Phillip Brewer &

S.A. Wilkinson.

Solicitors for Plaintiffs.

The appeal prayed for in the foregoing application is allowed and the appeal bond is fixed at \$200.00. This the 20th day of February, 1899.

Wm. M. Spinger,

Judge of the United States Court for the Northern District of the Indian Territory, and special Judge who presided at the trial of the aforesaid cause, the Judge of the Central District of the Indian Territory being disqualified.

In The United States Court, Central District, Indian Territory.

Joseph B. Glenn, et al,

Plaintiffs,

Assignments Or Error.

vs.

The Choctaw Nation,

Defendent.

Come the above named plaintiffs and present and file this their assignments of error, and aver that the errors herein set forth occurred during the trial of this cause as will more fully appear by reference to the record of this cause:

FIRST. The Court erred in overruling the motion of plaintiff to strike out the paragraph entitled "Eighth" in defenden's answer filed with the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribe of Indians.

SECOND. The Court erred in overruling plaintiffs motion to require defendent to make its answer filed with the aforesaid Commission more definate and certain in this: "To state in what Court or forum this cause was heretofore tried".

THIRD. The Court erred in overruling the motion of plaintiffs to require defendent to make its answer filed with the aforesaid Commission more difinate and certain in this: "To state who were the parties to the cause heretofore tried".

FOURTH. The Court erred in overruling the motion of the plaintiffs to require defendents to make its supplemental answer more definate and certain in this: "To plead the law laws of the Choctaw Nation authorizing and empowering the Choctaw Citizenship Committee referred to in defendents supplemental answer to pass upon and decide citizenship controversies such as are raised by the pleadings in this cause".

FIFTH. The Court erred in overruling the motion of plaintiffs to require defendents to make his supplemental answer more definate and certain in this: "To file a copy of the application made by the pa-

rties named in the supplemental answer to the Choctaw Citizenship Committee.

SIXTH. The Court erred in overruling the motion of the plaintiffs to require defendant to make his supplemental answer more definite and certain in this: "To set out the names of the various other parties who joined the parties mentioned in the aforesaid supplemental answer in an application to the aforesaid Choctaw Citizen ship Committee."

SEVENTH. The court erred in overruling the general demurrer filed by the plaintiff to defendant's answer filed with the commission to the Five civilized tribes of Indians.

EIGHTH. The court erred in overruling the general demurrer filed by plaintiffs to the supplemental answer filed by the defendant.

NINTH. The court erred in overruling the special demurrer filed by the plaintiff to the supplemental answer of the defendant upon the grounds that said supplemental answer was not filed before the Commission to the Five civilized Tribes.

TENTH. The Court erred in overruling the special demurrer of plaintiff to defendant's supplemental answer upon the grounds that the allegations contained in same were too vague and indefinite and uncertain to constitute a defense to plaintiff's cause of action?

ELEVENTH. The Court erred in ignoring the facts and issues raised by the reply filed by the plaintiffs to defendants answer and supplemental answer.

TWELFTH. The Court erred in sustaining the motion of the defendant for a judgment upon the pleadings without proof, the allegations set forth in said answer being denied or put in issue by plaintiffs.

THIRTEENTH. The court erred in declaring the law as it did and in rendering a decree against plaintiffs.

Philip Brewer

Samuel A. Wilkinson
Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

(1)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
INDIAN TERRITORY.

WHEREAS, it appears that the papers filed by the petitioners or plaintiffs in the matter of the family of Joseph B. Glenn and (55) other families, claiming to be the descendents of a common ancestor Abigail Rogers, and also the affidavits and exhibits and testimony of all kinds filed in support of said petition, and the petition for an appeal and the order allowing an appeal have been lost since the appeal was taken to the United States Court at South McAlester from the judgment of the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, and, WHEREAS, the said plaintiffs did on the 13th day of January, 1899 by and with the consent of the attorneys for The Choctaw Nation obtain leave of the aforesaid Court to substitute the before mentioned papers,

NOW THEREFORE, Know All Men that it is mutually agreed by the plaintiff Joseph B. Glenn and others, and the defendant, The Choctaw Nation that the papers attached hereto shall be filed as of the 13th day of January, 1899 by the Clerk of the United States Court, Central District, Indian Territory, at South McAlester, and that said papers shall be treated and considered as the original papers in this cause, provided the original papers are not hereafter found.

