

# Correspondence

Case No. 14

June - July, 1941



PETROLEUM AND ITS PRODUCTS

# GULF OIL CORPORATION

TULSA · OKLAHOMA

July 2, 1941

GYPSY  
DIVISION

RUSSELL G. LOWE  
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY

Oil Conservation Commission,  
Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Gentlemen:

Re: Case #14 - Hobbs Division Order #329  
Hobbs Proration Plan  
Petition for Rehearing

This acknowledges receipt of yours of the 27th of June and the Gulf Oil Corporation has no objection to withdrawing its petition for rehearing providing it will not be prejudiced by so doing and will be permitted to file petition for rehearing after the present order has been rewritten and clarified, in event the revised order is unsatisfactory.

Our production records show during the period the order has been in force, Gulf Oil Corporation has lost approximately 24,881 barrels in production and the areas in which additional allowables were granted have benefited approximately 58,233 barrels.

It is evident from the figures above, the order as written is detrimental to the interests of the Gulf Oil Corporation and its lessors and results in drainage.

Yours very truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Russell G. Lowe".

RGL.W.

# The Ohio Oil Co.

P. O. BOX 3128  
HOUSTON, TEXAS

July 1, 1941

New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission  
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Attn. of Mr. John M. Kelly, Secretary

Re: Case #14 - Hobbs Division Order #329 -  
Hobbs Proration Plan - Petition for  
Re-hearing

Gentlemen:

We acknowledge with thanks the receipt of your letter dated June 27, 1941, outlining the decision of the Commission on June 25th. in the above captioned case which is pending until issuance of a clarifying order.

Yours very truly,

THE OHIO OIL COMPANY

By: William Bush

General Superintendent



NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
HOBBS, NEW MEXICO

June 27, 1941

C  
O  
P  
Y  
  
Russell G. Lowe, Esq.  
Gulf Oil Corporation  
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Re: Case #14 - Hobbs Division Order #329 -  
Hobbs Proration Plan - Petition for Re-  
hearing.

Dear Mr. Lowe:

At its Executive session June 25th, in connection with the petition for re-hearing in the above captioned matter, the Commission decided that in view of the fact that in the promulgation of Order #329 the Commission had made reservation of jurisdiction for further determination, it would be advisable to exercise that jurisdiction by the issuance of a clarifying order.

The Commission further reached the conclusion in its Executive meeting to request the petitioner and all those joining in such petition to withdraw the petition until the final order and clarification is promulgated.

Very truly yours,

Oil Conservation Commission

By

John F. Kelly  
Secretary.

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
HOBBS, NEW MEXICO

June 27, 1941

C  
O  
P  
Y

Mr. R. H. Foster  
Executive Vice President  
Landreth Production Corporation  
Fort Worth, Texas

Re: Case #14 - Hobbs Division Order #329 -  
Hobbs Proration Plan - Petition for Re-  
hearing.

Dear Mr. Foster:

At its Executive session June 25th, in connection with the petition for re-hearing in the above captioned matter, the Commission decided that in view of the fact that in the promulgation of Order #329 the Commission had made reservation of jurisdiction for further determination, it would be advisable to exercise that jurisdiction by the issuance of a clarifying order.

The Commission further reached the conclusion in its Executive meeting to request the petitioner and all those joining in such petition to withdraw the petition until the final order and clarification is promulgated.

Very truly yours,

Oil Conservation Commission

By

John M. Kelly  
Secretary.

CDL:MS

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
HOBBS, NEW MEXICO

June 27, 1941

C  
O  
P  
Y

Mr. W. B. Hurley  
Assistant General Superintendent  
Texas-New Mexico Division  
Continental Oil Company  
Fort Worth, Texas

Re: Case #14 - Hobbs Division Order #329 -  
Hobbs Proration Plan - Petition for Re-  
hearing.

Dear Mr. Hurley:

At its Executive session June 25th, in connection with the petition for re-hearing in the above captioned matter, the Commission decided that in view of the fact that in the promulgation of Order #329 the Commission had made reservation of jurisdiction for further determination, it would be advisable to exercise that jurisdiction by the issuance of a clarifying order.

