

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING CALLED
BY THE OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION FOR
THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING:

APPLICATION OF AMEREDEV OPERATING, CASE NO. 20223
LLC FOR COMPULSORY POOLING, LEA COUNTY,
NEW MEXICO.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

February 7, 2019

Santa Fe, New Mexico

BEFORE: SCOTT DAWSON, CHIEF EXAMINER
KATHLEEN MURPHY, TECHNICAL EXAMINER
TERRY WARNELL, TECHNICAL EXAMINER
DAVID K. BROOKS, LEGAL EXAMINER

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, Scott Dawson, Chief Examiner; Kathleen Murphy and Terry Warnell, Technical Examiners; and David K. Brooks, Legal Examiner, on Thursday, February 7, 2019, at the New Mexico Energy, Minerals and Natural Resources Department, Wendell Chino Building, 1220 South St. Francis Drive, Porter Hall, Room 102, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

REPORTED BY: Mary C. Hankins, CCR, RPR
New Mexico CCR #20
Paul Baca Professional Court Reporters
500 4th Street, Northwest, Suite 105
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
(505) 843-9241

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

APPEARANCES

FOR APPLICANT AMEREDEV OPERATING, LLC:

KAITLYN A. LUCK, ESQ.
SETH McMILLAN, ESQ.
MONTGOMERY & ANDREWS LAW FIRM
325 Paseo de Peralta
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
(505) 982-3873
kluck@montand.com

FOR INTERESTED PARTY XTO ENERGY:

ERNEST L. PADILLA, ESQ.
PADILLA LAW FIRM, P.A.
1512 South St. Francis Drive
Post Office Box 2523
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504
(505) 988-7577
padillalaw@qwestoffice.net

INDEX

PAGE

Case Number 20223 Called	3
Case Presented by Affidavit	3
Proceedings Conclude	22
Certificate of Court Reporter	23

EXHIBITS OFFERED AND ADMITTED

Ameredev Operating, LLC Exhibit Numbers 1 through 4	9
---	---

1 (10:16 a.m.)

2 EXAMINER DAWSON: So with that, we'll go to
3 the next case, which is Case Number 20223, Ameredev
4 Operating, LLC for compulsory pooling, Lea County, and
5 this is for the Pimento Fed Com 26 36 3 #111H.

6 Please call for appearances.

7 MS. LUCK: Kaitlyn Luck, with Montgomery &
8 Andrews, for the Applicant, Ameredev Operating, LLC,
9 along with Seth McMillan.

10 MR. PADILLA: Ernest L. Padilla for XTO
11 Energy.

12 EXAMINER DAWSON: Okay, Mr. Padilla. Thank
13 you.

14 When you're ready, Ms. Locke [sic] or
15 Mr. McMillan.

16 MR. McMILLAN: Ms. Luck will be taking this
17 one.

18 EXAMINER DAWSON: Okay.

19 Your name again -- I'm sorry -- last name?

20 MS. LUCK: Kaitlyn Luck, L-U-C-K.

21 EXAMINER DAWSON: Luck. Oh, Okay. I'm
22 sorry.

23 MS. LUCK: That's okay.

24 EXAMINER DAWSON: Thank you.

25 MS. LUCK: In this case there have been no

1 interventions filed, and we intend to proceed by
2 affidavit, so we've not brought any witnesses here to
3 the hearing today.

4 EXAMINER DAWSON: Okay.

5 MS. LUCK: So starting with Exhibit 1,
6 we've just included the application that indicates that
7 the case is for an order pooling all uncommitted
8 interests in the Wolfcamp Formation creating a standard
9 640-acre spacing unit comprised of the west half-west
10 half of Sections 3 and 10 and the east half-east half of
11 Sections 4 and 9, Township 26 South, Range 36 East,
12 NMPM, Lea County, New Mexico.

13 Ameredev proposes to dedicate the spacing
14 unit to the proposed Pimento Fed Com 26 36 3 111H well.

15 So turning to Exhibit 2 is the affidavit of
16 Ameredev's landman, Brandon Forteza, and he has
17 previously testified before the OCD as an expert witness
18 in petroleum land matters.

19 Attached as Exhibit A to his affidavit is a
20 plat outlining the pool -- the unit being pooled, and it
21 shows the location of the proposed well within the unit.
22 Ameredev seeks an order incorporating the proximity
23 tracts, which by doing so, the completed interval for
24 the well is within the statewide rules.

