

FLETCHER G. FLAHERTY  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
CROCKER BUILDING.  
SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

February 15, 1934.

Mr. Ed Fletcher,  
Ed Fletcher Co.,  
San Diego, Cal.

Dear Sir:-

I discussed with Mr. Haldorn the matter of the improvement bonds against one-third of the Murray property of El Cajon Acres which you mentioned that you could buy for less than twenty cents on the dollar, but as he is unfamiliar with the value of the property and the particular acreage covered by the bonds you refer to, he cannot make any decision. Mr. Haldorn knew nothing of these street improvement bonds against the Murray property in El Cajon Acres and it would help him if you could tell him for what kind of improvement work these bonds were issued.

I would appreciate it if you would write to me about these bonds and enclose a diagram showing the exact property affected by the bonds you can buy and also what in your opinion each parcel is worth and the amount of the assessed valuation as well as a more definite amount that each bond can be purchased for.

Mr. Haldorn would be pleased if you could also tell him something more about your plan that you mentioned you have worked out regarding the Matoon Assessment on the Murray Hill property.

Yours very truly,

*Fletcher G. Flaherty*

FGF.LP.

*answer*  
*##*

*9067*  
*Miss Mary*  
*Has this been done?*  
*E. F. Sent Feb 17-34*

February 27, 1934.

Mr. Fletcher Flaherty,  
Crocker Building,  
San Francisco, California.

My dear Mr. Flaherty:

Answering yours of the 15th I am glad to inform you that the people have come down now and are willing to accept 35 cents on the dollar on A & I D No. 19 the Murray Hill property, but I believe that they will take 25. I am not in a position even to pay 25 now.

You and ourselves compose 90 percent of the entire A & I D No. 19. They tell me if I cannot sell the property nobody can, and in a way they are looking to me to sell the property for them - the people who own the bonds. We are on friendly terms now. The former president of the bond company lost all of his holdings in the company and new people are in charge.

For your information will say the Murray Hill property is in Mattoon Act A & I D No. 19, while the El Cajon Acres property is the usual assessment against each individual piece of land. Under the Mattoon Act every piece of property is responsible for the entire debt until the debt is paid in full, no matter whether an individual has paid taxes on his property or not and his title cannot be cleared.

Yours very truly,

EF:KLM

cc- Mr. Haldorn

April Twenty-first

1 9 3 4

Mr. Fletcher G. Flaherty  
Crocker Bldg.  
San Francisco, Calif.

Dear Mr. Flaherty:

Answering yours of April 18th will say that under existing conditions I think Mr. Haldorn will be lucky to get \$2500 for a quit claim deed to the property in El Cajon Acres.

I deeded 30 acres which I own to the bondholders for no consideration whatever directly or indirectly and it was included in the improvement district. They bought the bonds in good faith at 95. It was work splendidly done by the contractor and the cheapest unit price awarded that year but the county engineer insisted upon sewers and the city of El Cajon, before they would relinquish control demanded a 40 inch storm drain with the result that the improvements cost \$1500 an acre for the property which did not warrant any such construction.

I was out of the state when the storm drain and the sewers were included and if I had been here at the time I would certainly have protested and fought it. It is too late now to do anything, a most unfortunate mess.

I am not sure I can get the above amount. I am interested for the reason that the Fletcher Company own properties around that will be some what benefitted by the development of this property and I would like to see it developed.. Now it is an eye sore. There are only two houses on the tract and one of them is partially blown down. It needs a lot of money to go in there and buy up the property, cancel everything, build 10 or 15 houses and start things going again, selling for about 25¢ on the dollar of what we thought it was worth 5 years ago.

You promised to be here last January and failed me. How come?

Sorry to have missed you the last time I was in San Francisco but you were out of town.

With kind personal regards.

Very sincerely yours,

EF:ASK

August 17, 1936  
Mr. Fletcher G. Flaherty,  
Cracker Building,  
San Francisco, California.

My dear Mr. Flaherty:

Yours of the 11th received on my return from the south on a two days' fishing trip. You should have been along. Tell Stuart that we will repeat the performance if you and he will come down. You know I have to stand in with the politicians and they are good scouts, every one in the party. Enclosed find clipping telling the story.

Now answering your letter of the 11th, my understanding of our conversation over the phone was that you would recommend a settlement of the old contract for \$3,000 and that I would have \$1,000 of it. Of course, this was not binding and subject to Stuart's approval. You told me over the phone that the property had been appraised at \$5,000.00. That may have been o. k. some time ago but those days are past.

