

Chapter 1 : District Clerk | Taylor County, TX - Official Website

Find out more about paying court fees, fines and traffic citation in Robeson County.

A Guide to the Robinson Family Papers, Library, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation file: Library Colonial Williamsburg Foundation P. Conditions of Use [ca. Feb 26, converted to conform to eadVIVA. Special Collections staff John D. Robinson Family Papers, Descendants of Christopher Robinson soon became influential landholders, tobacco traders, and political leaders in the colony. Robinson descended from this "Hewick" line of the Robinson family. In addition to members of the Robinson family, notable names discussed in the collection of documents include: Farnham Burke, Lyon G. Tyler, Letitia Cornwallis, J. Scope and Content Information Original seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth-century manuscripts, official documents, sketches, and photographs, as well as copies of original letters and documents relating to Charles W. Robinson and his ancestors. The bulk of the material relates to Charles W. Index Terms Family Names: Farnham Henry Farnham , Simcoe, John Graves, Tyler, Lyon Gardiner, Wythe, George, Subjects: Administrative Information Access There are no restrictions. Contents List Family history papers: I Copy of a pedigree, Copy made by C. Pedigree, 10 August Robinson of Robinson family genealogy on pages Copy of a memorandum, Original by Frederick Robinson, Albert Woods, London, to Captain L. Robinson, 19 February Memorandum of John Beverley Robinson. Virginia Gazette article, 28 July Virginia Gazette article, 17 March Postscript by Richard Randolph. Copies of court records. Robinson, Richmond, to J. Robinson, Toronto, 16 April Copy of a petition of Richard Corbin and Ralph Wormeley, Copies of court records, Copy of court records, Copy of the will of Christopher Robinson, 16 July Copy of the will of Christopher Robinson, 19 October Copy of an Act of Parliament, Lord Seaton to Duke of Newcastle, 27 May Reply by Duke of Newcastle added to end. Lord Seaton to Captain Lepoy, 19 June Lord Elgin to Captain Lepoy, 4 July Letter, 3 April A clipping of the article is included. Beverley Robinson, 19 April Brock, Richmond, to C. Robinson, 21 March Farnham Burke, Somerset Herald, to C. Robinson, 10 August Farnham Burke, Somerset Herald, 16 August Robinson, 17 August Robinson, Linfield, 21 August Notes on sources, 8 August Beverley, Spotsylvania Court House, to C. Robinson, 21 January Robinson, 27 February Pedigree notice, 22 February Watkin decide there is insufficient evidence of certain family relations in the Robinson family genealogy. Copy of a deed, 3 November Robinson, 22 May Robinson, Ealing, 24 November Robinson, Ealing, to H. Other family members receive money, livestock, etc. Copy dated 4 May Copy dated 28 August Copy of a letter from P. Clarborin, 21 June Robinson, 2 May Robinson, Ealing, 13 March Enclosed is a chancery suit document about Peter Robinson. Copy of chancery suit, 13 June Robinson, London, 16 April Enclosing documents about Peter Robinson. Court Scheduled copy , July Copy of a petition. Robinson concerning the execution of the will of Peter Robinson. Copy of a petition, 29 August Copy of accounts, Robinson, Ealing, 14 October Robinson, Ealing, 7 February Standard, Virginia Historical Society, to C. Robinson, Ealing, 25 February Beverley Robinson, New York, to C. Robinson, 8 February Newspaper article from the Richmond Standard, 16 April Copy dated 13 July Sterling, Maugerville, New Brunswick, to C. Robinson, 27 November Copy of registry records , Robinson, 14 July Copy dated December Copy dated November Robinson, Ealing, 2 November Robinson, Ealing, 8 April

WorldCat is the world's largest library catalog, helping you find library materials calendrierdelascience.com more

