

Stogner, Michael

From: Stogner, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2003 2:20 PM
To: Jim Bruce (E-mail)
Cc: Arrant, Bryan
Subject: Nadel & Gussman's Tucker Fee #1-Y

Re: Your application (pMES0-319743586) on behalf of the operator, Nadel and Gussman Permian, L.L.C., for an unorthodox oil well location in the North Esperanza-Delaware Pool for its recently drilled and completed Tucker Fee Well No. 1-Y (API No. 30-015-32615), located 1600' FSL & 2300' FEL (Unit J) of Sec. 28-T21S-R27E.

MR. BRUCE,

The rig on the original well within the 40-acre oil spacing and proration unit comprising the NW/4 SE/4 of section 28, the Tucker Fee Well No. 1 (API No. 30-015-32579) located 1650' FSL & 2300' FEL of Sec. 28, was skidded 50 feet to the south. Why couldn't the rig had been moved to the north and/or east to another standard oil well location at that time?

Stogner, Michael

From: JamesBruc@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2003 7:50 PM
To: MSTOGNER@state.nm.us
Subject: Re: Nadel & Gussman's Tucker Fee #1-Y

Mike: Good question, and one for which I have no immediate answer. I'll get back to you as soon as I can, but I'll be in Loviington/Hobbs the next two days. Thanks.

Jim Bruce

7/17/2003

Stogner, Michael

From: Stogner, Michael
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2003 8:08 AM
To: 'JamesBruc@aol.com'
Subject: RE: Nadel & Gussman's Tucker Fee #1-Y

Thank you, I pride myself on asking the obvious. I'm sure it was probably because of the location and wellpad set-up, however I just need some explanation for the record.

-----Original Message-----

From: JamesBruc@aol.com [mailto:JamesBruc@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2003 7:50 PM
To: MSTOGNER@state.nm.us
Subject: Re: Nadel & Gussman's Tucker Fee #1-Y

Mike: Good question, and one for which I have no immediate answer. I'll get back to you as soon as I can, but I'll be in Loviington/Hobbs the next two days. Thanks.

Jim Bruce

7/17/2003