

NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS ON WELLS

(Submit to appropriate District Office as per Commission Rule 1106)

COMPANY The Ibox Company Box 752, Breckenridge, N.M.
(Address)

LEASE Neeler Yates State WELL NO. 9 UNIT 1 S 32 T 10 N R
DATE WORK PERFORMED see below POOL Artesia

This is a Report of: (Check appropriate block) ☐ Results of Test of Casing Shut-off
☐ Beginning Drilling Operations ☒ Remedial Work
☐ Plugging ☐ Other

Detailed account of work done, nature and quantity of materials used and results obtained.

4-21-58 Well making 95% water. Suspect casing leak. Move in clean out until
clean out.
4-22-58 Clean out to TD of 1995 and log well.
4-23-58 Set calscat plug at 1938. Test for water. Found casing leaking.
4-24-58 Ran 1938 feet of 5 1/2" 140 sals. casing and cemented with 150 sacks cement.
4-26-58 Drilled plug and put well back on production.
5-2-58 Water not shut off. Must be channeling through sand from water injection
wells.

FILL IN BELOW FOR REMEDIAL WORK REPORTS ONLY

Original Well Data:

DF Elev. 3579 TD 2034 PBD Prod. Int. Compl Date
Tbng. Dia Tbng Depth Oil String Dia Oil String Depth
Perf Interval (s)
Open Hole Interval Producing Formation (s)

RESULTS OF WORKOVER:

	BEFORE	AFTER
Date of Test	<u>4/15/58</u>	<u>5/2/58</u>
Oil Production, bbls. per day	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>
Gas Production, Mcf per day	<u></u>	<u></u>
Water Production, bbls. per day	<u>97</u>	<u>94</u>
Gas Oil Ratio, cu. ft. per bbl.	<u></u>	<u></u>
Gas Well Potential, Mcf per day	<u></u>	<u></u>
Witnessed by <u>Paul Darnell</u>	<u>The Ibox Company</u> (Company)	

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Name M. L. Armstrong
Title
Date M/ /

I hereby certify that the information given above is true and complete to the best of my knowledge.

Name T. A. Ford
Position Production Manager
Company The Ibox Company

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
ARTESIA DISTRICT OFFICE
No. Corina B.

No. Copies Received

DISTRIBUTION

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 ㉝ ㉞ ㉟ ㊱ ㊲ ㊳ ㊴ ㊵ ㊶ ㊷ ㊸ ㊹ ㊺ ㊻ ㊼ ㊽ ㊾ ㊿

— — — — —

...

Figure 1. Schematic representation of the experimental design. The subjects were divided into two groups: the control group and the experimental group. The control group was divided into two subgroups: the control group and the experimental group. The experimental group was divided into two subgroups: the control group and the experimental group. The control group was divided into two subgroups: the control group and the experimental group. The experimental group was divided into two subgroups: the control group and the experimental group.