

3. That on or about the 20th day of September, 1957, the lease holder of such property commenced the drilling of a gas well to be completed in the Tubb gas zone which gas well was completed as a commercial producer of dry gas and associated liquid hydro-carbons in the Tubb gas zone on or about the 1st day of January, 1958, and such production was attributed in accordance with the prior agreement of the parties and the prior order of the Commission.

4. That on the 17th day of December, 1958, the Oil Conservation Commission entered an order in Cause No. 1567 wherein the Commission pooled the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 25, Township 22 South, Range 37 East as a Tubb gas unit and the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of such section as a Tubb gas unit and thereafter the production of the gas well drilled in 1957 was attributed to the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of such section and a new gas well was drilled in the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of such section and the production of such new well was attributed to the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of said section; that the production realized from the new gas well in the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ is less than the production realized from the gas well originally attributed to the acreage of the petitioners herein.

5. That the records of the Commission causes numbered 929, 1567 and 2051 and the pooling agreement described in paragraph 2 hereof may be admitted into evidence and considered by the Court in the determination of this cause.

DONE this 13th day of November, 1961.

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

ATTORNEY FOR OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

ATTORNEY FOR TEXAS-PACIFIC COAL AND
OIL, SUCCESSOR TO OLSEN OILS, INC.