

Financial institutions
Energy
Infrastructure, mining and commodities
Transport
Technology and innovation
Life sciences and healthcare

 **NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT**

Analysis of Litigation Involving Shale & Hydraulic Fracturing

Barclay R. Nicholson, Partner
Fulbright & Jaworski LLP
January 1, 2014



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
Introduction	1-2
Litigation Involving Hydraulic Fracturing	2-40
Litigation Involving Earthquakes and Hydraulic Fracturing	40-42
Studies Concerning Possible Connections Between Earthquakes and Fracking	42-48
Litigation Concerning Municipal Bans of Hydraulic Fracturing	48-53
Litigation Concerning State vs. Local Zoning Regulation of Hydraulic Fracturing	54-58
Litigation Claiming Moratorium on Hydraulic Fracturing Affected Investment	59
Litigation Involving Oil & Gas Lease Disputes	60-69
Lawsuits Brought by Citizens, States, and Environmental Groups	70-77
Litigation Involving Enforcement	78
Litigation Challenging Government Regulations	78-79
Litigation Challenging Disclosure Regulations	79-81
Litigation Involving Antitrust Issues	81-82
Settlements Involving Hydraulic Fracturing and Shale Drilling	82-83
Regulatory Investigations	83-84
Potential for Shareholder Litigation	84
Conclusion	84
About the Author	85
Appendix A: Table of Cases	
Appendix B: Resume of Barclay R. Nicholson	

ANALYSIS OF LITIGATION INVOLVING SHALE & HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

Barclay R. Nicholson¹

Current as of January 1, 2014

Hydraulic fracturing involves the injection of highly pressurized fluids and proppants into shale or other non-porous hydrocarbon formations in order to increase production of oil and natural gas wells. Hydraulic fracturing utilizes large volumes of water; thus, it also produces large volumes of fluids called “flowback” or “produced water.” Most operators engaged in hydraulic fracturing dispose of their flowback or produced water by either treating and recycling the water, treating the water and disposing of it, or injecting the fluids into a well called a “Class II Well.”

Although hydraulic fracturing has been utilized in the United States for decades, within the past several years, hydraulic fracturing and its alleged impact on water quality have received increasing attention and scrutiny from the media, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Congress, regulatory agencies throughout the United States, state and local governments, and various environmental groups. Many parties have raised concerns about the reduction of citizens’ water supplies due to the large volume of water used in the fracturing process, the alleged contamination of aquifers that supply drinking water, and the appropriate disposal of or recycling of the flowback or produced water. At the heart of these concerns are the additives used in fracturing fluids, which some argue contain potentially toxic substances such as benzene, toluene, xylene, methanol, formaldehyde, ethylene, glycol, glycol ethers, hydrochloric acid, and sodium hydroxide.

While lawmakers debate the need for policies and regulations, and environmental agencies prepare studies and conduct tests, the number of civil cases involving hydraulic fracturing is rising. Many of these lawsuits (some of which are class actions) that have been filed by landowners in Arkansas, Colorado, Louisiana, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, and West Virginia against oil and gas operating and drilling companies, allege contamination of groundwater or sources of drinking water. These landowners either leased oil and gas rights to the companies, or reside in close proximity to where hydraulic fracturing operations have been conducted. Other shale and hydraulic fracturing lawsuits concern earthquakes, environmental issues, regulatory enforcement, municipal bans, government regulations, and oil and gas lease disputes.

This article discusses many of the recently filed lawsuits² that implicate hydraulic fracturing, and the claims made in those cases. The cases are listed by filing date from earliest to latest within

¹ Barclay R. Nicholson, a partner at Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P. (Norton Rose Fulbright), Houston, Texas, focuses his practice on energy and commercial disputes. He has significant experience in handling energy-related litigation and has represented some of the world’s major oil and gas producing and refining companies, as well as some of the nation’s biggest drilling and E&P companies. Barclay serves on the firm’s Shale and Hydraulic Fracturing Task Force and recently has authored numerous articles and given speeches both across the nation and internationally on this topic. Barclay also serves as the editor of www.frackingblog.com, a blog devoted to hydraulic fracturing.

each topic of discussion. Many of the cases are in the early stages of litigation, while others have been dismissed or settled. As of the date of this White Paper, the authors have not located any judgment against a well operator, drilling contractor, or service company for contamination of groundwater resulting from hydraulic fracturing.

Litigation Relating to Hydraulic Fracturing

Maring v. John Nalbhone, Jr., Universal Resource Oil & Gas; EnerVest Operating LLC, and Dallas Morris Drilling Inc., No. K12009001499 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Aug. 27, 2009)

In August 2009, Josephine Maring (“Plaintiff”) filed suit in Chautauqua County, New York against John Nalbhone Jr., Universal Resource Oil & Gas, EnerVest Operating LLC, and Dallas Morris Drilling Inc. (collectively, “Defendants”). According to Plaintiff, Defendants own and operate approximately 20 natural gas wells within a two-mile radius of her property. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants’ drilling and extraction activities have resulted in the contamination of her water well with methane gas, making the water unfit for ordinary use.

The complaint includes causes of action for trespass, nuisance, and negligence. Plaintiff seeks damages in the amount of \$250,000 plus litigation costs. Although the complaint states that Defendants’ gas drilling and extraction operations caused methane contamination, the complaint does not specifically mention hydraulic fracturing. While the Defendants appeared on September 19, 2011, there has been little activity in this case since that date.

Zimmermann v. Atlas America, LLC, No. 2009-7564 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Sept. 21, 2009)

Zimmermann v. Atlas America, LLC was filed in Pennsylvania state court on September 21, 2009 against Atlas America, LLC (“Atlas”). Plaintiffs George and Lisa Zimmermann are a married couple owning only the surface rights to their property in Pennsylvania. After attempting to prevent Atlas from conducting drilling operations on their property, the Zimmermanns entered into a settlement agreement with Atlas. The claims of contamination in this lawsuit arose after that settlement and after drilling had commenced.

Plaintiffs, who agreed in the settlement agreement to permit Atlas to conduct hydraulic fracturing operations on their farm, allege that Atlas used toxic chemicals during the fracturing process, and that the use of such chemicals contaminated and polluted their freshwater aquifers. They claim that their natural water aquifers and their previously pristine Heirloom Tomato farmland were destroyed as a result of Atlas’s hydraulic fracturing operations. Plaintiffs assert claims for trespass, nuisance, negligence, negligence per se, res ipsa loquitur, fraud/misrepresentation, and

² Information in this White Paper identifying plaintiffs, defendants, and causes of action comes from the docket sheets, complaints, petitions, motions, and orders filed in each lawsuit. Any information that is not included in the pleadings is footnoted or identified in this White Paper.

breach of the settlement agreement. They also allege that Atlas violated casing requirements of the Pennsylvania Oil & Gas Act.

For trespass, claiming that their surface rights extended to the aquifers below their property, Plaintiffs allege that Atlas contaminated their soil and water with carcinogens and other pollutants, and that this contamination went beyond any disturbance contemplated in the parties' settlement agreement. In addition, Atlas used substantially more acreage than agreed upon in the settlement agreement. The petition includes assertions that the contamination of the land and water and the release of noxious and harmful detectable gases into the air constituted a private nuisance.

For negligence, Plaintiffs argue that Atlas breached its duty of care to operate its mining operations with due regard to the rights of the property's surface estate, to use only so much of the property as reasonably necessary to conduct mining operations, and to conduct mining operations so as to leave the property intact. They assert that Atlas breached this duty by (1) not conducting its operations in a reasonable manner to protect their property; (2) failing to take proper precautions to prevent toxic and carcinogenic chemicals from escaping and damaging their property; (3) failing to take appropriate measures after discovering damage to the surface estate; (4) selecting well sites that were in close proximity to their home and natural water aquifers; and (5) employing hydraulic fracturing with the knowledge that it would cause the contamination to the surface estate.

In their fraud/misrepresentation claim, Plaintiffs state that prior to the commencement of drilling on their property, Atlas knew and should have disclosed that the chemicals injected into sub-surface reservoirs contained and/or would release hazardous contaminants into the soil and water.

On August 4, 2011, the Court dismissed the claims of *res ipsa loquitur*, gross negligence, and fraud/misrepresentation. The Court stated that it would reinstate the fraud/misrepresentation claim if Plaintiffs would re-plead to specifically state the existence of a duty and how that duty was breached.

Compensatory damages for permanent destruction of property, permanent destruction of water aquifers, loss of water well use, and reduction in value of property are sought. Plaintiffs also want punitive damages.

***Fiorentino v. Cabot Oil & Gas Corp. and Gas Search Drilling Services Corp.*, No. 3:09-cv-02284 (M.D. Pa., Nov. 19, 2009)**

Approximately 19 families in Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania ("Plaintiffs") sued Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation ("Cabot") and Gas Search Drilling Services Corporation (collectively, with Cabot, "Defendants") for state law violations and common law claims, including negligence,

gross negligence, negligence per se, nuisance, strict liability, fraudulent misrepresentation, breach of contract, medical monitoring trust fund, and violation of the Pennsylvania Hazardous Sites Cleanup Act. According to Plaintiffs, Defendants, among other things, allegedly (1) released combustible gas into the headspaces of Plaintiffs’ water wells; (2) caused elevated levels of dissolved methane to be present in Plaintiffs’ water wells; (3) discharged natural gas into Plaintiffs’ groundwater; (4) allowed excessive pressure to build up within gas wells near Plaintiffs’ homes and water wells which resulted in an explosion; (5) spilled diesel fuel onto the ground near Plaintiffs’ homes and water wells; (6) discharged drilling mud into diversion ditches near Plaintiffs’ homes and water wells; (7) caused an explosion due to the accumulation of evaporated methane in wellheads; and (8) caused three significant spills within a ten-day period.³

Plaintiffs sought compensatory damages including loss of property value, natural resource damage, medical costs, loss of use and enjoyment of property, loss of quality of life, emotional distress, and personal injury. In addition, the Plaintiffs asked for punitive damages, the cost of remediation, the cost of future health monitoring, an injunction, and litigation costs and fees.

