

224 U. S.

Opinion of the Court.

abrogated by statute. The decree refusing to enjoin the assessment of taxes on the exempt lands of plaintiffs must therefore be reversed, and the case remanded for further proceedings not inconsistent with this opinion.

*Reversed.*

---

GLEASON v. WOOD, COUNTY TREASURER OF  
PITTSBURG COUNTY, OKLAHOMA.

ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF  
OKLAHOMA.

No. 575. Argued February 23, 1912.—Decided May 13, 1912.

Decided on authority of *Choate v. Trapp*, ante, p. 665.  
28 Oklahoma, 502, reversed.

THE facts, which involve the taxability of Choctaw allotments in Oklahoma, are stated in the opinion.

*Mr. Willard L. Sturdevant* and *Mr. David C. McCurtain*, with whom *Mr. Edward P. Hill* was on the brief, for plaintiffs in error.

*Mr. Charles West*, Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma, for defendants in error.

MR. JUSTICE LAMAR delivered the opinion of the court.

The complaint alleges that the plaintiffs are Choctaws owning homesteads and surplus granted under the terms of the Atoka Agreement. Their applications to enjoin the officers of the State of Oklahoma from assessing their lands for taxation for the year 1909 was denied. All of the

questions involved are disposed of by the decision in *Choate v. Trapp*, ante, p. 665. The judgment, therefore, is reversed and the case remanded with directions for further proceedings not inconsistent with that opinion.

*Reversed.*

---

ENGLISH *v.* RICHARDSON, TREASURER OF  
TULSA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA.

ERROR TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF  
OKLAHOMA.

No. 559. Argued February 23, 1912.—Decided May 13, 1912.

Decided on authority of *Choate v. Trapp*, ante, p. 665.

28 Oklahoma, 408, reversed.

THE facts, which involve the taxability of Creek allotments in Oklahoma, are stated in the opinion.

*Mr. Willard L. Sturdevant*, with whom *Mr. Grant Foreman* and *Mr. M. L. Mott* were on the brief, for plaintiff in error.

*Mr. Charles West*, Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma, for defendants in error.

MR. JUSTICE LAMAR delivered the opinion of the court.

The plaintiff holds a patent dated December 12, 1902. It was issued to her as a member of the Creek Nation when the tribal lands were divided in pursuance of the same general policy as that discussed in *Choate v. Trapp*, ante, p. 665. There were, however, a few differences. The tax exemption covered only the homestead of forty acres,