

2 ne # 24.
9

December 4, 1940

Mr. G. H. Card
Stanolind Oil & Gas Company
Fair Building
Fort Worth, Texas

Re: Case No. 24, Petition of R. W. Fair, et al.,
for well location in NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Sec. 32-17S-30E.,
Loco Hills, closer to unit boundary than per-
mitted by rules of Commission.

Re: Case No. 25, Petition of Frank B. Hadlock for
well location in W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, Sec. 16-20S-32E.,
Halfway Pool, closer to unit boundary than
permitted by rules of Commission.

My dear George:

Your inquiry of November 29 to Mr. Andreas has been for-
warded to this office for reply.

As to Case No. 24, among other things, the petitioners
recite:

"In order to avoid the hazards of drilling a dry
well and to make the production of oil as certain
as possible and to be sure that the new well is
located on the structure at the best point it is
desired to drill said well approximately one hundred
and fifteen (115) feet south of the north boundary
line and one hundred and fifteen (115) feet east of
the west boundary line."

As to Case No. 25, the petitioner is indefinite as to
exact location, other than he desires a location 150 feet from
the west boundary of his particular 40-acre unit, as noted in
the second portion of the caption. Among other things is the
statement:

"A few years ago the Western Drilling Co. of Artesia
drilled a dry hole on this forty of mine and what I
want to do is to drill, and to stay as far away from
the dry hole as I can, and that would be still too

Mr. G. H. Card

-2-

12/4/40

close, as I understand it drops to the east fairly fast. Would I be allowed to set my location 150 feet from my west line in this case?"

This petition is very informal - in the form of a letter - and was accepted as a petition in order that that matter may be heard during the same session of the Commission with a number of other matters on docket. However, the petitioner, Mr. Frank B. Hadlock, 403 Bassett Tower, El Paso, Texas, advises the writer by letter that he does not now wish to go ahead with his petition, and he desires to know whether the matter may be brought up later. In reply, he was advised that his letter will be recommended to the Commission to be treated as a motion for dismissal without prejudice, in which event he may reinstate the case as a new case later, but it would now be simpler to go ahead with the matter than to reinstate the case, provided he really desires the unorthodox location and is in a position to receive sanction of the waiver of the adjoining unit holder or holders affected.

Very truly yours,

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

By Carl B. Livingston
Attorney

CBL:k

cc - Mr. G. H. Card
c/o Hotel Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma

cc - Mr. A. Andreas
New Mexico State Geologist
c/o Hotel Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma

ILLEGIBLE

NOTICE FOR PUBLICATION
STATE OF NEW MEXICO
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The Oil Conservation Commission, by law invested with jurisdiction as the oil and gas regulatory body of the State of New Mexico, hereby gives notice of the following public hearings to be held at the Capitol, Santa Fe, New Mexico:

Case No. 22.

The petition of Anderson-Prichard Oil Corporation and Stanolind Oil & Gas Company, for themselves and for other operators in that part of the Langlie Pool, Lea County, lying generally in Sections 4, 5, 8 and 9, T. 25 S., R. 37 E., N.M.P.M., for an order by the Commission regarding the unitization, repressuring, or other conservation measures as to that portion of said Pool in order to increase the ultimate recovery therefrom. This case is set for 9:00 A. M., December 11, 1940.

Case No. 25.

✓ The petition of Frank B. Hadlock for a well location in the W₂NE₁NE₁, Sec. 16, T. 20 S., R. 32 E. (Halfway Pool), for structural reasons, closer to the exterior unit boundary than is conformable to existing rules of the Commission. This case is set for 10:00 A. M., December 12, 1940.

Any person having any interest in the subject of the said hearings shall be entitled to be heard.

Given under the seal of said Commission at Santa Fe, New Mexico,
on November 25, 1940.

OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

By (Sgd.) FRANK WORDEN
Commissioner of Public Lands

By (Sgd.) A. ANDREAS
State Geologist

(SEAL)

*Original
22
copy of publication
#22.*

CALENDAR OF SETTING OF HEARINGS BEFORE
THE NEW MEXICO OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION
AT SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO, DURING
DECEMBER 11 and 12, 1940.

- CASE NO. 22, set for hearing 9:00 A. M., December 11, 1940, upon the petition of Anderson-Prichard Oil Corporation and Stanolind Oil & Gas Company, for themselves and for other operators in that part of the Langlie Pool, Lea County, lying generally in Sections 4, 5, 8 and 9, T. 25 S., R. 37 E., N.M.P.M., for an order by the Commission regarding the unitization, repressuring, or other conservation measures as to that portion of said Pool in order to increase the ultimate recovery therefrom.
- CASE NO. 23, set for hearing 2:00 P. M., December 11, 1940, upon the petition of the Operators' Committee for the operators in the Loco Hills Pool in Eddy County, in connection with the proposal of a collective pressure maintenance program for said Pool, for an order from the Commission permitting a ten percent increase over and above the normal allowable for each month until the principal investment in said pressure maintenance program has been amortized; the production of the monthly allowable of wells selected as input wells from another well or wells owned by the operator, preferably on the same basic lease, in order to preclude the penalizing of operators whose wells are used as input wells -- with special reference to the following wells proposed to be so used: R. W. Fairbairn #6, and Bassett & Birney #63-State.
- CASE NO. 24, set for hearing 9:00 A. M., December 12, 1940, upon the petition of R. W. Fair, Bert Aston, Charles A. Scheurich, Carl A. Hatch, J. R. Cole, Sidney Johnson and Anna Franklin, for a location for a well for oil and gas in the northwest corner of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 32, T. 17 S., R. 30 E., (Loco Hills), for structural reasons, at a point closer to the boundary line of said 40-acre tract than is permitted by present rules of the Commission.
- CASE NO. 25, set for hearing 10:00 A. M., December 12, 1940, upon the petition of Frank B. Hadlock for a well location in the W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, Sec. 16, T. 20 S., R. 32 E. (Halfway Pool), for structural reasons, closer to the exterior unit boundary than is conformable to existing rules of the Commission.
- CASE No. 21-E, set for hearing 2:00 P. M., December 12, 1940, upon the adoption of a final gas-oil ratio order for the producing fields in Eddy County and other areas in New Mexico except Lea County, recessed in Case No. 21 from the hearing of August 29, 1940, to November 15, 1940, and not heard at said latter date.

* * * * *

ILLEGIBLE