

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Santa Fe, New Mexico
July 19, 1961

Case No. 2343



BEFORE THE
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Santa Fe, New Mexico
July 19, 1961

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
)

Application of Southwest Production Company)
for an order force pooling a 300-acre non-)
standard gas proration unit, San Juan County,)
New Mexico. Applicant, in the above-styled)
cause seeks an order force pooling all mineral)
interests in a 300-acre gas proration unit in)
the Basin-Dakota Gas Pool, consisting of the)
E/2 of Section 7, Township 30 North, Range 11)
West, excepting the S/2 SW/4 SE/4 thereof,)
San Juan County, New Mexico. Interested)
parties include John J. (Juan J) Moya and)
Helen Moya.)

Case
2343

BEFORE:

Elvis A. Utz, Commissioner

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING

MR. UTZ: Case 2343.

MR. MORRIS: Application of Southwest Production Company
for an order force pooling a 300-acre non-standard gas proration
unit, San Juan County, New Mexico.

MR. UTZ: What are the Appearances in this case?

A George L. Verity for the Applicant, and Mr. Juan J.
Moya is here for himself. And, do you represent Mrs. Moya?

MR. MOYA: I represent Kindom Uranium in this case, and
also myself.

MR. UTZ: You are appearing for yourself as well as
Kindom Uranium?



MR. MORRIS: I would like to set the record straight. Mr. Moya, if you are not an attorney, you can't appear for Kindom in this case; and they would have to be represented by an attorney. So, I imagine you can just appear for yourself.

MR. MOYA: Yes, I believe so; but, for the record, I want to say that Kindom have received a notation of this case. I don't know if they have effect or not.

MR. MORRIS: Publication has been made as described by law.

MR. VERITY: We don't have any arguments with Kindom Uranium about this, and we will make the record clear about this.

JACK D. JONES,

called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. VERITY:

Q Would you please state your name?

A Jack D. Jones.

Q What is your occupation?

A I am an independent land man.

Q Have you been doing land work and representing Southwest Production Company in their land operations?

A Yes, sir; I have.

Q Are you familiar with their lease land and development situation on this non-standard unit consisting of all of the east



half of Section 7, Township 30 North, Range 11 West, except the south half of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter?

A Yes, sir.

Q This Commission recently established a non-standard proration unit for the Dakota Gas?

A Yes, sir.

Q And Southwest, since then, drilled a well on this unit?

A Yes, sir; we have.

Q Where is it located?

A The well is located in the Northeast Quarter. I do not know the footage, but it's in the Northeast Quarter.

Q Does Southwest Production Company own all of the working interests underlying this non-standard unit?

A Yes, sir.

Q Will you explain to the Commission, please, the land situation with regard to the Southeast Quarter of Section 7?

A Well, I wouldn't exactly -- What do you mean by that?

Q Well, why do you at this time ask --

A We are asking for the relief requested in this Application for the following reason: We understood that Juan was a married man and his wife had not executed -- rather I should say, we understood that Juan was divorced, but in checking the pattern out we found that his wife had not signed, or Mrs. Moya had not signed. And, when we asked Juan about this, he informed us that he was divorced and the papers were of record, but we have been



unable to find these papers, and Juan hasn't been able to find them, and we have been unable to locate Mrs. Moya to get her signed up though Juan has undertaken to do that for us; but, we have not been successful to this time for getting her signed up. And, this relief is requested as a title curety measure.

Q How did Southwest Production Company acquire its lease hold on the Southeast Quarter site?

A These lands were required from Kindom Uranium who, in turn, has acquired them from Juan.

Q And, did you also acquire leases from the mineral owners who were denying the lease hold state of Kindom?

A Except for one.

Q And, you have an assignment of Kindom's rights with an overriding reserved to them under the Southeast Quarter?

A That's right.

Q How did Kindom acquire that lease?

A From Juan, Juan signed it.

Q And, it's Southwest's position that you own all of the working interest underlying this Southeast Quarter?

A Yes, sir.

Q Have you made an effort to contact Mrs. Helen Moya?

A Yes.

Q Have you been able to reach her?

A No, sir; we have not.

Q Have you made very effort that you could to locate her?



A Yes, sir; I think so.

Q What is the last known address you had for her?

A Well, the last address was she was visiting her sister or a relative in Cleveland, Ohio, and it's merely Cleveland, Ohio.

