

CASE 2524: Application of CITIES SER.  
for a non-standard gas proration unit  
in the Jalpat Gas Pool

452 / 10.

2524

dition, Transcript,  
all Exhibits, Etc.

GOVERNOR  
EDWIN L. MECHEM  
CHAIRMAN

State of New Mexico  
Oil Conservation Commission

LAND COMMISSIONER  
E. S. JOHNNY WALKER  
MEMBER



STATE GEOLOGIST  
A. L. PORTER, JR.  
SECRETARY - DIRECTOR

P. O. BOX 871  
SANTA FE

May 11, 1962

Mr. Jason Kellahin  
Kellahin & Fox  
Box 1713  
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Re: Case No. 2524  
Order No. R-2240  
Applicant:  
Cities Service Petroleum Co.

Dear Sir:

Enclosed herewith are two copies of the above-referenced  
Commission order recently entered in the subject case.

Very truly yours,

A. L. PORTER, Jr.  
Secretary-Director

ir/

Carbon copy of order also sent to:

Hobbs OCC / x

Artesia OCC       

Aztec OCC       

OTHER

BEFORE THE OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING  
CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION  
COMMISSION OF NEW MEXICO FOR  
THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING:

CASE No. 2524  
Order No. R-2240

APPLICATION OF CITIES SERVICE  
PETROLEUM COMPANY FOR A NON-  
STANDARD GAS PRORATION UNIT,  
LEA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO.

ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

BY THE COMMISSION:

This cause came on for hearing at 9 o'clock a.m. on April 11, 1962, at Santa Fe, New Mexico, before Daniel S. Mutter, Examiner duly appointed by the Oil Conservation Commission of New Mexico, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission," in accordance with Rule 1214 of the Commission Rules and Regulations.

NOW, on this 11th day of May, 1962, the Commission, a quorum being present, having considered the application, the evidence adduced, and the recommendations of the Examiner, Daniel S. Mutter, and being fully advised in the premises,

FINDS:

(1) That due public notice having been given as required by law, the Commission has jurisdiction of this cause and the subject matter thereof.

(2) That the applicant, Cities Service Petroleum Company, seeks the establishment of a 320-acre non-standard gas proration unit in the Jalmat Gas Pool, comprising the E/2 of Section 19, Township 24 South, Range 37 East, HMPM, Lea County, New Mexico; applicant proposes to dedicate said unit to the Thomas Well No. 2 located at an unorthodox location 2310 feet from the North line and 2210 feet from the East line of said Section 19.

(3) That the SE/4 of said Section 19 heretofore has been dedicated to the Thomas Well No. 1 located in the SW/4 SE/4 of said Section 19, and the NE/4 of said Section 19 heretofore has been dedicated to the aforesaid Thomas Well No. 2.

(4) That the subject application should be approved, and the status of the Thomas Well No. 1 attributed to the status of the Thomas Well No. 2.

-2-

CASE No. 2524  
Order No. R-2240

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:


(1) That a 320-acre non-standard gas proration unit in the Jalmat Gas Pool is hereby established, effective June 1, 1962, comprising the E/2 of Section 19, Township 24 South, Range 37 East, NMPM, Lea County, New Mexico. Said unit shall be dedicated to the Thomas Well No. 2 located 2310 feet from the North line and 2210 feet from the East line of said Section 19.

(2) That the status of the Thomas Well No. 1 located in the SW/4 SE/4 of said Section 19 shall be attributed to the status of the Thomas Well No. 2.


(3) That jurisdiction of this cause is retained for the entry of such further orders as the Commission may deem necessary.

DONE at Santa Fe, New Mexico, on the day and year hereinabove designated.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION



EDWIN L. MECHEM, Chairman

  
E. S. WALKER, Member  
A. L. PORTER, Jr., Member & Secretary

ear/

BEFORE THE  
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
Santa Fe, New Mexico  
April 11, 1962

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Cities Service Petroleum Company for a non-standard gas proration unit, Lea County, New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks the establishment of a 320-acre non-standard gas proration unit in the Jalmat Gas Pool, comprising the E/2 of Section 19, Township 24 South, Range 37 East, Lea County, New Mexico; said unit is to be dedicated to the Thomas Well No. 2 located at an unorthodox location 2310 feet from the North line and 2210 feet from the East line of said Section 19.

