

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NUMBER CV 91 0062496 S

RETURN DATE: JULY 16, 1991

HIGH ST. ASSOCIATES

: SUPERIOR COURT

V.

: JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF
MIDDLESEX AT MIDDLETOWN

WILLIAM J. ZISK

: SEPTEMBER 19, 1997

_____ /

AFFIDAVIT

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN, TAKE NOTICE, that the real property affected by this affidavit is located at 106 High Street, in the Village of Higganum, Town of Haddam, Connecticut, consisting of 32 acres, more or less, and is more particularly described in Schedule A attached hereto and incorporated herein.

I, William J. Zisk, being duly sworn hereby aver and say:

1. I am over 18 years of age and believe in the obligation of an oath.

2. I am the eldest of the four children born during the marriage of William W. Zisk and Mary A. Zisk, being William J.

Zisk, Edward J. Zisk, Marion A. (Zisk) Krivanec and Donald R. Zisk.

3. On December 3, 1943, William W. Zisk and Mary A. Zisk purchased the above described parcels, hereinafter "subject property", from Beda L. Brainard, by Manuscript Warrantee Deed, recorded in the land records of the Town of Haddam, Connecticut at Volume 67, page 469 and 470.

4. On July 20, 1952, William W. Zisk and Mary A. Zisk, as a wedding gift granted to their eldest son, William J. Zisk, a four acre portion of the above described subject property, described as follows:

"All that certain real property situated in Middlesex County, Connecticut, fronting on the East side of Killingworth Road, being a portion of the Zisk property and having a frontage of approximately 300 feet on Killingworth Road and adjacent on the North side to the South boundary line of Professor West Property; running East along the said boundary line to the east end of West property and thence in a Southerly direction along the extension of the East boundary line of West property to the South boundary line of Zisk property; thence West along the South boundary line of Zisk property to the West boundary line of Zisk property fronting on Killingworth Road, containing approximately four (4) acres, more or less, exepting and reserving a right of way for ingress and egress to the main real property along the North side of Professor West property, said right of way to be fifty (50) feet in width extending from the Killingworth Road to the main real property."

At all times since the gifted transfer, William J. Zisk has exercised dominion and control over said four acre parcel and has been seized of and possessed said parcel to the exclusion of all other rights, interests and claims of any other person or party. After the death of William W. Zisk on February 3, 1969, Mary A. Zisk documented the gifted grant in her Will, dated June 24, 1974 by a Declaration, witnessed by two signatures.

5. On February 3, 1969, while alone at a temporary residence at 115 Linda Drive in Roseville, California, William W. Zisk was stricken with a fatal heart attack and died at the Roseville Hospital. Mary A. Zisk was in the State of Connecticut on the date of the death of William W. Zisk.

6. William W. Zisk died "intestate," without a will, and was a domiciliary of the State of Connecticut. By existing Connecticut intestate law, William J. Zisk inherited an additional undivided legal title ownership interest in the remaining 28 acre portion of the "Intestate Estate" of William W. Zisk, at 106 High Street, Higganum, CT, through the Connecticut laws of Intestate Succession, which were in effect on February 3, 1969, to wit:

(a) PROPERTY RIGHTS OF HUSBAND AND WIFE

Connecticut General Statutes, Title 46, Chapter 809,
Section 46-12, Succession upon the death of either:

(at page 140 of the Statute)

On the death of a husband or wife, "the survivor" shall be entitled to the "use for life" of one-third in value of all property, real and personal, legally or equitably owned by the other at the time of his or her death, after the payment of all debts and charges against the estate, "such third" to be set out by distributors appointed by the Court of Probate in any property, real or personal or both, according to the judgment of such distributors. The right to such third shall not be defeated by any disposition of the property by will to other parties, but, "if there is no will, the survivor shall take such third absolutely"; and, - - - - (emphasis added)

(at page 141 of the Statute)

- - - -. In any such case where the husband or wife by will does not make any provision for the surviving wife or husband, such "surviving spouse" shall, within two months after the expiration of the time limited for exhibition of claims against such estate, file a notice, in writing of his or her intention to take a "life use" of one-third of such estate under the provisions of this section with the Court of Probate before which such estate is in settlement, and if such notice is not so filed such person shall be barred of such statutory share. - - - - (emphasis added).