Q Her residence is supposed to be --

A Minneapolis.

Q And, have you endeavored to reach her both places?

A Yes, sir.

Q You ask the Commission, do you, to force pool any possible claim that Mrs. Moya might have or that Juan Moya might have by virtue of her failure of assignment?

A Yes, sir.

Q You have other acreage in this area where Kindom Uranium has signed it, do you?

A Yes, sir.

Q And, in these instances, you have been able to successfully obtain communitization agreements from Kindom Uranium?

A Yes, sir.

Q You anticipate in this situation you will have no problem in this regard?

A None at all.

Q I believe you say that Southwest has drilled a well in the Northwest Quarter; has it been completed?

A Northeast Quarter.

Q Excuse me. Northeast Quarter. Has it been completed as



yet?

A Yes, sir.

Q Is it surrounded by other wells completed in the Basin Dakota Gas Pool?

A Yes, sir.

MR. VERITY: I believe that is all of this witness.

MR. UTZ: Are there other questions of the witness?

MR. MORRIS: Yes, sir.

Q (By Mr. Morris) Mr. Jones, in the event either Mr. or Mrs. Moya asserted any claim in this acreage, what would be the extent of the claim that you anticipate?

A Well, I should say that legally the extent of the claim might be the entire working interest in the Southeast Quarter. Assuming that Juan were married and she failed to join in the assignment, there is some reason to believe the assignment might be a community.

MR. VERITY: And, assuming also, of course, that she had not entered into a separation, and further, assuming, if I might, that the lease stemming from them is valid.

MR. MORRIS: Yes, sir.

Q (By Mr. Morris) So, that would be --

THE WITNESS: In other words, we have a rather complicated title problem.

MR. MORRIS: I understand. I was just trying to understand to what extent the defect might extend.

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO



MR. VERITY: Well, if there is any defect, it would extend to half or possibly all of the working interest.

THE WITNESS: I'd say theoretically it could extend to the full working interest.

MR. MORRIS: Now, you mentioned an overriding royalty interest that was retained by Kindom at some point in the line. Now, just what was that, again?

THE WITNESS: Well, Juan signed the land to Kindom, who assigned the land to Southwest. As is usual in an assignment, they reserved an overriding royalty.

Q (By Mr. Morris) Now, that override is carved out of the working interest; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q So, Kindom is at present an owner of a working interest?

A I don't know if in New Mexico that is --

MR. VERITY: Provided their lease is valid.

THE WITNESS: If they recognize our override, and we'll pay it.

Q (By Mr. Morris) Are you force pooling? Are you asking today that this override be force pooled?

A No, sir.

Q Do you have an agreement with Kindom?

MR. VERITY: We anticipate there will be no problem to force pool.

THE WITNESS: Kindom has signed us all rights, title,



and interest reserving their override. There is no reason to believe they won't go along with us, because they have in the past.

Q (By Mr. Morris) In your Application, you have asked that any interest that might be owned by the Moyas be force-pooled and that you retain out of production 150 per cent of the cost attributable to that interest. Is that still what you are asking us to include in any order that we might issue stemming from this Hearing?

A Yes, sir.

Q Why do you think the 150 per cent is a proper figure?

A I really don't believe it is. I believe the figure probably should be considerably more than the 50 per cent; but the 50 per cent because it's the maximum allowable under Statute, I believe, where somebody assumes the risks, and puts their money up, and drills these wells, that they are entitled to that return on their money.

Q Do you feel that there is an unusual amount of risk in this well?

A Not now since it's already drilled and completed. I'd say that obviously since it's not completed as a producer there is no risk, but that was not true at the time George drew the Petition.

Q I believe, Mr. Verity will check me if I'm wrong --
No. Our Statute now provides that we must make a provision for

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO



supervision which can exceed 100 per cent; that we can grant what might be termed a bonus for risk not to exceed 50 per cent of the well costs, but that that 50 per cent is directly for risks.

A As a risk factor, yes.

Q Do you agree with that?

A I believe that is the interpretation I've been given.

Q You couldn't say at this moment, at least at this point of the Hearing of this case, that there is any risk?

A I would say that since the well has been drilled and completed as a producer, there is no risk.

Q If the Commission were to consider only changes for supervision, what would you require a reasonable change for supervision in excess of 100 per cent?