CASE 2524

BEFORE: Daniel S. Nutter, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MR. NUTTER: We call Case 2524.

MR. WHITFIELD: Case 2524: Application of Cities Service Petroleum Company for a non-standard gas proration unit, Lea County, New Mexico.

MR. KELLAHIN: Jason Kellahin, Kellahin and Fox, Santa Fe, representing the Applicant. We have one witness I would like to have sworn.

(Witness sworn.)

(Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibits 1 through 6 marked for identification.)

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.  
PHONE 325-1182

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.  
PHONE 243-6691



DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.  
PHONE 325-1182

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.  
PHONE 243 6691

E. F. MOTTER

called as a witness, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KELLAHIN:

Q Would you state your name, please?

A E. F. Motter.

Q By whom are you employed and in what position?

A Cities Service Petroleum Company, Division Engineer, Hobbs Division.

Q Have you testified before the Oil Conservation Commission and had your qualifications made a matter of record?

A Yes, numerous times.

MR. KELLAHIN: Are the witness' qualifications acceptable?

MR. NUTTER: Yes, sir.

Q (By Mr. Kellahin) Mr. Motter, are you familiar with the application of Cities Service in Case No. 2524?

A Yes. On March 16th I filed a letter for administrative approval of a 320-acre non-standard gas proration unit to be dedicated to the Thomas No. 2, and inadvertently didn't realize at the time that it was a location which could not be approved administratively, and the Commission therefore set it for this hearing.

Q Referring to what has been marked as Exhibit 1, would



DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.  
PHONE 325.1182

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.  
PHONE 243 6691

you discuss the information on that exhibit?

A Yes. This Exhibit No. 1, with the Thomas lease shaded yellow, indicates the wells thereon. Previously we have had two 160 non-standard proration units with acreage dedicated to the No. 1 and to the No. 2 Well. We now desire that the entire acreage be dedicated to the No. 2 Well.

Q What is the situation as to the No. 1 Well at the present time?

A Well, the No. 1 Well for several months failed to make its allowable, and actually the last time it made its allowable was in March of 1961. So we went in to frack that well and fracked it with 20,000 pounds of sand, 10,000 gallons of water, and 1500 gallons of acid in three stages. Actually, we plugged this well back and fracked mainly the Yates, plugged it back 3170 prior to fracking; its previous total depth was 3440. We had considerable trouble getting that well to respond after fracking. It was necessary to swab it repeatedly, so we went in and cleaned out the plug-back material and cleaned out the whole total depth of 3440, and again attempted to make a satisfactory well out of it and were unsuccessful for nearly the whole month of November. We swabbed and shut it in and tried to take tests, and this water that we had fracked with kept coming in on us and the well would die.

In the early part of this year, in January, actually, we went in with some water block removal agent, thinking that we had caused a water block in the formation; and treated it with



## DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.  
PHONE 325-1182ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.  
PHONE 243-6691

3,000 gallons of this material, and again we have had repeated swabbing and the well would flow for four or five hours and load up and die again. Actually, it indicates that there's pretty good pressure; usually in twelve to fourteen hours it will build up to five or six hundred pounds of surface pressure, but when we open it up it will flow maybe ten, fifteen barrels of water and then die.

We shut it in, the same thing, and several times it has been necessary to swab to induce flow. We don't feel that the fracking has at all condemned the particular acreage for gas production. I think we probably have a water block and have been unable to remove it. We have spent so much time and money on the well that it appears now that any more money we spent would probably just be lost; and for that reason, we would like to have the entire acreage dedicated to the No. 2 Well.

Q There's nothing in the No. 1 Well, in your opinion, that would indicate that acreage is not productive of gas from the Jalmat?

A No, it does flow gas, but just for a short period of time, and loads up and dies.