Cabot filed a motion to dismiss, which was granted as to Plaintiffs’ gross negligence claim. Cabot has consistently maintained that the Plaintiffs’ water was suitable for consumption. Testing by the EPA in the winter and spring of 2012 served to confirm Cabot’s position.⁴

On September 12, 2012, a joint stipulation of dismissal was filed with the Court. The stipulation covered the majority of Plaintiffs, with only twelve individual Plaintiffs continuing the lawsuit. On December 17, 2012, the Court allowed counsel for the remaining Plaintiffs to withdraw, with all but two Plaintiffs (for whom a suggestion of death has been filed) continuing *pro se*. On September 23, 2013, the Court ordered the parties to identify at least three consecutive dates for the completion of plaintiffs’ experts’ depositions and has stayed its previous pre-trial scheduling order until discovery is complete and all pending motions are heard.

Kartch v. EOG Resources, No. 4:10-cv-00014 (D. N.D. March 4, 2010)

Frankie and Kristin Kartch (“Plaintiffs”) filed suit in the Northwest Judicial District Court, County of Mountrail, State of North Dakota, against EOG Resources, Inc. on August 13, 2009, alleging that EOG was drilling a well on their property without any contractual agreement for compensation. The lawsuit was removed to the U.S. District Court for District of North Dakota, Northwestern Division on March 4, 2010. This case settled and was dismissed by the Court on September 18, 2012.

³ The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (“PDEP”) also instituted a regulatory action against Cabot alleging methane contamination of certain residents’ water wells as a result of Cabot’s nearby drilling activities. The PDEP reached a settlement agreement with Cabot in December 2010. *See* Settlements Involving Hydraulic Fracturing and Shale Drilling, discussed *infra*.

⁴ On August 22, 2012, the PDEP gave a green light to Cabot to resume fracking seven wells in Dimock County. *See* <http://thetimes-tribune.com/news/dep-lets-cabot-resume-dimock-fracking-1.1361871>.

In their Second Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs claimed that EOG had “entered upon a portion of the surface estate owned by Plaintiffs and constructed a road and a well pad, dug a waste pit, filled the pit with waste, and is operating a producing well with storage tanks and other associated facilities,” without an agreement between the parties regarding compensation for damages. They claimed that the waste pit constructed by EOG was not reasonably necessary to explore and develop the mineral estate and that there were reasonable and economical alternatives to the waste pit. The waste pit which was “negligently constructed and monitored was used to store benzene, diesel fuel, trace elements and other chemicals and toxins.” The toxic waste in the pit was not removed prior to EOG simply burying the liner and the contents of the pit. Plaintiffs sought compensation for damages to their surface estate.

Hallowich v. Range Resources Corporation, Williams Gas/Laurel Mountain Midstream, Markwest Energy Partners, L.P., Markwest Energy Group, LLC, and Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, Case No. 2010-3954 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl. May 27, 2010)

On May 27, 2010, by Praecepto to Issue Writ of Summons, the Hallowich family initiated an action against several oil and gas companies and the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, alleging that the companies’ drilling activities interfered with their enjoyment of their property rights and violated the state’s environmental laws. They complained that their water was polluted by the wells, pipelines, processing operations and truck traffic that came into the rural area where they built their home. Before filing a complaint, the Hallowiches settled the dispute on July 11, 2011. With minor children involved, as required by state law, the Hallowiches filed a Petition for Approval of Settlement of Minors.

A hearing was held on August 23, 2011, at which time the Court approved the settlement and the record was sealed. Immediately thereafter, two Pittsburgh newspapers sought to unseal the record. The newspapers’ initial petition to unseal the record was denied. On appeal, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court reversed and remanded the case. Back in the Court of Common Pleas of Washington County, briefs were filed and an evidentiary hearing held. The oil and gas companies argued that they had the right to negotiate a mutual confidentiality agreement under the privacy protections of the Commonwealth’s constitution.

On March 20, 2013, the Court ordered that the settlement agreement be unsealed and made available to the public. The Court found that there is “a presumption of openness under the common-law rule of access to the courts” and there is “no business-entity right of privacy within the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to prevent the operation of that rule.”

The Judge concluded that the companies’ privacy rights were trumped by the press and public’s right of access to the record. “Confidentiality runs only between defendants and the Hallowiches. Thus, the unsealing of this record leaves these obligations wholly intact, because the parties remain just as gagged from speaking of the terms and conditions of the settlement as

they were prior to the unsealing.” A page from the unsealed settlement agreement shows that the Hallowiches were paid \$750,000.

Scoma v. Chesapeake Energy Corp., Chesapeake Operating, Inc., and Chesapeake Exploration, LLC, No. 3:10-cv-01385 (N.D. Tex., July 15, 2010)

Plaintiffs Jim and Linda Scoma, landowners in Johnson County, Texas, brought an action for negligence, nuisance, and trespass against Chesapeake Energy Corporation (dismissed without prejudice on July 27, 2011), Chesapeake Operating, Inc., and Chesapeake Exploration, LLC (collectively, “Chesapeake”). Plaintiffs settled their claims and, on December 9, 2011, the Court entered a Final Judgment dismissing all claims with prejudice.

Plaintiffs lived near oil and gas wells being developed by Chesapeake on adjacent property. In their complaint, Plaintiffs alleged that Chesapeake stored drilling waste at the well sites and disposed of fracturing waste in injection wells near Plaintiffs’ property. They claimed that, as a result of Chesapeake’s hydraulic fracturing and disposal activities, their water well became contaminated with benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, xylene, barium, and iron.

For the nuisance claim, Plaintiffs asserted that the contamination prevented them from the use of their well water and made the enjoyment of their property uncomfortable and inconvenient. Plaintiffs stated in their trespass claim that Chesapeake exceeded its drilling rights on the adjacent property by causing petroleum by-products to enter Plaintiffs’ land and contaminate their water. Plaintiffs further alleged that Chesapeake breached its duty of care by negligently or unnecessarily damaging Plaintiffs’ land and well water. As damages, Plaintiffs sought the cost of water testing, loss of use of land, loss of market value of land, loss of intrinsic value of well water, emotional harm and mental anguish, nominal damages, exemplary damages, and injunctive relief.

Berish v. Southwestern Energy Production Co. and Southwestern Energy Co., No. 2010-1882 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Sept. 14, 2010), removed to M.D. Pennsylvania, No. 3:10-cv-01981, on Sept. 29, 2010

In September 2010, a group of 13 families (“Plaintiffs”) filed suit in Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania against Southwestern Energy Production Company (“Southwestern”) and its parent Southwestern Energy Company (voluntarily dismissed by Plaintiffs on October 12, 2010). *Berish v. Southwestern Energy Production Co., et al.*, No. 2010-1882 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Sept. 14, 2010). The case was removed to the Middle District of Pennsylvania on September 29, 2010. In their third amended complaint filed on May 17, 2012, Plaintiffs added four new defendants (Halliburton Energy Services, Inc.; BJ Services Company, Inc.; Schlumberger Limited

(voluntarily dismissed on November 16, 2012); and Union Drilling, Inc.)⁵ (collectively, with Southwestern, “Defendants”).

Plaintiffs allege that, beginning in 2008, their water wells became contaminated from Defendants’ hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling activities within 700 to 1,700 feet of their water resources. They claim that Southwestern’s natural gas well was improperly cased, allowing contaminants such as diesel fuel, barium, manganese, and strontium to migrate to the water wells. According to the complaint, at least one plaintiff is exhibiting neurological symptoms consistent with exposure to heavy metals.

Plaintiffs assert causes of action for negligence per se, common law negligence, nuisance, strict liability, trespass, medical monitoring trust fund, and violation of the Pennsylvania Hazardous Sites Cleanup Act. On December 8, 2010, the Court dismissed a portion of Plaintiffs’ citizen’s suit under the Pennsylvania Hazardous Sites Cleanup Act. On September 4, 2012, the Court issued an order dismissing all personal injury claims (except for the minor who retained the right to assert a personal injury claim in the future if she develops an injury), all claims for natural resource damages, and portions of the negligence per se claim.

In their negligence claim, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants had a duty of care to (1) responsibly drill, own, and operate the natural gas well; (2) respond to spills and releases of hazardous chemicals; (3) prevent such releases and spills; and (4) take all measures reasonably necessary to inform and protect the public, including Plaintiffs, from the contamination of their water supply and exposure to hazardous chemicals and combustible gases. Plaintiffs further state that Southwestern has created and maintained a continuing nuisance by allowing the natural gas well to exist and operate in a dangerous and hazardous condition, resulting in injuries to Plaintiffs’ health, well being, and property. As for strict liability, Plaintiffs contend that “the use, processing, storage, and activity of hydro-fracturing” at the wells near their home constitute abnormally dangerous and ultra-hazardous operations, “subjecting persons coming into contact with the hazardous chemicals and combustible gases to suffer personal injuries, regardless of degree of caution Defendants might have exercised.”

Plaintiffs seek costs for remediation of the hazardous substances and contaminants and for the purchase of an alternative source of water. They want compensatory damages for lost property value, damage to the natural resources on the property, loss of quality of life, loss of use and enjoyment of their properties, emotional distress as to one plaintiff,⁶ inconvenience and

⁵ The additional defendants provided services, equipment, and support for the drilling, casing, tubing, and fracking operations at the well site. *Berish* is one of the first cases in which plaintiffs named support companies, not just the operating and/or drilling company, as defendants. Including service and supply companies as defendants is likely to be a future trend. See *Haney v. Range Resources*, *infra*.

⁶ The Court dismissed all other claims for emotional distress on February 3, 2011, *see* 763 F. Supp. 2d 702 (M.D. Pa. Feb. 3, 2011).

discomfort, and personal injury. The complaint also requests punitive damages and preliminary and permanent injunctions against future contamination, as well as reasonable attorneys' fees.

As for discovery, on January 28, 2013, the parties agreed to and the Court signed a Stipulated Case-Management Order that provides deadlines for Phase I discovery which focuses on causation of the alleged contamination or damages to the Price No. 1 well and of the alleged personal injuries suffered by a minor plaintiff. The Court limits and specifically sets out the topics that the parties can cover in their discovery requests. Plaintiffs can request Defendants to provide information about the drilling and construction of the well, including the substances and chemicals used during all phases of development (drilling, casing, cementing, and fracturing), the number of fracturing stages, the depth of each fracturing stage, sources of water, analysis of flowback water, how and where production water was stored, analyses or testing results related to subsurface geology and groundwater migration, and the sampling or testing of produced water, any potable water, and groundwater within 10 miles of the well. Defendants can request medical records, an independent medical examination, analyses and testing of water from any well alleged to be contaminated, construction and maintenance records of the well, and how Defendants' activities or substances/chemicals caused the injuries alleged.

