CONTACT INFORMATION
Mining Records Curator
Arizona Geological Survey
1520 West Adams St.
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-771-1601
http://www.azgs.az.gov
inquiries@azgs.az.gov

The following file is part of the

Arizona Department of Mines and Mineral Resources Mining Collection

ACCESS STATEMENT

These digitized collections are accessible for purposes of education and research. We have indicated what we know about copyright and rights of privacy, publicity, or trademark. Due to the nature of archival collections, we are not always able to identify this information. We are eager to hear from any rights owners, so that we may obtain accurate information. Upon request, we will remove material from public view while we address a rights issue.

CONSTRAINTS STATEMENT

The Arizona Geological Survey does not claim to control all rights for all materials in its collection. These rights include, but are not limited to: copyright, privacy rights, and cultural protection rights. The User hereby assumes all responsibility for obtaining any rights to use the material in excess of "fair use."

The Survey makes no intellectual property claims to the products created by individual authors in the manuscript collections, except when the author deeded those rights to the Survey or when those authors were employed by the State of Arizona and created intellectual products as a function of their official duties. The Survey does maintain property rights to the physical and digital representations of the works.

QUALITY STATEMENT

The Arizona Geological Survey is not responsible for the accuracy of the records, information, or opinions that may be contained in the files. The Survey collects, catalogs, and archives data on mineral properties regardless of its views of the veracity or accuracy of those data.

PRINTED: 11/19/2001

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND MINERAL RESOURCES AZMILS DATA

PRIMARY NAME: LAZY DOC

ALTERNATE NAMES:
GOLD NUGGET
FOURTY-NINER CLAIM
THUNDERGOD

MARICOPA COUNTY MILS NUMBER: 407

LOCATION: TOWNSHIP 2 N RANGE 9 E SECTION 30 QUARTER W2
LATITUDE: N 33DEG 29MIN 15SEC LONGITUDE: W 111DEG 28MIN 15SEC
TOPO MAP NAME: GOLDFIELD - 7.5 MIN

CURRENT STATUS: UNKNOWN

COMMODITY:
GOLD LODE

BIBLIOGRAPHY:
ADMMR LAZY DOC FILE
BLM MINING DISTRICT SHEETS
BLM MINERAL SURVEY MS 4450, MS 4764

12/11/86

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND MINERAL RESOURCES FILE DATA

PRIMARY NAME: LAZY DOC

ALTERNATE NAMES:
GOLD NUGGET
FOURTY-NINER CLAIM
THUNDERGOD

MARICOPA COUNTY MILS NUMBER: 407

LOCATION: TOWNSHIP 2 N RANGE 9 E SECTION 30 QUARTER W2
LATITUDE: N 33DEG 29MIN 15SEC LONGITUDE: W 111DEG 28MIN 15SEC
TOPO MAP NAME: GOLDFIELD- 7.5 MIN

CURRENT STATUS: UNKNOWN

COMMODITY:
GOLD LODE

BIBLIOGRAPHY:
ADMMR LAZY DOC FILE
BLM MINING DISTRICT SHEETS MS 4450, MS4764

DEPARTMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

News Items

Date January 15, 1953

Mine Thundergod Mine

Location About 10 mi north Apache Jct.

Owner L. G. Rosecrans,

Address Star Route, Mesa

Operating Co. Rosecrans

Address

Pres.

Genl. Mgr.

Mine Supt.

Mill Supt.

Principal Metals Gold

Men Employed 2

Production Rate None

Mill, Type & Capacity

Power, Amt. & Type Diesel on compressor
hoist gasoline operated.

Signed A. L. FLAGG

(Over)

Present Operations Driving crosscut from 60-ft. level in shaft.

Equipment: 220 c. fm., compressor and small gasoline hoist

New Work Planned

LAZY DOC MINE MILS 407 MARICOPA COUNTY

RRB WR 9/24/82: Ralph Barthalomew was in to inquire about the Lazy Doc Mine in Sec. 30, T2N R9E, Goldfield District, Maricopa County. The owner, C. G. Rosecranz wants him to put up the money to start mining. I outlined the basic rules to follow and what to watch out for before investing.