MR. VERITY: I object to this question because I don't believe it needs to be determined by the Commission. The Statute does not provide, does it, that this be determined by the Commission at the Hearing whether it's force pooled.

MR. MORRIS: Mr. Verity, I don't have a copy. Well, I do have a copy of the Statute, here, and it says that we shall determine.

MR. VERITY: That you shall determine the amount of the supervision costs?

MR. MORRIS: If I may read from my copy of the Statutes, 65-3-14 C. I don't want to read it all, but in effect. I will read a portion of it: "Such pooling order of the Commission shall



DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

make a definite provision as to any owner or owners who elect not to pay his proportionate share in advance for the prorated reimbursement solely out of this production to the parties advancing the costs of the development and operations which shall be limited to the actual expenditures required for such purchase not in excess of what are reasonable." -- and here I come to the pertinent part -- "But, which shall include a reasonable charge for supervision, and may include a charge for the risk involved in the drilling of such well which charge for risk shall not exceed 50 per cent of the non-consenting working interest owner or owners, prorate a share of the cost of drilling and completing the well."

MR. VERITY: I repeat my objection because I don't believe that at this time it's proper for the Commission to make a finding with regard to either the cost of supervision or the cost of completing the well. It is our position that the Statute provides that the Commission may pool the acreage and that they shall make a finding as to whether or not there are risks involved; but that this risk is a percentage and that you do not endeavor to determine at this time what supervision for completion or drilling costs are, but this is a matter that the parties are liable for once the interests have been force pooled; and after this has all been completed, if the parties have any difficulty or do not come to an understanding with regard to the percentage of production -- excuse me, not the percentage of production, but amount of production, that they take to reimburse themselves.



Then, the Commission, at that juncture, can make a determination as to whether or not the operator is requesting costs that are not actual costs as it is defined there.

MR. PORTER: Then, it is your provision, Mr. Verity, that here the Commission would just rule on the force pooling of this aspect without regard to --

MR. VERITY: All we think is that you should, or can determine, as whether or not there is risk involved; and well, first whether or not it should be force pooled, and then whether or not there is risk involved, and if so, how much. And then, once that is determined, it's a matter of the actual costs of the operation that are recouped by the operator, either 100 per cent, a minimum of 100 per cent of only his actual expenditures and actual supervision costs plus any percentage that is allowed for risk. And, I can see that it's premature now to make a determination of these costs because they are not known, and it would not be a valid order for the Commission to set them to be a certain figure, either maximum, minimum, or actual, before they are known and can be determined. Then, once these costs are incurred, and an accounting must be kept, of course, we can take 100 to 150 per cent of these costs out of this production according to whether or not there is a risk factor involved. And, if the party who has been force pooled objects to them, he is entitled to a hearing. If he objects to the accounting that has been submitted to him.

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO



MR. VERITY, elsewhere in the Statute that I refer to, it does make the provision that in the event of a dispute relative to costs, then the Commission shall determine. And, I agree with you that the Commission has no business determining costs until a dispute arises. I find this difficulty, however, to reconcile myself to the thought that the Commission can not determine what would be a reasonable charge for supervision when it cites here, it seems to me, that the Commission shall do that.

MR. VERITY: Well, no reasonable cost. I mean, no supervision charges have been made at this juncture.

MR. MORRIS: No, but as you are aware, in past orders of the Commission relative to force pooling, the Commission has specified that the operator is entitled to recover 110 and in other cases 125 per cent of the costs of the development and operation of it.

(Continued following page.)

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO



MR. VERITY: And, you have fixed these percentages as supervision costs?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

MR. VERITY: Well, I have no objection to fixing it. Certainly, I'm skeptical as to whether or not it's valid, but I will withdraw my objection.

THE WITNESS: Now, to answer your question: I do not know what Southwest's costs are. I was with Shell for 10 years, and I know that the costs with Shell ran from 10 to 20 per cent depending upon where the field was located and how many wells we had and such things as that. And, I just cannot tell you what Southwest would figure it.

MR. VERITY: Would you say it would be a minimum of 10 per cent?

THE WITNESS: Well, that was the expense with Shell. I should imagine with Southwest that it might be a little more than 10 per cent because they don't have as many wells or anything to handle as many as Shell did in these areas; and of course, the more wells you have the more efficiency you have because one man can take care of more wells that way. So, as time is allocated to more wells rather than to pure wells, and I

--

MR. UTZ: 10 per cent of what?