Justia Opinion Summary The Supreme Court affirmed in part and reversed and remanded in part the decisions of the trial court and court of appeals agreeing with Plaintiffs that a local water district owned an open-space area at Medina Lake the community had long considered public space for recreation and access to the lake. Plaintiffs, three families who owned lots on a peninsula at Medina Lake, filed suit after new neighbors, who claimed that they owned the open-space area and that the community members had no easements or other rights to use it, denied Plaintiffs access to the disputed area. The trial court declared that the new neighbors did not own the open-space. So stupendous is the conception, so vast the scale of actual accomplishment in the construction of the Medina Dam Project that thousands of its nearest neighbors have positively no conception of the immensity of this undertaking. The project, which included the Medina Dam, the Diversion Dam a few miles downstream, and a twenty-six-mile canal system, was an engineering marvel at the time. By the time the lake first reached its capacity in , the , acre-feet of water creating miles of live-oaked shoreline had become a popular destination. In addition to the scenic views and recreational opportunities in the Box Canyon west of San Antonio, the project has provided agricultural irrigation, prevented flooding, supplied drinking water, and offered a peaceful place to live or enjoy a weekend home. Seventy men died while constructing the dam. The investors and operators endured financial defaults and receiverships. Floods and aging have required expensive re-stabilization efforts. And disputes over ownership and easement rights in the land surrounding the lake have resulted in repeated and protracted litigation. In this case, three families who own lots on a peninsula at Medina Lake filed suit after their new neighbors denied them access to an open-space area the community has long considered public space for recreation and access to the lake. The plaintiffs contend that a local water district owns the land, and alternatively, that they have an easement right to use it regardless of who owns it. The trial court and court of appeals agreed with the plaintiffs. We affirm in part and reverse in part and remand the case to the trial court. MVICO acquired those rights in various forms from numerous different landowners, including Theresa Spettle and her three daughters. About six months after executing the Spettle Deed, Theresa and her daughters executed another deed through which they partitioned among themselves about 4, acres of their remaining land in Bandera and Medina counties, which until then they held jointly in common. The Partition Deed describes each of the tracts by referring to acreage amounts, previous surveys, and boundaries based on points, directions, distances, and various natural markers. Although it is possible to access the water below the cliff from these lots, the steep, rocky incline makes it difficult and, at least to some degree, unsafe. Since at least the s, the Robinsons and other lot owners have constructed improvements in this open space, including walkways, a dock, a boat ramp, and a deck. Although the open space has long been surrounded by a low post-and-cable fence, the community members have freely used the open space as a place for recreation and easy access to the water. More specifically, the Robinsons contend that the Spettle Deed granted MVICO fee-simple ownership in all of the land up to a point that is even with the height of the top of Medina Dam, which the parties refer to as Elevation When the lake is full, however, as opposed to either low or flooded, the water reaches only up to a point that is even with the top of a spillway that is adjacent to and twelve feet below the top of the dam. The parties refer to this point as Elevation Because of the spillway, the lake reaches only to a meandering line at Elevation , leaving a dry area around the lake between Elevation and Elevation Because the difference consists of altitudinal feet, the twelve-foot span covers only a short distance on the cliffs on the west side of the peninsula but extends a much longer distance on the gently sloping eastern side. The open space where the Robinsons and other Redus Point residents have gathered and constructed improvements lies within this contour zone. In other words, the Deed Without Warranty purports to convey the area in the contour zone between Elevation and Elevation that lies east of Lot 8, which includes the disputed open space. Thus, the Spettle Deed conveyed the land up to Elevation to MVICO, not up to Elevation , and the Partition Deed partitioned the land down to that same point, so the Spettles retained ownership of the land in the contour zone. And, according to the Lances, the

Deed Without Warranty confirms that they purchased the portion of that land that constitutes the disputed area from the Franks. They later amended their petition to add claims to quiet title, for intentional infliction of emotional distress, intentional invasion of privacy, and civil conspiracy. The trial court granted a temporary restraining order and later a temporary injunction, finding that the Lances failed to establish that the Franks had any interest in the property the Deed Without Warranty describes. The Water District asserted claims for declaratory judgment, Chapter 12 violations, and civil conspiracy. The trial court denied that motion, and the Lances did take an interlocutory appeal from that order. As a result, on the issue of ownership, the final summary-judgment order declares that the Lances do not own the disputed area, but it does not declare who does own it. At the earlier temporary-injunction hearing, the Robinsons offered certified copies of the deeds into evidence, and the trial court admitted them without objection. Nevertheless, the Lances now contend that the Robinsons failed to meet their summary-judgment burden because the deeds were not in evidence. The court of appeals held that any defect in the summary-judgment evidence was not substantive, and thus the Lances waived this issue by failing to object in the trial court. Relying primarily on *MBank Brenham, N.* It is true that the complete absence of evidence necessary to support a summary judgment constitutes a substantive error that may be raised for the first time on appeal. Similarly, they argue the Robinsons could not rely on the deeds for summary-judgment purposes because they did not request an exhibits volume from the temporary-injunction hearing until after the case was on appeal. They thus qualified as proper summary-judgment evidence, and the trial court did not err by relying on them. Initially, the court also declared that the Water District owns the disputed area, but it deleted that declaration in its amended summary-judgment order. The Lances challenge these declarations, arguing that the Robinsons did not bring the proper cause of action to challenge the Deed Without Warranty, that the Robinsons lacked standing to challenge the validity of the Deed Without Warranty, that the Robinsons were required to establish who does own the disputed area to prove that the Lances do not own it, and that the Robinsons failed to prove either of those facts. The Lances also complain that the appeals court failed to adequately address some of these arguments in violation of Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure. The Lances argue that the Declaratory Judgments Act is the wrong vehicle to determine title to the disputed area. Instead, they argue that the Robinsons had to plead and prove claims for trespass to try title. The issue of whether a claimant must seek relief related to property interests through a trespass-to-try-title action, as opposed to a suit under the Declaratory Judgments Act, has been the source of some confusion in this Court and others. Because we agree that the Robinsons were not required to file a trespass-to-try-title action because they do not claim any ownership or possessory right to the disputed area, we need not address their alternative arguments. See *Martin, S.* A claimant who prevails on a claim to establish an easement cannot prevail on a trespass-to-try-title claim without also establishing title or a possessory right. We hold that the Robinsons were not required to file a trespass-to-try-title action to assert their alleged easement rights over the disputed area in Redus Point. In seeking to establish alleged easement rights, the Robinsons do not assert any ownership or possessory interest in the disputed area. First, they argued that the Lances cannot deny them access because the Lances do not own the disputed area. Second, they argued that even if the Lances own the area, the Robinsons have an easement over the disputed area. But the Robinsons sought these declarations to defend their alleged nonpossessory easement, not to assert superior title or possessory rights in themselves. We hold that they could properly pursue that relief under the Declaratory Judgments Act, and were not required to sue for trespass to try title. Because the Water District asserted superior title and possessory rights in itself, it could only bring that claim as a suit for trespass to try title. The trial court initially declared that the Water District owns the land, but it later amended its order to strike that declaration. Although the trial court declared that the Lances do not own the land, the effect of that declaration could only deprive the Lances of the right to exclude the Robinsons; it could not resolve any ownership dispute between the Lances and the Water District. Because the Lances and the Water District assert competing claims for superior title to the disputed area, those claims must be resolved through a suit for trespass to try title. The summary-judgment order before us today, however, does not resolve that dispute. And importantly, they did not move for summary judgment on this ground. Because the Robinsons do not claim ownership in the disputed area, the Lances argue the Robinsons

