

- 1905: Cascaden v. Dunbar – “As a general rule (to which there are exceptions), an oral agreement to convey a mining claim or of an interest therein, or to charge or encumber it, is void. It must be conveyed by deed.”
- 5.24.38: Nygard v. Dickinson – 9th Circuit – “A mining claim is “real property,” though it is possessory in character and no written instrument is necessary to create it, so that written instrument is necessary to convey interest therein.”
- 12.18.47: USSR&M v. Lowe – No requirement in state law that location notices for claims made prior to 1913 be recorded. The Territorial First Legislature established such recording laws in 1913.
- 8.10.49: PLO No. 601 – “Tok – Eagle” road – Feeder classification – 200’ ROW
- 10.16.51: S.O. No. 2665 – “Taylor Highway” – Feeder classification – 200’ Highway Easement
- 1952: Date Robinson purported to purchase Jack Wade Creek claims.
- 7.23.55: Multiple Use Mining Act of 1955 30 USC 612 - “(b) Rights under any mining claim hereafter located under the mining laws of the United States shall be subject, prior to issuance of patent therefor, to the right of the United States to manage and dispose of the vegetative surface resources thereof and to manage other surface resources thereof (except mineral deposits subject to location under the mining laws of the United States)....”
- 6.30.59: Omnibus Act QCD conveying highway ROW to State of Alaska. FAS Class “A” Route No. 785 – Tetlin Junction to Eagle.
- 12.1.77: IBLA 77-375 Alaska Placer Co. (33 IBLA 187) – Where there is a break in the chain of title, a valid claim location can be shown by secondary evidence and even occupation. Using 30 USC 38 (1970) “This statute requires that a mineral patent applicant provide evidence of having possessed and worked the claims for the period of time equal to that prescribed by the statute of limitations for mining claims in the State or Territory where the claims are sited. In Alaska the statutory period is 10 years. (AS 9.10.030) The possession and development by a claimant based on occupation cannot be tacked on to the period of a preceding claimant if there is not conveyance of title between them.
- 7.3.79: Date of Location according to BLM “ACRES” database as this was the date Robinson filed FLMPA required documentation.
- 4.30.85: IBLA 84-111 Hugh B. Fate, Jr. (86 IBLA 215) – “When BLM declares a mining claim null and void ab initio because the claim was located on land segregated from entry and location under the mining laws, the mining claimant may rebut that finding by showing that he merely amended a valid pre-segregation location of the claim. However, to do so, he must show that he is the owner of the claim through a regular chain of title. An unsupported allegation that the previous owner “gave” him the claim 24 years ago will not suffice. The United States has the right to invoke the statute of frauds in order to clear title to the public lands.”

“Furthermore, based on the record before us, we find the chain of title between Fate and the original locators cannot be proven. Fate cannot claim through an unbroken chain of title to the original locators of mining claim No. 11 because the asserted conveyance of this mining claim from Collins to Fate in 1960 violates the statute of frauds and is, therefore, invalid.”

- 7.23.86: BLM Null & Void Decision declaring Robinson claims abandoned as a result of failure to file original locations notices as required by Section 414 FLPMA.
- 9.29.86: Robinson Affidavit in support of his IBLA Appeal – “I purchased these claims in 1952...”
Robinson did not provide the names of the prior owners or a copy of the deed.
- 10.9.86: IBLA 85-398 Estate of Van Dolah (94 IBLA 121) – “In order for BLM to determine whether or not the placer mining claims were located at a time when the lands were open to location and entry under the Federal mining laws, the claimant must present further evidence that the claims relate back to the original dates of location by submitting evidence that he has title to the claims without gaps in ownership from the original dates of location or submit evidence of possessory right under 30 U.S.C. Sec. 38.”
- “When an applicant desires to make his proof of possessory right in accordance with 30 U.S.C. Sec. 38, he should submit proof of labor for the 10 years (1962 through 1978) (sic) before the land was segregated and submit three (3) witness statements of any disinterested persons of credibility who may be cognizant of the facts of his possession.”
- 7.31.87: BLM Abandonment decision was vacated and remanded to BLM for further adjudication.
- 8.8.87: BLM State Director Penfold to Sen. Murkowski – “...we will be free to process Mr. Robinson’s plan of operations file under BLM’s Surface Management Regulations (43 CFR 3809).
- 8.20.93: QCD Estate of Robinson to Stringfellow for 10-18 Ab. Lower Disc. & Martin Fr.
- 2.10.05: IBLA 96-25 Nevada Pacific Mining Co. (164 IBLA 384) “The Mining Law of 1872 was modified on July 23, 1955, by section 4(b) of the Multiple Use Mining Act of 1955 (Multiple Use Act), 30 U.S.C. § 612(b) (2000). The language of the Multiple Use Act important to this case is that which modified the Mining Law of 1872 to authorize multiple use by the United States of the surface of unpatented mining claims located after July 23, 1955. The existence of an unpatented mining claim would not, per se, prevent the grant or use of a right-of-way across the claim. However, the statute also protects the mining claimant’s right to use the surface and subsurface resources for mining and related purposes. By its terms, the modification of the 1872 Mining Law to provide for multiple use of the surface estate by the United States is not applicable to unpatented mining claims located prior to July 23, 1955. 30 U.S.C. § 612(b) (2000).”
- 2.2011: BLM Memo to File by Julie Capps – Summary of Robinson case.
- 4.29.11: QCD Stringfellow to Baburkin for No. 11-13 Ab. Lower Discovery.
- 4.4.13: QCD Baburkin to Kuzmin for No. 11-13 Ab. Lower Discovery.