25 On Exhibit B, it reflects the parties being

1 pooled and their last known addresses. And just for
2 point of clarification, Ameredev is seeking to pool the
3 unleased mineral interest owners in this case. There
4 aren't any depth severances in the Wolfcamp Formation.
5 He indicates that he has conducted a diligent search of
6 the public records in Lea County where the well's
7 located and mailed all parties the well proposals,
8 including the AFE. Ameredev has made a good-faith
9 effort to obtain voluntary joinder.

10 Attached as Exhibit C are the proposed
11 C-102s for the well that reflect that the well is
12 developing the Wolfcamp Formation and the pool code is
13 reflected in the landman's affidavit as well.

14 Attached as Exhibit D to the landman's
15 affidavit is his sample well-proposal letter, along with
16 the AFE that's sets forth the estimated cost of the
17 well, which, in his opinion, are fair and reasonable and
18 comparable to the cost of other wells of similar lengths
19 and depths drilled in this area of New Mexico.

20 Ameredev is requesting overhead rates of
21 \$7,000 a month for drilling and \$700 a month for the
22 producing well, which are, again, fair and reasonable,
23 as charged by other operators of this type in the area
24 of southeastern New Mexico.

25 Turning to Exhibit 3 in your packet is the

1 affidavit of Ameredev's geologist, Parker Foy. He has
2 previously testified before the Division and had his
3 credentials accepted.

4 He attaches to his affidavit Exhibit A,
5 which is a Wolfcamp structure map. The map reflects
6 that the strata dips approximately 250 feet southward
7 across the sections where the well is located. No
8 structural hazard exists at the location, and the unit
9 being pooled is outlined by the yellow rectangle on the
10 structure map. And, again, the structure dips down to
11 the southwest.

12 Exhibit B attached to the geologist's
13 affidavit is the Wolfcamp stratigraphic cross section
14 hung on the top of the Wolfcamp. And, again, you'll see
15 the cross section shows that there is consistent target
16 thickness. In the wells near the Pimento sections, the
17 well logs on the cross section give a representative
18 sample of the Wolfcamp Formation in the area and
19 demonstrate reasonable well control. The target zone
20 for the well is the Wolfcamp, as indicated on the -- and
21 I apologize. There is not a line on Exhibit B that
22 shows the -- it does show the target interval, but it
23 doesn't show the landing zone for the well. And we can
24 update this exhibit as well if the hearing examiners
25 would like us to do so.

1 EXAMINER DAWSON: Please. Can you get the
2 geologist to give us a revised Exhibit B with the
3 landing zone interval marked on it with the thickness of
4 the landing zone also?

5 MS. LUCK: Yes. We will -- we will submit
6 a revised Exhibit B to the geologist's affidavit.

7 EXAMINER BROOKS: Now, for clarification
8 purposes, is this a depth-severance case?

9 MS. LUCK: No. And I failed to mention, in
10 the affidavit of our landman, turning to paragraph ten
11 of his affidavit -- so that's Exhibit 2, paragraph
12 ten -- it reflects there are no depth severances in this
13 area of the Wolfcamp Formation.

14 EXAMINER BROOKS: Okay. Thanks. I just
15 wondered because of the question being asked about the
16 landing zones.

17 Go ahead.

18 MS. LUCK: Okay. And then finally attached
19 as Exhibit C to Exhibit 3 -- so that's 3C -- is a gross
20 isochore of the Wolfcamp Formation. The map shows
21 thickness for the target interval indicated in Exhibit
22 B. The Wolfcamp is uniform across the whole unit. The
23 preferred well orientation in this area is north-south.
24 This is because the inferred orientation of the maximum
25 horizontal stress is roughly east-west. And it's

1 Ameredev's geologist's conclusion that the horizontal
2 spacing and proration unit is justified from a
3 geological standpoint, and there are no structural
4 impediments or faultings that will interfere with
5 horizontal development in this area.

6 Finally, the granting of the application is
7 in the interest of conservation, the prevention of waste
8 and the protection of correlative rights, as reflected
9 in both the affidavits of the landman and the geologist.