Upon the death of William W. Zisk on February 3, 1969, Mary A. Zisk did not file a notice in writing of her intention to take a "life use" of one-third of such estate under the provisions of this section and is therefore barred of such statutory share.

(b) Connecticut General Statutes, Title 45, Chapter 795,
Section 45-274 - DISTRIBUTION TO SPOUSE AND CHILDREN:

After distribution has been made to the husband or wife of the "intestate" of such portion or shares of the estate of the intestate as such husband or "wife" is entitled to by law, all the residue of the real and personal estate "shall" be distributed in equal proportions, according to its value at the time of distribution, "AMONG THE CHILDREN" and the legal representatives of any of them who may be dead, - - - (emphasis added).

(c) Connecticut General Statutes, Title 45, Chapter 795,
Section 45-272 clearly states:

The Court of Probate "shall" ascertain the heirs and distributees of each "INTESTATE ESTATE" and "HEIRS" and "DISTRIBUTEES" of, and their respective shares in, - - - the Court "shall" order the administrator or other fiduciary charged with administration of the estate to deliver possession of or pay over the INTESTATE ESTATE. (emphasis added)

Mary A. Zisk, as the administrator of the "INTESTATE ESTATE" of William W. Zisk has not delivered possession of, or payed over the Intestate Estate in compliance with the applicable foregoing Connecticut General Statutes. As a result, no distribution of the intestate estate of William W. Zisk has ever been made to the "CHILDREN HEIRS" of the domicillary estate in Connecticut, nor has any "DEEDS" ever been issued to the "CHILDREN HEIRS" to the INTESTATE ESTATE of William W. Zisk, or recorded in the land records of the Town of Haddam, Connecticut.

7. During September 1989, Steven A. Rocco of 1783 Saybrook Road, Haddam, Connecticut, intervened into the Zisk family private affairs by unduly influencing and deceiving my 77 year old mother, Mary A. Zisk. Although the majority of the Zisk family was residing in the State of California, on September 13, 1989 Steven A. Rocco, as an individual, instituted a partition action in the State of Connecticut, Middlesex County Superior Court Case No. CV 89-56040 S, naming William J. Zisk as the sole defendant. Steven A. Rocco represented that he was Attorney-in-Fact for Mary A. Zisk, Edward J. Zisk, Marion A. (Zisk) Krivanec and Donald R. Zisk, duly appointed and authorized to act in their names, place and stead with regard to all issues as set forth in the partition complaint. The complaint claimed a partition/sale of the entire 32 acre 106 High Street, Higganum, Connecticut Zisk family Intestate Estate, which included the statutory portion acquired by William J. Zisk through the Connecticut General Statutes of Intestate Succession, as well as the 4 acre wedding gift adjacent to Killingworth Road (Route 81), which was granted to William J. Zisk on July 20, 1952 by then owners William W. Zisk and Mary A. Zisk. The Partition action,

Middlesex Superior Court No. CV 89-56040 S, instituted by Steven A. Rocco on September 13, 1989, was subsequently terminated by Summary Judgment in favor of defendant William J. Zisk. The Honorable Richard T. O'Connell granted the Summary Judgment on March 7, 1991, due to the fact that Steven A. Rocco was not the legal title owner of any part of the Zisk family Intestate Estate at 106 High Street, Higganum, Connecticut.

8. During 1989 and 1990, Steven A. Rocco filed an application with the Town of Haddam, Connecticut Planning and Zoning Commission and Inland Wetlands Commission, under the fictitious name of "Walkley Heights Associates", seeking approval of a "proposed" subdivision which included the "entire" 32 acre Zisk family Intestate Estate at 106 High Street, Higganum, Connecticut, including the "entire" interest of William J. Zisk. Neither, Steven A. Rocco, nor the fictitious name of "Walkley Heights Associates" was the "title owner" of any part of the 106 High Street Estate. The Steven A. Rocco and/or Walkley Heights Associates proposed subdivision application was subsequently denied by both Commissions due to the fact that the applicant was not a title owner of any part of the subject

property at 106 High Street, and the fact that the application was not consistant with the current Town of Haddam, Connecticut Subdivision Regulation requirements.