Q Is there production in the Jalmat in acreage offsetting your acreage?

A Yes. If you will refer to my map that we are discussing, it has a legend down there indicating all the wells completed at different intervals in that particular area. The J. G. indica-



DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.  
PHONE 325-1182

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.  
PHONE 243-6691

tion is the Jalmat gas wells. There's a Jalmat gas well to the south, Continental Jack B-30 No. 1, and to the west, in the Southwest Quarter of Section 19 is the Amerada Falby No. 3, and over to the northeast is the Late Oil Company Thomas No. 1.

The lease is pretty well surrounded with Jalmat gas wells. There are some Langley-Mattix gas wells on to the east.

The next couple of exhibits, and also all the cross sections, will tend to show that we are right on the very top of a high there, is the reason why we are producing gas and some of the same zones are producing oil downdip.

Q Exhibit No. 1 shows a dry hole for El Paso?

A This is a well that was drilled by El Paso about two years ago. This particular lease of Cities Service, we hold only the gas rights and the other company holds the oil rights. El Paso took a farmout and drilled this well to the Queen and attempted to produce oil, and if my memory serves me right, I don't think they ever got a ratio less than 120,000 to 1. Naturally, since we had the gas rights, they couldn't have a dual dedication of acreage, so they subsequently plugged the well.

Q Referring to what has been marked as Exhibit No. 2, would you discuss that exhibit?

A Yes, Exhibit No. 2 is a contour map on the top of the Yates. I would like to direct your attention to the East Half of Section 19, this high that we have coming in from the Southeast. Exhibit No. 4 is a contour map on top of the Queen.



DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.  
PHONE 325-1182

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.  
PHONE 243 6691

Q That is No. 3, is it not?

A Excuse me, yes, No. 3, which actually shows the continuity of the high that remains in the area. As you know, the limits of the Jalmat Pool are from 100 foot above the top of the Queen to the Tansil, and that's the reason why these two exhibits indicate the general trend of the formation throughout that interval.

Q On the basis of the information shown on this exhibit, in your opinion is all of the acreage in the East Half of Section 19 productive from the Jalmat?

A Yes, I would say; and rather than spend any time on the cross sections that we have prepared, we have two from north to south, one east to west across the lease, and they substantially show the same thing that Exhibits 2 and 3 show.

Q Those are Exhibits 4, 5, and 6?

A Yes. I would like to point out one thing, as a matter of record, that No. 2 Well in 1955 was plugged back to 3480 so as to conform within the limits of the Jalmat Pool. I think that the log there shows a total depth of some 3600 some feet.

Q That well, when was it drilled?

A 1950.

Q Was it drilled to the Queen Formation?

A Yes, sir, it was.

Q As you say, it was plugged back in 1955?

A Yes.



## DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.  
PHONE 325-1182ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.  
PHONE 243-6531

Q Is it presently completed in the vertical limits of the Jalmat Gas Pool?

A Yes, sir, it is. This particular well has never been treated. It's been a natural completion ever since it was drilled and has been a fairly good gas well. We recently had a deliverability test run by El Paso which indicated a deliverability of 1.356 MCF per day.

Q Would that well make the allowable which would be assigned to a 320-acre unit?

A Yes. I tried to make some calculations on what the allowable would be, and considered it with relation to the entire field, and I came up that the allowable would be slightly less than twice, which runs from 15 to 16 million a month; or this would make allowables probably around 30 million a month.

On the deliverability it shows about 1.8 million a day, and we feel that it has adequate capacity to produce this gas.

Q Now at the present time the Northeast Quarter is dedicated to that well, is that correct?

A To the No. 2.

Q And the Southeast Quarter is dedicated to the No. 1?

A That is correct.

Q What is the status of the two wells as to over or underproduction?

A Well, of course, the No. 1 was being underproduced prior to the time we made the workover, and of course we have had no



## DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.  
PHONE 325-1182ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.  
PHONE 243 6691

production at all from it in the months of December, January, February, and March. So according to the schedule that just came out, it has a March allowable -- or, excuse me, this would be the March allowable, is 35,507,000, which none was produced, and the April allowable was 5,412,000, so it has about 41,000,000 assigned to it right now.

