

cuted the same as Sheriff, and as his free and voluntary act and deed, for the uses and purposes therein set forth.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and official seal in said county, the day and year last above written.

My commission expires Dec. 28, 1925 (SEAL) Dolly Boatright-Notary Public
 Filed for record at Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, June 5, 1923 at 11:10 O'clock A.M. and
 recorded in Book 457 Page 162
 By Brady Brown - Deputy (SEAL) O. G. Weaver - County Clerk.

232482-ACM

SHERIFF'S DEED

COMPARED

THIS INDENTURE, made this 5th day of June, 1923, by and between R. D. Sanford, as sheriff of Tulsa County, Oklahoma, party of the first part, and Isaac O. Gruwell, ^{and Clarence B. Gruwell} both of Tulsa, County, Oklahoma, and Edward A. Gruwell of Chase County, Kansas, parties of the second part:

WITNESSETH: that whereas one S. S. Mohrman commenced his action in the District Court of Tulsa County, on the 12th day of April 1922, against Isaac O. Gruwell, Edward A. Gruwell and Clarence B. Gruwell, and Agnes Bard, Eileen Marsh, and Ruth Reed, alleging that the plaintiff and defendants were the owners of Lots Eight (8) and nine (9) in Block Twenty (20) of North Tulsa Addition of the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, and plaintiff alleging that he was the owner of an undivided one-third (1/3) interest in said real estate, and that said Isaac O. Gruwell, Edward A. Gruwell, and Clarence B. Gruwell, and Agnes Bard were each the owners of an undivided two-fifteenths (2/15) interest in said real estate and that Eileen Marsh and Ruth Reed were each the owners of an undivided one-fifteenth (1/15) interest in said real estate and asking that said real estate be partitioned between said parties, and in said portions, or if it could not be partitioned that same be sold according to law and the proceeds thereof divided.

INTERNAL REVENUE

Said case was No. 18264 in said Court.

And whereas summons was properly issued and all parties entered their appearance, and the Court appointed commissioners according to law to partition said real estate, and if same could not be partitioned without manifest injury, to appraise the value of the same; and said commissioners did make a report to the Court that said lots, nor either of them, could ~~not~~ be partitioned without manifest injury, and reported the appraisement of same as follows: Lot eight (8) was appraised at Seven Thousand Five Hundred (\$7,500) Dollars and said Lot Nine (9) at Six Thousand (\$6,000.00) Dollars.

And whereas the Court found and adjudged that the interest owned by each of the above named parties, plaintiff, and defendants, were as above set forth.

And whereas none of the parties elected to take said lots, or either of them, at the appraised value, the court did on the 6 day of April 1923, issued an order to the sheriff of Tulsa County, Oklahoma to sell said lots separately to the highest bidder for cash in the manner of sale of real estate under execution and according to law.

And whereas, I, the undersigned, sheriff did receive said order and execute same by giving notice that I would sell said lots separately to the highest bidder for cash at the West front door of the Court house in Tulsa, Oklahoma, on the 11th day of May, 1923, at two o'clock p.m. said notice was given by publication in the Tulsa Daily Legal News, a newspaper published and printed in the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, and having been so printed and having had a general circulation throughout the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, for more than fifty-two consecutive weeks next before the first publication of said notice, which first publication was had in said newspaper on the 9th day of April, 1923, and was published in every issue of said paper for more than thirty days next before said sale, the last publi-