THE WITNESS: Of the cost of the well.

MR. UTZ: 10 per cent of the cost of the well?



THE WITNESS: Yes, as I figured that we had roughly used from 10 to 20. We always went for 20, but we would fight to the death at nothing less than 10 per cent in our operating agreement.

MR. UTZ: Are there any more questions?

Q (By Mr. Verity) On the operation of the well, did you also have 10 per cent minimum cost of operation over and above the actual expenditures?

A Well, we usually set it as a percentage of the costs of the well.

Q (By Mr. Morris) Mr. Jones, would Southwest Production be willing to submit to the Commission a statement of the well costs on the well on this unit?

A I see no reason why they wouldn't be willing to do so.

Q Would you be willing to furnish a copy of those costs to Mr. Moya?

A Surely.

MR. MORRIS: I have no further questions.

THE WITNESS: If one desires.

MR. MOYA: I guess -- Do I have the right to ask him any questions, Mr. Jones, in this case?

MR. MORRIS: Certainly, acting as an individual.

Q (By Mr. Moya) Mr. Jones, do you know these individual owners of these 20 acres? Do you understand, the units?

A Brimhall. I'm acquainted with Brimhall.



Q Is Mr. Brimhall -- I understand he has an outstanding lease before.

A Well, why, that's a part of the title probably that's involved in this. Are you aware of the title problem?

A Yes, I do. But as far as I know --

A I haven't litigated the matter, and I don't want to set myself up as a judge on the matter. Those people are contending your leases are not valid for various and sundry reasons, and that is why I went out and got new leases from each and every one of them for that reason, just to protect Southwest's rights.

Q Mr. Jones, did you go by what -- Do you go by what the lessee tells you or by the title to the land?

MR. VERITY: I believe, Juan, that -- I don't want to cut you out, but I believe it's just not material here on this question. The Commission can't -- Previously, at another hearing, this 20 acres which Brimhall claims the lease was excluded from this unit; and as I have explained to you before, the mineral owners out there can test the title to your lease; and as you know, we have settled all these problems the very best we could because we have worked it out with you and took an assignment from Kindom in order to protect the title. Then, we bought a lease from all of the landowners, except Brimhall with whom we couldn't deal; and have, as you know, we have entered into a stipulation with Kindom and this as set up and reserved an override for Kindom. And, you know this, and we're not con-



testing your override in any way. It's been stipulated and agreed to, and this Hearing in any ways detract or endeavor to diminish the override that Southwest has stipulated and agreed to for Kindom Uranium. We are willing to pay it. We acknowledge it. We will submit a communitization agreement to Kindom as we have in the other cases so that the 140 acres of the Southwest Quarter will be communitized with the Northwest Quarter for this production. But, the problem is that: In order to be able to bank this well and proceed with development and production of it, we must remove the cloud from the title because of the difficulty of making record of the land situation created by your marital situation. Do you understand?

MR. MOYA: Yes, I understand.

Q (By Mr. Moya) It is claimed that you have a good title on a hundred and all of the complete Southeast Quarter, there is no paper in the south?

A There is no record in the Courthouse in any County in New Mexico.

Q But, this particular lease is being counseled, and therefore you are holding a good lease there in the Southeast Quarter equivalent to around 160 acres. At the moment, you still have that. So, just by leaving out that 20 acres, I mean, I don't see what Southwest is so afraid about. They seem to exclude these.

MR. VERITY: We are not excluding these 20 acres at



this Hearing, Juan. The Hearing with the non-standard unit was previously held, and the Commission entered an order that established this non-standard unit, being Order R-1991. And, if we can get as a matter of record that Order, if we can ever work out anything reasonable with Brimhall why we are going to include that 20 acres in this unit.

THE WITNESS: And, your override will attach --

MR. VERITY: And, your override will attach according to our stipulation. And, we are endeavoring to work through Brimhall's attorney in Arizona and come up with a reasonable relationship with regard to that 20 acres.

THE WITNESS: In case you Gentlemen are interested, because you wanted to you, I contacted his attorney two weeks ago, and we arrived at satisfactory terms; but he is having a little trouble getting Mr. Brimhall to agree to the terms that we worked out.

MR. MORRIS: I see.

MR. UTZ: Mr. Moya, are you questioning the validity of the lease on Brimhall's 20 acres? Is that the point of your question?

MR. MOYA: I just wanted to find out. This particular question on the Application, I just want -- I have another question.