The No. 2 Well has an overage of 15,182,000 at the end of March, but was assigned 10 million in April, so its current allowable situation is about 5 million over. I have no idea how much they produced in April, but I would like to point out one thing about the No. 2 Well. This well was underproduced considerably, and in November this well was placed on intermediate line, and since that time they have taken large amounts of gas out to bring it from an underproduced to overproduced status in that short length of time.

Q What do you propose in regard to handling this allowable situation in this unit?

A We would recommend and prefer that if the entire acreage is assigned to the No. 2 Well, and since the allowables have been assigned to this acreage, we would like to see all the allowables assigned to the No. 2 Well, which would give it currently a net allowable of probably some 20 million underproduction, which I have reason to believe could be made up in not too long a time.

Q If the Commission did elect to approve this unit subject to the No. 2 Well being brought into balance, would you object to



DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.  
PHONE 325-1182

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.  
PHONE 243-6691

that?

A No, we would not.

Q Were Exhibits 1 through 6 prepared by you or under your supervision?

A Yes, sir, they were.

MR. KELLAHIN: I would like to offer in evidence Exhibits 1 through 6.

MR. NUTTER: The Cities Service Exhibits 1 through 6 will be admitted in evidence.

MR. KELLAHIN: That's all I have from this witness.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. NUTTER:

Q As I understand it, your No. 2 Well currently has an overproduced status of 5 million, less what they took in April?

A Yes. If you would like, I'll read it from the record here.

Q Well, these round numbers are all right. I just wanted to get the drift.

A At the end of March, it had an overage of 15,182,000, and its April allowable was 10,012,000. So right now it should be about 5 million over.

Q If they take the allowable in April?

A Well, now, no, if they don't take any in April -- I have no idea how much they have taken in April, I am sure they have taken some, I'm sure its overage status would probably remain



DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.  
PHONE 325-1112

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.  
PHONE 243 6691

15 million. I feel they will go ahead and take this during April, we haven't requested them not to bring it in balance, at least.

Q Now the No. 1 has an underproduction of 35 million?

A At the end of March it had an underproduction of 35 million, and had an April allowable assigned to it of 5,412,000, so adding these two together -- I know there'll be no gas taken out of that well -- adding them together it will be 41 million. If we deduct the 15 from 41, what would it be, 25 million.

Q So what Cities Service requests is that the status of both be consolidated to get a new net for the 320-acre unit?

A Right, and be assigned to the No. 2 well.

MR. NUTTER: Off the record.

(Whereupon, a discussion off the record was held.)

MR. NUTTER: Now, back on the record.

Q (By Mr. Nutter) Is the ownership of the gas rights in the Jalmat Gas Pool identical throughout this entire 320-acre unit?

A Yes, sir, it is. It's all Thomas lease.

Q Did the El Paso well make any test of the Jalmat Pool when they went through the Jalmat?

A They tested the entire interval from, I believe -- I don't have the record here with me, but as I recall, they tested nearly everything that showed any porosity from the Yates through the Queen. If you will notice, there are wells offsetting this particular well to the west, Continental, for instance, their No. 4, Jack No. 4 and 8, one is a Jalmat oil well and the other is



DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.  
PHONE 325-1112

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.  
PHONE 243-6691

a Langley-Mattix oil well. I'm sure that's the horizon they were hitting for. They tested nearly all zones.

Q What zone is your No. 2 Well open in?

A Well, it's --

Q What formation?

A Casing is set at 2870 and plugged back, total depth is 3480, so it's open through the Yates and to 100 feet above the Queen; it includes the Seven Rivers.

Q It has all the Yates and Seven Rivers?

A All that's permissible in the Jalmat Pool.

Q It's open throughout the Jalmat?

A Yes.

Q What is the gas-liquid ratio?

A It's a dry gas.

MR. NUTTER: Any further questions of Mr. Motter? He may be excused.

