

BEFORE THE  
**Oil Conservation Commission**  
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO  
November 17, 1954

IN THE MATTER OF:

CASE NOS. 765-778 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  
Santa Fe, New Mexico  
November 17, 1954

-----  
IN THE MATTER OF:

Operators' requests for exception to the 'No-Flare' Rule as set forth in Order R-520, were originally set for hearing on October 20, 1954, at Hobbs, but were given a blanket continuation to November 17th, pending consideration of the Commission's plan to work out a system for administrative approval of such exceptions, without the necessity for notice and hearing. (See Case 790 on the current docket.) In the meantime, effective date for the 'No-Flare' Rule was changed from November 1, 1954, to January 1, 1955.

Cases 765-77  
(Inclusive)  
Continued.

BEFORE:

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

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

MR. MACEY: The next cases on the docket are 765 -- The docket says 767, it should read 765 through 778, inclusive. If there is anyone who wishes to present their case at this time we will be glad to hear it.

MR. SELINGER: On the part of Skelly Oil Company -- We are applicant in Case 774. In view of the testimony and evidence in Case 790, we wish to dismiss our application in 774.

MR. MACEY: Is there objection to dismissal of Case 774? If not the case will be dismissed. Anyone else?

MR. COUCH: Ohio Oil Company requests that the Case 770 be continued until the December meeting, with the idea that it may

be dismissed and substitution made prior to that time.

MR. KELLAHIN: Continental Oil Company requests that its cases, I don't have the numbers available, be continued until the December hearing.

MR. MACEY: Yours is 767.

MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you.

MR. MACEY: You requested continuance?

MR. KELLAHIN: Yes.

MR. GIRAND: We wish to continue Case 772 until the December hearing, subject to the action of the Commission on our application.

MR. MACEY: Anyone else?

MR. CAMPBELL: On behalf of the Texas Pacific Coal and Oil Company, I would like to request the continuation of 777 until the December hearing.

MR. MACEY: Anyone else?

MR. WALKER: I don't remember the case number.

MR. MACEY: 768.

MR. WALKER: We would like to have that continued until the December hearing.

MR. MACEY: Anyone else?

MR. MANKIN: On behalf of Texas Company, Our case, I believe, was 773.

MR. MACEY: No, 776.

MR. MANKIN: We ask that be dismissed.

MR. MACEY: Anyone else?

MR. GIRAND: Is it understood that any applications now on file that have not been dismissed, that received notification from the Commission, that they are not satisfactorily informed or do not

meet the procedural steps that you are going to require with the necessary supporting evidence to be contained with the application. Will we have a right to come in and present those matters at the December hearing, irrespective of the time of filing of the amendment and notice thereon?

MR. SELINGER: That is what the testimony disclosed in 790.

MR. GIRAND: That is my understanding.

MR. MACEY: You can amend your application, if you want to put the case on next month and amend your application if it doesn't fit it, get the job done.

MR. GIRAND: I don't want to be confronted with no notice on the amended application to change.

MR. SELINGER: I understood the Commission to say, in Case 790, that the Commission will pass on all these applications that are on file now, and that in the event they were dissatisfied with any single application that they would, of themselves, set it at the December hearing.

MR. MACEY: Exactly right.

MR. SELINGER: Based on that understanding, we dismissed our application. It would not be necessary to continue it.

MR. MACEY: That is exactly right. If we are not satisfied with it we will advise the operator.

MR. SELINGER: And it will be set for hearing in December, automatically?

MR. MACEY: That is right. Anyone else? Is there objection to the continuation of the Cases as outlined, and the dismissal of the cases. I have continuations on Cases 770, 768, 772, 777 and 767, and dismissal on 774 and 776. If not, we will continue those

cases which have been requested and dismiss the other two cases.

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 Santa Fe, 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 20th day of November, 1954.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public, Court Reporter

My Commission Expires:  
June 19, 1955