CAMPBELL, CARR, BERGE 8 SHERIDAN, P.A.

٠.

LAWYERS

MICHAEL B. CAMPBELL
WILLIAM F CARR
BRADFORD C. BERGE
MARK F SHERIDAN
MICHAEL H. FELDEWERT
ANTHONY F MEDEIROS
PAUL R. OWEN

JACK M. CAMPBELL OF COUNSEL JEFFERSON PLACE
SUITE I - 110 NORTH GUADALUPE
POST OFFICE BOX 2208

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87504-2208

TELEPHONE: (505) 988-4421

FACSIMILE: (505) 983-6043
E-MAIL: ccbspa@ix.netcom.com

HAND DELIVERED

William J. LeMay, Director
Oil Conservation Division
New Mexico Department of Energy,
Minerals ans Natural Resources
2040 South Pacheco Street
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

Re: Case 11599 (<u>De Novo</u>): Application of Gillespie-Crow, Inc. for an allowable reduction, Lea County, New Mexico

July 9, 1997

Dear Mr. LeMay:

On February 20, 1997, the Division entered Order Nos. R-9722-C and R-10448-A in the above referenced case which, among other things, reduced the pool allowable for the West Lovington-Strawn Pool from 445 BOPD to 250 BOPD and abolished the project allowable for the West Lovington Strawn Unit ("WLSU"). The reasons stated for these allowable changes were that "all wells whether inside or outside the WLSU should be treated the same" to "assure fairness for all operators in this reservoir." (Finding 15, page 6)

On March 8, 1997, Yates Petroleum Corporation and Hanley Petroleum, Inc. filed written applications for hearing <u>de novo</u> in this case to preserve for later review the issues related to these new pool allowables. No other party filed for hearing <u>de novo</u>.

Since the entry of Order Nos. R-9722-C and R-10448-A, there has been a two day hearing before Examiner Catanach concerning this pool and unit. In that case, the Examiner is being asked to determine the proper unit boundaries for the WLSU and to amend the unit participation formula. Until there is a decision in that case, any further discussion of pool allowables is premature. Furthermore, the allowable issues in Case 11599 are intertwined with the issues in the case now before the Examiner. Accordingly, Yates and Hanley have withdrawn their Applications for Hearing De Novo.

William J. LeMay, Director Oil Conservation Division New Mexico Department of Energy, Minerals ans Natural Resources July 9, 1997 Page 2

On July 8, 1997, James Bruce wrote the Division/Commission on behalf of Gillespie-Crow, Inc. characterizing the withdrawal of our applications for hearing <u>de novo</u> as a "motion to dismiss" and then asking that it be denied.

In response to the argument of Gillespie-Crow, Inc., Yates and Hanley call your attention to the provisions of the Oil and Gas Act. The Act does not state, as Mr. Bruce suggests, that the Rules of Civil Procedure govern Division proceedings. Instead, Sections 70-2-7 and 70-2-13 direct the Division to "prescribe by rule its rules of order or procedure." That has been done.

Enclosed is a copy of Oil Conservation Division Rule 1220, a portion of which is set out below. With this rule, the Division has prescribed how a case may be appealed to the Commission for <u>de novo</u> review. It reads in pertinent part as follows:

RULE 1220. - DE NOVO HEARING BEFORE THE COMMISSION

"When any order has been entered by the Division pursuant to any hearing held by an Examiner, any party of record adversely affected by such order shall have the right to have the matter or proceeding heard <u>de novo</u> before the Commission, <u>provided</u> that within thirty (30) days from the date such order is rendered <u>such party</u> files with the Division a written application for such hearing before the Commission..."

Unlike Yates and Hanley neither Gillespie-Crow, Inc. nor any other party filed a written application for hearing <u>de novo</u>. They cannot do it now. Yates and Hanley have withdrawn their applications. Order Nos. R-9722-C and R-10448-A are final orders and nothing remains for the Commission to consider.

If you determine a hearing on this matter is required, I will be at the Division all day on July 10, 1997 and will be prepared to present argument on this issue at your convenience.