10 Turning to Exhibit 4 is our Affidavit of
11 Notice. We received this case from Ameredev's prior
12 counsel who had submitted the notice by mail to the five
13 unleased mineral interest owners, and we have
14 confirmation that four of the five parties did receive
15 those letters. There was one interest owner that
16 appears their letter was not delivered, as you'll see on
17 Exhibit A attached to Exhibit 4. That's EG Energy, LLC.
18 But we also had notice published in the "Hobbs
19 News-Sun," which you'll see attached as Exhibit 4B, and
20 that reflects that EG Energy, LLC was provided timely
21 notice publication prior to this hearing.

22 And that concludes our exhibits. We
23 seek -- we'll move to admit Exhibits 1 through 4, along
24 with the exhibits thereto, and we'll stand for any
25 questions.

1 EXAMINER DAWSON: Okay. At this time
2 Exhibits 1 through 4 will be admitted to the record.

3 (Ameredev Operating, LLC Exhibit Numbers 1
4 through 4 are offered and admitted into
5 evidence.)

6 EXAMINER DAWSON: Mr. Brooks, do you have
7 questions?

8 EXAMINER BROOKS: I do.

9 I just hadn't noticed if this is something
10 that's been done before. Do you have -- you
11 characterize yourself in the Affidavit of Notice as
12 "attorney in fact and authorized representative for
13 Ameredev." Do you have a power of attorney from
14 Ameredev for the purpose of making this affidavit?

15 MS. LUCK: No.

16 MR. McMILLAN: We're counsel of record.

17 EXAMINER BROOKS: You may respond if you
18 wish.

19 I'm kind of mystified by it because I
20 always thought there was a fairly clear distinction
21 between an attorney in fact, who acts pursuant to a
22 power of attorney, than an attorney at law, who acts by
23 virtue of being an attorney of law.

24 MR. McMILLAN: Huh.

25 EXAMINER BROOKS: And I was just curious

1 about the way this was expressed.

2 MR. McMILLAN: That's an interesting
3 distinction.

4 If I may have an opportunity to jump in
5 explain how this all happened. We were notified on
6 short notice that there was a conflict with prior
7 counsel, so we took on the case and entered our
8 appearance. And we are attorneys at law most certainly.
9 Do we have a piece of paper identifying us as attorneys
10 in fact? No, not so much. But we are counsel of
11 record, and this reflects appropriately.

12 If, in the future, eliminating that phrase,
13 "attorney in fact," would --

14 EXAMINER BROOKS: I would just say attorney
15 if I were doing it, because I think attorney in fact
16 suggests that you're acting pursuant to an express power
17 of attorney. And an attorney in fact does not have to
18 be an attorney at law to act under the terms of a power
19 of attorney. They have to be an attorney at law to
20 practice -- to practice law, but, of course, whether or
21 not they're practicing law without a license is a
22 question for the Grievance Committee. It doesn't
23 involve whether or not they have authority to act.

24 MR. McMILLAN: Well, I suspect, for
25 purposes of drawing up this affidavit, we got a little

1 too fancy our own good.

2 EXAMINER BROOKS: Yes. And I don't think
3 it makes any difference as far as this affidavit is
4 concerned.

5 MR. McMILLAN: Okay. Going forward, we'll
6 take your comments under advisement. Thanks.

7 EXAMINER DAWSON: Is that all, Mr. Brooks?

8 EXAMINER BROOKS: That's all.

9 EXAMINER DAWSON: Do you have any
10 questions, Mr. Padilla?

11 MR. PADILLA: No, Mr. Examiner. I can't
12 cross-examine an affidavit. I would especially like to
13 question somebody, I think the landman, on the proposed
14 AFE about the \$15.4 million for drilling this well.

15 EXAMINER BROOKS: This raises some
16 interesting questions, when we have these objections to
17 the affidavits. The rule on presenting cases by
18 affidavit says that they must be uncontroverted -- there
19 must be no controversy.

20 Did you object to this case being submitted
21 by affidavit?

22 MR. PADILLA: Well, I have to, yes, at this
23 point based on the affidavit itself.

24 EXAMINER BROOKS: Okay.

25 MR. McMILLAN: Mr. Examiner, if I may,

1 Mr. Padilla's appearance is just in the past couple of
2 days. There was no pre-hearing statement. There's
3 nothing -- no procedural steps were taken that would
4 make appropriate at this time a demand to cross-examine
5 witnesses. We proceeded in good faith that no
6 opposition had been noted as of record and accordingly
7 have presented this case by affidavit. We would ask
8 that Mr. Padilla's request -- I guess it's a request to
9 somehow cross-examine these witnesses or these
10 affidavits, it simply be denied as not timely.

