

BEFORE THE  
**Oil Conservation Commission**  
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO  
Hobbs, New Mexico  
October 20, 1954

IN THE MATTER OF:

CASE NO. 763 - Regular Hearing

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

**ADA DEARNLEY AND ASSOCIATES**  
COURT REPORTERS  
ROOMS 105, 106, 107 EL CORTEZ BUILDING  
TELEPHONE 7-9546  
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

BEFORE THE  
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
Hobbs, New Mexico  
October 20, 1954

-----  
IN THE MATTER OF:

The application of the Texas Company for approval of an unorthodox gas proration unit.

Applicant, in the above-styled cause, seeks an order permitting the creation of a 160-acre unorthodox gas proration unit in exception to Rule 5 of the Special Rules and Regulations for the Eumont Gas Pool, as set forth in Order R-520; said proration unit to consist of E/2 NE/4 of Section 26 and W/2 NW/4 of Section 25, Township 19 South, Range 36 East, Lea County, New Mexico

Case No. 763

-----  
BEFORE:

Honorable Edwin L. Mechem  
Mr. E. S. (Johnny) Walker  
Mr. William B. Macey

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

.MR. MACEY: The next case on the docket is Case 763.

MR. WHITE: Charles White from Santa Fe, representing The Texas Company. In regard to Case 763 it is in reference to the Texas Company's application for 160-acre non-standard proration unit covering its William Weir lease within the Eumont Gas Pool, and we have one witness; Mr. Mankin.

WARREN MANKIN,

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

By MR. WHITE:

Q Will you please state your name and address?

A Warren Mankin with the Texas Company, residing in Fort Worth, Texas.

Q What is your capacity at the present time, with the Texas Company?

A Petroleum Engineer.

Q Are you acquainted with the petition in Case Number 763?

A Yes, sir.

Q Have you had an occasion to study the proposed non-standard unit?

A Yes, sir.

Q In regard to the well on the Wier Lease, is it the Texas Company's intention to dually complete the well?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you know whether or not the Texas Company has made application to and received approval from the Oil Conservation Commission?

A Yes, sir.

Q For the dual completion?

A Yes, it has received permission to complete the, dually complete the well, as of September 21, 1954.

Q I direct your attention to what is marked as Exhibit No. 1 and ask if that was prepared under your direction?

A It was.

Q Will you state to the Commission what it is designed to portray?

A This particular gas well plat indicates the non-standard unit

which is located in Section 25 and Section 26, consisting of the east half of the northeast quarter of Section 26, the west half of the northwest quarter of Section 25, all located in Township 19 South, Range 36 East.

Q Does it show the location of the proposed well?

A It does.

Q Is it practical or possible to unitize this area with the adjoining tracts in either section?

A No, sir, it is not.

Q Will you state why?

A Previously, there has been units, non-standard units formed has been the Amerada State "T" Well Number 3 that is directly east of this particular non-standard unit which was authorized; there is a non-standard unit just south of the 80-acre unit which is Skelly's and Amerada's Christmas Well Number 1. There is the Amerada's Weir "B" Well Number 1 located just west of the unit, which was authorized as a non-standard unit, and was recently authorized, the Ohio Grail Number 1, as the 80-acre unit. Therefore, all units around have been authorized as non-standard units.

MR. WHITE: In that connection we would like the Commission to take judicial notice of the contents of the orders in Consolidated Cases 637, 645, 650. I would like to read the statement made by the Texas Company in the record of those consolidated cases, wherein we stated: "We have no protest to the granting of these applications, however, we would like to point out to the Commission that the Texas Company is the owner of the east half of the northeast, and the west half of the northwest in 25 and 26. If these unorthodox units are approved on the west and the east, it will

necessarily block the Texas Company in the position whereby, of necessity, they will have to appear before the Commission for an unorthodox unit which transgresses the sectional line.

Q Mr. Mankin, in your opinion, is this area productive commercially?

A Yes, it is, as shown by commercially producing wells within the defined vertical limits of the Eumont Gas Pool surrounding it.

Q Would the granting of this application effect the establishment of other proration units outside these two sections, in any manner whatsoever?

A No, sir, it would not.

Q Would the granting of this application, in your opinion, result in waste or prejudice any correlative rights?

A No, sir.

MR. WHITE: If the Commission please, we move the introduction of Exhibit 1, and that concludes our case.

MR. MACEY: Is there objection to the introduction of this exhibit? If not it will be received in evidence.

Any questions of the witness? If no further questions of the witness he may be excused and the case taken under advisement.

(Witness excused.)

STATE OF NEW MEXICO )  
                                  : SS.  
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO )

I, ADA DEARNLEY, Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing and attached transcript of proceedings before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission at Hobbs, New Mexico, is a true and correct record to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have affixed my hand and notarial seal this 4th day of November, 1954.

*Ada Dearnley*

My Commission Expires:  
June 19, 1955

Notary Public, Court Reporter

ADA DEARNLEY & ASSOCIATES  
STENOTYPE REPORTERS  
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO  
TELEPHONE 3-6691