25

```
Page 2
 1
                             APPEARANCES
. 2
     FOR APPLICANT CIMAREX ENERGY COMPANY:
 3
          JENNIFER L. BRADFUTE, ESQ.
          MODRALL, SPERLING, ROEHL, HARRIS & SISK, P.A.
          500 4th Street, Northwest, Suite 1000
          Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
 5
          (505) 848-1800
          jlb@modrall.com
     FOR MOBIL PRODUCING TEXAS & NEW MEXICO, INC.
         JORDAN L. KESSLER, ESQ.
          HOLLAND & HART
 9
          110 North Guadalupe, Suite 1
         Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
          (505) 988-4421
-10.
         jlkessler@hollandhart.com
11
12
     ALSO PRESENT: James Bruce, Esq.
13
14
                                INDEX
،15
                                                           PAGE
16 ·
    Case Numbers 15619 and 15620 Called
                                                               3
17 Request for Case to be Taken Under Advisement
                                                               3
18
     Proceedings Conclude
                                                               6
19
     Certificate of Court Reporter
20
21
-22
                    EXHIBITS OFFERED AND ADMITTED
.23.
     (No exhibits offered.)
24:
25
```

1	(8:21 a.m.)
2	EXAMINER GOETZE: Therefore, we will start
3	with Case Number 15619, application of Cimarex Energy
4	nonstandard spacing and proration unit, project area and
5	compulsory pooling Eddy County, New Mexico, along with
6	Case Number 15620, application of Cimarex Energy Company
7 ,	for a nonstandard spacing and proration unit, project
8	area and compulsory pooling, Eddy County, New Mexico.
. 9	Call for appearances.
10	MS. BRADFUTE: Mr. Examiners, my name is
11	Jennifer Bradfute, and I'm with the Modrall Sperling Law
12	Firm here on behalf of Cimarex Energy.
13.	MS. KESSLER: Jordan Kessler, from the
14	Santa Fe office of Holland & Hart, on behalf of Mobil
15	Producing Texas & New Mexico.
16	EXAMINER GOETZE: Very good. Proceed.
17	MS. BRADFUTE: Mr. Examiner, this case was
18	continued from the January 19th docket because the
19	Affidavit of Notice hadn't been published outside the
20	ten-day business period. The Affidavit of Publication
21	was presented as an exhibit at the hearing on January
22	19th, so we continued the hearing to this date in order
23	to see if anyone appeared at the hearing to present any
24	objections to the applications.
25	EXAMINER GOETZE: So we're fulfilling the

- 1 time requirements, and there are no additional
- 2 requirements as far as applications of notice or
- 3 anything along that. So we have no more exhibits?
- 4 MS. BRADFUTE: That's right.
- 5 EXAMINER GOETZE: So you would like to
- 6 proceed with taking the case under advisement?
- 7 MS. BRADFUTE: Yes, I would, Mr. Examiner.
- 8 MS. KESSLER: No objection.
- EXAMINER GOETZE: No objections.
- Very good. Case Numbers 15619 and 15620
- 11 are taken under advisement. Thank you very much.
- 12 EXAMINER BROOKS: Let me make a statement
- 13 about the case.
- 14 EXAMINER GOETZE: Oh, wait a minute.
- 15 EXAMINER BROOKS: I'm going to make a
- 16 statement about this case because I was thinking about
- 17 it driving in this morning. And in reality, I believe
- 18 we should require and I will advise the Division to
- 19 require in the future in cases like publication, because
- 20 the interpretation is not clear, but it seems to be
- 21 necessarily -- to me to be necessarily reasonable to --
- 22 and I will discuss it with the director before adopting
- 23 a new policy. But it seems to me that there is -- in
- 24 cases of this type where a publication affidavit --
- 25 where a published -- a notice is published late, that it

- 1 should be republished rather than merely delaying the
- 2 hearing two weeks.
- 3 The reason it seems that way is because it
- 4 is very unlikely that anybody is going to appear at a
  - 5 hearing pursuant to a published notice, of course. It's
  - 6 so unlikely that maybe we should disregard it
  - 7 altogether. But at the same time, it's even more
- 8 unlikely that anybody has read any notice in the
- 9 newspaper after January the whatever and finds out that
- 10 there was a hearing on that date that's already past is
- 11 going to come in and appear on a hearing two weeks later
- 12 that is not mentioned in the notice. So I just put that
- 13 out for information.
- MS. BRADFUTE: Okay. Thank you.
- 15 EXAMINER GOETZE: Okay. Thank you.
- MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, Mr. Brooks is
- 17 incorrect because I've had three cases with people that
- 18 showed up from publication. Mr. Carr can explain those.
- 19 (Laughter.)
- 20 EXAMINER BROOKS: But did they show up on
- 21 the date published, or did they show up on some other
- 22 date?
- MR. BRUCE: They -- they filed
- 24 applications to vacate the pooling orders.
- 25 EXAMINER BROOKS: Oh.

	Page 6
1	EXAMINER GOETZE: Well, evidently the
2.	attorneys will have to discuss this at length to come
3	forward with some guidance, I'm sure.
4	EXAMINER BROOKS: Yes. This is strictly a
5	legal issue.
6	EXAMINER GOETZE: Very good. That'll be it
7	for this case.
-8	MS. BRADFUTE: Thank you.
9	(Case Numbers 15619 and 15620 conclude,
10	8:25 a.m.)
11	·
√12	
13	·
14	
15	1 65.
16	the Edge Interior of the proceedings in the foreign the interior of the proceedings in the process in the
17	heard by a tracker of the processing to
18	Feb. 2 15(10)
19	the Edward of the precendings in Scamines  Oil Conservation Division, Examines
20	Bervation Division . Examiner
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

24

25,

Paul Baca Professional Court Reporters