9. On March 23, 1991, Marion A. (Zisk) Krivanec conveyed her interest in the 106 High Street, Higganum, Connecticut Zisk Estate to William J. Zisk, by Quit Claim Deed, recorded in Book 179, page 441 of the land records of the Town of Haddam, Connecticut.

10. On May 8, 1991, Mary A. Zisk, Edward J. Zisk and Donald R. Zisk purportedly conveyed a ten/twelves (10/12) interest in the entire 32 acre Zisk Estate to a non-existant purported partnership, "High Street Associates". The land records of the Town of Haddam is evidence that Mary A. Zisk, Edward J. Zisk and Donald R. Zisk were not the chain title "DEED" owners of a 10/12 interest in the subject property at 106 High Street on May 8, 1991, when the transfer was alleged to have occurred. The purported conveyance was executed just 2 months after Judge O'Connell granted a Summary Judgment to William J. Zisk, terminating Steven A. Rocco's first attempted partition Complaint (Docket No. CV 89-56040 S), due to lack of

legal title ownership.

11. On May 23, 1991, the non-existant fictitious named alleged partnership of High Street Associates purported to execute a Mortgage Deed and Note for \$183,333.32 on the entire 32 acre subject intestate estate, including the entire ownership interest of William J. Zisk. The terms of the Mortgage Deed and Note were such that "no interest or payments" were required for a period of five years. The purported deed and note transfers were made to and from a non-existant fictitious partnership, with no money changing hands, for the sole purpose of commencing a second Partition Complaint by Steven A. Rocco, under the non-existant fictitious named partnership of High Street Associates.

12. On June 4, 1991, Steven A. Rocco, under the guise of a non-existant fictitious alleged partnership, High Street Associates, filed a second (identical) partition complaint in Middlesex County Superior Court, Docket No. CV 91-0062496S, alleging to be an undivided 5/6 "co-owner" in the entire 106 High Street 32 Acre Zisk Intestate Estate. The complaint alleged the plaintiff High Street Associates, to be a Connecticut general partnership, "organized and existing"

pursuant to the laws of the State of Connecticut with an office and place of business at 1783 Saybrook Road, Haddam, Connecticut. A summary of the relevant and material facts and law is as follows:

This Partition action was commenced by Plaintiff High Street Associates on June 4, 1991, by Writ, Summons and Complaint, returnable to this Court on July 16, 1991. Plaintiff High Street Associates asserted Quit Claim and Warranty Deeds dated May 8, 1991, and Mortgage Deed and Note dated May 23, 1991, all being recorded on June 3, 1991, in its one count Complaint against Defendant William J. Zisk. Plaintiff High Street Associates was not in legal existence when the above referenced Deed[s] and Notes were executed and was not in legal existence when the Complaint for Partition was filed. Defendant William J. Zisk requests Judicial Notice of the file in this Case.

A judgment, void on its face, pursuant to inspection of the judgment roll in this partition action, may be vacated at any time and by a judge or court, other than the Judge or court who pronounced judgment, Micinonilo v. Micinonilo 459 A. 2d 519 (Conn. 1983), Broaca v. Broaca 181 Conn. 463, 467, 435A.2d 1016 (1980), Arseniadis v. Arseniadis 477 A. 2d 152,

Barnes v. McKellar 644 A.2d 770(1994). All that is necessary of Defendant is to bring the illegality of the judgment to the attention of a Judge/Court. If voidness is found, relief is not discretionary, but mandatory, V.T.A., Inc. v. Airco, Inc. 597 F 2d221]4[(1979).

Fictitious Plaintiff High Street Associates, an alleged general partnership, did not have legal existence when it recorded it's deeds on June 3, 1991. Said asserted deeds were void against third party Defendant William J. Zisk in fictitious Plaintiffs one count complaint of June 4, 1991. As a consequence of the asserted void deeds, the Plaintiffs December 22, 1995 Supplemental Judgment (all court actions, in favor and in behalf of fictitious Plaintiff High Street Associates), stemming from the asserted void deeds, are void for want of jurisdiction. Plaintiff High Street Associates did not have legal standing to bring the partition action against William J. Zisk. Every ruling, including the December 22, 1996 Supplemental Judgment must be vacated for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, Vogel v. Vogel Conn., 422 A. 2d 271, 273 (1979), F.P., Inc. V. Collegium & Wethersfield 639 A. 2d 527, 529(1994), Investors Mortgage Co. v. Rodia 625 A.2d 833,835, 836 (1993).