11 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, I need to look at
12 the rule, so give me just a minute here (reading).

13 (Pause in proceedings, 10:29 a.m. to 10:30
14 a.m.)

15 EXAMINER BROOKS: Mr. Dawson, I'm going
16 request -- I'm going to advise that you not take this
17 case under advisement until I've had a chance to look at
18 this, and I will do so at the next break.

19 EXAMINER DAWSON: Okay. So do you have any
20 other questions?

21 EXAMINER BROOKS: No, just about the
22 propriety of us taking the case under advisement without
23 giving Mr. Padilla -- without giving Mr. Padilla a
24 chance to cross-examine the witness. I know there is a
25 rule on it, and I know it's somewhat ambiguous, and I

1 need to look at it. So if you'll give me this
2 consideration, I'll try to get to it as soon as
3 possible.

4 EXAMINER DAWSON: Do you have any
5 questions, Mr. Warnell?

6 EXAMINER WARNELL: I have no questions. I
7 thought the presentation was done well.

8 MS. LUCK: Thank you.

9 EXAMINER DAWSON: Ms. Murphy?

10 EXAMINER MURPHY: No questions.

11 EXAMINER DAWSON: I have no questions.

12 At this point, we will put this case on
13 hold until our attorney has a chance to review
14 Mr. Padilla's request, and then we will address it.
15 Whenever he comes to a conclusion, we will address the
16 answer to his question.

17 MS. LUCK: Okay.

18 EXAMINER BROOKS: Hopefully that will be
19 within the next hour.

20 MS. LUCK: Thank you.

21 MR. McMILLAN: I think it would be helpful
22 if on the record the nature of the request was made
23 clear. I'm not entirely certain what Mr. Padilla is
24 asking.

25 EXAMINER BROOKS: My understanding was that

1 Mr. Padilla wants to cross-examine somebody on the AFE.

2 Could you clarify that?

3 MR. PADILLA: That's correct. I mean, I
4 haven't seen an AFE for drilling of a Wolfcamp well at
5 15.4 million. So --

6 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, do you know which
7 witness this affidavit --

8 MR. PADILLA: It will be the -- it's
9 attached to the affidavit of the landman in this case,
10 Mr. --

11 EXAMINER BROOKS: Yeah. That's what I
12 thought you had said. That in itself raises some
13 questions because, in my experience, landmen do not
14 prepare AFEs. So I don't know whether it's within the
15 scope of their expertise to testify about the
16 reasonableness of the affidavit -- the reasonableness of
17 the expenses.

18 MR. McMILLAN: With all due respect, I
19 think it's been done for years. Isn't that a standard
20 piece of the landman's testimony in these proceedings,
21 that the AFE is, in fact, in line with other wells of
22 similar depths and lengths?

23 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, they can testify to
24 that as a fact if they have actual knowledge. I do not
25 believe a landman can testify to the reasonableness

1 because my experience is engineers prepare AFEs.

2 MR. PADILLA: That's correct.

3 EXAMINER BROOKS: So I don't know what is
4 needed in this case, but that's something I need to look
5 at a little further.

6 MR. McMILLAN: Well, we have his testimony
7 from a previously qualified land expert who -- I mean,
8 landman -- I don't know in this case who prepared the
9 AFE, but these are the folks who are -- they're seeing
10 AFEs every day in their work. And once qualified as an
11 expert in land matters, it would seem to me that would
12 fall within their expertise that --

13 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, I think that a
14 landman could certainly testify that an AFE was within a
15 range of what a similar AFE would be -- what a similar
16 well would be as a matter of fact if he has that
17 experience.

18 MR. McMILLAN: Uh-huh.

19 EXAMINER BROOKS: I do not think it comes
20 within his expertise as a landman because, like I said,
21 landmen don't prepare AFEs.

22 Let's see. Ameredev is the Applicant in
23 this case, right?

24 MR. McMILLAN: Correct.

25 EXAMINER DAWSON: Right.

1 EXAMINER BROOKS: Is Concho in any way
2 involved in this matter?

3 MS. LUCK: I don't believe so.

4 MR. McMILLAN: It doesn't appear so.

5 EXAMINER BROOKS: Thank you. Thank you.

6 I will probably have to hold this over to
7 the afternoon session, but I will try to -- I will come
8 up with definitive advice today.