Q (By Mr. Moya) Mr. Jones, I have never read this Application, in fact, but the Commission -- the cost of super-



vision in this well. Since, I presume, if Mrs. Moya will contest this cost --

A Well, I think I can say, Juan, that if Mrs. Moya signs the papers, there will be no cost of supervision because the reason for the request will have been removed. But, until she does, we've got to take this means of seeing to it that her interest is subject to the well so we can draw our allowable on it. Once she signs the papers that we have furnished you there are no longer any problems. There will be no cost of supervision or anything else; that we will, then have as full working interest, and all we would be doing is charging ourselves with the cost.

MR. VERITY: This Hearing will become entirely moot, Juan, if she signs the papers that I placed in your hands last week.

MR. MOYA: You mean, that order for Mrs. Moya, if she signs it everything will be all right?

MR. VERITY: Yes.

MR. MOYA: But, what if she does not sign it?

MR. VERITY: Then, you will submit a cost of the well supervision to the Commission.

MR. MOYA: I have one more question.

Q (By Mr. Moya) Do you say it's a well already completed in this location?

A Yes.

Q Do you anticipate any further cost in the well now?



A Well, the cost of supervising it, you know, of operating the well.

Q How about the cost of the working of the well, I mean, the completion costs?

A No. Those costs have all been met. The well has been completed, so it's --

MR. MOYA: That is all.

MR. UTZ: Are there any other questions?

MR. MORRIS: One more.

Q (By Mr. Morris) Mr. Jones, who was the royalty owner under this 300 acres that we are considering?

A There are several.

Q But they have been taken care of?

A As I tried to explain to Juan, this is a matter to insure that all possible outstanding interests under that tract of land is subject to our right to drill and produce the well.

Q The only interests that we're concerned with here today is the possible claim of the Moyas?

A Of the Moyas. Now, Juan has signed an assignment, but Mrs. Moya has failed to do so.

Q Which might void it?

A There is a possibility that the transaction might be --

MR. VERITY: To answer Mr. Utz' question addressed to Mr. Moya, Brimhall does contest Kindom Uranium's lease which was assigned by Kindom to Mr. Moya. And, so that we don't drill a



well and then have a lawsuit about it, Southwest has acquired title from both sides of this controversy except Mr. Brimhall, and we are negotiating with him.

MR. UTZ: I just didn't want us to get in a position of trying to decide the title.

MR. VERITY: We are not asking you to, and we understand. But, if it should result in that eventuality, we would contest. And, we don't think it will, but it would resolve that the title of Kindom would fail, and their title was good then, the Commission will have pooled these interests for this well.

MR. MORRIS: Mr. Verity, do you think that it would be proper for the Commission to enter an order something to the effect recognizing the constituency of the claim of the Moyas and pooling?

MR. VERITY: I think it's proper. I don't think it's necessary that you recognize it because I think you could do it either by saying that all interests are force pooled or, and then this leaves us to --

MR. MORRIS: Determine who has the interests?

MR. VERITY: Determine who that is. And, if we have title, we will select under that; and if we don't have, we will rely upon the order; but I think it would be perfectly proper for the Commission to say that there are force pooling contingent interests not owned by the applicants.

MR. MOYA: You say you have a new lease from these

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO



people. This new lease does include the mineral rights?

MR. VERITY: No. The lease from the new people that we took, Juan, only covered the rights below the base of the Pictured Cliff. And, as I had explained to you many times before, we are just not taking any sides in that controversy. We just don't want to find ourselves in the middle of it. And so, we have made what was an amicable settlement and arrangement with you, and then in addition to that, we have gone and made a settlement with them so that whatever happens we won't have someone come in and take a gas well away from us.

MR. UTZ: Do you have any more questions, Mr. Morris?

MR. MORRIS: No.

MR. UTZ: The Witness may be excused. Are there other statements in this case?

MR. VERITY: I think, Juan, why don't you be sworn and let me ask you a question or two.

JUAN J. MOYA,

called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was examined and testified as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. VERITY:

Q Will you please state your name?

A John J. Moya.

Q Your name is Juan J. Moya, right?

A Yes, sir.



Q Do you know Helen Moya?

A Yes.

Q Is she your wife?

A She is my former wife.

Q Your former wife. Were you divorced from her?

A Yes.

Q Where did this take place?