I am enclosing map showing the property included in the contract in yellow, approximately 3 1/2 acres. Right across the street Lot 339, nearly an acre and a corner lot, marked x in black, sold within the last six months for \$550 cash. We sold Lot 299 for \$600 less than six months ago, the best corner of the three. Lot 340, another corner lot of approximately an acre, was sold within the last four months for \$500.00.

Right on the highway the Bank of America which has a mortgage on Lots 490 to 495 inclusive, forced us to put the lots on the market at \$300 a lot. Lots 292, 293, 294, 295 and 296 adjoining your lots, planted to 5 year old avocado trees, we are trying to sell for \$750.00 each. They are some of the finest trees in San Diego County - and not a sale, while your lots are not planted at all.

In Lot 279 marked circle A, 4 acres, I can buy for \$150.00 an acre. Two acres in Lot 21 we just sold for \$500 an acre. We sold Lot 309 for \$1,000. Lot 3, marked circle x sold for \$350.00 an acre last year. Of course, all these prices are generally subject to 10 percent commission.

I have no one who will buy Lots 200 to 205 inclusive, but we have a prospect to buy a part of Lot 200. It is out of the question for me to keep up my payments and contracts. 90 percent of them failed to keep them up with me and we are selling our land at 25 cents on the dollar at Grossmont compared to what we were asking six years ago.

We lost our corner at 9th & Broadway where our office is only last week, and took a loss of \$100,000. We are tenants now. You know where Fletcher Hills is - He owes \$145,000 principal and something like \$30,000 interest, tied up in Mattoon Act. I sent a deed to my interest, losing any amount of money but the people to whom I owe the money sent the deed back and told me to pay them \$25,000 and they would cancel the whole works. I am looking for the \$25,000.

When the federal government is re-financing the bonds of 60 irrigation districts in this state, bonds issued under the supervision of the State of California and legal for savings banks, and are only paying 50 cents on the dollar, it is mighty hard to get 100 cents on the dollar on any contracts made 5 or 6 years ago.

If we are going to do any business with this party I should know something definite immediately. I think under all of the circumstances a fair adjustment of this matter is a release of \$1500.00 on Lot 200, or the Northerly one-half of Lot 200 \$800.00 and the Southerly one-half \$1,000, and the release of Lots 201 to 205 inclusive an additional \$1,000.00 for the five lots.

I am sorry to have to admit it but I am absolutely insolvent, owe the banks over \$400,000, in addition to what I have mentioned before and they have every piece of property that I have as security for what I owe them. The property the children own is most of it delinquent for taxes 5 and 6 years, and the Santa Fe Irrigation District took a deed to over half a million dollars worth of property for irrigation district taxes. The district is now suing to quiet title and we have had a three day battle in court already, on technicalities, with the trial postponed until September. The other districts are awaiting the decision before they start something. The La Mesa Irrigation District is particularly friendly and playing ball.

Lots 200 to 205 inclusive are delinquent in taxes since 1931 and it will cost approximately \$400.00 to redeem the district and state and county taxes.

-3-

I have been forced to compromise 300 or 400 of my contracts which I put up to the bank as security for loans for 25 to 40 cents on the dollar. I took over this property at just the wrong time. At the time when I hope to sell some of it at an early date and failed. It is up to Stuart now to give me a break to dispose of this property.

I feel the contract price should be reduced to \$2500.00 net, and we clean up the taxes.

There is a possibility of selling the Northerly half of Lot 200 and our two lots 295 and 296 planted with avocado trees to one party, part of it a trade. If you can see your way clear to release Lot 200 for \$1500 cash net to you I think I can do it and clean up the taxes as well, thru the money coming to me from Lots 295 and 296.

On receipt of this please wire final answer as this deal has been dragging and you know how easy it is for a party to lose a sale.

Yours sincerely,

EF M

P. S. Lots 215 to 219, marked in blue, facing the highway, we will gladly sell today, any one of them, for \$400.00 each. Lots 209 to 214, marked in blue, highway lots, we will gladly sell any one of them at \$500.00 a lot, but no buyers and we have had none for 10 years.

E.F.

**Ed Fletcher Papers**

**1870-1955**

**MSS.81**

**Box: 8 Folder: 12**

**General Correspondence - Flaherty, Fletcher**



**Copyright:** UC Regents

**Use:** This work is available from the UC San Diego Libraries. This digital copy of the work is intended to support research, teaching, and private study.

**Constraints:** This work is protected by the U.S. Copyright Law (Title 17, U.S.C.). Use of this work beyond that allowed by "fair use" requires written permission of the UC Regents. Permission may be obtained from the UC San Diego Libraries department having custody of the work (<http://libraries.ucsd.edu/collections/mscl/>). Responsibility for obtaining permissions and any use and distribution of this work rests exclusively with the user and not the UC San Diego Libraries.