Under a second amended scheduling order, fact discovery must be completed by December 21, 2013, with Plaintiffs' expert reports due 60 days thereafter. Defendants' expert reports are due 60 days later, with the deadline for expert depositions 60 days thereafter. Within 45 days of the close of Phase 1 Discovery, the parties must file their *Daubert* motions.

The parties are also entangled in a discovery issue involving trade secrets. Plaintiffs asked Southwestern and non-party Schlumberger Technology Corporation ("STC") to produce open-hole logs and seismic data, maps, and interpretations relating to the well at issue. Both Southwestern and STC questioned the relevancy of these documents and asserted trade secret protection. On October 11, 2013, the court ordered the documents produced, finding that the documents were relevant and that Southwestern and STC had not met their burden to prove trade secrets. Both have asked for reconsideration of the court's order. A hearing was scheduled for December 17, 2013.

***Armstrong v. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC; Chesapeake Energy Corp. and Nomac Drilling, LLC*, No. 10-cv-000680 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Oct. 27, 2010), removed to M.D. Pennsylvania, No. 3:10-cv-002453, on Dec. 6, 2010, remanded to Pa. Ct. Com. Pl. on July 29, 2011.**

In October 2010, Plaintiff Judy Armstrong filed suit in Bradford County, Pennsylvania against Chesapeake Appalachia LLC, Chesapeake Energy Corporation, and Nomac Drilling, LLC ("Defendants"). *Armstrong v. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, et al.*, No. 10-cv-000680 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Oct. 27, 2010). The case was removed to the Middle District of Pennsylvania on December 6, 2010 (Case No. 3:10-cv-02453). On January 20, 2011, Plaintiff added two new plaintiffs (Carl Stiles and Angelina Fiorentino) (collectively, "Plaintiffs") and two new

defendants (Great Plains Oilfield Rental LLC and Diamond Y Enterprise, Inc.) to the lawsuit. With the addition of these new Pennsylvania corporate defendants, there was no longer a basis for federal diversity jurisdiction. Plaintiffs filed a motion for remand which was granted on July 29, 2011.

Plaintiffs own property and water wells located three miles from oil and gas wells owned and operated by Defendants. They allege that Defendants' use of improper drilling techniques, including defective and ineffective well casings, caused methane, ethane, barium, and other harmful substances to enter into and contaminate their water supply.

Plaintiffs assert causes of action and damages for negligence, negligence per se, nuisance, strict liability, trespass, medical monitoring trust funds, and violation of the Pennsylvania Hazardous Sites Cleanup Act.

As a result of water contamination complaints from Plaintiffs and others, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection ("PDEP") initiated a joint review of possible natural gas drilling violations by Chesapeake. The results of the joint review were inconclusive and the PDEP reached a settlement agreement with Chesapeake on May 17, 2011. *See* Settlements Involving Hydraulic Fracturing, *infra*.

Sizelove v. Williams Production Co., LLC; Mockingbird Pipeline, LP; XTO Energy, Inc.; GulfTex Operating, Inc., Trio Consulting & Mgmt., LLC, and Enexco, Inc., No. 2010-50355-367 (367th Dist. Court, Denton County, Tex. Nov. 3, 2010) (transferred to 431st Dist. Ct., Denton County, Tex. Jan. 1, 2011)

On November 3, 2010, the Sizelove family ("Plaintiffs") filed suit against Williams Production Company, LLC (non-suited on April 6, 2011); Mockingbird Pipeline LP; XTO Energy, Inc. (dismissed with prejudice on March 21, 2012); GulfTex Operating, Inc. (dismissed with prejudice on May 16, 2012); Trio Consulting & Management, LLC (dismissed with prejudice on May 11, 2012); and Enexco, Inc. (non-suited on April 13, 2011) (collectively, "Defendants") in Denton County, Texas. Williams Production-Gulf Coast Company, L.P. (n/k/a WPX Energy Gulf Coast, L.P.) and A&D Exploration Company were added as defendants on April 6, 2011 and April 13, 2011, respectively. This case was settled at mediation on November 9, 2012.

Plaintiffs initially sued for nuisance, trespass and negligence, alleging that Defendants' compressor operations, gas drilling, and hydraulic fracturing caused Plaintiffs to suffer severe headaches and respiratory problems. Specifically, Plaintiffs claimed that Defendants' operations were polluting the air and water surrounding Plaintiffs' home with toxic hydrocarbons such as benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylene.

In July 2011, Plaintiffs amended their complaint, dropping their negligence claim and all allegations of water contamination. Plaintiffs continued to pursue their claims for trespass and

nuisance. In their nuisance claim, Plaintiffs alleged that Defendants have substantially interfered with and invaded Plaintiffs’ private interest in their land by contaminating both the surface and the air above their property with hydrocarbons and other deleterious substances. For their trespass claim, Plaintiffs stated that Defendants wrongfully cut down nearly thirty trees on their property and allowed workers to use their land as a toilet.

Plaintiffs sought damages for the loss of market value of their land, sickness, annoyance, discomfort, bodily harm, injury to personal property, mental anguish, and additional exemplary damages.

Heinkel-Wolfe v. Williams Production Co., LLC; Mockingbird Pipeline, LP, XTO Energy, Inc., Gulfex Operating, Inc., Trio Consulting & Mgmt., LLC, and Enexco Inc., No. 2010-40355-362 (362nd Dist. Court, Denton County, Texas, Nov. 3, 2010)

In November 2010, Margaret Heinkel-Wolfe and her daughter, Paige Wolfe,⁷ (“Plaintiffs”), filed suit against Williams Production Company LLC (dismissed without prejudice on April 6, 2011); Mockingbird Pipeline LP; XTO Energy Inc. (dismissed with prejudice on March 21, 2012); Gulfex Operating Inc.; Trio Consulting & Management LLC; and Enexco, Inc. (non-suited on April 13, 2011) (collectively, “Defendants”) in Denton County, Texas. Williams Production-Gulf Coast Company, L.P. (n/k/a WPX Energy Gulf Coast, L.P.) and A&D Exploration Company were added as defendants on April 6, 2011 and April 13, 2011 respectively. Defendants filed traditional and no evidence motions for summary judgment, but these became moot when the case was settled at mediation on August 14, 2012. A final judgment was signed by the court on August 27, 2012.

Plaintiffs sued Defendants for nuisance, negligence, and trespass, alleging that Defendants’ activities related to their produced water collection site, gas compressor stations, and gas drilling polluted the air and water around Plaintiffs’ property and seeking damages for the loss of market value of their land, sickness, annoyance, discomfort, bodily harm, injury to personal property, mental anguish, and exemplary damages. As in *Sizelove, supra*, Plaintiffs amended their petition and voluntarily dropped their negligence claim and all allegations of water contamination.

Hagy v. Equitable Production Co.; Warren Drilling Co., Inc., BJ Services Co., USA, and Halliburton Energy Services, Inc., No. 10-c-163 (Jackson County Cir. Ct., Oct. 26, 2010), removed to U.S. District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, No. 2:10-cv-01372 on Dec. 10, 2010

The Hagy family (“Plaintiffs”) filed suit in West Virginia state court on October 26, 2010 against Equitable Production Co. (summary judgment granted on May 17, 2012); Warren Drilling

⁷ On August 4, 2011, the daughter non-suited all Defendants.

Company, Inc. (dismissed with prejudice on April 25, 2012); BJ Services Company USA; and Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. (settled in March 2012) (collectively, “Defendants”).

In their complaint, Plaintiffs claimed contamination of their property and water well located approximately 1,000 feet from Defendants’ natural gas wells. One of the Plaintiffs allegedly suffered neurological symptoms consistent with toxic exposure to heavy metals.

Plaintiffs’ causes of action included negligence, negligence per se, nuisance, strict liability, trespass, and medical monitoring trust funds. Plaintiffs also sought an injunction against further drilling activities, along with compensatory damages, punitive damages, the cost of future health monitoring, and litigation fees and costs.

On July 22, 2011, the Court dismissed Plaintiffs’ claims of strict liability and medical monitoring and dismissed the claims of nuisance and trespass for two of the Plaintiffs (the adult children who no longer lived on the property). After settling with defendants Halliburton Energy Services, Inc. and Warren Drilling Company, Inc., on May 7, 2012, the adult children voluntarily dismissed all their other claims.

On March 19, 2012, BJ Services filed a motion for summary judgment and Plaintiffs responded. On May 23, 2012, the Court ordered Plaintiffs to clarify their response by specifying “exactly what conduct by defendant BJ Services is alleged to have caused them harm...” Plaintiffs filed their response to the Court’s Order on June 29, 2012. On that same date, the Court entered its Judgment Order, dismissing the lawsuit, stating that Plaintiffs failed to provide evidence that BJ Services acted negligently, trespassed, or created a private nuisance; or to prove a causal connection between BJ Services and Plaintiffs’ injuries.⁸

On July 30, 2012, Plaintiffs filed a Notice of Appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (Case No. 12-1926), appealing the Court’s orders granting the motions for summary judgment filed by BJ Services Company USA and Equitable Production Company. The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals issued its unpublished opinion on October 8, 2013, affirming the lower Court’s orders.

Mitchell v. Encana Oil & Gas (USA), Inc.; Chesapeake Operating, Inc.; Chesapeake Exploration, LLC, No. 3:10-cv-02555 (N.D. Tex., Dec. 15, 2010)

On December 15, 2010, Grace Mitchell (“Plaintiff”) filed suit against Encana Oil & Gas (USA) Inc.; Chesapeake Operating, Inc.; and Chesapeake Exploration, LLC (collectively, “Defendants”) in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas. This case was dismissed with a final judgment on December 27, 2011.

⁸ The Court did not consider Plaintiffs’ experts’ reports because Plaintiffs failed to identify the chemical to which they were exposed and to provide evidence of dose, exposure amount, and duration.

Plaintiff alleged that Defendants’ hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling activities and associated storage of drilling wastes had contaminated her water well in Johnson County, Texas. After Defendants commenced hydraulic fracturing operations near her property, Plaintiff claimed that her well water became slick to the touch and gave off a gasoline-like odor and that test results revealed the groundwater was contaminated with various chemicals, including C12-C28 hydrocarbons, similar to diesel fuel.

Plaintiff asserted causes of action for nuisance, trespass, negligence, fraud, and strict liability. For her nuisance claim, Plaintiff stated that Defendants had substantially interfered with and invaded her private interests in her land by contaminating her groundwater, offending her senses, and making her enjoyment of the property uncomfortable and inconvenient. For trespass, Plaintiff alleged that Defendants caused and permitted petroleum by-products to cross Plaintiff’s property boundaries and enter her land and groundwater, resulting in damage to the property and injury to Plaintiff’s right of possession. In addition, Plaintiff claimed that Defendants breached their duty to not negligently and unnecessarily damage her surface and subsurface estate, including the groundwater.