(Witness excused.)

MR. NUTTER: Do you have anything further, Mr. Kellahin?

MR. KELLAHIN: That's all I have in this case, Mr. Nutter.

MR. NUTTER: Does anyone have anything they wish to offer in Case 2524? We'll take the case under advisement, and take a fifteen minute recess.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

\*\*\*



STATE OF NEW MEXICO )  
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO ) ss

I, ADA DEARNLEY, Notary Public in and for the County of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached Transcript of Proceedings was reported by me, and that the same is a true and correct record of said proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

DATED this 14th day of April, 1962, in the City of Albuquerque, County of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico.

*Ada Dearnley*  
NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires:

June 19, 1963.

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of Case No. 2524 heard by me on 4/11, 1962.

*[Signature]*, Examiner  
New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

FARMINGTON, N. M.  
PHONE 325-1162

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.  
PHONE 243-6691



OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
P. O. BOX 871  
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

6-11-524

March 19, 1962

C  
O  
P  
Y

Cities Service Petroleum Company  
500 Broadmoor Building  
P. O. Box 97  
Hobbs, New Mexico

Attention: Mr. E. F. Motter

Gentlemen:

Reference is made to your application, dated March 16, 1962, for administrative approval of a 320-acre non-standard gas proration unit in the Jalmat Gas Pool comprising the E/2 of Section 19, Township 24 South, Range 37 East, Lea County, New Mexico.

Your attention is directed to Rule 5(B) of Order No. R-1670 setting forth the General Rules and Regulations for the prorated gas pools of Southeastern New Mexico; said rule requires the location of the unit well be at least 660 feet and 1980 feet from the two nearest boundaries of the non-standard unit in order for 320 acres to be dedicated thereto. In view of the fact that your Thomas Well No. 2 is located 330 feet from the west side of your proposed non-standard unit, your application is not eligible for administrative approval but must be considered at hearing. Accordingly, the application is being set for hearing before one of the Commission's examiners on April 11, 1962.

In the event the date of hearing is not satisfactory to you or if I can be of further assistance to you in this matter, please advise.

Very truly yours,

J. E. WHITFIELD  
Legal Assistant

3/30/62  
JEW/esr

CITIES SERVICE PETROLEUM COMPANY  
500 Broadmoor Building  
P. O. Box 97  
Hobbs, New Mexico  
MAIN OFFICE OCC

1962 MAR ~~19~~ PM 6:29 March 16, 1962

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

Attention: Mr. A. L. Porter, Jr.

Re: Non-Standard Gas Proration  
Unit Jalmat Gas Pool,  
Lea County, New Mexico.

Gentlemen:

It is respectfully requested that the Oil Conservation Commission authorize administratively a non-standard gas proration unit composed of the E/2 Section 19 (320 acres) to be dedicated to the Thomas #2 located 2310' FNL, 2210' FEL, Section 19 both in T-24S, R-37E, Jalmat Pool, Lea County, New Mexico.

In support of this application the following information is submitted:

- (1) The entire acreage can be assumed productive of gas from within the vertical limits of the Jalmat Gas Pool.
- (2) The Thomas #2 is favorably located to provide drainage from the proposed non-standard gas proration unit.
- (3) The Thomas #2 on a test March 9 indicated a deliverability of 1356 MCF per day.
- (4) The Thomas #1 to which the SE/4 of Section 19 is dedicated was recently water fraced in an attempt to increase productivity. A water block has apparently developed in this well and frequent swabbing is necessary to maintain flow.

7524  
Hearing  
B  
well location  
non standard  
320 acres

Cities Service Petroleum Company requests, for the above reasons, that a non-standard gas proration unit composed of the E/2 Section 19, T-14S, R-37E, Lea County, New Mexico, be dedicated to the Thomas #2. A plat showing all offset wells and operators is included as well as NMOC Form C-128.

All offset operators have been sent copies of this request.