William J. LeMay, Director Oil Conservation Division New Mexico Department of Energy, Minerals ans Natural Resources July 9, 1997 Page 3

Your attention to this matter is appreciated.

∜ery truly yours,

WILLIAM F. CARR

WFC:mlh

Attorney for Yates Petroleum Corporation and Hanley Petroleum, Inc.

cc: Marilyn S. Hebert, Esq., (Via Hand-Delivery)

James Bruce, Esq., (Via Hand-Delivery)

J. Scott Hall, Esq., (Via Hand-Delivery)

W. Thomas Kellahin, Esq., (Via Hand-Delivery)

1217 EXAMINER'S MANNER OF CONDUCTING HEARING

An Examiner conducting a hearing under these rules shall conduct himself as a disinterested umpire. [9-15-55...2-1-96]

1218 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS, EXAMINER'S HEARING

Upon the conclusion of any hearing before an Examiner, the Examiner shall promptly consider the proceedings in such hearing, and based upon the record of such hearing the Examiner shall prepare his written report and recommendations for the disposition of the matter or proceeding by the Division. Such report and recommendations shall either be accompanied by a proposed order or shall be in the form of a proposed order, and shall be submitted to the Division Director with the certified record of the hearing. [9-15-55...2-1-96]

1219 DISPOSITION OF CASES HEARD BY EXAMINERS

After receipt of the report and recommendations of the Examiner, the Division Director shall enter the Division's order disposing of the matter or proceeding. [9-15-55...2-1-96]

1220 DE NOVO HEARING BEFORE COMMISSION

When any order has been entered by the Division pursuant to any hearing held by an Examiner, any party of record adversely affected by such order shall have the right to have such matter or proceeding heard <u>de novo</u> before the Commission, provided that within thirty (30) days from the date such order is rendered such party files with the Division a written application for such hearing before the Commission. If such application is filed, the matter or proceeding shall be set for hearing before the Commission at the first available hearing date following the expiration of fifteen days from the date such application is filed with the Division. Any party to the proceeding adversely affected by the order or decision rendered by the Commission after hearing before the Commission may apply for rehearing pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of Rule 1222 and said Rule 1222 together with the law applicable to rehearings and appeals in matters and proceedings before the Commission shall thereafter apply. [9-15-55...

1221 NOTICE OF COMMISSION AND DIVISION ORDERS

Within ten days after any order, including any order granting or refusing rehearing, or order following rehearing, has been rendered, a copy of such order shall be mailed by the Division to each person or his attorney of record who has entered his appearance of record in the matter of proceeding pursuant to which such order is rendered. [9-15-55...2-1-96]

1222 REHEARINGS

Within 20 days after entry of any order or decision of the Commission any person affected thereby may file with the Division an application for rehearing in respect of any matter determined by such order or decision, setting forth the respect in which such order or decision is believed to be erroneous. The Commission shall grant or refuse any such application in whole or in part within 10 days after the same is filed and failure to act thereon within such period shall be deemed a refusal thereof and a final disposition of such application. In the event the rehearing is granted, the Commission may enter such new order or decision after rehearing as may be required under the circumstances. [1-1-50...2-1-96]

JAMES BRUCE ATTORNEY AT LAW

POST OFFICE BOX 1056 SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87504

SUITE B 612 OLD SANTA FE TRAIL SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87501

(505) 982-2043 (505) 982-2151 (FAX)

July 8, 1997

Via Fax

William J. LeMay Oil Conservation Division 2040 South Pacheco Street Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

Re: Case 11599 (De Novo); Application of Gillespie-Crow, Inc. for an allowable reduction, Lea County, New Mexico

Dear Mr. LeMay:

We have received the request of Yates Petroleum Corp[oration and Hanley Petroleum, Inc. to "withdraw" the de novo application. Gillespie-Crow, Inc. requests that this motion to dismiss be denied, for the following reasons:

- 1. A case cannot be dismissed without the approval of all of the parties involved. The rules of civil procedure apply to with the administrative proceedings, and those rules require all parties to agree to the dismissal of an action. SCRA to the (1986) 1-041. Gillespie-Crow, Inc. and Enserch Exploration, Inc. do not agree to a dismissal.
- Gillespie-Crow, Inc. is also seeking relief in the de novo case: In the order entered by the Division in the February 1997, the unit's project allowable was eliminated, even though no request for termination of the allowable was requested by any party. Gillespie-Crow, Inc. seeks the re-institution of a unit project allowable. This request is based on a change in circumstances since the original hearing last October. Enserch Exploration supports this request.