9 MR. McMILLAN: Okay. This is all very new
10 to me. I've never seen anyone bring forth an engineer
11 to speak to the reasonableness of an AFE. The pattern
12 and practice for my entire experience before this body
13 is that a properly qualified landman is qualified based
14 on his expertise to opine.

15 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, I would comment on
16 that that while what has been done before is usually
17 okay in the law, there are some times when an innovation
18 might be concerning. And I think -- I don't think --
19 most of the time we've been dealing with these matters,
20 reasonableness of cost of the AFE has not been an issue.
21 And when it's not an issue, then I don't think we need
22 to worry about it. But I'm seeing a trend here because
23 of the two cases this morning and the one case earlier
24 in the week and one case that was discussed at a
25 prehearing conference earlier in the week. And if there

1 is a trend developing here, we need to decide something
2 about how we're going to handle it, that is the trend
3 toward the costs going up and becoming increasingly
4 irritating to nonoperators and being dismissed by the
5 examiners and the operators as something that's not
6 likely to raise controversy. So I'm just concerned
7 about it.

8 MR. McMILLAN: Thank you, Mr. Brooks.

9 EXAMINER DAWSON: Okay. So we'll let
10 Mr. Brooks review it and get back.

11 MS. LUCK: Thank you.

12 (Recess, 10:37 a.m.)

13 (11:36 a.m.)

14 EXAMINER DAWSON: Yes. Since Mr. Padilla
15 and Mr. McMillan are here and also Ms. Luck, we'll go
16 ahead and go back on the record in Case --

17 EXAMINER BROOKS: Is that 20223?

18 EXAMINER WARNELL: Yes.

19 EXAMINER DAWSON: Yes.

20 -- Case Number 20223. We will open that
21 case back up for the record for our decision on the
22 request by Mr. Padilla.

23 EXAMINER BROOKS: Okay. I really need to
24 address this to the attorneys because if there is
25 something I'm overlooking, I don't want to overlook

1 something. The Rule 4 deals with pre-hearing statements
2 in 413B. And I do not see anything in that particular
3 rule and I was not aware of anything that would -- that
4 says you have to file a pre-hearing statement to be
5 entitled to cross-examine the witnesses. Now, there is
6 such a provision in Rule 3- -- such a provision
7 expressly in Rule 311B, but that applies only to
8 rulemaking. So if I were pressed to rule upon the issue
9 of whether or not Mr. Padilla has waived the right to
10 cross-examine by not filing a pre-hearing statement, at
11 this point, unless there is something I'm overlooking, I
12 would have to say that I believe that is not the case.

13 However, I also believe that it is very
14 questionable whether or not the reasonableness of an AFE
15 is actually an issue that the Division has to address in
16 a pre- -- in an otherwise uncontested compulsory pooling
17 case, because although I realize it's of practical
18 importance, the question is: Is it of legal importance
19 when the party, if they elect to participate, still has
20 the right to raise the issue of reasonableness in a
21 post-drilling proceeding? And I can see why the issue
22 is postponed because it has to be addressed to actual
23 costs.

24 The question then becomes: Does the ruling
25 on -- does a ruling -- does a granting of a compulsory

1 pooling application over an objection that the AFE which
2 is filed in the compulsory pooling case, even though it
3 is not necessarily the same as the AFE supplied for the
4 purposes of making an election and certainly not the
5 same as the AFE filed after the drilling of the well on
6 the basis of which reasonable costs are determined, is
7 that AFE filed at the original compulsory pooling
8 hearing of any legal effect?

9 Well, it may be because -- at least a
10 practical effect because the Division may have some
11 degree of inclination -- even if it's not legally
12 barred, they have some degree of disinclination to hear
13 complaints that a party did not make at the original
14 hearing to the proposed items in the AFE when they
15 are -- you know, you can certainly complain about the
16 actual cost of the AFE on the ground that it exceeds the
17 original AFE and is unreasonable. But can you complain
18 about it being unreasonable if it did not exceed the
19 original AFE? And I don't know the answer to that.

