

No action

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO.
APR 15 1952

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
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

APPLICATION OF FULLERTON OIL COMPANY)
FOR REHEARING) Case No. 338

A P P L I C A T I O N

Comes now the Fullerton Oil Company, one of the interested parties in Case No. 338, and files this its application for rehearing of said case and for cause thereof states:

(1) That Case No. 338 covered a designation of a new pool to be known as the Terry-Simpson Pool to include Sections 1, 2, 11 and 12, Township 21 South, Range 37 East, N.M.P.M., Lea County, New Mexico, and applicant supported the above application insofar as the following area was covered:

The Northwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 12; The Southwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 1; Lots 13, 14 in Section 1; The Southeast $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 2; The Northeast $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Southwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 2 and Lots 14, 15 and 16 in Section 2, Township 21 South, Range 37 East, N.M.P.M., Lea County.

(2) That all of the area supported by the Fullerton Oil Company in the Commission's application to designate the Terry-Simpson Pool was included in the advertised notice of said hearing.

(3) The case came on to be heard before the Commission on February 21, 1952, and thereafter on March 26, 1952, the Commission entered its order denying Case No. 338 insofar as the designation of the Terry-Simpson Pool was concerned, using the following language:

"That there is insufficient evidence before the Commission at this time to warrant the designation of the proposed Terry-Simpson Pool to include all of the Sections 1, 2, 11 and 12, Township 21 South, Range 37 East, N.M.P.M., Lea County, New Mexico."


(4) That at the time of the entry of said order the Commission did not have before it a complete transcript of the

1 testimony, the transcript being completed by the reporter on
2 March 27, 1952, and, therefore, the Commission could not enter
3 an order stating that there was insufficient evidence before
4 the Commission at the time the action was taken.

5 (5) Applicant believes that if the Commission should
6 review the entire transcript of the testimony that a more
7 favorable determination can be made on behalf of applicant.

8 (6) Applicant would further show that the evidence
9 is uncontroverted that a different water level exists between
10 the Gulf State No. 6 well and the Fullerton Federal Elliott No.
11 1 well as compared with the water level of other wells in the
12 Hair Pool.

13 WHEREFORE applicant prays that the Commission consider
14 this application for a rehearing and grant unto applicants a
15 rehearing to be held at such time and place as the Commission
16 shall fix after due notice to all interested parties.

17
18 FULLERTON OIL COMPANY
19 BY 
20 W. D. Girand, Attorney
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32