As a result of the foregoing, a dismissal of the de novo case is improper. Due to witness travel plans, Gillespie-Crow, Inc. respectfully requests that a decision on the dismissal motion be issued by Thursday morning. I believe all counsel are available

to meet with Ms. Hebert at that time to discuss this matter, if you so desire.

very truly yours,

James Bruce

Attorney for Gillespie-Crow, Inc.

cc:

William F. Carr (via fax)
J. Scott Hall (via fax)
W. Thomas Kellahin (via fax)
Marilyn S. Hebert (via fax)

JAMES BRUCE
Attorney at Law
Post Office Box 1056
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
Telephone: (505) 982-2043
Fax: (505) 982-2151

FAX COVER SHEET

DELIVER TO: Lyn Hebert

COMPANY: Oil Conservation Division

CITY: Santa Fe, New Mexico

FAX NUMBER: 827-8177

NUMBER OF PAGES: 3 (Including Cover Sheet)

DATE SENT: 7/8/97

MEMO:

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This transmission contains information which may be confidential and legally privileged. The information is intended only for the above-named recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, any copying or distribution of the information is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please call us at the above number and return the document by United States mail. Thank you.

CAMPBELL, CARR, BERGE 8 SHERIDAN, P.A.

LAWYERS

MICHAEL B. CAMPBELL
WILLIAM F. CARR
BRADFORD C. BERGE
MARK F. SHERIDAN
MICHAEL H. FELDEWERT
ANTHONY F. MEDEIROS
PAUL R. OWEN

JACK M. CAMPBELL OF COUNSEL JEFFERSON PLACE

SUITE I - IIO NORTH GUADALUPE POST OFFICE BOX 2208

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87504-2208

TELEPHONE: (505) 988-4421
FACSIMILE. (505) 983-6043
E-MAIL: ccbspa@ix.netcom.com

July 8, 1997

HAND-DELIVERED

William J. LeMay, Director
Oil Conservation Division
New Mexico Department of Energy,
Minerals and Natural Resources
2040 South Pacheco Street
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

Re: Oil Conservation Division Case No. 11599 (De Novo):

Application of Gillespie-Crow, Inc. for Pool Expansion and Contraction, Pool Creation, and the Promulgation of Special Pool Rules Therefor, Lea County, New Mexico

Dear Mr. LeMay:

Yates Petroleum Corporation and Hanley Petroleum, Inc., hereby withdraw their Application for Hearing De Novo in the above-captioned case and request that the July 14th hearing on this matter be dismissed.

Your attention to this matter is appreciated.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM F. CARR

WFC:mlh

cc: Rand Carroll, Esq., (Via Hand-Delivery)

Jim Bruce, Esq., (Via Hand-Delivery)
J. Scott Hall, Esq., (Via Hand-Delivery)

OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION 2040 South Pacheco Street Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505 (505) 827-7131

June 3, 1997

Mr. James Bruce Attorney at Law Post Office Box 1056 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

Mr. William F. Carr Campbell, Carr, Berge & Sheridan Attorneys at Law Post Office Box 2208 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2208 Mr. Thomas Kellahin Kellahin & Kellahin Attorneys at Law Post Office Box 2265 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2265

Mr. Scott Hall
Miller, Stratvert, Torgerson
& Schlenker
Attorneys at Law
Post Office Box 1986
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-1986

Gentlemen:

The request for continuance of De Novo Case No. 11599 received from Hanley Petroleum, Inc. and Yates Petroleum Corporation as De Novo applicants in said case is hereby granted. De Novo Case No. 11599 will be continued to the Commission hearing scheduled for July 8, 1997.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM Director

WILLIAM J. LEMAY