20 Because this matter needs to be visited
21 more, especially in view of what Mr. McMillan correctly
22 referred to as the Division's long-standing practice of
23 not being rigorous about proof of reasonable costs in
24 the initial proceeding, what I propose to do is to rule
25 at this point that in view of lack of the contest -- in

1 view of the lack of an alternative proposal, that this
2 issue of reasonableness does not mandate that the --
3 even if we concluded that the AFE was unreasonably high,
4 we would still not be justified in refusing the
5 compulsory pooling request when we're not presented with
6 an alternative. But I believe that that should not
7 be -- should not result in an inability to contest costs
8 if they're unreasonable -- found to be unreasonable on
9 the actual expenses AFE.

10 I think this should not be a precedent for
11 how we rule in future cases because I think the Division
12 needs to visit this. It's too important to let it just
13 hang out there in the air. But at the same time, in
14 going forward, nonoperating parties can protect
15 themselves by stating that -- in their AFE that they may
16 contest reasonableness of the costs as presented at the
17 hearing.

18 There is no reason why Mr. Padilla would
19 have been expected to do that filing his APD -- filing
20 a -- a pre-hearing statement because he wouldn't have
21 anticipated the necessity, I don't think.

22 But I would state that this record will be
23 available if there is a controversy at the far end about
24 the AFE and the reasonableness of actual costs if
25 Mr. Padilla's client elects to participate. And that

1 can be litigated at that time without being prejudiced
2 by failure to raise it at this proceeding. I'm dancing
3 around this because I want to be fair to the parties
4 here, but I also want to preserve the Division's options
5 to reconsider these matters in light of the way things
6 are going. And I get the feeling that at least in the
7 Wolfcamp, the price of poker is going up.

8 Yes, sir. Do you have a question?

9 MR. McMILLAN: I do.

10 EXAMINER DAWSON: Go ahead.

11 MR. McMILLAN: What's the ruling?

12 EXAMINER BROOKS: The ruling is that we do
13 not have to find that the AFE is reasonable in order to
14 grant the compulsory pooling order --

15 MR. McMILLAN: Okay.

16 EXAMINER BROOKS: -- because there is no
17 counterproposal.

18 MR. McMILLAN: Sounds reasonable to me. As
19 such, how do we proceed in this particular matter?

20 EXAMINER BROOKS: Well, we will take the
21 case under advisement.

22 Mr. Padilla's request to have -- to
23 continue the hearing to permit him to cross-examine
24 witnesses will be denied. However, I would strongly
25 suggest to the parties, because there is serious

1 concern, which there may well be, that the parties try
2 to resolve it peacefully.

3 MR. PADILLA: We do have the option of a de
4 novo.

5 EXAMINER BROOKS: You certainly have the
6 option of a de novo. And it may not be a case in which
7 the Division would want to grant it. I certainly intend
8 to present this to other people -- present this to other
9 people in the Division. But I think that it would
10 not -- especially when we're continuing for six weeks,
11 it would be counterproductive to -- when we don't really
12 know where the parties stand, it would be
13 counterproductive to continue the case for this reason,
14 when the complaining party has --

15 MR. McMILLAN: Thank you, Mr. Brooks, for
16 your thoughtful analysis.

17 EXAMINER BROOKS: You're welcome.

18 EXAMINER DAWSON: With that, Case Number
19 20223 will be taken under advisement.

20 And we will break for lunch until 1:00. So
21 we'll see you back here at 1:00.

22 Thank you.

23 (Case Number 20223 concludes, 11:46 a.m.)

24 (Recess, 11:46 a.m. to 1:06 p.m.)

25

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO
2 COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

3

4 CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

5 I, MARY C. HANKINS, Certified Court
6 Reporter, New Mexico Certified Court Reporter No. 20,
7 and Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify
8 that I reported the foregoing proceedings in
9 stenographic shorthand and that the foregoing pages are
10 a true and correct transcript of those proceedings that
11 were reduced to printed form by me to the best of my
12 ability.

13 I FURTHER CERTIFY that the Reporter's
14 Record of the proceedings truly and accurately reflects
15 the exhibits, if any, offered by the respective parties.

16 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither
17 employed by nor related to any of the parties or
18 attorneys in this case and that I have no interest in
19 the final disposition of this case.

20 DATED THIS 7th day of March 2019.

21

22

23 MARY C. HANKINS, CCR, RPR
24 Certified Court Reporter
25 New Mexico CCR No. 20
Date of CCR Expiration: 12/31/2019
Paul Baca Professional Court Reporters

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