As for fraud, Plaintiff stated that Defendants failed to warn and/or concealed the danger that her groundwater would become contaminated from chemicals similar to diesel fuel. Finally, she alleged that Defendants should be held strictly liable because petroleum drilling and hydraulic fracturing constitute ultra-hazardous and abnormally dangerous activities. Both the fraud and strict liability claims were withdrawn when Plaintiff filed her amended complaint on April 25, 2011.

Plaintiff requested damages for loss of the use of groundwater, loss of market value of property, loss of the intrinsic value of well water, expenses incurred from buying water from an alternate source, medical monitoring damages, remediation, nominal damages, and exemplary damages.

***Otis v. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, Chesapeake Energy Corporation, and Nomac Drilling, LLC*, No. 3:11-cv-00115-ARC (M.D. Pa. (Scranton), Jan. 18, 2011)**

***Bidlack v. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, Chesapeake Energy Corporation, and Nomac Drilling, LLC*, No. 3:11-cv-00129-ARC (M.D. Pa. (Scranton), Jan. 19, 2011)**

Plaintiffs Edwin and Candy Bidlack, Jessie Northrup, and Jason and Janet Otis (“Plaintiffs”) filed their lawsuits in Pennsylvania Court of Common Pleas of Bradford County, on December 17, 2010. *Bidlack, et al v. Chesapeake Energy Corp., et al*; No. 10-EQ-000761 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Dec. 17, 2010); *Otis v. Chesapeake Energy Corp., et al*; No. 10-EQ-000775 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Dec. 17, 2010). Both the *Bidlack* lawsuit and the *Otis* lawsuit were removed to the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania (Scranton) in mid-January 2011. The U.S. District Court has stayed both cases, requiring the parties to engage in binding arbitration of their claims. Plaintiffs’ counsel has filed motions to vacate the Court’s stay order, arguing that

immediate action needs to be taken because the “harm to their residence and water supply is more extensive and more severe than originally contemplated...” Plaintiffs’ motions to vacate were denied on May 11, 2012. These cases remain stayed pending arbitration. In June 2013, the parties filed status reports with the Court, indicating that they were working to resolve the lawsuits.

Plaintiffs state that Defendants Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, Chesapeake Energy Corporation, and Nomac Drilling, LLC (“Defendants”) located, drilled, and conducted explorations of wells within 1,000 feet of the Otis residence and water supply well and within a five mile radius of the Bidlack residence and water supply well. Plaintiffs allege that their water supplies have been contaminated and they have been exposed to hazardous chemicals and substances, including methane. They have lost the use and enjoyment of their residence and their quality of life, living in constant fear of future physical illness.

Plaintiffs’ causes of action include violations of the Hazardous Sites Cleanup Act, negligence, private nuisance, strict liability, trespass, and medical monitoring trust fund. For negligence, Plaintiffs accuse Defendants of failing to prevent and/or contain releases and migration of hazardous chemicals, failing to prevent contamination of the water supplies, creating a risk of explosion, and using improper drilling techniques and materials, including defective and ineffective well casings and negligent planning, training, and supervision of staff, employees and/or agents.

Plaintiffs seek costs for remediation of the hazardous substances and contaminants and compensatory damages for medical costs, loss of use and enjoyment of the property, loss of quality of life, emotional distress, personal injury, and future health monitoring. In addition, Plaintiffs have requested damages for the diminution of value of their residence and real property, including the debt service and cost to maintain the residence and real property. They also request punitive damage and preliminary and permanent injunctions against future contamination, as well as litigation costs.

***Harris v. Devon Energy Prod. Co., L.P.*, No. 4:10-cv-00708 (E.D. Tex., Dec. 22, 2010) (originally filed in the N.D. Tex. Case No. 3:10-02554, Dec. 15, 2010).**

Doug and Diana Harris (“Plaintiffs”) brought action against Devon Energy Production Co., LP in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas (Case No. 3:10-cv-02554) on December 15, 2010. The case was transferred to the Eastern District of Texas on December 22, 2010.

Defendant, Devon Energy, drilled bore holes under and near Plaintiffs’ property in Denton County, Texas. Plaintiffs claimed that, after Devon Energy commenced hydraulic fracturing operations near their property, their groundwater became contaminated and polluted with a gray substance. According to the complaint, test results showed high levels of metals including

aluminum, arsenic, barium, beryllium, calcium, chromium, cobalt, copper, iron, lead, nickel, potassium, and zinc.

In the complaint, Plaintiffs state causes of action for nuisance, trespass, negligence, fraud (dismissed July 12, 2011), and strict liability. The Court dismissed the fraud claim on July 12, 2011. Damages sought include loss of the use of land and groundwater, loss of market value of property, loss of the intrinsic value of well water, expenses related to testing contaminated water, expenses incurred from buying water from an alternate source, emotional harm and mental anguish, medical monitoring damages, remediation, nominal damages, and exemplary damages.

In an interesting turn of events, on December 6, 2011, shortly after Devon Energy filed a motion for summary judgment, Plaintiffs filed a motion to dismiss without prejudice, stating that “recent testing showed that the contamination is no longer at a toxic level for human consumption.” Plaintiffs stated that “[b]ecause the Plaintiffs’ groundwater has apparently purged itself of elevated levels of toxic substances, Plaintiffs cannot trace or prove that Defendant Devon was the cause of the Plaintiffs’ toxic water.” On December 21, 2011, in its response to the dismissal motion, Devon Energy asked the Court to dismiss the case with prejudice and award attorneys’ fees. On January 25, 2012, the Court dismissed the lawsuit without prejudice.

***Teel v. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC*, No. 5:11-cv-00005-FPS (N.D. W. Va. January 6, 2011) (originally filed in the Circuit Court of Wetzel County, W. Va., Case No. 10-C-94DH, Nov. 30, 2010)**

On November 30, 2010, plaintiffs Dewey and Gay Teel filed a complaint in the Circuit Court for Wetzel County, West Virginia, against Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC (“Chesapeake”) (Case No. 10-C-94DH). The case was removed to federal court on January 6, 2011.

Chesapeake began natural gas drilling on the Plaintiffs’ property in 2008. At that time, according to Plaintiffs, Chesapeake affirmatively assured them that the drilling area would be suitable for home sites after completion. Among the facilities constructed by Chesapeake was a pit or pond to hold the waste materials generated by the hydraulic fracturing and natural gas drilling operations. As described by Plaintiffs, the waste that was deposited into and eventually filled the pit “was dark, thick and smelled strongly of diesel fuel.” In 2009, Plaintiffs claim that Chesapeake brought in a “foamy, foul-smelling material by truck and deposited” it in the waste pond and in other trenches on their property. Further, Plaintiffs contend that, after Chesapeake’s heavy equipment breached the pit, allowing waste material to flow onto unprotected soil, Chesapeake simply covered the waste pit and trenches with dirt. The substances put into the pit and trenches remain beneath the surface, contaminating the soil and groundwater and killing grass, trees, and plants.

Plaintiffs assert causes of action for nuisance (intentional nuisance, unintentional nuisance, and nuisance per se), trespass, negligence, res ipsa loquitur, strict liability, recklessness or gross

negligence, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and negligent infliction of emotional distress. They seek both monetary relief and injunctive relief, including the removal of the waste and remediation of the contaminated areas of the property.

In ruling on both parties' motions for summary judgment, the Court found that Chesapeake's use of pits for drill cuttings on Plaintiffs' land was not a trespass. The Court then signed the parties' joint stipulation of dismissal, enabling an appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit to go forward (Case No. 12-2046). Briefs have been filed. On October 10, 2013, Chesapeake filed a motion to dispense with oral argument or to dismiss the appeal based on the Fourth Circuit's decision in *Whiteman v. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, infra*, which had the same issues and similar facts. In *Whiteman*, the appeals court upheld the lower court's dismissal.

On October 17, 2013, the Fourth Circuit affirmed the award of summary judgment to Chesapeake.

United States v. Range Production Company and Range Resources Corporation, No. 3:11-cv-00116 (N.D. Tex., Jan. 18, 2011)

Range Production Company and Range Resources Corporation (collectively, "Range") own and operate gas extraction wells in the Newark East (Barnett Shale) Field, in and around the Fort Worth, Texas area. On December 7, 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") issued an Emergency Administrative Order ("EAO") pursuant to Section 1431 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, 42 U.S.C. § 300i. The EAO identified contaminants that "may present an imminent and substantial endangerment to the health of persons," and determined that two water wells had been affected by Range's drilling activities. The EPA also found that state and local authorities had not taken sufficient action to address the endangerment.⁹

The EAO required Range to: (1) notify the EPA of whether it intended to comply with the EAO within 24 hours; (2) provide replacement water supplies to the recipients of water from the affected water wells within 48 hours; (3) install explosivity meters at the affected dwellings within 48 hours; (4) submit a survey listing water wells within 3,000 feet of the gas wells at issue with a plan for EPA approval to sample those wells to see if they have been contaminated, including air and water samplings; (5) submit a plan for EPA approval to conduct soil gas surveys and indoor air analyses for all dwellings served by the affected water wells within 14 days; and (6) submit a plan to identify gas flow pathways to the affected aquifer if possible, and remediate impacted areas of the aquifer.

Range disputed the EPA's finding and the validity of the EAO. At the request of the Administrator of the EPA, the United States filed a complaint for injunctive relief and civil penalties against Range on January 18, 2011 in the Northern District of Texas. The action by the

⁹ Notably, a parallel investigation by the Texas Railroad Commission ("TRC") concluded that Range's operations of the gas wells did not cause or contribute to contamination of the water wells (Case No. 7B-0268629).

U.S. alleged violations of the EAO, resulting in the presence of contaminants that may pose an imminent and substantial endangerment to the health of persons in violation of the Safe Drinking Water Act. The U.S. sought permanent injunctive relief to require Range to comply with the provisions of the EAO, as well as to pay a civil monetary penalty for each day of each violation.

On January 20, 2011, Range filed a petition for review of the EAO with the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals (Case No. 11-60040), arguing that the EAO violated its due process rights. On June 20, 2011, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas entered an order staying its action until the Fifth Circuit ruled on Range's petition. Oral arguments in the Fifth Circuit were heard on October 3, 2011. A decision from the Fifth Circuit became moot when the EPA withdrew its EAO on March 29, 2012, after the U.S. Supreme Court's March 21, 2012 decision in the *Sackett* case, *infra*. The Fifth Circuit dismissed its case on April 2, 2012 while the District Court action was dismissed on March 30, 2012.