In testimony whereof we each hereunto set out hand this the 15th day of February, 1899.

Phillip D. Brewer &
S.A. Wilkinson.

Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

Stuart Gordon & Hailey.

Attorneys for the defendant,
The Choctaw Nation.

(2)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
INDIAN TERRITORY.

To the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes:

WHEREAS, Joseph B. Glenn, et al has this day filed a petition in the United States Court for the Central District of the Indian Territory praying for an appeal from the judgment rendered by you in the matter of the suit of Joseph B. Glenn, et al, vs. The Choctaw Nation, your No. 201, recently pending before you, and,

WHEREAS, the said petition has this day been allowed,

YOU ARE THEREFORE, required and directed to forthwith transmit the papers filed by the parties in the before mentioned cause before you, together with a certified copy of the Judgment rendered by you in this cause to the Clerk of the aforesaid Court at the town of South McAlester, Indian Territory.

Signed and sealed in the United States Clerk's office at South McAlester, Central District, Indian Territory, on this 26th day of January, 1897.

(Signed) P.B. Stoner,

Clerk.

Seal.

Joseph B. Gleen, et al.

vs. No. 61 Judgment, Cent. Dist. Jan. 13, 1898.

Choctaw Nation.

Now on this 13th day of January, 1898, come the appellee herein and filed supplemental answer, with exhibits thereto, consisting of copy of the "General and Special Laws of the Choctaw Nation", and the affidavit of N. B. Ainsworth.

Come the appellants and file motion to require Appellee's answer and supplemental answer made more definite and certain, which motion by the court is overruled, to which ruling of the court the appellants at the time excepted, and thereupon filed demurrer to appellee's answer and supplemental answer, which demurrer was by the court overruled, to which ruling of the court appellants at the time excepted, and thereupon filed their reply to appellee's answer and supplemental answer.

Now comes the appellee and prays the court for judgment in this cause; whereupon the opinion of the Court was ordered filed and judgment entered as follows to-wit:

Judgment.

On this 13th day of January, 1898, the same being one of the days of the regular December, 1898 term of this court this cause came on from trial before the Honorable William ~~XXXXXX~~ XXXXXX M. Springer, Judge of the Northern District of the Indian Territory for the reason that the Honorable Wm. H. H. Clayton, Judge of Central District of the Indian Territory, is disqualified herein, and plaintiff and defendant appeared and defendant moves the court for judgment upon the pleadings herein; and the court having heard said motion, and being well and fully advised in the ~~XXXXXX~~ premises doth sustain the same.

It is therefore by the court considered, ordered and decreed that the plaintiffs take nothing by their suit and that the plaintiffs Joseph B. Glenn, Nevada E. Glenn, Jane E. Glenn, William H. Glenn, Margaret A. Edmiston, Lon Edmiston, Tony Edmiston, Mollite T. Ratteree,