RRB WR 10/8/82: Ludwig Rosenkranz, 2902 N. Highway 88, Apache Junction, Arizona 85220 was in to discuss the best location for a diamond drill hole for the Lazy Doc Claims.

RRB WR 1/14/83: It was reported that Doc Rosenkranz has started on operation at 2902 N. Highway 88 out of Apache Junction. This is apparently the Lazy Doc Mine, Goldfield Distrist, Maricopa County.

RRB WR 12/5/86: Bill Keller reprots tht Doc Bosencranz (c) died April, 1986. His heirs, Edna H. Keller and Cora T. Haynes, 4607 Tipperary Trail, Lincoln, Nebraska 68512, (402) 423-8773 now own the Lazy Doc Mine (f) Goldfield District, Maricopa County. It is currently leased to the Double Eagle Mining Co.

RECEIVED
AUG 20 1958
MINERAL RESOURCES
PHOENIX, ARIZONA

DEPARTMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES
State of Arizona
MINE OWNER'S REPORT

Date August 16, 1958

1. Mine: Lazy Doc mining property. (Was called Thunder-god mine for short time).
2. Location: Sec. ..... Twp. ..... Range ..... Nearest Town Mesa Distance 25 mi.
   Direction east Nearest R.R. ..... Distance .....
   Road Conditions Excellent.
3. Mining District and County: Goldfield Maricopa County
4. Former Name of Mine: .....
5. Owner: Ludwig G. Rosecrans
   Address: Star Route, Mesa, Arizona.
6. Operator: .....
   Address: .....
7. Principal Minerals: Gold
8. Number of Claims: Lode 3 Patented ..... Unpatented X
   Placer ..... Patented ..... Unpatented .....
9. Type of Surrounding Terrain: .....

10. Geology and Mineralization: Granitic batholith (mineralized), overlain by, and dipping to west, by conglomerate (Arkosic), and tertiary volcanics. - - Mineralization strikes northerly and southerly, with a width of 70 feet, and dips about 70 degrees to the west. Within this area are four fractured, sheared zones paralelling the strike. Country rock between the sheared zones is mainly barron. The gold in the sheared zones comes in ore-shoots which rake to the southwest. - - The mineral lies on contact between granite and conglomerate, mainly in the granite on the surface. - - Area consists of block-faulting and fold faulting.

11. Dimension and Value of Ore Body: No ore bodies have been developed. The ore shoots are rich in spots but not commercial in themselves.

Please give as complete information as possible and attach copies of engineer's reports, shipment returns, maps, etc. if you wish to have them available in this Department's files for inspection by prospective leasors or buyers.

(over)

12. Ore "Blocked Out" or "In Sight":

Ore Probable:

13. Mine Workings—Amount and Condition:

No.	Feet	Condition
Shafts		
Raises		
Tunnels		
Crosscuts		
Stopes		

14. Water Supply: good

15. Brief History: The Lazy Doc property is not a developed mine. It has a shaft 60 feet deep with a drift of 120 feet.

16. Remarks: The geology here is somewhat similar to Bisbee. The ore-shoots have good chance of running into ore-bodies if developed.

17. If Property for Sale, List Approximate Price and Terms:

Property open for lease.

18. Signature: Ludwig L. Rosecrans

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS
INTERIOR BOARD OF LAND APPEALS
4015 WILSON BOULEVARD
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22203

Lazy Doc
Lode Claim
NW 1/4 Sec 30, T2N R9E
Gadsden Mining District

UNITED STATES
v.
LUDWIG G. ROSENKRANZ

IBLA 79-230 Decided February 29, 1980

Appeal by contestee from a decision by Administrative Law Judge Harvey C. Sweitzer declaring Lazy Doc lode mining claim null and void. Arizona 8461.

Affirmed as modified.

1. Mining Claims: DISCOVERY--Nature of Requirement--determination of validity--extent of deposit--marketability requirement--profitability--prudent man test.

   A discovery of valuable mineral exists where the claim contains mineralization of sufficient quality and quantity to justify further expenditure of labor and means, with a reasonable prospect of success in developing a valuable mine.

2. Mining Claims: DISCOVERY--Proof--determination of validity; PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE--Contests--burden of proof--determination of validity--evidence--prima facie case.

   When the Government contests a mining claim on a charge of lack of discovery, the Government has the burden of proving a prima facie case; the burden then shifts to the mining claimant to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that discovery exists.