Of interest, in relation to determining the validity of an EAO issued by the EPA is *Sackett v. Environmental Protection Agency*, 622 F.3d 1139 (9th Cir. 2010), *cert. granted* June 28, 2011, a recent Ninth Circuit case that was granted certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court and decided on March 21, 2012, Case No. 10-1062, 2012 WL 932018, 566 U.S. ____, 132 S.Ct. 1367 (Mar. 21, 2012). The Sacketts placed fill material on their Bonner County, Idaho property, which is located approximately 500 feet from Lake Priest, a navigable waterway. Claiming that the land was jurisdictional wetlands under the Clean Water Act, the EPA issued an administrative compliance order directing the Sacketts to remove the fill and restore the lot to its original condition or face civil penalties up to \$32,500 per day per violation, plus administrative penalties. The Sacketts contested the EPA's findings and filed a lawsuit asking the District Court to declare that their property was not protected wetlands. The District Court ruled, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals agreed, that the Sacketts could not seek that declaration until the EPA asked a federal judge to enforce the EPA's administrative order. The U.S. Supreme Court disagreed with both lower courts, holding that parties subject to an EAO have the right to challenge that compliance order in court before the agency brings legal action to enforce it.

Now that the U.S. Supreme Court has determined that the Sacketts had their due process rights violated and that the Sacketts and other alleged environmental violators have a right to judicial review of an EAO issued without a hearing or any proof of violation, the EPA's use of EAOs may be curtailed.¹⁰

¹⁰ Parties considering a judicial challenge to an EAO should be aware that the EPA would likely file a counterclaim and face review under the Administrative Procedures Act ("APA"). The APA might provide a favorable standard for the EPA if it prepares an administrative record. *See* B. Shrestha, "Sackett's Impact on EPA Not So Dramatic, Ex-Official Says," Law360, April 26, 2012.

***Whiteman v. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC*, No. 5:11-cv-00031-FPS (N.D. W. Va. February 23, 2011) (originally filed in Circuit Court of Wetzel County, W. Va., Case No. _____, Dec. 23, 2010)**

In 2007, Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC (“Chesapeake”) began natural gas drilling on property owned by Martin and Lisa Whiteman. Chesapeake chose prime hay fields and graded approximately 10 to 15 acres of land, where it installed natural gas wells and ancillary facilities, including two large waste ponds used for the deposit of waste materials resulting from hydraulic fracturing and drilling operations. Chesapeake also deposited waste materials in open trenches on the property. The waste ponds with their contents were buried. The Whitemans believe that the waste is migrating through the soil, surface water and groundwater on their property.

On December 23, 2010, the Whitemans brought this lawsuit in the Circuit Court of Wetzel County, West Virginia, complaining that Chesapeake did not have permission to leave waste material on the site. The case was removed to federal court on February 23, 2011. The causes of action alleged are nuisance, trespass, negligence, strict liability, recklessness or gross negligence, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and negligent infliction of emotional distress. On June 7, 2011, the Court granted in part Chesapeake’s motion for summary judgment and dismissed the Whiteman’s trespass claim. On June 11, 2011, the parties stipulated to the dismissal of the remainder of the claims.

The order dismissing the trespass claim was appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, Case No. 12-1790. Oral arguments were heard on March 21, 2013. On September 4, 2013, the Fourth Circuit upheld the lower court’s dismissal of the trespass claim by finding that

...creating drill waste pits was reasonably necessary for recovery of natural gas and did not impose a substantial burden on the Whitemans’ surface property, that creation of the pits was consistent with Chesapeake’s rights under its lease, was a practice common to natural gas wells in West Virginia, and consistent with requirements of applicable rules and regulations for the protection of the environment.

***Smith v. Devon Energy Production Company, L.P.*, Case No. 4:11-cv-00104 (E.D. Tex., March 7, 2011) (originally filed in N.D. Texas, Case No. 3:11-cv-00196, on Jan. 31, 2011)**

The Smith family complained that the quality of their water deteriorated after Defendant Devon Energy Production Company began natural gas exploration, hydraulic fracturing, and other production operations near their home. At first, their water supply contained sediment. They installed an in-line filtration system. That system worked well until April 2010 when Defendant installed a natural gas collection infrastructure about 600 feet away from their home. Then, according to the Smiths, the water became fouled with a grey, clay-like substance. This was reported to Defendant, who contacted the Texas Railroad Commission. Water samples were

taken, and the results showed high levels of arsenic, barium, chromium, lead, and selenium. The Smiths stopped using their water supply.

The Smiths asserted causes of action for trespass, nuisance, and negligence for allowing metals, chemicals, and other substances from Defendant’s drilling and fracking activities to enter their land and their only source of drinking water. They sought damages for loss of land use, loss of market value, loss of intrinsic value of the well water, loss of value of groundwater, emotional harm and mental anguish.

On May 25, 2012, this lawsuit was dismissed on the Smiths’ motion, indicating that “water test results [provided during discovery] show that the well water no longer exhibits contamination in excess of the MCLs [maximum contaminant levels].”

Baker v. Anschutz Exploration Corp., Conrad Geoscience Corporation, and Pathfinder Energy Services, Inc., No. 6:11-cv-06119 (W.D. N.Y. March 9, 2011)

In February 2011, 15 landowners (“Plaintiffs”) filed suit under Cause No. 2011-1168 in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Chemung County, against Anschutz Exploration Corporation (“Anschutz”); Conrad Geoscience Corporation (dismissed on June 12, 2013); and Pathfinder Energy Services, Inc. (collectively, “Defendants”). This case was transferred to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of New York, Rochester Division, on March 9, 2011.

Plaintiffs allege that Defendants were negligent in their drilling, construction, and operation of natural gas wells such that: (1) combustible gas was released into the headspaces of Plaintiffs’ water wells; (2) elevated levels of dissolved methane, propane, and other natural gases were present in Plaintiffs’ wells; (3) natural gas was discharged into Plaintiffs’ groundwater; (4) excessive pressures were present within gas wells near Plaintiffs’ homes and water wells; (5) pollutants including toxic sediments and industrial waste were discharged into the soil and water near Plaintiffs’ homes and water wells; and (6) drilling muds and fluids were allowed to be discharged onto the surface and into the subsurface near Plaintiffs’ homes and water wells. Specifically, Plaintiffs claim that Anschutz’s improper drilling, well capping, and/or cement casing caused toxic chemicals to be discharged into Plaintiffs’ groundwater. Plaintiffs further claim that, when hired by Anschutz to investigate possible contamination, Conrad Geoscience failed to conduct a reasonable and prudent investigation, in conformity with industry standards that would have warned Plaintiffs about the contamination.

The complaint sets out causes of action for negligence per se, common law negligence, nuisance, strict liability, trespass, medical monitoring, premises liability, fear of developing cancer, and deceptive business acts and practices. Damages sought include the loss of market value of land, costs of repair and restoration, loss of the use of land, expenses related to testing, medical monitoring, and consequential damages, in the amount of \$150,000,000 per cause of action.

Plaintiffs seek exemplary or punitive damages of at least \$500,000,000, litigation costs, and attorneys' fees.

Discovery is on-going. On September 25, 2012, the Court entered a Modified Scheduling Order requiring (a) Defendants to provide Plaintiffs with all data and documents relating to the monitoring of the water wells and (b) Plaintiffs to provide Defendants with (i) expert reports identifying all hazardous substances to which they claim exposure, the precise location of each exposure, and an explanation of causation; (ii) all studies and reports showing contamination of Plaintiffs' property; and (iii) identification and quantification of contamination of Plaintiffs' real property that Plaintiffs attributed to Defendants' operations. On August 23, 2013, the Court issued a Scheduling Order under which fact discovery must be completed by January 15, 2014 and all expert reports and depositions completed by May 30, 2014.

Parr v. Aruba Petroleum, Inc., Ash Grove Resources, LLC, Encana Oil & Gas (USA), Inc., Halliburton Co., Republic Energy, Inc., Ryder Scott Co., LP; Ryder Scott Oil Co., Tejas Production Services, Inc., and Tejas Western Corp., No. 11-01650 (Dallas County Ct. at Law, Mar. 8, 2011)

Plaintiffs are a married couple in Wise County, Texas, owning property close to oil and gas wells being developed by defendants Aruba Petroleum, Inc.; Ash Grove Resources LLC;¹¹ Encana Oil & Gas (USA) Inc.; Halliburton Company; Republic Energy Inc. (dismissed with prejudice on November 11, 2011); Ryder Scott Company, LP;¹² Ryder Scott Oil Company; Tejas Production Services, Inc. (dismissed without prejudice on July 25, 2012); and Tejas Western Corporation¹³ (collectively, "Defendants"). In their Second Amended Petition, filed on August 5, 2011, Plaintiffs added Burlington Resources Oil & Gas Company LP as a defendant. Discovery is on-going. Trial is scheduled for March 3, 2014.

Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' natural gas drilling activities and operations, including releases, spills, emissions, and discharges of hazardous gases from vehicles, engines, construction, pits, condensate tanks, dehydrators, flaring, venting, and fracking, have exposed Plaintiffs and their property to hazardous gases, chemicals, and industrial wastes. Plaintiffs have identified 79 natural gas well sites that are located in close proximity to their property. Due to Defendants' natural gas activities, Plaintiffs claim to have experienced serious health effects, with medical

¹¹ Ash Grove Resources LLC was dropped as a named defendant in Plaintiffs' Sixth Amended Petition filed on September 20, 2012. On March 22, 2013, the claims against Ash Grove Resources LLC and Tejas Western Corporation were severed (Case No. CC-13-01784-E) for settlement purposes. A final judgment was entered on May 3, 2013.

¹² Ryder Scott Company, LP was dropped as a defendant in Plaintiffs' Second Amended Petition filed on August 5, 2011.

¹³ Tejas Western Corporation was dropped as a named defendant in Plaintiffs' Sixth Amended Petition filed on September 20, 2012. On March 22, 2013, the claims against Ash Grove Resources LLC and Tejas Western Corporation were severed (Case No. CC-13-01784-E) for settlement purposes. A final judgment was entered on May 3, 2013.

tests revealing the presence of natural gas chemicals, compounds, and metals such as ethylbenzene and xylene. The complaint further alleges that Defendants’ activities resulted in the death of household pets and chickens, and ultimately forced Plaintiffs to evacuate their home.

