

STANLEY

REFERENCE CASE NO 924
STANOLIND GUILLULLY B NO 4

XXXX914

NW NW SEC 22 20 37

DOES WELL MAKE ANY OIL IN EUMONT GAS POOL INTERVAL HAS ANY TENDERS
BEEN ASKED FOR FROM GAS POOL HORIZON IN THIS DUALLED WELL

GETTING FILE H
THE EUMONT IN THIS WELL IS BELIEVED TO BE DRY GAS
MIN PLS
IT IS A DRY GAS WELL
OVER
END END OR GA

} Case # 914

May 23, 1955

Stanolind Oil & Gas Company
Box 1410
FORT WORTH, TEXAS

Attention: Mr. Clarke or Mr. Hilts

Gentlemen:

Your application of April 28 for approval of a 480-acre non-standard gas proration in the Eumont Gas Pool has been set up as Case 914, and advertised for hearing on June 13, 1955, State Capitol, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Very truly yours,

W. B. Macey
Secretary - Director

WBM:nr


C

O

P

Y

GENERAL OFFICES
120 BROADWAY NEW YORK



AMERADA PETROLEUM CORPORATION

BEACON BUILDING
P. O. BOX 2040
TULSA 2, OKLA.

June 10, 1955

Re: Case No. 914

New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission
P. O. Box 871
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Attention: Mr. W. B. Macey

Gentlemen:

This has reference to Stanolind Oil & Gas Company's application for a non-standard gas proration unit in the Eumont Gas Pool, Lea County, New Mexico. They request a 480-acre unit be assigned to their O. J. Gillully "B" No. 4, located 340 feet from the north and west lines of Section 22, Township 20 South, Range 37 East, as shown on the attached plat.

An examination of the attached plat discloses a concentration of wells near the center of Sections 15, 16, 21 and 22. Locations so spaced will cause a concentration of withdrawals which is not considered a good conservation practice. Furthermore, testimony has been presented to show that one well will drain 640 acres. You will note a circle of approximately 640 acres in the area has been circumscribed around the Stanolind Gillully B-4 well which clearly indicates said well will drain offset acreage and not the entire 480 acres requested for the subject well.


At the May hearing, Stanolind requested a 320-acre unit for its Gillully Well 6 X (Case No. 899), also an unorthodox location insofar as a 320-acre gas unit is concerned. Likewise, a circle around this well shows the area of drainage.

We submit if the Commission approves these applications in Cases 899 and 914, the concentrated withdrawals will tend to create waste and in our opinion, will not protect correlative rights. Therefore, we protest the granting of Stanolind's request in Case No. 914 and ask that Rule 5A, Order No. 520, pertaining to the Eumont Pool, be enforced.

New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission
June 10, 1955
Page 2

We had expected that Case No. 877 only would be heard on June 13; therefore, we are not prepared to attend the hearings on this date. If this letter is not considered sufficient evidence in this case, we respectfully request the case be continued to the June 28th or July hearing, at which time we will have a representative present.

Yours very truly,


R. S. Christie

RSC:mt

cc: Mr. R. G. Hiltz
Stanolind Oil & Gas Company
Ft. Worth, Texas

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

P. O. BOX 871

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

September 20, 1955

Mr. Alex Clarke, Jr.
Stanolind Oil & Gas Company
Oil and Gas Building
Fort Worth, Texas

Dear Sir:

We enclose a copy of Order R-682 and Order R-685 issued September 15, 1955, by the Oil Conservation Commission in Cases 914 and 899 respectively.

Very truly yours,

W. B. Macey
Secretary - Director

WBM:brp
Encls. 2

C
O
P
Y