

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:

CASE NOS: 22853

APPLICATION OF PRIDE ENERGY COMPANY  
FOR COMPULSORY POOLING, LEA COUNTY,  
NEW MEXICO.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF VIRTUAL PROCEEDINGS  
EXAMINER HEARING  
JULY 7, 2022  
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

This matter came on for virtual hearing before  
the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, HEARING OFFICER  
WILLIAM BRANCARD and TECHNICAL EXAMINER DEAN McCLURE on  
Thursday, July 7, 2022, through the Webex Platform.

Reported by: PAUL BACA PROFESSIONAL COURT REPORTERS  
500 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 105  
Albuquerque, NM 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

A P P E A R A N C E S

JAMES BRUCE  
P.O. Box 1056  
Santa Fe, NM 87504-1056  
505-982-2151  
jamesbruce@aol.com

DARIN SAVAGE  
ABADIE & SCHILL  
214 McKenzie Street  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

JOBY RITTENHOUSE  
ConocoPhillips Company  
600 W Illinois Ave  
Midland, TX 79701-4882

I N D E X

CASE CALLED	
CONTINUED	05
REPORTER CERTIFICATE	06

1 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you. We are  
2 now on Item Number 19. This is Case 22853, Pride Energy.

3 MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, Jim Bruce on behalf of  
4 Pride Energy.

5 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you. Cimarex  
6 Energy Company?

7 MR. SAVAGE: Mr. Examiner, Darin Savage with  
8 Abadie & Schill on behalf of Cimarex Energy.

9 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: ConocoPhillips

10 MR. RITTENHOUSE: Mr. Examiner, this is Joby  
11 Rittenhouse appearing (audio dropped).

12 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: You cut out there at  
13 the end, Mr. Rittenhouse. Any other persons for Case 22853?

14 (No audible response.)

15 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: So it looks like we  
16 have objections to these cases going forward by affidavit  
17 from both Cotera and ConocoPhillips.

18 MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, if I can speak up and  
19 then the other counsel can, can verify if I am correct. COG  
20 desired additional time to work out a JOA with Pride Energy  
21 Company and wanted this matter continued for, I believe, a  
22 couple more months.

23 It was continued once before at COG's request.

24 And Pride was -- Pride Energy was unwilling to grant a  
25 voluntary continuance, so Mr. Rittenhouse filed an objection

1 to hearing by affidavit.

2 As to Cotera, this Ghost State 401H well is an  
3 Upper Wolfcamp well, and I was informed by Mr. Savage that  
4 Cotera was concerned about any effect that well might have  
5 on the Third Bone Spring and therefore wished additional  
6 time to review that in-house. If I could ask my fellow  
7 counsel to see if I correctly summarized that.

8 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: So, Mr. Savage?

9 MR. SAVAGE: Mr. Bruce, that's a good general  
10 summary from Cimarex.

11 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: So Cimarex is looking  
12 for a contested hearing at some point in the future.

13 MR. SAVAGE: Not a contested hearing at this  
14 point, but we would like to resolve this technical matter  
15 regarding the proximity of the end point of the well to the  
16 base of the Third Bone Spring.

17 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: So you are looking  
18 for a delay?

19 MR. SAVAGE: We are looking for some time to  
20 address that.

21 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Mr. Rittenhouse?

22 MR. RITTENHOUSE: I agree. That's a fairly  
23 accurate summary ( ) some significant working interests in  
24 these proposed ( ) so we want some additional time to  
25 evaluate the proposal. My understanding, that while we have

1 the JOA, it came a bit late, so we are in the process of  
2 evaluating that and again significant working interest ()  
3 just want to make sure that we've got everything squared  
4 away.

5 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Mr. Bruce, are we  
6 talking several months, are we talking September, October  
7 for a status conference?

8 MR. BRUCE: Well, I would, I would like  
9 September, as early as possible in September. That is a  
10 status conference, but of course, you know, counsel would  
11 always have the right to object which would make it a status  
12 conference. But if everything is resolved within the next  
13 two months, my client would prefer to move forward without  
14 another status conference.

15 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: How about if we  
16 continue this case to September 15?

17 MR. BRUCE: Thank you.

18 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: We are continuing  
19 that as just a hearing on the schedule.

20 MR. BRUCE: Thank you.

21 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Thank you. Any other  
22 comments on Case 22853?

23 (No audible response.)

24 HEARING EXAMINER BRANCARD: Hearing none, let's  
25 move on. (Continued.)

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

STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that I reported the foregoing virtual proceedings in stenographic shorthand and that the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcript of those proceedings to the best of my ability.

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

I FURTHER CERTIFY that the Virtual Proceeding was of poor to good quality.

Dated this 7th day of July 2022.

/s/ Irene Delgado  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Court Reporter  
License Expires: 12-31-22