In the Tenth Amended Petition filed on August 26, 2013, Plaintiffs assert claims for negligence *per se*,¹⁴ common law negligence, gross negligence, private nuisance,¹⁵ and trespass. Plaintiffs seek actual damages in a maximum amount of \$66,000,000 for medical expenses, loss of earning capacity, loss of consortium, property damage, loss of market value, replacement and repair costs, sentimental value damages, loss of use, medical monitoring, cost of remediation, unliquidated damages, attorneys’ fees, nominal damages, and exemplary damages. In addition, Plaintiffs seek a permanent injunction to preclude current and future drilling and hydraulic fracturing activities near Plaintiffs’ land.

Strudley v. Antero Resources Corp., Calfrac Well Services, and Frontier Drilling LLC, No. 2011-cv-2218 (Denver County Dist. Ct., Mar. 23, 2011)

On March 23, 2011, the Strudley family (“Plaintiffs”) sued Antero Resources Corporation; Calfrac Well Services (“Calfrac”); and Frontier Drilling LLC (collectively, “Defendants”) in Colorado state court. According to Plaintiffs, Defendants operate several natural gas wells in Garfield County, Colorado, within one mile of their residence and water supply well. Plaintiffs allege that environmental contamination from Defendants’ drilling activities caused health injuries, loss of use and value of their property, loss of quality of life, emotional distress, and other damages. Specifically, Plaintiffs stated that Defendants’ negligence caused the presence of hydrogen sulfide, hexane, n-heptane, toluene, and other toxic hydrocarbons and hazardous pollutants to be discharged into the air, ground, and aquifer near Plaintiffs’ property.

The Strudleys set out causes of action for negligence *per se*, common law negligence, nuisance, strict liability, trespass, and medical monitoring trust funds. On July 20, 2011, the Court dismissed the negligence *per se* claim against Calfrac, finding that fracturing fluids and other oil and gas materials used by Calfrac were not “wastes” under the Colorado Hazardous Waste Act and that Calfrac was not an operator or owner as required by the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission regulations.

¹⁴ For negligence *per se*, Plaintiffs set out three (3) statutes allegedly violated by Defendants. These are the Texas Administrative Code relating to water protection, leaks, and environmental quality, Texas Penal Code for assault and reckless damage or destruction to property, and Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code for trespass.

¹⁵ Plaintiffs include claims for negligent private nuisance, intentional private nuisance, and *per quod* private nuisance. For the *per quod* claim, Plaintiffs allege that, even absent negligence or intentional private nuisance, Defendants engaged in activities that were “abnormal and out of place in their surroundings.” Plaintiffs set out a list of “Private Nuisance Activities” which include Defendants’ alleged air and subsurface trespass as well as the creation of offensive noise, odors, smells, sights and light pollution, heavy traffic, and disturbances “in the natural environment to cause wildlife to flee.”

Damages sought in this case included the cost of remediation, cost of future health monitoring, compensatory damages, loss of use and enjoyment of property, loss of quality of life, emotional distress, personal injury, diminution of property value, and litigation costs and fees.

In their Motion to Modify the Court’s Case Management Order filed on September 19, 2011, Defendants asserted that Plaintiffs had only provided vague allegations of injury and exposure and that Plaintiffs failed to identify any current or future disease or to allege that any treating physician or qualified scientist had connected any such disease to the chemicals or wastes used during Defendants’ operations. Because of the vagueness of the claims, Defendants argued that the Court should issue a “Lone Pine” order,¹⁶ requiring Plaintiffs to make a prima facie showing of exposure, injury, and specific causation by providing expert affidavits. The Court agreed with the Defendants and, on November 10, 2011, ordered Plaintiffs to provide sufficient evidence of their claims by means of sworn affidavits from doctors, contamination reports, and other information relating to the identification and quantification of contamination on their property attributable to Defendants’ operations. Plaintiffs presented their evidence to the Court on February 23, 2012.

Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment on March 23, 2012, arguing that the Plaintiffs’ evidence was insufficient to support their claims. The Court agreed, ruling that the affidavit from Plaintiffs’ doctor failed to establish a causal connection between Plaintiffs’ injuries and Defendants’ drilling activities, and dismissed Plaintiffs’ claims with prejudice on May 9, 2012. Plaintiffs appealed this dismissal.

On July 3, 2013, the Colorado Court of Appeals (Case No. 12 CA 1251) reversed the Lone Pine order and the dismissal order. The Court cited two primary reason for doing so. The first was anchored in two Colorado Supreme Court cases that the court interpreted as standing for the proposition “that a trial court may not require a showing of a prima [facie] case before allowing discovery on matters central to a plaintiff’s claims.” Second, the court cited differences between Colorado Rule of Procedure 16 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16.¹⁷ (Federal courts often cite to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 as the basis of their authority to issue Lone Pine orders.) The Court further held that, even assuming it was writing on a blank slate, unlike the majority of cases

¹⁶ See *Lore v. Lone Pine Corp.*, No. L-33606-85 1986 WL 635707 (N.J. Sup. Ct. Nov. 18, 1986). In order to streamline the proceedings in this toxic tort case, the court entered a case management order requiring the Plaintiffs to present certain basic facts regarding their claims of contamination from a landfill. First, the court required the Plaintiffs to provide the following documentation with respect to each personal injury claim: (i) facts of each individual Plaintiff’s exposure to alleged toxic substances at or from the site; and (ii) reports from treating physicians or other experts, supporting each individual Plaintiff’s claim of injury and causation. The court then required the Plaintiffs to give the following with respect to the property damage claims: (i) location of the property; and (ii) reports from real estate or other experts supporting property damage claims, including the timing and degree of the damage as well as causation of the same.

¹⁷ Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(c)(2) allows a federal court to “consider and take appropriate action...” to formulate and simplify the issues and eliminate frivolous claims or defenses. The Colorado Court of Appeals points out that, while the Colorado rule does not contain this language, rules relating to motions to dismiss and motions for summary judgment “provide adequate procedures for challenging claims lacking in merit.”

allowing Lone Pine orders, this was not a mass tort case nor was it “any more complex or cost intensive than an average toxic tort case.” The Court saw this lawsuit as a simple case involving four family members suing four defendants over alleged pollution of one parcel of land, making the Lone Pine order unnecessary.

On August 29, 2013, the Defendants filed a Petition for Writ of Certiorari with the Colorado Supreme Court (Case No. 2013SC576), requesting review of the Court of Appeals decision. The Colorado Defense Lawyers Association, the Colorado Civil Justice League, and the American Petroleum Institute have all filed amicus curiae briefs in support of the use of Lone Pine orders in Colorado.

Andre v. EXCO Resources, Inc. and EXCO Operating Co., No. 5:11-cv-00610-TS-MLH (W.D. La. April 15, 2011)

Beckman v. EXCO Resources, Inc. and EXCO Operating Co., 5:11-cv-00617-TS-MLH (W.D. La. April 18, 2011)

On April 15, 2011, David Andre, individually and on and behalf of “consumers of water in the immediate vicinity of DeBroeck Landing, Caddo Parish, Louisiana” and, on April 18, 2011, Daniel Beckman with seven other person (collectively “Plaintiffs”) filed suit against EXCO Resources, Inc. and EXCO Operating Company.

According to both complaints, on April 18, 2010, a natural gas well operated by EXCO near DeBroeck Landing “experienced problems resulting in the contamination” of the Caddo Parish aquifer and all of the Plaintiffs’ properties.

While the complaints do not allege that EXCO engaged in hydraulic fracturing, the Plaintiffs seek to compel disclosure of the formulation of the “drilling muds and solutions” allegedly used by EXCO in the natural gas well in order to allow “appropriate tests and monitoring of the aquifer [to] take place.”

Plaintiffs set out causes of action for negligence, strict liability, nuisance, trespass, unjust enrichment, and impairment of use of property. They seek a variety of damages, including groundwater remediation costs, diminution of property value, and losses from property market value “stigma.” They also seek a declaratory judgment, “general and equitable relief,” economic damages, and mental anguish and emotional distress damages. Additionally, the Plaintiffs request an order requiring remediation by EXCO of the groundwater and development of a “long-term monitoring program” near the site of the alleged well failure and the allegedly contaminated aquifer.

On November 12, 2013, the court entered a final order certifying the settlement class (any person owning, residing or working at residences or businesses within 1.5 miles of the incident that

were subject to a mandatory evacuation for any period of time between April 18, 2010 and May 4, 2010), approving the settlement, and dismissing the action with prejudice.

Ginardi v. Frontier Gas Services, LLC, Kinder Morgan Treating LP, Chesapeake Energy Corporation, and BHP Billiton Petroleum, No 4:11-cv-0420 BRW (E.D. Ark. May 17, 2011)

On May 17, 2011, a class action suit was filed on behalf of all Arkansas residents who live or own property within one mile of any natural gas compressor or transmission station (collectively, “Plaintiffs”). Defendants are Frontier Gas Services, LLC; Kinder Morgan Treating, LP; Chesapeake Energy Corp.; and BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville), LLC (dismissed without prejudice on August 17, 2011) (collectively, “Defendants”). On July 8, 2011, Crestwood Arkansas Pipeline LLC was added as a defendant. According to Plaintiffs, Defendants used hydraulic fracturing to produce gas from the Fayetteville Shale and own and operate related facilities across the state of Arkansas. Plaintiffs complained that Defendants’ operations pollute the atmosphere, groundwater, and soil with harmful gases, chemicals, and compounds. The causes of actions alleged by Plaintiffs were strict liability, nuisance, trespass, and negligence.

Plaintiffs sought compensatory and punitive damages for loss of use and enjoyment of property, contamination of soil, contamination of groundwater, contamination of air and atmosphere, loss of property value, and severe mental distress. Besides punitive and compensatory damages, Plaintiffs further requested establishment of a fund for monitoring future air, soil, and groundwater contamination, costs, and pre-judgment interest. The Court dismissed Plaintiffs’ claim for attorneys’ fees on August 10, 2011.

On December 14, 2011, Plaintiffs filed a motion for partial summary judgment on their trespass cause of action, alleging that there was no disputed issue of fact that Defendants’ activities trespassed upon Plaintiff’s property. On January 17, 2012, the Court denied this motion as being premature, advising that the class certification had to be held first. On February 6, 2012, Plaintiffs filed their Motion to Certify Class. The certification hearing was held on April 3, 2012. On April 6, 2012, the Judge issued a letter stating that “I am much inclined to deny class certification...” A formal order denying class certification was issued on April 19, 2012, with the Court ruling that “individual issues presented in this case predominate over the common issues.”