The Commission further reached the conclusion in its Executive meeting to request the petitioner and all those joining in such petition to withdraw the petition until the final order and clarification is promulgated.

Very truly yours,

Oil Conservation Commission

By

John M. Kelly  
Secretary.

OEL:MS

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
HOBBS, NEW MEXICO

June 27, 1941

C  
O  
P  
Y  
Mr. Glenn Bish  
General Superintendent  
Ohio Oil Company  
P. O. Box 3013  
Houston, Texas

Re: Case #14 - Hobbs Division Order #329 -  
Hobbs Proration Plan - Petition for Re-  
hearing.

Dear Mr. Bish:

At its Executive session June 25th, in connection with the petition for re-hearing in the above captioned matter, the Commission decided that in view of the fact that in the promulgation of Order #329 the Commission had made reservation of jurisdiction for further determination, it would be advisable to exercise that jurisdiction by the issuance of a clarifying order.

The Commission further reached the conclusion in its Executive meeting to request the petitioner and all those joining in such petition to withdraw the petition until the final order and clarification is promulgated.

Very truly yours,

Oil Conservation Commission

By

John W. Kelly  
Secretary

CBL:MS

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
HOBBBS NEW MEXICO

June 27, 1941

C  
O  
P  
Y  
  
Hayes McCoy, Esq.  
Cities Service Oil Company  
Bartlesville, Oklahoma

Re: Case #14 - Hobbs Division Order #329 -  
Hobbs Proration Plan - Petition for Re-  
Hearing.

Dear Mr. McCoy:

At its Executive session June 26th, in connection with the petition for re-hearing in the above captioned matter, the Commission decided that in view of the fact that in the promulgation of Order #329 the Commission had made reservation of jurisdiction for further determination, it would be advisable to exercise that jurisdiction by the issuance of a clarifying order.

The Commission further reached the conclusion in its Executive meeting to request the petitioner and all those joining in such petition to withdraw the petition until the final order and clarification is promulgated.

Very truly yours,

Oil Conservation Commission

By

John M. Kelly  
Secretary

JMK:MS



STANDARD TIME INDICATED
RECEIVED AT TULSA OKLA
TELEPHONE YOUR TELEGRAMS TO POSTAL TELEGRAPH



THIS IS A FULL RATE TELEGRAM, CABLE-GRAM OR RADIOGRAM UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED BY SYMBOL IN THE PREAMBLE OR IN THE ADDRESS OF THE MESSAGE. SYMBOLS DESIGNATING SERVICE SELECTED ARE OUTLINED IN THE COMPANY'S TARIFFS ON HAND AT EACH OFFICE AND ON FILE WITH REGULATORY AUTHORITIES.

Form 16 Dbl

10VDE TWS PAID-3M-

PGY TULSA OKLA 1153A 6/25 '41

GULF CONSERVATION COMMISSION

SANTAFE NMEX

ON JANUARY 29 1941 I FORWARDED YOU PETITION FOR REHEARING AND RECONSIDERATION OF CASE NUMBER FOURTEEN SUBDIVISION 9000000 ORDER THREE TWO NINE STOP WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR CONSIDERATE APPLICATION OF PETITION AND IF APPLICATION FOR REHEARING IS GRANTED FIX A DATE FOR HEARING.

GULF OIL CORPN, BY RUSSELL G. LOWE

1132A

**SETH AND MONTGOMERY**  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW  
III SAN FRANCISCO ST.  
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

J. O. SETH  
A. K. MONTGOMERY

June 19, 1941

Mr. John Kelly, Secretary  
Oil Conservation Commission  
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Dear Mr. Kelly:


Re: Case #14, Hobbs Division,  
Proration Matters

Please refer to the Oil Conservation Commission's letter of February 4 in the above designation, addressed to Mr. A. M. McCorkle.

The Stanolind Oil and Gas Company believes that Order No. 329 is, in all respects, right and proper and believes that any petition for rehearing or reconsideration of said Order should be denied without further hearing.

We did not answer your letter earlier because we were one of the interested parties in this matter and did not see how there could be any doubt as to our views on the record made up.

Very truly yours,

  
Attorney for Stanolind  
Oil and Gas Company

JOS/bf  
cc/ Mr. A. M. McCorkle, Houston, Texas