

Pension Application for John Lutz or Luts

R.6537 (Widow: Elizabeth) Married 1790. John died January 15, 1830.

Honorable Zachery Taylor – President of the United States.

Sir; We trust you will permit us to address you on business though not immediately connected with you own department but not beyond the reach of your power to effect; as it is with subordinate departments of the government and in consideration of the urgency of the case we hope to be pardoned for this transcending the ordinary rules of business in representing the hereinafter statement of facts to the Highest Authority and whom we wish to make acquainted with the facts as they exist in the pension department.

This being our only and last resort—As all our efforts on behalf of the Revolutionary Claimants with very few exceptions have proved unavailing before the pension and War Departments—notwithstanding we have strictly complied with the provisions of the laws under which those claims have been asserted—and which have in several instances been referred to the Secretary of War which has only resulted in his endorsing the commissions adverse reports without even examining the documents and evidence in support of the same himself—

Under those circumstances we have disposed of a few adjustment of our claims until a change in the administration of government and a consequent necessary change in the subordinate departments.

It seems the appointment of commissions to finally settle this class of claims has been deferred. Hence the necessity if any thing further can be done until the future action of Congress on the subject to forward their legal adjustment of so doing as the surviving relics of the revolution are fast passing away and indeed but a small number yet survive and they too [?] in a helpless and deponent situation—

And in this case in every instance with those whose claims I have in hand whose circumstances render it extremely necessary if they are ever settled with his the benevolent frames of the law intended they should be—that it should be attended speedily or they will soon all be beyond the reach of our assistance—

It is through their constant appeals to us that we reiterate the same to the only source to which we can apply—And it appears very extraordinary that those aged people should be treated with such great severity by subordinate officers of the government. Since the frames of the laws have been this liberal in the passage of acts expressly for their benefit.

But such indeed is the fact. And after the legal requirements are strictly complied with. The commission makes arbitrary and exorbitant demands for more proof in cases where it is under real by law and recollect for by every principal of Justice. And which he must well know is beyond the reach of possibility to obtain at this remote period from that in which the events of the revolution transpired. And this [?] too from a subordinate officers clothes only with powers to enforce the provisions of the law—without any discretionary powers of his own. But who seems to set [?] defiance all law at his pleasure, exercising [?] and dictatorial authority in saying what claims shall and what shall not be allowed, however well supported in evidence.

And we ourselves have been tauntingly told in the pension office at Washington that there were a thousand or more pension claims there on file from New York that never had and should not be allowed.

We would not bother the Chief Executive with those complains were we alone in recinding this mode of [?] but we find it universally the case with those particularly heading business with that department and hence we find ourselves fully able to sustain our position.

And all we ask is to have the several claims with the evidence in support of the same that we have on file in the pension department examined and settled by a competent and impartial judge strictly in conformity to the laws under which they are respectively asserted—which would greatly relieve several very aged helpers and dependent individuals (relics of the revolution).

And that without being perceptably [?] Some of the titles of the above claims referred to we will have mention, that in the event they may be taken up and examined we would particularly [?] some attention to viz Maria Blendelto widow of Paul Powles Lieut—one forth part of which has been paid on the proof in support of a full allowance of the whole—Hannah Cox widow of James Cod Dep Quartermaster & Forage master general—Elizabeth Luts, Mary Winship, Mary Smith, Elizabeth Romans widow of Capt. Bernard Romans, Christian Lynder, Jonatha Owens, a suspended pensioner. Lieutenant Daniel Chandler an Invalide of our late war with Great Britain & (Nicholas Sescow Colonel) The above are some of the claims to which we wish to call the attention of the Secretary of the Home Department or such other officer as may have charge of this branch of the government but of whom we are not [?] But to whom we ask a refference at his earlyist convenience.

I am Sirs with the highest consideration and respect your very humble servant.
William K. Hoyt. New York April 18th 1849.

Letter in folder dated June 28, 1818, written in reply to an inquiry.

In response to your letter dated the 18th instant, you are advised that it is alleged in the Revolutionary War pension claim, R. F. No. 6,537 that John Luts, name also spelled Lutts and Sutts, was the son of John Luts, and while residing in Montgomery, Orange County, N.Y. enlisted in the New York troops and served at various times under Captains Sovrinus Kook, John Hess, and Rudolph KooH in Colonels Jacob Klock, Peter Waggoner, and Frederick Weissenfels Regiments, and was In various engagements with the enemy in one of which at the taking of Fort Montgomery, as wounded in the face and right arm.

He married in 1790, at Montgomery New York, Elizabeth Ray, who was born in Orange County New York. He died January 10, or 15, 1830, in New York City. There were ten children: Ann, David Crawford, Daniel born February 29, 1796, Alexander, William, Eliza wife of ___Delano and Mrs. Scofield are the only whose names are stated. In 1854 Sarah Jane Colladay a grand child was living.

Widow Elizabeth applied for pension July 18, 1845 while residing in New York City but her claim was not allowed as she failed to prove that her husband rendered the alleged services.