All that is necessary, is to use the Judicially Noticed record in this case, to show the date of the recorded asserted deeds of June 3, 1991; to show that High Street Associates did not have legal existence at that time and to apply controlling case law and controlling Connecticut General Statutes §35-1, §52-495. Plaintiff High Street Associates did not have standing to sue, Hiland v. Ives 257 A. 2d 822.

Connecticut General Statute §35-1 states:

Fictitious trade names forbidden; certificates. Unfair trade practices:

"No person, except as hereafter provided, shall conduct or transact business in this state under any assumed name, or under any designation, name or style, corporate or otherwise, other than the real name or names of the person or persons conducting or transacting such business, unless there has been filed, in the office of the town clerk in the town in which such business is or is to be conducted or transacted, a certificate stating the name under which such business is or is to be conducted or transacted and the full name and post-office address of each person conducting or transacting such business or in the case of a corporation using such an assumed name, it's full name and principal post-office address. Such certificate shall be executed by all such persons or, in the case of a corporation, by an authorized officer thereof, and acknowledged before some authority qualified to administer oaths. Each town clerk shall keep an alphabetical index of the names of all persons filing such certificates and all the names or styles assumed as herein before provided and, for the indexing and filing of such certificate, shall receive the statutory filing fee for documents established in section 7-34a, to be paid by the person filing

such certificate. A copy of any such certificate, certified by the town clerk in whose office the same has been filed, shall be presumptive evidence, in all courts of this state, of the facts therein contained....., See Metro Bullintins Corp. v. Soboleski 620 A. 2d 1315 (1993)

It is important to recognize that the doctrine of misrepresentation and its concurrent remedy of rescission apply in this case because the misrepresentation was made prior to the filing of the complaint by the plaintiff in this action.

The general rule is that the object or purpose of statutes which regulate the doing of business under a fictitious or assumed name is - - - to protect the public by giving notice or information as to the person with whom they deal and to afford protection against fraud and deceit (57 Am. Jur. 2d, names § 66).

"We will not presume that the legislature intended to enact meaningless or useless legislation" (Turner v. Turner, 219 Conn. 703, 713, 595 A.2d 297 (1991)).

Section 35-1 provides two substantial penalties for non-compliance. First, a failure to comply shall be deemed to constitute an unfair or deceptive practice under § 42-110b(a) of the Connecticut unfair trade practices act (CUTPA). As a result, the defendant faces a full range of civil penalties and

liabilities applicable to a CUTPA violation. Second, the defendant may be criminally prosecuted and imprisoned for as long as one year and fined up to \$500.

Connecticut General Statute §35-1, therefore is controlling in this action involving High Street Associates, unequivocally being a fictitious Plaintiff, in its one count complaint for partition, brought pursuant to controlling Connecticut General Statute § 52-495. Therefore, at the outset, Plaintiff High Street Associates violated both statutes, when the deeds were executed and recorded and when its Complaint was filed. Plaintiffs rush to thereafter record the purported Certificate of Trade Name on July 18, 1991, is indisputable evidence that Plaintiff was not in legal existence when the subject Deeds were executed on May 8, 1991 and May 23, 1991, and recorded on June 3, 1991.

It is important to recognize the doctrine of misrepresentation and its concurrent remedy of rescission apply in this case. "Deeds transferring land to one who has no legal existence does not pass title, though such deed is valid between grantor and grantee under principles of equity, deed is void when asserted against third parties". Community Credit

Union v. Federal Exp. 534 A 2d 331, 333, (1987). The court in Community Credit Union, supra, ruled that the deed was invalid, since corporate status was lacking at the time of the conveyance. The same court rejected an argument that the deed was validated retroactively, that in turning to the merits of the dispute the court observed first that a deed transferring land to one who has no legal existence does not pass title, that such a deed is void when asserted against third parties.

"A deed or other conveyance to a grantee not in existence at the time of the conveyance - - - does not convey legal title to the land or estate described in the conveyance". Connecticut Standard of Title, Standard 7.1, Comment 1.

"If a deed does not transfer legal title to a purported grantee because such grantee is not in existence at the time of the conveyance - - - the legal title to the land - - - remains in the grantor". Connecticut Standard of Title, Standard 7.1, Comment 2.

