

**NEW MEXICO STATE LAND OFFICE
OFFICE OF THE STATE GEOLOGIST
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO**

MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS ON WELLS

Submit this report in duplicate to the State Geologist or proper Oil and Gas Inspector within ten days after the work specified is completed. It should be signed and sworn to before a notary public for reports on beginning drilling operations, results of shooting well, results of test of water shut-off, result of abandonment of well, and other important operations, even though the work was witnessed by the State Geologist or Oil and Gas Inspector. Reports on minor operations need not be signed and sworn to before a notary public, but such operations should be witnessed by an Oil and Gas Inspector if possible.

Indicate nature of report by checking below:

REPORT ON BEGINNING DRILLING OPERATIONS		REPORT ON DEEPENING WELL	
REPORT ON RESULT OF SHOOTING WELL		REPORT ON PULLING OR OTHERWISE ALTERING CASING	
REPORT ON RESULT OF TEST OF WATER SHUT-OFF		REPORT ON REPAIRING WELL	
REPORT ON RESULT OF ABANDONMENT OF WELL	X		

Midland, Texas August 5, 1933.

PLACE

DATE

Mr. E. H. Wells State Geologist,
Santa Fe, N. Mex.

Following is a report on the work done and the results obtained under the heading noted above at the

Fisher & Lowrie-State

Well No. 1 in the

W. 1 COMPANY OR OPERATOR of Sec. 11, T. 18-S, R. 36-E, N. M. P. M.,

Oil Field, Lea County.

The dates of this work were as follows: Operations commenced 6/1/33-Completed 7/1/33.

Notice of intention to do the work was (was ~~not~~) submitted on Form SG to Mr. E. H. Wells on May 11, 1933, and approval of the proposed plan was (was ~~not~~) obtained. (Cross out incorrect words.)

DETAILED ACCOUNT OF WORK DONE AND RESULTS OBTAINED

Killed oil and gas with heavy mud under pressure; filled with heavy mud to 4723'; set cement plug from 4723' to 4603'; filled with heavy mud to 3120'; set cement plug from 3120' to 3110'; filled with heavy mud to 2010'; set cement plug from 2010' to 2000'; filled with heavy mud to 240'; set cement plug from 240' to 230'; filled with heavy mud to the surface where a cement block was set in which a 4' pipe was inserted as a permanent marker.

duplicate

Subscribed and sworn to before me this
8th day of July, 1933.

In and for Midland County, Texas.
My commission expires.....

NOTARY PUBLIC.

I hereby swear or affirm that the information given above is true and correct.

Name
Position Manager for Texas and New Mexico
Representing Honolulu Oil Company
Address P. O. Box 776, Midland, Texas.

COMPANY OR OPERATOR.

Remarks:

[Signature]

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF TEXAS

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

Application for a writ of habeas corpus was filed in the District Court of the County of [County Name], State of Texas, on the [Date] day of [Month], 19[Year]. The applicant, [Name], is a resident of the County of [County Name], State of Texas. The respondent, [Name], is a resident of the County of [County Name], State of Texas. The applicant alleges that the respondent is unlawfully detained and is entitled to a writ of habeas corpus. The respondent denies the allegations and claims that the applicant is lawfully detained. The court has jurisdiction to grant the writ of habeas corpus.

The court has reviewed the pleadings and the evidence presented. The court finds that the applicant has established a prima facie case that the respondent is unlawfully detained. The respondent has failed to establish a valid legal basis for the detention. Therefore, the court grants the writ of habeas corpus to the applicant. The respondent is ordered to release the applicant immediately.

The court has reviewed the pleadings and the evidence presented. The court finds that the applicant has established a prima facie case that the respondent is unlawfully detained. The respondent has failed to establish a valid legal basis for the detention. Therefore, the court grants the writ of habeas corpus to the applicant. The respondent is ordered to release the applicant immediately.

The court has reviewed the pleadings and the evidence presented. The court finds that the applicant has established a prima facie case that the respondent is unlawfully detained. The respondent has failed to establish a valid legal basis for the detention. Therefore, the court grants the writ of habeas corpus to the applicant. The respondent is ordered to release the applicant immediately.

The court has reviewed the pleadings and the evidence presented. The court finds that the applicant has established a prima facie case that the respondent is unlawfully detained. The respondent has failed to establish a valid legal basis for the detention. Therefore, the court grants the writ of habeas corpus to the applicant. The respondent is ordered to release the applicant immediately.

The court has reviewed the pleadings and the evidence presented. The court finds that the applicant has established a prima facie case that the respondent is unlawfully detained. The respondent has failed to establish a valid legal basis for the detention. Therefore, the court grants the writ of habeas corpus to the applicant. The respondent is ordered to release the applicant immediately.

The court has reviewed the pleadings and the evidence presented. The court finds that the applicant has established a prima facie case that the respondent is unlawfully detained. The respondent has failed to establish a valid legal basis for the detention. Therefore, the court grants the writ of habeas corpus to the applicant. The respondent is ordered to release the applicant immediately.

The court has reviewed the pleadings and the evidence presented. The court finds that the applicant has established a prima facie case that the respondent is unlawfully detained. The respondent has failed to establish a valid legal basis for the detention. Therefore, the court grants the writ of habeas corpus to the applicant. The respondent is ordered to release the applicant immediately.

The court has reviewed the pleadings and the evidence presented. The court finds that the applicant has established a prima facie case that the respondent is unlawfully detained. The respondent has failed to establish a valid legal basis for the detention. Therefore, the court grants the writ of habeas corpus to the applicant. The respondent is ordered to release the applicant immediately.