On July 11, 2012, the parties filed a Joint Motion to Dismiss With Prejudice, stating that they had “resolved and settled all their claims and cross-claims” and that the case should be dismissed with prejudice.

Tucker v. Southwestern Energy Co., XTO Energy, Chesapeake Energy Corp., and BHP Billiton Petroleum, No. 1:11-cv-0044-DPM (E.D. Ark. May 17, 2011)

Berry v. Southwestern Energy Co., XTO Energy, Chesapeake Energy Corp., and BHP Billiton Petroleum, No. 1:11-cv-0045-DPM (E.D. Ark. May 17, 2011)

On May 17, 2011, two class action suits were filed on behalf of all Arkansas residents who live or own property within three miles of any bore holes, wellheads, or other gas extraction operations. These two cases were consolidated on July 22, 2011. Southwestern Energy Corporation; XTO Energy (dismissed on July 15, 2011); Chesapeake Energy Corporation (dismissed with prejudice on May 17, 2012); and BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville), LLC (collectively, “Defendants”) were the defendants. These cases settled and were dismissed on August 29, 2012.

On February 17, 2012, the Court ordered Plaintiffs to amend their complaints to “plead more facts to give the companies notice of what and how each driller supposedly did wrong” because the complaints are “too thin on some critical facts.” The Court also determined that the motion to deny class certification was premature and would be considered after Plaintiffs amended their complaints. Plaintiffs filed their Combined Amended Complaint on March 23, 2012, adding two plaintiffs and adding more facts to support their claims for strict liability, nuisance, trespass, and negligence.

On July 2, 2012, Plaintiffs asked the Court for permission to file their Second Combined Amended Complaint (“Second Complaint”) in order to “remove certain parties who are no longer Defendants...and to add allegations concerning Southwestern Energy’s “Underwood experimental salt water disposal well.” The Court granted Plaintiffs’ motion and the Second Complaint was filed on July 11, 2012. This Second Complaint did not include BHP Billiton as a named defendant.

Plaintiffs claimed that Defendants’ drilling operations in the Fayetteville Shale polluted their soil, groundwater, air, and water wells. Plaintiffs asserted that their water wells and groundwater were contaminated with alpha methyl styrene or had emitted methane and hydrogen sulfide.

Plaintiffs sought punitive and compensatory damages for loss of use and enjoyment of their property, contamination of soil, contamination of groundwater, contamination of water wells, contamination of air and atmosphere, loss of property value, emotional and mental anguish, and physical harm and injury. Additionally, Plaintiffs requested establishment of a fund for monitoring future air, soil, and groundwater contamination, costs and attorney’s fees, and pre-judgment interest.

Ruby Hiser v. XTO Energy, Inc., No. 4:11-cv-00517-KGB (E.D. Ark. June 24, 2011)

On June 7, 2011, plaintiff Ruby Hiser sued XTO Energy, Inc., alleging that XTO’s natural gas drilling operations on her next-door neighbor’s property “created mechanical vibrations which have caused near-total destruction of the Plaintiff’s home and continues to cause injury to” her and her home. According to the Plaintiff, her home was rendered unstable and un-level, the roof separated from the home, ceramic tile and mortar cracked and loosened, windows were broken, and there were cracks in the ceilings and walls throughout the home. She plead nuisance per se and unlawful trespass. Damages sought included the value of her home and the diminution in value of her property, the loss of use and enjoyment of her property, and the intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress which have caused harm to Plaintiff’s health and welfare.

This case was tried to a jury on August 27-29, 2012, with a final judgment signed on September 10, 2012. The verdict was in favor of the plaintiff, with a damage award of \$300,000 (\$100,000 compensatory and \$200,000 punitive damages). During deliberations, the jurors sent out a question asking “were they [XTO] drilling only or were they also fracking?” The Court instructed the jury to make their decision based on what they recalled of the evidence. It is undisputed that there was no evidence of hydraulic fracturing presented at trial and that any discussions among the jurors as to fracking were outside the record.

After the verdict, XTO’s counsel’s request to contact the jurors was granted. One of the jurors provided an affidavit stating that the jurors discussed the negative impact that fracking might have had on the plaintiff’s property. More specifically, the jurors discussed that fracking caused earthquakes and vibrations.

XTO filed a motion for new trial based on the jury’s alleged misconduct. On April 23, 2013, the Court issued an order, stating that it would examine whether the jury had discussed extraneous information in making its decision. Two jurors were called to testify before the Court. On September 30, 2013, the Court denied XTO’s motion for a new trial, stating in part that the jury had not been influenced by extraneous, prejudicial information.

XTO filed a notice of appeal to the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals (No. 13-03443) on October 3, 2013. XTO’s brief is due December 30, 2013.

Lipsky v. Durant, Carter, Coleman LLC, Silverado on the Brazos Development Company #1 Ltd., Jerry V. Durant, James T. Coleman, Estate of Preston Carter, Range Production Company, and Range Resources Corp., Cause No. CV11-0798 (Parker County Dist. Ct., June 20, 2011)

In 2005, Steven and Shayla Lipsky (“Plaintiffs”) built their dream home in Silverado on the Brazos, a subdivision developed by Durant, Carter, Coleman LLC in Parker County, Texas In

the summer of 2010, Plaintiffs discovered that their well water contained benzene, toluene, ethane, and a large amount of methane gas, making the well unusable. Plaintiffs learned that Range Production Company and Range Resources Corporation (the “Range Defendants”) had begun to extract gas from the Barnett Shale formation very near their home, in direct violation of the subdivision’s covenants. Plaintiffs filed their lawsuit on June 20, 2011, seeking \$6.5 million in damages.

Earlier, in December 2010, the EPA issued an emergency order against Range, finding that the hydrocarbons in the Plaintiffs’ well water were likely caused by gas drilling and posed serious health risks.¹⁸ Later this statement was refined to indicate that the hydrocarbons from Range’s operations may have caused or contributed to the contamination. The Texas Railroad Commission (“Commission”) stepped in to investigate the claims; and in March 2011, the Commission issued an order exonerating the Range Defendants, stating that Range’s wells were not responsible for the contamination of Plaintiffs’ water and that the methane gas in the water wells likely was naturally occurring and came from the shallow Strawn geological formation, far above the Barnett Shale.

In the lawsuit, the Range Defendants filed a plea to the Court’s jurisdiction, alleging that Parker County was not the proper venue for challenging the Commission’s order. On January 30, 2012, the Court ruled that Plaintiffs should have filed their lawsuit in Travis County, where the Commission sits. Because the statute of limitations has run on appealing the Commission’s decision, the Court’s order essentially dismissed Plaintiffs’ claims against the Range Defendants.¹⁹

¹⁸ See *United States v. Range Production Co., et al.*, *supra*.

¹⁹ The lawsuit in Parker County continues on Range’s counterclaims for defamation, business disparagement, and conspiracy under the Texas anti-SLAPP (strategic lawsuits against public participation) Act, 27 Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 27.001 *et seq.* The defamation and business disparagement claims are based in part on videos purportedly showing Steven Lipsky setting fire to well water flowing from a garden hose, while in reality the hose was attached to the gas vent on the water well.

The Lipskys appealed the trial court’s February 16, 2012 order, in which the court denied their motion to dismiss and found “sufficient clear and specific evidence” for Range’s counterclaims. *Steven and Shyla Lipsky and Alisa Rich v Range Production Company and Range Resources Corporation*, in Case No. 2-12-00098, in the Second Court of Appeals for the State of Texas (filed March 12, 2012). The Court of Appeals dismissed this appeal for want of jurisdiction, stating that it had no jurisdiction over an interlocutory appeal under the anti-SLAPP Act. On October 8, 2012, the Lipskys appealed this decision to the Texas Supreme Court (Case No. 12-0811), which dismissed the petitions for review on December 3, 2013.

On August 23, 2012, the Lipskys filed a request to proceed as a petition for writ of mandamus (Case No. 2-12-00348-CV, *In re Steven and Shyla Lipsky and Alisa Rich*). On April 22, 2013, the Court of Appeals concluded that there was enough evidence for Range to proceed with its defamation and business disparagement counterclaims against Steven Lipsky, but the claims against Shyla Lipsky and Alisha Rich should be dismissed. All motions for rehearing and en banc reconsideration were denied on October 10, 2013. The Lipskys filed a Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the Texas Supreme Court on November 25, 2013 (Case No. 13-0928, *In Re Lipsky*), arguing that the entire case should be dismissed because Range did not show clear and specific evidence of the alleged defamation.

Evenson v. Antero Resources Corporation, Antero Resources Piceance Corporation, and John Doe Well Service Providers; No. 2011-cv-5118 (Denver County Dist. Ct., July 20, 2011)

This lawsuit was filed by several families (“Plaintiffs”) residing in Battlement Mesa, Garfield County, Colorado, who claimed that the drilling and exploration activities of Antero Resources Corporation, Antero Resources Piceance Corporation, and John Doe Well Service Providers (collectively “Defendants”) were exposing their properties and persons to hazardous gases, chemicals, and industrial wastes. Plaintiffs requested class action status for more than 1,000 property owners and 5,000 past and present residents of the community. Plaintiffs’ claims was based on one alleged incident in which petroleum odors emanated from one well pad near Battlement Mesa.

Based on the anticipated effects of future natural gas drilling, Plaintiffs sought equitable relief requiring Defendants to use unspecified practices to prevent releases, spills, and discharges; compensation for diminution in property value resulting from a “stigma” that has attached to the property; and creation of a medical monitoring fund to cover the costs arising from the alleged intentional, knowing, reckless and negligent acts and omissions of the Defendants in connection with their releases, spills, and discharges of hazardous chemicals used in their drilling activities.

The Antero Defendants filed a motion to dismiss, arguing that Plaintiffs had not asserted any legal claims for relief, but only requested remedies based on conduct that had not yet occurred. Further the Antero Defendants asserted that Plaintiffs had failed to plead any injury to their property; that Plaintiffs were attempting to usurp the jurisdiction of the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission by imposing additional drilling and operational requirements on the Antero Defendants; and that medical monitoring was not a recognized cause of action in Colorado. Moreover, the Antero Defendants argued that all of Plaintiffs’ claims were not “ripe” since they were based on speculative future drilling and operational activities. The Court ruled in favor of the Antero Defendants on August 17, 2012 and dismissed the claims.