Accordingly, it is clear that the land did not pass title, because Plaintiff High Street Associates was not in legal existence under Connecticut General Statute §35-1, at the time of the purported Deed transfers on May 8, 1991 and May 23, 1991. Defendant William J. Zisk being asserted as a third party, accordingly, makes said deeds void, precluding Plaintiff High Street Associates standing to bring the partition action,

Middlesex Superior Court Docket No. CV 91 0062496 S.

On January 8, 1992, Plaintiff High Street Associates filed a Lis Pendens, in Middlesex Superior Court Docket No. CV 91-0062496S, in the land records of the Town of Haddam, Connecticut at Book 182 Page 928, a copy attached hereto and incorporated.

CONCLUSION

Ownership being a prerequisite for a partition action, Plaintiff High Street Associates did not have standing, making every ruling, including the Plaintiffs December 22, 1996 Supplemental Judgment, void. The court never acquired subject matter jurisdiction in the partition complaint, Middlesex Superior Court No. CV 91 0062496S and the court was without authority to award any relief to Plaintiff High Street Associates and against third party Defendant William J. Zisk. William J. Zisk is entitled to equal protection of the laws and due process afforded by the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Connecticut. William J. Zisk is indisputedly entitled to the mandatory court action necessary to reopen and vacate the Supplemental Judgment and for the reinstitution of Defendant William J. Zisk's November 23, 1992 Counterclaim.

13. My mother, Mary A. Zisk, died on September 8, 1994 in Roseville, California. Probate proceedings were initiated in Placer County Superior Court Action No. S PR 05678. Donald R. Zisk was appointed special administrator with "limited authority". Donald R. Zisk requires court supervision and authority to execute any documents in behalf of the estate of Mary A. Zisk, which has not been granted as of September 8, 1997. No inventory has been submitted to the Court as of this date, nor has there been any settlement of the estate, nor has any ancillary proceedings been commenced in the State of Connecticut.

The matters stated herein based on personal knowledge and information are true and correct. Those matters stated under belief, I believe them to be true and correct. If called to testify as a witness in this matter I can competently testify as to matters of fact.


/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

- 18 -

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the State of Connecticut that the foregoing is true and correct.
EXECUTED this September 19, 1997 at Roseville, California 95678.


William J. Zisk Pro Se
205 Thomas Street
Roseville, California 95678
Telephone (916) 782-2233

SCHEDULE A

All those certain pieces or parcels of land situated in the Village of Higganum, in the Town of Haddam, County of Middlesex and State of Connecticut, bounded and described as follows:

First Piece - The Homestead, so called, bounded by a line beginning on the highway at the northwest corner of said homestead property and running thence easterly by land of Frank Skrivanek, to land of Charles B. Carlson, thence southerly by lands now or formerly of Charles B. Carlson, Robert H. Carlson and Burr & Baroni, Incorporated, to land now or formerly of Carl Andeen; thence westerly by land of Carl Andeen to the highway; thence northerly by highway to land of Herbert S. Johnson; thence easterly, northerly and northwesterly by land of said Herbert S. Johnson and land of Charles B. Carlson to land of Mazie M. Carlson to the highway; thence northerly by highway to the point of beginning, containing by estimation twenty-four (24) acres, more or less, with the dwelling house and all other buildings and improvements thereon, together with such rights of way and rights to maintain water pipes appurtenant to the land granted as record may appear, and especially as described in deed from Charles B. Carlson to Otto F. Carlson dated August 1908 and recorded in Vol. 47, pages 420, 421, and 422 of the Haddam Land Records; the premises being also subject to certain rights of way and to maintain water pipes, as by record will appear and especially as described in deed from Otto F. Carlson to Gustaf B. Carlson dated September 9, 1910 and recorded in Vol. 51, at Page 228 of the Haddam Land Records, and in an agreement between Otto F. Carlson and Charles B. Carlson dated August 18, 1916 and recorded in Haddam Land Records, Vol. 51, at Page 393.

Second Piece - Being a sprout land and containing seven (7) acres, more or less, bounded northerly and easterly by land now or formerly of Burr & Baroni, Incorporated; southerly by lands now or formerly of Mashinda and Carl Andeen and westerly by the Third Piece herein described, it being the second piece described in a deed from Charles B. Carlson to Otto F. Carlson dated August 1, 1908, recorded in Vol. 47, at Pages 420, 421, and 422 of the Haddam Land Records.

