

Newman J. Burton, Contestant. )  
vs. ( Involving lot 3, block 24,  
William Innis, Contestee. ) Edmond, O.T.

I dissent from the findings of fact and law by the board in the above entitled case. It is my opinion that ~~Innis~~ <sup>Hullman</sup> according to the evidence, made sufficient improvements on said lot to show good faith, and that he never abandoned the same. Newman J. Burton as I view the evidence, entered upon the contested premises and occupied the house of Innis as tenant, paid rent as his tenant and is therefore estopped from disputing the title or claim of his land-lord for the said lot. This principle of law is so well settled to require argument or citations. It is my opinion in as much as ~~Innis~~ <sup>Hullman</sup> entered upon lot 3 in person, erected a habitable house thereon which he occupied for a time, and continued to occupy same through a tenant, that he ~~Innis~~ <sup>Hullman</sup> is entitled to a deed for said lot. The occupancy of the tenant, in my judgement was the occupancy of the land-lord.

*Edgar W. Smeek*  
-----  
Chairman Tenants Board No. 2.