

IKE VAN METER *v.* EMMA MURPHY ADDINGTON ET AL

5-5560

466 S. W. 2d 249

Opinion delivered May 3, 1971

TAXATION—TAX DEEDS—SUFFICIENCY OF DESCRIPTION.—Tax deed describing land as “Parts of Section Exc. 1A W of RR  $\frac{1}{4}$  NE  $\frac{1}{4}$  Sec. 22 Twp. 2S, Range 3E, Acres 24, 100ths .00 year for which forfeited 1966” *held* void for insufficiency of description.

Appeal from Phillips Chancery Court, *George Craft*, Chancellor; affirmed.

*W. G. Dinning Jr.*, for appellant.

*David Solomon*, for appellees.

CONLEY BYRD, Justice. Appellant Ike Van Meter acquired a State tax deed from the State Land Commissioner under the following description:

“Parts of Section Exc. 1A W of RR SW  $\frac{1}{4}$  NE  $\frac{1}{4}$  Sec. 22 Twp. 2S, Range 3E, Acres 24, 100ths .00 year for which forfeited 1966.”

In a quiet title suit by appellees Emma Murphy Addington and Deborah White, the trial court held the description void. We affirm for the reasons stated in *Brinkley v. Halliburton*, 129 Ark. 334, 196 S. W. 118 (1917), *Halliburton v. Brinkley*, 135 Ark. 592, 204 S. W. 213 (1918), and *Irby v. Drusch*, 220 Ark. 250, 247 S. W. 2d 204 (1952).

Affirmed.

---