3. Mining Claims: DISCOVERY--Nature of Requirement--extent of deposit.

   Minute amounts of mineralization may justify further exploration without establishing discovery.

INDEX CODE: None

4. Mining Claims: DISCOVERY--Nature of Requirement--determination of validity--geological inference.

Discovery of gold sufficient to validate a mining claim must be made on the claim itself, despite gold discovery on land nearby which might induce a reasonable prospector to continue searching for a valuable mineral deposit on the claim.

5. Mining Claims: PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE--Appeals--evidence outside of record--new evidence--Contests--determination of validity--Evidence--Hearings.

Evidence submitted on appeal after an initial decision in a mining contest may not be relied upon in making a final decision but may only be considered to determine if the hearing should be reopened.

APPEARANCES: Ludwig G. Rosenkranz, pro se.

OPINION BY ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE GOSS

Ludwig G. Rosenkranz appeals the January 19, 1979, decision in which Judge Sweitzer declared his Lazy Doc lode mining claim 1/ null and void for lack of discovery of a valuable mineral deposit. Appellant has an application for patent pending. The contest complaint, initiated by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management at the request of the U.S. Forest Service, charged that there was no discovery of a valuable mineral deposit on the claim. Judge Sweitzer agreed, after a prehearing conference and hearing.

On appeal, contestee alleged that Government agents repeatedly showed bad faith, attempted to discredit his claim, and that efforts to remove and sell overburden were blocked. He maintained that treatment of his claim was unnecessarily severe. He disputed Government sampling, argued that neighboring discoveries by geologic inference indicated gold on his claim, and asserted that recent gold price increases should render his claim marketable. Above all, appellant alleged that the mining laws were improperly applied to his situation. He particularly objected to the use of the marketability test over the old "prudent man" test.

1/ The Lazy Doc lode mining claim was located by the contestee November 27, 1946, recorded December 10, 1946, and amended and rerecorded November 7 and 8, 1947. The claim is situated in the NW 1/4 sec. 30, T. 2 N., R. 9 E., Gila and Salt River meridian, Maricopa County, Arizona, in the Goldfield Mining District within the Tonto National Forest.

[1] As Judge Sweitzer pointed out in his decision, the existence of gold on the claim was not at issue. Instead, the contest disputed the extent of that mineralization, i.e., whether sufficient mineralization existed to satisfy the "prudent man" test. This test dictates that in order for a mining claim to be valid, the claim must contain a mineral deposit of such quantity and quality as to justify a person of ordinary prudence in further expenditure of time, labor, and means in the development of a paying mine. United States v. Coleman, 390 U.S. 599 (1968);[a] Chrisman v. Miller, 197 U.S. 313, 322 (1905). Incorporated in the "prudent man" test is the concept of marketability. It must appear to a prudent person that the material may be mined, removed, and marketed at a profit. Converse v. Udall, 399 F.2d 616 (9th Cir. 1968), cert. denied, 393 U.S. 1025 (1969).[b]

[2] Once the Government contests a mining claim on a charge of no discovery, the Government must meet the initial burden of making its prima facie case. This burden is met where, as here, a Government mineral examiner samples a claim and gives his expert opinion that no discovery exists on the claim. United States v. Bechthold, 25 IBLA 77 (1976).[c] Once this prima facie case is established, the burden shifts to the mining claimant to show by a preponderance of the evidence that a discovery has been made within the limits of the claim. Foster v. Seaton, 271 F.2d 836, 838 (D.C. Cir. 1959); United States v. Ross, 40 IBLA 169 (1979).[d]

The record does not indicate bad faith on the part of the Government's mineral examiners.

