

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY AND MINERALS DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION
STATE LAND OFFICE BLDG.
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

12 August 1987

EXAMINER HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Application of Amerind Oil Company CASE
for compulsory pooling, Lea County, 9191
New Mexico.

BEFORE: Michael E. Stogner, Examiner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Division: Jeff Taylor
Attorney at Law
Legal Counsel to the Division
State Land Office Bldg.
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

For the Applicant: Scott Hall
Attorney at Law
CAMPBELL & BLACK, P.A.
P. O. Box 2208
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

2

I N D E X

STATEMENT BY MR. HALL

3

E X H I B I T S

Amerind Exhibit One, Letter

4

Amerind Exhibit Two, Notices

4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. STOGNER: Call next Case
Number 9191.

MR. TAYLOR: Application of
Amerind Oil Company for compulsory pooling, Lea County, New
Mexico.

MR. STOGNER: Call for appear-
ances in this case?

MR. HALL: Mr. Examiner, Scott
Hall from Campbell & Black on behalf of the applicant.

MR. STOGNER: Are there any
other appearances in this matter?

Mr. Hall, do you have a witness
for this case?

MR. HALL: No, Mr. Examiner. I
would point out that this cased was previously heard on July
1st, 1987, under Case 9162 involving an application for a
nonstandard proration unit and compulsory pooling. That
would have been the west half of the southeast quarter and
the east half of the southwest quarter of Section 28.

They are no longer seeking a
nonstandard unit. They are seeking a standard unit consis-
ting of the south half of the southeast quarter of the same
section; therefor, the only matter before the Commission --
the Examiner now is the pooling. The interests in both of

1 those cases are consistent. There are two uncommitted in-
2 terest owners, Pennzoil and Samson Resoures.

3 The previous opponent in Case
4 9162 was Rio Pecos. They have advised the Division by let-
5 ter, which was addressed to you but received in our office,
6 and we tender that as Exhibit One.

7 And we also have copies of the
8 notices by certified mail sent out to all the interest
9 owners in this newly advertised case, Exhibit Two, which --
10 both of which we'd ask be entered into evidence.

11 And we'd also request that the
12 evidence in Case 9162 and the record testimony be incorpor-
13 ated into this case.

14 MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Hall, is this
15 packet just an affidavit of service notice?

16 MR. HALL: Yes, that's correct,
17 and copies of these letters to each of the interest owners
18 and also copies of the certified receipts.

19 MR. TAYLOR: Do you have an ac-
20 tual affidavit in here or --

21 MR. HALL: No, sir, we don't.
22 We can get the author of that letter to testify, if you
23 like.

24 MR. TAYLOR: Why don't you just
25 supply us with an affidavit.

1 MR. HALL: All right, we'll do
2 that.

3 MR. STOGNER: Mr. Hall, is this
4 all you plan today or present?

5 MR. HALL: Yes, Mr. Examiner.
6 We understand that the case is going to be required to be
7 readvertised due to an advertising error.

8 MR. STOGNER: We have some
9 clarification between Order No. R-8472, which was heard in
10 Case Number 9162. As far as the interest owners go is there
11 any difference between what was force pooled in that
12 particular case and --

13 MR. HALL: No, it's my
14 understanding that the interests are consistent in both sets
15 of tracts.

16 MR. STOGNER: Do you have any-
17 thing further at this time, Mr. Hall?

18 MR. HALL: No, Mr. Examiner.

19 MR. STOGNER: Okay. This case
20 was misadvertised and is going to be required to be readver-
21 tised for the August 26th, 1987, hearing, at which time this
22 case will be called.

23 So at this time we won't take
24 it under advisement. We'll hold the record open for any ad-
25 ditional testimony or records which may need to be put into
the record.

(Hearing concluded.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, SALLY W. BOYD, C.S.R., DO
HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing Transcript of Hearing before
the Oil Conservation Division (Commission) was reported by
me; that the said transcript is a full, true, and correct
record of the hearing, prepared by me to the best of my
ability.

Sally W. Boyd CSR

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is
a complete record of the proceedings in
the Examiner hearing of Case no. 9141,
heard by me on 12/1/87, 1987.

William R. Boyd, Examiner
Oil Conservation Division