Very truly yours,

CITIES SERVICE PETROLEUM COMPANY



E. F. Motter  
Asst. Division Engineer

EFM/sjb

Attachments

CC:

New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission  
P. O. Box 2045  
Hobbs, New Mexico

King, Warren & Dye  
P. O. Box 1505  
Midland, Texas

Carper Drilling Company  
200 Carper Building  
Artesia, New Mexico

Continental Oil Company  
P. O. Box 1377  
Roswell, New Mexico

Amerada Petroleum Corporation  
Drawer D  
Monument, New Mexico

Texaco, Inc.  
P. O. Box 728  
Hobbs, New Mexico


Texas Pacific Coal & Oil Co.  
P. O. Box 1688  
Hobbs, New Mexico

Late Oil Company  
P. O. Box 670  
San Angelo, Texas

Western Natural Gas Company  
823 Midland Tower Bldg.  
Midland, Texas

Southern Petroleum Exploration, Inc.  
P. O. Box 1434  
Roswell, New Mexico

915  
 SECTION PLAT  
 Scale: 1 inch = 660 feet  
 Printed in U.S.A.



Plat showing Proposed 320 Acre  
 Non Standard Gas Proration Unit  
 Thomas Lease

Chas 2524

**NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
WELL LOCATION AND ACREAGE DEDICATION PLAT**

FORM C-128  
Revised 5/1/57

SEE INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS FORM ON THE REVERSE SIDE

**SECTION A**

Operator <b>Citico Service Petroleum Company</b>			Lease <b>Thomas</b>		Well No. <b>2</b>
Unit Letter <b>8</b>	Section <b>19</b>	Township <b>24</b>	Range <b>37</b>	County <b>Lee</b>	
Actual Footage Location of Well: <b>2310</b> feet from the <b>North</b> line and <b>2210</b> feet from the <b>East</b> line					
Ground Level Elev. <b>3291</b>	Producing Formation <b>Yates Green Shale</b>		Pool <b>Johnston Gas</b>	Dedicated Acreage: <b>320</b> Acres	

1. Is the Operator the only owner in the dedicated acreage outlined on the plat below? YES ☒ NO ☐ . ("Owner" means the person who has the right to drill into and to produce from any pool and to appropriate the production either for himself or for himself and another. (65-3-29 (e) NMSA 1935 Comp.)
2. If the answer to question one is "no," have the interests of all the owners been consolidated by communization agreement or otherwise? YES ☐ NO ☐ . If answer is "yes," Type of Consolidation \_\_\_\_\_
3. If the answer to question two is "no," list all the owners and their respective interests below:

Owner	Land Description

**SECTION B**


**CERTIFICATION**

I hereby certify that the information in SECTION A above is true and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Name *E. L. Hester*  
 Position **Asst. Division Engineer**  
 Company **Citico Service Petroleum Co.**  
 Date **March 13, 1962**

I hereby certify that the well location shown on the plat in SECTION B was plotted from field notes of actual surveys made by me or under my supervision, and that the same is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Date Surveyed \_\_\_\_\_  
 Registered Professional Engineer and/or Land Surveyor


Certificate No. \_\_\_\_\_

0 330 660 990 1320 1650 1980 2310 2640 2000 1500 1000 500 0

*Case 2524*

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF FORM C-128**

1. Operator shall furnish and certify to the information called for in Section A.
2. Operator shall outline the dedicated acreage for *both* oil and gas wells on the plat in Section B.
3. A registered professional engineer or land surveyor registered in the State of New Mexico or approved by the Commission shall show on the plat the location of the well and certify this information in the space provided.
4. All distances shown on the plat must be from the outer boundaries of the Section.
5. If additional space is needed for listing owners and their respective interests as required in question 3 of Section A, please use space below.



CODE =

JO Jalmat Oil  
JG Jalmat Gas  
LO Langlie - Mattix Oil  
LG Langlie - Mattix Gas

BEFORE EXAMINER NUTTER  
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
EXHIBIT NO. 1  
CASE NO. 2524

# CITIES SERVICE PETR. CO.

Thomas Lease Aren, Twp 24S Rge 37E  
Lea County, New Mexico 4-2-'62 efm