Judge Sweitzer considered the hearing testimony as follows:

> Mr. Gilbert Matthews, a mining engineer employed by the Forest Service, took samples from the Lazy Doc, had the samples assayed, and otherwise examined the claim. He made several trips to the claim and on two occasions was accompanied by Raj Daniel, a mineral examiner employed by the Forest Service. No sampling was done when Mr. Daniel was present but he examined the claim noting where samples had been taken and examined the assay reports.
> Mr. Matthews and Mr. Daniel each testified that in his opinion a prudent man would not be justified in spending time and money with a reasonable hope of developing a paying mine on the Lazy Doc. In their testimony, both commented on the spotty nature of the mineralization and the narrowness of the vein each had observed.
>
> In consideration of the testimony of Mr. Matthews and Mr. Daniel, both of whom were shown to be qualified mineral examiners, I find the Contestant established a prima facie case. See, United States v. Ramsey, 14 IBLA 152, 154 (1974),[e] United States v. Blomquist, 7 IBLA 351 (1972).[f]

For Footnotes see:
46 IBLA 115a

Although Contestee contends Mr. Matthews was biased and that Mr. Daniel's testimony should be stricken because he was not present when ore samples were actually taken, no bias is established and the testimony of both witnesses was probative and shown to be reliable.

The evidence offered by Contestee consists of opinions that extensive mineralization exists on the claim and that low costs of conducting a mining operation on the claim would be such that it should be concluded a profit could result. I find the evidence relating to mineralization to be speculative and based on geologic inference, and that the evidence relating to production is not credible.

Contestee presented evidence that the presence of "slickensides" on the claim constitutes "very, very wonderful things for ore and depth." (Tr. 53) Contestee also had assays of samples showing mineral values but was unable to show when or how the samples were taken. (See Tr. 84-88.) Such evidence does not suffice for Contestees' case. See, United States v. Henault Mining Company, 73 I.D. 184 (1966),[g] aff'd Henault v. Tysk, 419 F.2d 766 (9th Cir. 1969), cert. denied, 398 U.S. 950 (1970);[h] United States v. Ramsher Mining and Engineering Company, Inc., 13 IBLA 268 (1973).[i]

The Contestee or his lessees have been on the claim since 1946 and the work performed during this period of more than 30 years is substantial, but there has been no processing or sale of any ore. Such mineral as has been removed has been left on or near the claim. Clearly, there has been ample time for the development of a mine. What persons have done is much more persu[a]sive evidence than what a witness is willing to state that a prudent man would do. [2/] United States v. Flurry, A-30887 (March 5, 1968).[j]

2/ In his concurrence hereto, Judge Fishman questions this sentence. I agree that the sentence goes too far--the sentence would indicate that it is virtually impossible to prove a discovery if there has been no development of the claim. While lack of development over a considerable period raises a presumption of no discovery, such a presumption may be rebutted by persuasive evidence. United States v. Hess, 46 IBLA 1 (1980).[k] To this extent, the Administrative Law Judge's opinion is modified. The presumption of lack of discovery applies regardless of whether a precious mineral is involved. United States v. Hess, supra.

For Footnotes see:
46 IBLA 115a

> It would appear from the evidence presented that the geology of the claim might warrant further exploration but a valuable mineral deposit has not been found simply because continued exploration of the claim might be warranted. United States v. McClurg, 31 IBLA 8, 11 (1977);[l] United States v. Taylor, 25 IBLA 21, 25 (1976).[m]
>
> A prima facie case of no discovery having been made and Contestee having failed to establish the existence of a discovery by a preponderance of the evidence, a conclusion that the contested mining claim is invalid is required.
>
> Therefore, pursuant to the prayer of the complaint, the captioned mining claim is declared null and void for the reason that no valuable mineral deposit has been discovered within the limits of the claim.

Decision at 2-3.

[3] Minute amounts of mineralization may justify further exploration to demonstrate the feasibility of development, without establishing discovery. Chrisman v. Miller, supra; United States v. Robinson, 21 IBLA 363, 82 I.D. 414 (1975).[n] Samples must be representative of the mineral deposit to be meaningful. United States v. Bechthold, supra. Appellant was unable to establish that here, after ample opportunity to find and present evidence of sufficient mineral deposits to prove discovery.

[4] Discovery of gold sufficient to validate a mining claim must be made on the claim itself, despite discovery of gold on neighboring lands. Nearby discoveries might induce a reasonable prospector to continue searching for a valuable mineral deposit on the claim, but such discoveries are hardly conclusive of discovery on this claim. Humboldt Placer Mining Co. v. Secretary of the Interior, 549 F.2d 622, 624 (9th Cir. 1977); United States v. McHenry, 43 IBLA 122 (1979).[o] While geologic inference may be used to establish mineral character of a claim, United States v. Bunkowski, 5 IBLA 102, 79 I.D. 43 (1972),[p] it is discovery rather than mineral character which is at issue here. It was on the basis of lack of discovery that the claim was held to be null and void by the Administrative Law Judge. Regardless of recent increases in the price of gold, appellant has not made sufficiant showing of quantity to prove a discovery of sufficient value to warrant issuance of a patent.