were not entitled to any declaration quieting title in the disputed area or removing any cloud on their alleged easement. In their original petition, the Robinsons did not plead any claim to quiet title. The record does not include any prior amended petitions, so we are unable to determine whether they pleaded a quiet-title claim before they moved for summary judgment. We can find no evidence or indication, however, that the Lances ever objected to the invalid-cloud declaration on that ground. We agree with the Lances that the court of appeals erred in this conclusion. We have never addressed the nuanced differences between quiet-title claims, trespass-totry-title claims, and modern declaratory-judgment claims in any real depth. We find it unnecessary to decide that issue here, however, because the parties have identified no reason why the answer would make any difference in this case. And if the trial court erred by both its 23 ownership and easement declarations, its invalid-cloud declaration cannot stand. We thus decline to issue any advisory opinions in this case regarding the nature and requirements of a quiet-title action. Relying primarily on our decision in *Nobles v. We do not agree that the Nobles rule applies here. The Nobles plaintiffs sought to enforce a judgment lien against property the judgment debtor, Macoa, had deeded to others. We did not hold in Nobles that grantors are the only parties who can ever sue to set aside a deed for fraud. In this case, however, the Robinsons do not seek to set aside the Deed Without Warranty based on fraud by the grantees the Lances against the grantors the Franks. Rather, their claim is that the Lances and the Franks both committed fraud against third parties the Robinsons by creating and presenting a deed that purports to convey an interest that neither of them owns. If the deed is fraudulent or otherwise invalid, the Franks as grantors are not harmed; the Robinsons are. Whether the Robinsons can challenge the deed as fraudulent or merely as ineffective to convey any interest does not matter; in either case, the Robinsons, who allege an easement interest in the land, may seek a declaratory judgment that the deed conveyed no ownership interest. We conclude that the Robinsons have standing to seek a 25 declaration that the deed is ineffective because they allege the deed harms their own interests, not those of the parties to the deed. The court of appeals did not address these evidentiary arguments. The Lances complain that the court of appeals violated Rule Law Office of Oscar C. Any issue that is not properly presented on appeal, however, is not considered raised for purposes of Rule We agree with the Lances that they challenged the ownership evidence on appeal. But they are meritless, and we agree with the trial court that, at least on this record, no evidence could support a finding that Lances own the disputed area. The Lances rely on the Deed Without Warranty to establish their ownership, but no evidence establishes that the Franks had any interest in the land that deed describes. The only deed by which the Franks obtained any interest in land on Redus Point is the deed the Franks received from their predecessors, the Prados. Walker acquired the land in , as part of a acre conveyance by deed from Mathilda Spettle Redus. The uncontroverted evidence also establishes that, when Walker platted the Redus Point Addition subdivision in , he platted the lots to the Elevation boundary, consistent with the land he had acquired from Mathilda. So regardless of whether Mathilda or MVICO owned the contour zone area between Elevation and Elevation after the Spettle Deed and Partition Deed, this record can only establish that the property Walker received from Mathilda and then platted and conveyed extends only to Elevation Although the Lances contend that some evidence would support the conclusion that the Spettle Deed and Partition Deed involved land that reached down to Elevation , we have found no record evidence that the land deeded to Walker or the Redus Point lots, as platted or as subsequently conveyed, extend past Elevation Like the trial court, however, we do not hold that the Water District owns the disputed area described in the Deed Without Warranty, in the contour zone surrounding Redus Point, or in any of the contour zone surrounding Medina Lake. That is one of many issues that have given rise to other litigation involving Medina Lake,¹³ but we cannot and need not resolve it here. MVICO acquired different rights in the lands for Medina Lake from numerous different landowners through different deeds that each contain their own unique provisions. Even as to the disputed area at issue here, we cannot say that the record in this case conclusively establishes that the Water District or any other party owns it. In support of their assertion that the Water District owns it, the Robinsons and the Water District rely on the Spettle Deed, the Partition Deed, and the testimony of their expert witness. The Lances argue, however, that by failing to prove who owns the disputed area, the Robinsons necessarily failed to prove that the Lances do not own it.*

