

18. Although the primary terms of the TMBR/Sharp leases have apparently expired, TMBR/Sharp alleges that the leases were preserved by the drilling of the "Blue Fin 24 Well No. 1" and subsequent production from that well. The Blue Fin 24 Well No. 1 is located in the offsetting section 24.

19. Subsequent to Stokes and Hamilton's execution of leases in favor of Ameristate Oil & Gas Inc., they granted leases in the same property to James D. Huff on March 27, 2001. See TMBR/Sharp Exhibit 9. The leases to Mr. Huff were recorded in Book 1084 at Page 282 and in Book 1084 at Page 285 in Lea County, New Mexico. The parties referred to these leases as "top leases," meaning that according to their terms, they would not take effect until the prior or "bottom" leases became ineffective. See TMBR/Sharp Exhibit 9, ¶ 15.

20. Arrington alleges Mr. Huff is an agent of Arrington but presented nothing to support that contention.

21. In July and August 2001, Ocean acquired a number of farm-out agreements in Section 25. See TMBR/Sharp Exhibit 10, Schedule 1. By an assignment dated September 10, 2001, Ocean assigned a percentage of the farm out agreements to Arrington under terms that require Arrington to drill a test well in Section 25 known as the Triple Hackle Dragon "25" Well No. 1 in the NW/4 of that section.

22. On August 21, 2001, after receiving the denials of the applied-for permits to drill from the District office, TMBR/Sharp filed suit against Arrington and the lessors of its mineral interests in the Fifth Judicial District Court of Lea County, New Mexico. In that case, styled "TMBR/Sharp Drilling, Inc. v. David H. Arrington Oil & Gas, Inc., *et al.*", TMBR/Sharp alleged that its leases were still effective and the Arrington top leases were ineffective. The District Court, in its Order Granting Partial Summary Judgment, dated December 24, 2001, agreed with TMBR/Sharp's contention. See TMBR/Sharp's Exhibit No. 12,

23. During the hearing of this matter, TMBR/Sharp argued that because the Fifth Judicial District Court found that Arrington's "top leases" had failed, TMBR/Sharp was entitled to permits to drill in Sections 23 and 25 and Arrington was not entitled to permits to drill and its permits should be rescinded. TMBR/Sharp also argued that Arrington had filed applications to prevent TMBR/Sharp from being able to drill and to place its obligations under the continuous drilling clauses of the oil and gas leases in jeopardy. TMBR/Sharp argued that Ocean Energy's letter agreement with Arrington could not revive Arrington's claim of title and that Ocean Energy's pending pooling application with the Division is essentially irrelevant to the question of whether TMBR/Sharp should have been granted a permit to drill.

24. Arrington argued in response that the title issue ruled upon by the District Court with respect to section 25 is irrelevant because Arrington acquired an independent