A At Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Q And, when did it occur?

A Sometime in 1955.

Q You, at one time, owned oil and gas leases covering the entire mineral interest underlying the Southeast Quarter of Section 7, 30 North, 11 West, San Juan County, New Mexico.

A Yes, sir.

Q Did you assign all of this interest to Kindom Uranium Corporation?

A Yes, sir.

Q Was this Assignment executed and delivered after your divorce from Helen Moya?

A It was executed before.

Q Before your divorce from Helen Moya?

A Excuse me. I'm sorry.

Q Let me rephrase the question. Were you divorced from Helen Moya prior to the time that you executed and delivered the last assignment to Kindom Uranium?



A Repeat the question, please?

Q Maybe I have confused you. I desire to establish whether your divorce was first or your assignment to Kindom Uranium Corporation was first. Tell us which event took place first?

A Exactly, I couldn't tell you. It was about the same, a question of two or three days between one and the other. I couldn't tell you, exactly.

Q Well, previously, Juan, you have told us, haven't you, that you were divorced from her at the time you executed and delivered the gas units.

A Yes, and I still believe this.

Q So, what you are saying is that the Assignments came after your divorce?

A Yes.

Q And, in your divorce, you were granted all of the New Mexico property, were you?

A No.

Q Well, you were -- This 160 acres being the Southeast Quarter of Section 7, 30 North, 11 West, was given to you in the divorce?

A Yes.

Q Did you have a divorce settlement?

A Yes.

Q And, did your wife, Helen, agree that this property



would be yours?

A Yes.

Q And, she signed a paper to this effect, did she?

A Yes. We both signed an Assignment to Kindom Uranium. It was signed and notarized in Santa Fe, here.

Q And do you know where that paper is?

A I don't know. She kept those papers. It was supposed to have been recorded.

Q Do you know where Helen Moya is?

A I believe in Minneapolis.

Q Do you know what her address is?

A No, I don't know the address.

Q Do you know where she lives?

A I understand she was living in Cleveland, Ohio. At the present time, she is visiting her sister in Minneapolis.

Q You think that her residence is in Cleveland, do you?

A I believe so.

Q It's in Cleveland proper, or one of the suburbs, do you know.

A I think some of the suburbs in Cleveland.

Q Do you know which one?

A I understood it was Shaker Heights.

Q Shaker Heights?

A Yes.

Q Juan, when did you last see Helen Moya?



DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

A About four and a half years ago.

Q Have you talked to her recently?

A Yes, sir; I have talked to her on the telephone.

Q But, you don't know where to locate her?

A Yes. We're supposed to have a meeting, now, in Minneapolis.

Q But, you don't know where she lives or where you could locate her there other than at this meeting?

A No, it's through her sister in Minneapolis. That's as far as I know.

Q Is Helen Moya's name still Helen Moya, or has she been remarried?

A I do not know, exactly.

Q Do you know her sister's name?

A Yes, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Myrt Johnson.

Q Do you know what her address is?

A The address they gave me on the phone was Raddison Hotel.

Q About the best address that you would know at this time for Helen Moya would just be Cleveland, Ohio, or possibly in care of Mrs. Myrt Johnson, temporarily in care of Mrs. Myrt Johnson at Minneapolis, Minnesota?

A Yes, sir.

MR. VERITY: I believe that is all.

MR. UTZ: Are there other questions of the witness?



MR. VERITY: Oh, excuse me. One more question.

Q (By Mr. Verity) Mr. Moya, you don't object to the Commission granting this order today, do you?

A No, I don't with the provisions that the Commission has expressed.

Q And so far as you know, Helen Moya doesn't object to it?

A I couldn't speak for her.

MR. VERITY: All right. That is all.

MR. UTZ: The Witness may be excused. Are there other statements to be made in this case? The case will be taken under advisement.

The Hearing is adjourned.

(Whereupon the July 19, 1961 session was concluded at 2:30 P.M.)

DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO



DEARNLEY-MEIER REPORTING SERVICE, Inc.

PHONE CH 3-6691

ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
)
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO)

I, MICHAEL P. HALL, 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 19th day of July, 1961.

Michael P. Hall

Notary Public-Court Reporter

My Commission expires:

June 20, 1965

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a complete record of the proceedings in the Examiner hearing of case No. 2343, heard by me on July 19, 1961.
[Signature]

New Mexico Oil Conservation Commission Examiner