Third Piece - Being sprout land and containing one acre, more or less, bounded northerly by land formerly of Cyrus A. Hubbard, easterly by land formerly of Cyrus A. Hubbard, in part and partly by land formerly of James C. Walkley; southerly by land of Cyrus A. Hubbard and westerly by land formerly of Chauncey D. Skinner being the same land described as the third piece in said deed of Carlson to Carlson, recorded in Vol. 47, at Pages 420-422 of said Haddam Land Records.

NO. 62496

HIGH STREET ASSOCIATES

V.

WILLIAM J. ZISK

: SUPERIOR COURT

: JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF
MIDDLESEX AT MIDDLETOWN

: JANUARY 8, 1992

LIS PENDENS

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN, TAKE NOTICE, that an action has been brought to the SUPERIOR COURT being the Docket Number and case title as set forth above and returnable on July 16, 1991 in the Judicial District of Middlesex at Middletown, in which High Street Associates of 1783 Saybrook Road, Haddam, Connecticut, is the plaintiff, and William J. Zisk of 205 Thomas Street, Roseville, California 95678 is defendant.

The purpose of this action is to partition real property located on High Street in the Town of Haddam, Connecticut owned by the above named parties.

The property affected by said partition action is more particularly described in Schedule A attached hereto and incorporated herein.

Dated at Middletown, Connecticut this 8th day of January, 1992.

PLAINTIFF

By 

Joseph E. Milardo, Jr., of
Jozus, Milardo & Thomasson
Its Attorney

SCHEDULE A.

All those certain pieces or parcels of land situated in the Village of Higganum, in the Town of Haddam, County of Middlesex and State of Connecticut, bounded and described as follows:

First Piece - The Homestead, so called, bounded by a line beginning on the highway at the northwest corner of said homestead property and running thence easterly by land of Frank Skrivanek, to land of Charles B. Carlson; thence southerly by lands now or formerly of Charles B. Carlson, Robert H. Carlson and Burr & Baroni, Incorporated, to land now or formerly of Carl Andeen; thence westerly by land of Carl Andeen to the highway; thence northerly by highway to land of Herbert S. Johnson; thence easterly, northerly and northwesterly by land of said Herbert S. Johnson and land of Charles B. Carlson to land of Mazie M. Carlson; thence northerly and westerly by land of said Mazie M. Carlson to the highway; thence northerly by highway to the point of beginning, containing by estimation twenty-four (24) acres, more or less, with the dwelling house and all other buildings and improvements thereon, together with such rights of way and rights to maintain water pipes appurtenant to the land granted as of record may appear, and especially as described in deed from Charles B. Carlson to Otto F. Carlson dated August 1, 1908 and recorded in Vol. 47, pages 420, 421, and 422 of the Haddam Land Records; the premises being also subject to certain rights of way and to maintain water pipes, as by record will appear and especially as described in deed from Otto F. Carlson to Gustaf B. Carlson dated September 9, 1913 and recorded in Vol. 51, at Page 228 of the Haddam Land Records, and in an agreement between Otto F. Carlson and Charles B. Carlson dated August 18, 1916 and recorded in Haddam Land Records, Vol. 51, at Page 393.

Second Piece - Being sprout land and containing seven (7) acres, more or less, bounded northerly and easterly by land now or formerly of Burr & Baroni, Incorporated; southerly by lands now or formerly of Mashinda and Carl Andeen and westerly by the Third Piece herein described, it being the second piece described in a deed from Charles B. Carlson to Otto F. Carlson dated August 1, 1908, recorded in Vol. 47, at Pages 420, 421, and 422 of the Haddam Land Records.

Third Piece - Being sprout land and containing one acre, more or less, bounded northerly by land formerly of Cyrus A. Hubbard, easterly by land formerly of Cyrus A. Hubbard, in part and partly by land formerly of James C. Walkley; southerly by land of Cyrus A. Hubbard and westerly by land formerly of Chauncey D. Skinner being the same land described as the third piece in said deed of Carlson to Carlson, recorded in Vol. 47, at Pages 420-422 of said Haddam Land Records.

1892-1945
TOWN OF HADDAM

Ann P. Huffstetter