
The United States *v.* Pillerin et al.

Andrè Martin the original grantee. And, also, notice to the register and receiver of the land-office at Opelousas, Louisiana, of an application on behalf of the heirs, by their attorney, for confirmation of the grant under date of 23d December, 1836.

The concession was an inchoate and incomplete grant; and there is no evidence that any possession was ever taken of the land, nor of any claim set up under the grant to the same, from its date down to 1836, when notice was given to the officers of the land-office; nor any evidence of the existence of the grant during the whole of this period. The case falls directly within the principles of the two previous cases just decided.

There is, also, no proof of any title in the plaintiff derived from the original grantee. The conveyance purporting to be executed by the heirs notwithstanding the recitals to that effect, furnishes no evidence of the fact of heirship.

We think the decree of the court below erroneous, and should be reversed; and that the proceedings be remitted to the court below, and the petition be dismissed.

*ORDER.

[*9

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States, for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this court, that the decree of the said District Court in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed and annulled, and this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court, with directions to dismiss the petition of the claimant.

THE UNITED STATES, APPELLANTS, *v.* ARMAND PILLERIN AND OTHERS; THE UNITED STATES, APPELLANTS, *v.* A. B. ROMAN; THE UNITED STATES, APPELLANTS, *v.* CARLOS DE VILLEMONT'S HEIRS AND OTHERS; THE UNITED STATES, APPELLANTS, *v.* JEAN B. LABRANCHE'S HEIRS.

This court again decides, as in 9 How., 127, and 10 How., 609, that French grants of land in Louisiana, made after the treaty of Fontainebleau, by which Louisiana was ceded to Spain, are void, unless confirmed by the Spanish authorities before the cession to the United States.¹

¹ See notes to these two cases.

The United States v. Pillerin et al.

But if there has been continued possession under the grants so as to lay the foundation for presuming a confirmation by Spain, then the cases are not included within the acts of 1824 and 1844, which look only to inchoate and equitable titles. The District Court of the United States has therefore no jurisdiction.²

THESE four cases were land cases, arising under the acts of 1824 and 1844, and were appeals from the District Court of the United States, for Louisiana.

They were cases of French grants made after the treaty of Fontainebleau by which Louisiana was ceded to Spain.

They were argued by *Mr. Crittenden*, (Attorney-General,) for the United States, and by *Messrs. Janin and Taylor*, for the appellees, except the second which was argued by *Mr. Soulé*.

Mr. Chief Justice TANEY delivered the opinion of the court.

These four cases are all French grants made after the treaty of Fontainebleau by which Louisiana was ceded to Spain. We have already decided in the cases of *The United States v. Reynes*, 9 How., 127, and *The United States v. D'Auterive*, 10 How., 607, that grants of this description are void, unless confirmed by the Spanish authorities before the cession to the United States. In some of these cases evidence *10] has been offered *of continued possession by the grantees of those claiming under them, ever since the grants were made. But if there has been such a continued possession, and acts of ownership over the land as would lay the foundation for presuming a confirmation by Spain of these grants, or of either of them or any portion of either of them, such confirmation would amount to an absolute title, and not an inchoate or imperfect one. For all of the grants are absolute, or upon conditions subsequent; and if they had been originally made by competent authority, would have passed the legal title at the time, subject only to be divested by a breach of the condition, in the cases where a condition subsequent is annexed. Such a title, if afterwards recognized by the Spanish authorities, is protected by the treaty, and is independent of any legislation by Congress, and requires no proceeding in a court of the United States to give it validity.

Titles of this description were not therefore embraced in the acts of 1824 and 1844, under which these proceedings were had. These laws were passed to enable persons who

² FOLLOWED. *United States v. Rose's*, 15 How., 37.

Crawford v. Points.

had only an inchoate and equitable title, to obtain an absolute and legal one, by proceeding in the District Court in the manner prescribed. And when the title under which the party claims, would be a complete and absolute one, if granted by competent authority or established by proof, the District Courts have no jurisdiction under the acts of Congress above mentioned to decide upon its validity. The act of 1824 is very clear upon this point; and it has always been so construed by this court.

Upon this ground the decree of the District Court in each of these cases is erroneous and must be reversed and a mandate issued directing the petitions to be dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

But this decision is not to prejudice the rights of the respective petitioners or either of them in any suit where the absolute and legal title to these lands or any portion of them may be in question, or prevent them from showing if they can that the French grant was recognized as valid or confirmed by the Spanish authorities before the treaty of St. Ildefonso.

ORDER.

These causes came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States, for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and were argued by counsel. On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this court, that the decree of the said District Court in these causes, be, and the same is hereby reversed and annulled, and that these causes be, and the same are hereby remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the petitions of the claimants for want of jurisdiction.

*ALEXANDER CRAWFORD, APPELLANT, v. JAMES POINTS, ASSIGNEE IN BANKRUPTCY OF HENRY HOTTE. [*11]

An appeal does not lie to this court, from the decision of a District Court in a case of bankruptcy.

Even if it would, the decree of the District Court in this case is not a final decree.¹

¹ FOLLOWED. *Humiston v. Stainthorp*, 2 Wall., 110. CITED. *Grant v. Phoenix Ins. Co.*, 16 Otto, 431.