Chapter 3 : calendrierdelascience.com – Just another WordPress site

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

More support available when you need it: Supporting Manager Life at Robinson Court Accommodation At Robinson Court sheltered housing scheme, we offer purpose-built and well-maintained rented accommodation for people over the age of 60. Your home will be completely self-contained with your own front door allowing the privacy and independence you expect. It will be easy to maintain, and you will be able to give your new home a personal touch and decorate and furnish it as you wish. Your kitchen will have fully-fitted units. There will be storage space and lounge and bedroom areas. Many of the people who live in our properties have arranged broadband and digital or satellite TV and most properties have a telephone point. Activities Our retirement properties have a real community feel where people interact with their neighbours, families and friends, continuing to do all the things they love. Our rented housing locations plan and organise a wide range of activities and events tailored to the interests of the people living in them. Events are varied and many of our rented housing locations choose to set up social committees to include everyone in the planning of communal events and activities. Pricing Pricing information Anchor endeavour to be completely transparent about all our charges and fees. Below is indicative pricing to act as a guide to the costs at Robinson Court, Barnoldswick. For further information please contact us. How much does it cost? What is included in rental fees? Our service charge covers all the cost of amenities you share with your neighbours, including the scheme manager service, our 24 hour emergency call service Anchorcall , repairs and maintenance, window cleaning, gardening and the cleaning of communal areas. Your local council will be able to advise you about getting help paying your rent and service charge through housing benefit. They will also be able to tell you if they will be paying grant to us to meet or contribute towards the support cost elements of our services to you. Meet the team Our customers really value the service that our scheme managers provide. They are there to make sure that our rented accommodation is welcoming and pleasant to live in. We encourage visits to Robinson Court sheltered housing scheme so you can meet our scheme manager and get a feel of what it would be like to live here. You will be able to look around, meet your new neighbours, find out what goes on and ask any questions you may have. It is important to us that you make the right decision and are happy with your choice of new home. Why not come and visit us so you can get a feel of what it would be like to live here. Many people find visiting retirement housing really helps them feel confident in their decision and so we welcome you to come along and visit us. It is important to us that you make the right decision for you and are happy with your choice of new home.

Chapter 4 : Court Schedules

*Fulton County Clerk of Magistrate Court Fee Schedule Each Additional Document Name or Type Fee(s) Page
Miscellaneous Fees Certified Copies \$ \$ Exempted Copies \$ \$*

Chapter 5 : A Guide to the Robinson Family Papers, #MS

*Create an Account - Increase your productivity, customize your experience, and engage in information you care about..
Sign In.*

Chapter 6 : Robeson County Court

It would be two hours before Oliver Robinson finally learned the price he'd pay of his egregious sins months in federal prison, \$, in restitution for the government's court costs and.

Chapter 7 : Illinois Circuit Court Clerks (by county)

The Appeal judgement was announced in Court 4 at the Royal Courts of Justice. There was a notice on the door of the court room warning the public that filming would take place, and that those not wishing to be caught on film should sit at the rear of the court. The doors were unlocked at 10am, and a.

Chapter 8 : Formats and Editions of Robinson's County court costs. [calendrierdelascience.com]

The elected District Clerk is a registrar, recorder, and custodian of all court documents that are a part of any cause of action and is responsible for the security of those records. The District Clerk is also responsible for docketing, indexing, recording, collecting fees, fines, and court cost and managing all funds held in litigation and.

Chapter 9 : Navarro County, Texas

Court the judgment of the Circuit Court with costs taxed to the appellant. At the time the appeal is perfected in the Clerk's office, the clerk shall give the.