

Brooks, David K., EMNRD

From: jamesbruc@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2009 8:27 AM
To: Brooks, David K., EMNRD
Subject: Re: Cases 14306 and 14274

David: After the first hearing, Mewbourne found that several interest owners had leased their interests (before notice was given of the first case), so the second case was to force pool these "new" working interest owners. Sorry for the confusion.

Jim

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

From: Brooks, David K., EMNRD <david.brooks@state.nm.us>
To: jamesbruc@aol.com
Sent: Tue, 21 Apr 2009 4:40 pm
Subject: Cases 14306 and 14274

Dear Jim

This is confusing. You presented Case No. 14306 on April 16, 2009, and we took it under advisement.

However, it seems that Order R-13099, issued in Case No. 14374 on March 9, 2009, pooled the exact same unit and dedicated to the exact same well.

What exactly is going on here?

Sincerely

David

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail, including all attachments is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited unless specifically provided under the New Mexico Inspection of Public Records Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this message. -- This email has been scanned by the Sybari - Antigen Email System.

Green cleaning products -- do they work as well? [Find out now!](#)

This inbound email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
