

**Davidson, Florene, EMNRD**

---

**From:** Brooks, David K, EMNRD  
**Sent:** Monday, October 2, 2017 5:03 PM  
**To:** J. Scott Hall; jamesbruc@aol.com; smorgan@cilawnm.com; padillalaw@qwestoffice.net  
**Cc:** Davidson, Florene, EMNRD  
**Subject:** Cases 15547 et al; Welch heirs Motion to Amend Orders

Gentlemen

I recently received a call from Mr. Padilla wanting to know when a response would be required to the referenced motion.

Since these order have been issued, there is no rule applicable to a request to amend them. Division precedent, however, requires a Motion to Re-open, which is then set for hearing as if it were a new application.

To avoid requiring unnecessary paperwork, I have decided to treat this motion as a motion to re-open. By copy of this email, I am directing Florene to docket the Motion as Applications to Re-Open each of the subject cases, and set the matter for hearing for the next available docket, which is on Wednesday, November 8.

Parties should file pre-hearing statements setting forth their positions not later than Thursday, November 2.

Sincerely

David K. Brooks  
Attorney for the hearing examiners

P.S. to Florene

Please have this message scanned into the case files.