

Feb. 18.
N.L.C. 89/728.

296
BP
Dunedin.

Registrar N.L.C.
Auckland.

Del. to W. Lyon, Opoitiki

Reg. if filed at Op. Court.

NEW ZEALAND POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS.

A. Code: _____ Handed in (Time): _____ No. of Message } Bay of Plenty Office Stamp.

Office of Origin: _____	Words. _____	Sent. _____
Instructions: <i>O.P. I only urgent</i>	Charge. _____	At _____ m.
		To _____
		By _____

For Stamps.
The Stamps should be affixed by the Sender. 18/2/89

This Telegram is presented for Transmission by the undersigned, subject to the authorized Conditions posted up in this office. The Government will not be held responsible for errors, omissions, or delays in the transmission of telegrams, nor for the non-transmission of any telegram, nor for delays in the delivery nor for the non-delivery of any telegrams, from whatever cause the same may arise. All applications respecting this telegram should be made within six months from the date of its transmission, after which period it will not be kept. The Name and Address of the Sender, or either of them, if to be telegraphed, must be written at the End of the Message; and if not to be telegraphed, they should be written on the Back of the Form.

TO Mr Lyon
N.L.C. Auckland
89-686 Charge 27.2.89 file
89-802

Please say at once whether the file of papers re the Oamaru Block is with you

Edw Hammond
Reg. N.L.C.

No. 1711

~~Opoitiki 3.6.2/39 p~~
~~urgent~~
~~Collect L 8.~~
~~Edw Hammond~~
~~reg. N.L.C. Auckland~~
 Oamaru file, here
 W. Lyon

N.Z. AUCKLAND 18 FEB 89

No. 214. Collins, Billing & Co., Printers, Dunedin.

Oamaru

Opitiki 22 Feb. 1889.

Applications for rehearing
Chief Justice + Nikorima Teototara
Treasurer

Oamaru No. 1. L.L.
Application of

Para to Pakihi against Oamaru No. 1.

Since the application parties
have met and agreed to withdraw
Withdrawn accordingly

Oamaru No. 1.

Le Heu + vs
Tauka + vs.

Tauka appears to support both papers
as Kairakakara
Divided block into 2 portions, claiming
each under a diff. ancestor of Tarawa
& Rangipurahi. I asked Court to allow
me to speak of each portion separately
I was dealing more especially as to con-
sistency. When I had finished one block
I objected to go on with the other block
but the Court refused. I made several
applications but it was not allowed.

(1)

Survey was made having view that
held under both ancestors and not
under one only. The Court said it
was not competent for these two an-
cestors Whatupui + Ruamoko to have
freed the boundary, I alleged they
did. The boundary, was laid down
by Te Whatupui and Te Hancotamara
who was father of Ruamoko.

Not under the 3 Bays
Maake stated he was entitled to
Whatupui, but the Court was not allowed
Maake admitted Tautahi's claim through
ancestry Tarawa

I was left out of No 3 very much
on account of the evidence of Tivai who
was not an intimate part of our people
of our

Judge Wilson in awarding No 3
gave some reasons founded upon
evidence given by Tivai. No reason
was given for setting the particular
area to Ngatirakautahi that was allotted
to them.

Line of Survey, Pukerua along ridge
called Mookai and thence to Moko
hara trip etc. marked on plan. The
survey was agreed by stipulation and
by the Chairman Wm King. The Court
admitted five acres the portion that was
agreed to.

Judge Wilson to a certain extent
biased by the Whatutohea.

to whom he awarded ~~only~~ a large portion of the block.
— These are all the reasons —

To Han

What has been said by Judge applies to my interest.

Case No 4 + 5.

Revised Niwa

No 4 was awarded to me
I gave boundaries from Strubens following
~~Hand~~ survey line to point ~~to~~
tangi. These by dotted line, not
quite in a straight line
Mackie's evidence was clear. I do not
understand why Judge did not give portion
claimed —

— As to list of names —
When award made by Judge I
said I do not apply for releasing.
Assenting of parties interested file
through. The list applied was the
only list given in. The list applies only
to those admitted to No 4

Oamuru No 5

Karamia Kora

Just to speak of the smaller portion of No 5. We approve of the judgment so far as we are concerned. We can place our names as admitted to this portion of the block although we had the same ancestor. If the Ngati have will consent to our names by indeed were ~~not~~ willing to withdraw this application.

Oamuru No. 1.

Wetini Tareha

Reasons for application

Nikora was entrusted some Rai whole chain to try the names of certain of our ancestors. This is fact & do thought before that only the names of ~~the~~ his own ancestors.

If allowed in presence of Court to insert names application will be withdrawn —

Tareha

Nikora did not bring the matter supply clearly before the Court

Oamaru No 2

Pihana Tiwai does not appear
~~but is represented by~~
Le Hau

When case for Ngatepate was
closed Judge called on Tiwai to
make a statement. Which appears
to have been misunderstood and is
appertained the award to Ngatepate
He stated it was intended to apply to Nos 1 & 2
and not to No 3. This application
I object to this application

I reminded him this application
was coming on and he said I take
little interest in the matter

Le Awani I am a man in connection I
think he has got a fair share
Dismissed

Application of Jemima Shera
Applicant does not appear
No authorized representation
— Le Awani objects —
Dismissed

Applicant's half brother proposes to
settle the claim out of court. or discuss
it. Adjourn this claim 9 tomorrow