Thomas N. Ratteree, Ethel Ratteree, Medda Ratteree, Martha Collins,
Edwards Barnes, Hayden Collins, James A. Collins, William E. Barnes,
, Mary Barnes, Sherman Barnes, Lillie Ann Stephens, W. S. Stephens,
Nannie L. Stephens, William F. Stephens, Harriett Stephens, Gertie
Stephens, Charles A. Stephens/ Lillian Stephens, Nancy S. Stephens,
L. D. Martindale, Jeanette Martindale, Mantha A. Martindale, Albert W.
Martindale, Leonida Martindale, Willie L. Martindale, James A. Martin
dale, Johnnie J. Martindale, Julia Baker, George W. Baker, W. W.
Sapphington/ Charlie R. Sapphinton, Eliza Sapphington, John F. Glenn,
Nora Glenn, Pearilia Baggs, John Baggs _____ Baggs _____ Baggs,
Children of said John Baggs, and Parilia Bags, _____ Brown and Ada
Brown, and their children Martha A. French, Juda French, A Frank
R Glenn, Manda Glenn, Annie D. Glenn, Sarah E. Glenn, Charlie S. Glenn,
Charles A. Glenn, James ~~xxxx~~ Glenn, Martha D. ~~xxxx~~ Glenn, Dave
Glenn, Jr. Margaret S. Gleen, Levi S. Glenn, Eli H. Glenn,
William Tucker, James Tucker, George Tucker, William Tucker, Jr., James
~~xxxxxxxx~~ Haggard, William Haggard, Joseph Haggard, Mattie Haggard,
Louisa Haggard, L. Laura Haggard, Margaret M. Baker, John R. Haggard,
Louis R. Haggard, L. B. Haggard, Endy Hailey, John Haggard, Georgia
Ann Wilkerson, Andy C. Wilkerson, Florence I. M. Haggard, James McCall
Truda A. McAll Myrtie McCall, Dorthula McCall, Lafayette F. Barnes,
Emeline Barnes, Lettie L. Barnes, William W. Barnes, Nancy E. Barnes,
~~xxxxxxxx~~ Lindey F. Barnes, Mary Barnes, Lucinda Mathews, J. M.
Mathews, John Mathews, Mary W. Williams, Robert L. Williams,
John R. Williams, Carlie Williams, Jesse J. Williams, Margaret A.
King, Walter J. King, Margaret F. Rhoads, Charles Rhoads, Alexander
Rhoads, Nancy P. Rhoads, Manda E. Rhoads, Mary A. Pate, Thomas Pate,
Sarah E. Keith, James B. Keith, Della M. Keith, Arthur Keith,
Edward Edmonson, Jennie Edmondson, Rosa B. Keef, William H. Keef,
Thomas M. Keef/ Mary M. Keef, Margaret A. Kimmer, David L. Kimmer,
Florence M. King, Luther King, Elmer H. King, Edward W. Barnes,
Charles A. Barnes, John L. Barnes, James R. Barnes, Silas Lee Barnes,
Joseph F. Barnes, Ada F. Barnes, Thomas R. Barnes, Lucinda I. Barnes,
Maggie M. Barnes, Sarah W. George, Albert W. Barnes, Grover L. Barnes,

Lillie E. Barnes, James B. Tucker, Darthula Tucker, Artala Tucker, Venelia Tucker, John B. Tucker, Laura Tucker, oLouis M. Tucker, Louis M. Barnes, Austin Barnes, Donie Barnes, D. M. Barnes, J. C. Barnes, Flossie Barnes, Bartie E Barnes, R. Z. Barnes, C. E. Barnes, L. M. Barnes, J. S Barnes, Patia Gear, Sallie E. Barnes, Ella M. Gear, Louis Geaw, Zeno B. Gear, George W. Stephens, William Henry Stephens, , George Ryan Stephens, , Catherine Cloniuer, Sam Stephens, Martha Simpkins, John Johnson, Minnie Johnson, Nathan Johnson, George Simkins, Laura Simkins, Chesty ~~xiokix~~ Simpkins, Lucy Boone, Mary J. Smith, Mary E. Smith, William Smith, B. F. Smith, Sadie A. M. Smith, Ida Smith, Iran Smith, Jane E. Smith, Lena R. Armstead, Mamie Armstead, Elizabeth W. Smith, Melvin Smith, Bert Smith, Ophelia Smith, E;gadia Smith, Thomas V. Smith, Della Smith, Boss Smith, Calvin Smith, James G. Smith, Ola Howard, Oscar Howard, Leonard Howard, george W. Barnes, Kizzie Hughes, Elvina F. Jennings, Robert I. Jennings, John Jennings, Zack B. Jennings, Virgie Jennings, Ellis jennings, Daisy Jennings, Lillie Jennings, Paul Jennings, Opie Jennings and any and all oth r persons, who have taken their appeal in this case from the decision of the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, and that they are herebt barred from any and all rights as Choctaw citizens under and by virtue of this suit. That the judgment of the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes herein be and the same is hereby affirmed, and that the defendant have and recover of said plaintiffs all its cost in this action laid out and expended, for which let executionnissue.

To which judgment of the court the appellants at the time excepted and prayed an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which prayer for an appeal was granted, and the appeal bond fixed by the court at \$100. to be approved by the Clerk of this Court.