[5] On October 9, 1979, appellant submitted statements from Stanley B. Keith, geologist; Robert T. O'Haire, minerologist; and David D. Robb, mining engineer. All concurred in the following evaluation:

For Footnotes see:
46 IBLA 115a

Based on the data I was shown any statement that the Lazy Doc Lode is non-mineral in character violates the weight of the data. Many of the assays tickle 1 oz/Ton which at todays price of gold (is 340.00 per oz. as of 09/11/79) is nothing to take lightly. The geologic map indicates structure conducive to localization of precious metals as resembles structures in known precious mineral areas. Also, the geologic map is permissive of an extension of the structure to depth. Any deep potential will have to be prospected by drilling to prove or disprove ore potential. Until such drilling is done the Lazy Doc lode remains a valid gold occurrence with ore potential.

Such newly offered evidence may not be considered on appeal except with reference to whether the hearing should be reopened. E.g., United States v. McKenzie, 20 IBLA 38 (1975).q Since the new evidence would show that the quantity of the ore remains to be discovered, the offered evidence is not sufficient to justify reopening the hearing.

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to the Board of Land Appeals by the Secretary of the Interior, 43 CFR 4.1, the decision appealed from is affirmed as modified.

q) GFS(MIN) 27(1975)

Joseph W. Goss
Administrative Judge

I concur:

Anne Poindexter Lewis
Administrative Judge

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE FISHMAN CONCURRING SPECIALLY:

While I have no quarrel with the conclusions reached in the case that (1) no discovery of a valuable mineral has been demonstrated, (2) the patent application was properly rejected, and (3) that consequently the decision of the Administrative Law Judge is properly affirmed, I question the applicability of a certain concept enunciated in the decision below and cited in the main opinion.

On page three of his decision, the Administrative Law Judge stated:

> The Contestee or his lessees have been on the claim since 1946 and the work performed during this period of more than 30 years is substantial, but there has been no processing or sale of any ore. Such mineral as has been removed has been left on or near the claim. Clearly, there has been ample time for the development of a mine. What persons have done is much more persu[a]sive evidence than what a witness is willing to state that a prudent man would do. United States v. Flurry, A-30887 (March 5, 1968).[r] [Emphasis in original].

I recognize that earlier decisions of the Board have recited that a failure to develop minerals or to do anything to develop a mining claim may raise a presumption of lack of discovery. See, e.g., United States v. Stewart, 5 IBLA 39, 79 I.D. 27 (1972).[s] That was a sand and gravel case.

The case at bar involves gold. We cannot adopt a prismatic view and ignore the fact that precious metals have had a huge increase in values in recent years. In 1946, gold was worth some $35 an ounce, in contradistinction to some $600 + per ounce recently.

In retrospect, a prudent man might well have refrained from 1946 to the present from developing a gold deposit. The rationale for the presumption in sand and gravel cases dissipates when applied to the case at bar.

Frederick Fishman
Administrative Judge

r) GFS(MIN) SO-20(1968)
s) GFS(MIN) 11(1972)

Footnotes from 46 IBLA 111

a) GFS(MIN) JD-1(1968)
b) GFS(MIN) JD-4(1968)
c) GFS(MIN) 32(1976)
d) GFS(MIN) 33(1979)
e) GFS(MIN) 12(1974)
f) GFS(MIN) 59(1972)

Footnotes from 46 IBLA 112

g) GFS(MIN) SO-27(1966)
h) GFS(MIN) JD-3(1970)
i) GFS(MIN) 97(1973)
j) GFS(MIN) SO-20(1968)
k) GFS(MIN) 40(1980)

Footnotes from 46 IBLA 113

l) GFS(MIN) 31(1977)
m) GFS(MIN) 29(1976)
n) GFS(MIN) 50(1975)
o) GFS(MIN) 84(1979)
p) GFS(MIN) 13(1972)
q) GFS(MIN) 27(1975)