Kamuck v. Shell Energy Holdings GP, LLC, Shell Energy Holdings LP, LLC, and SWEPI, LP (d/b/a Shell Western Exploration and Production, LP); No. 4:11-cv-01425-MCC (M.D. Pa., August 3, 2011)

Edward Kamuck (“Plaintiff”) brought this lawsuit claiming damages from hydraulic fracturing activities on his 93-acre tract of land, which was under an oil and gas lease at the time of his purchase in 2009.²⁰ Plaintiff complains that fracking fluid contains significant amounts of

On December 3, 2013, Range countered with its own Petition for Writ of Mandamus (Case No. 13-0928, *In Re Range Production Company and Range Resources Corporation*), seeking to reinstate the dismissed claims and asking the Court to determine what and how much evidence must be shown to prove that a claim under the Texas Citizens Participation Act (TCPA) is not frivolous.

²⁰ Plaintiff is also suing to correct an alleged improper unitization under the oil and gas lease as well as to stop Defendants from drilling into the Marcellus Shale because the lease only allowed unitization for drilling in the Onondaga or Oriskany formations or below. The Marcellus Shale is located above these formations.

hazardous, toxic and carcinogenic chemicals which remain in the well, come to the surface, and harm his property and his health. He further complains that 100 to 150 vehicles a day go directly past his residence (within 45 feet) on an unpaved, dusty road, creating noise and dust. In addition, Plaintiff claims that Defendants spray an unidentified fluid on the dirt roads which drains into the ditches and seeps into the ground.

Plaintiff has brought the following causes of action relating to hydraulic fracturing: injunctive relief (prohibiting all fracking operations and related activities), anticipatory trespass, private nuisance, negligence, negligence per se, gross negligence, and strict liability. On April 27, 2012,²¹ upon Defendants' motion, the Court dismissed the claims for anticipatory trespass, negligence per se, and gross negligence. The Judge indicated that he would entertain motions for summary judgment on the remaining claims of negligence, strict liability, and private nuisance after discovery was completed

Plaintiff seeks damages for the reasonable and necessary costs of remediation of the hazardous substances and contaminants on his property, the cost of future water and health monitoring, loss of property value, damage to natural resources, medical costs, loss of use and enjoyment of property, loss of quality of life, emotional distress, and other reasonable damages.

On June 21, 2012, Defendants' filed a Motion for A Modified Case Management Order, requesting that the Court enter a "Lone Pine" order²² as in the *Strudley* case, *supra*. Plaintiff argued that such an order was not warranted because this was not a mass tort case, having only one plaintiff, and the motion seeks to circumvent the standing discovery orders. On September 5, 2012, the Court denied this motion, finding that it was not currently warranted "despite what appear to be arguable shortcomings on the part of Plaintiff's allegations and evidentiary production to date."

On June 11, 2013, the Court entered its own Case Management Order setting the case for trial on April 21, 2014. All dispositive motions must be filed by January 17, 2014. Under an order signed by the Court on October 8, 2013, Defendants do not need to produce their expert reports until 30 days after the court rules on Defendants' motion for summary judgment.

²¹ See 2012 WL 1466490.

²² See footnote 16, *supra*.

Dillon v. Antero Resources a/k/a Antero Resources Appalachain [sic] Corp. s/k/a Antero Resources Appalacia [sic], LLC; No. 2:11-cv-01038 (W.D. Pa. August 11, 2011) (originally filed in the Court of Common Pleas of Washington County, Pa., Case No. 2011-4813, July 18, 2011)

Becka v. Antero Resources a/k/a Antero Resources Appalachain [sic] Corp. s/k/a Antero Resources Appalacia [sic], LLC; No. 2:11-cv-01040 (W.D. Pa. August 12, 2011)) (originally filed in the Court of Common Pleas of Washington County, Pa., Case No. 2011-4812, July 18, 2011)

The Dillon and Becka families (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) filed their lawsuits in the Court of Common Pleas of Washington County, Pennsylvania on July 18, 2011 (Case Nos. 4813 of 2011 G.D. and 4812 of 2011 G.D., respectively). These cases were then removed to federal court on August 12, 2011. Court-ordered mediation took place in each case on December 15, 2011, ending with no resolution. The Court consolidated both cases on April 25, 2012. Both cases have now settled, *Dillon* on August 9, 2012 and *Becka* on September 24, 2012.

According to the complaints, in early 2010, Defendant Antero Resources began drilling activities on property within 400 to 580 feet of Plaintiffs’ well water supplies. Plaintiffs claimed that Antero used hazardous chemicals during its hydraulic fracturing activities and that the use of such chemicals contaminated Plaintiffs’ groundwater.

Plaintiffs asserted claims for negligence, absolute liability, and trespass; and sought injunctive relief to stop the drilling. In their negligence claim, the Plaintiffs set out 31 alleged negligent acts and omissions of the Defendants, including (1) injecting hazardous chemicals, compounds, or fluids into the earth in such a fashion as to damage Plaintiffs’ water supplies, the soil, and the environment; (2) failing to properly safeguard the groundwater and spring water; (3) failing to report or warn of spills and releases; (4) failing to prevent drilling mud and other contaminants from being discharged into erosion ditches near Plaintiffs’ homes and water wells; (5) failing to prevent run-off through Plaintiffs’ driveways and residence areas; (6) failing to comply with state statutes relating to safe drinking water and drilling activities; (7) failing to hire, train, manage, and supervise qualified professionals; and (8) failing to properly monitor the work being performed.

Plaintiffs sought damages for personal and property damage. Plaintiffs wanted compensation for their fear that their health had been compromised and that they might develop cancer or other serious illnesses. Plaintiffs also sought reimbursement for increased medical expenses, testing and monitoring of water and soil quality, emotional distress and inconvenience, contamination of their water and land, loss of property value, and loss of enjoyment and use of their land.

Scoggin v. Cudd Pumping Services, Inc., RPC Inc., and Cudd Energy Services, No. 4:11-cv-00678-JMM (E.D. Ark. Sept. 12, 2011)

This is a lawsuit brought on behalf of two minor children, B. and H. Scoggin, by and through their next friend, Tina J. Scoggin (“Plaintiffs”) against Cudd Pumping Services, Inc., RPC Inc., and Cudd Energy Services (collectively, “Defendants”). Defendant Cudd Energy Services was dismissed without prejudice from the lawsuit on December 9, 2011.

In August of 2011, Defendants hydraulically fractured three natural gas wells which were located approximately 250 feet from the Plaintiffs’ home. Plaintiffs allege that, during the fracking process, large amounts of benzene, zylene, and methylene chloride were released into the environment, causing “dense clouds of a toxic mixture of atomized chemicals...” Air quality measurements taken in the Plaintiffs’ home revealed toxic levels of the chemicals.

Plaintiffs set out causes of action for strict liability, nuisance, trespass, and negligence, claiming that Defendants did not exercise reasonable care in their operations by allowing hazardous chemicals to migrate from the well sites without warning. As a result of Defendants’ activities, Plaintiffs “suffered severe and life threatening exposure to carcinogenic substances, as well as other toxic pollutants” that can cause Acute Myeloid Leukemia. Plaintiffs alleged that, because Acute Myeloid Leukemia can take up to ten years to fully manifest itself, the minors needed bi-annual monitoring for signs and symptoms. Plaintiffs sought \$20,000,000 in compensatory damages, \$50,000,000 in punitive damages, and the establishment of a medical monitoring fund. On June 10, 2013, a joint Stipulation of Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice was filed with the Court.

Beck v. ConocoPhillips Company, No. 2011-484 (Dist. Ct. Panola County Tex., Dec. 1, 2011)

Strong v. ConocoPhillips Company, No. 2011-487 (Dist. Ct. Panola County Tex., Dec. 2, 2011)

There are approximately 70 named Plaintiffs²³ between these two lawsuits which were filed in Panola County, Texas in early December of 2011. Plaintiffs allege that Defendant ConocoPhillips has contaminated their water wells through its use of hydraulic fracturing to extract gas from the Haynesville Shale formation and by disposing of fracturing waste near Plaintiffs’ properties. Plaintiffs claim that their water wells intermittently smell bad, taste bad, and “give off a gas that they believe to be methane gas.” Upon receiving notice of the water

²³ Plaintiffs’ Fourth Amended Complaint in the *Beck* case was filed on September 28, 2012, adding 10 plaintiffs and removing one (for a total of 67 plaintiffs). The Fifth Amended Petition filed on January 23, 2013, added one plaintiff.

problems, Defendant began providing potable water to the Plaintiffs, but Defendant has advised Plaintiffs that this practice will be stopped at some point in the future.²⁴

Plaintiffs set out causes of action for nuisance, trespass, and negligence. Plaintiffs claim that “Defendant failed to use a reasonable alternative means of recovering the minerals pursuant to the accommodation doctrine.” They seek damages of \$5,000,000 for loss of use of their land, loss of market value of their land, and loss of the intrinsic value of their well water. They also want damages for their “emotional harm and mental anguish from deprivation of enjoyment, loss of peace of mind, annoyance, inconvenience, and anxiety about the contaminated well water.” In addition, Plaintiffs have asked the Court for a permanent injunction precluding future drilling and fracking activities near Plaintiffs’ land.

Currently the parties are continuing with discovery. In both lawsuits, trial dates have been passed by agreement, with the cases being retained on the court’s docket.

Perna v. Reserve Oil & Gas, Inc., No. 11-c-2284 (Circuit Court of Kanawha County, West Virginia, Dec. 21, 2011)

Louis Perna (“Plaintiff”) owns forty acres on which Reserve Oil & Gas, Inc. (“Defendant”) operates a natural gas well. Plaintiff complains that the well was placed within 1,000 feet of his water well and that Defendant destroyed timber on his property when it constructed a road and installed a culvert. Plaintiff was forced to install a fence to prevent Defendant from using his property as a staging area and from depositing fracking fluid on his property. In addition, the fracking fluid was kept in two pits, one of which did not have a synthetic liner, and the pit waste was not fully reclaimed after completion of the well.

Plaintiff wants the well leases to be declared unenforceable and asserts claims for negligence, prima facie negligence, trespass, unreasonable use, and nuisance. Plaintiff seeks property damages under the West Virginia Oil and Gas Production Damage Compensation Act as well as damages for mental anguish, emotional distress, annoyance and inconvenience, and economic loss.

Bartlett v. Frontier Gas Services, LLC, Crestwood Arkansas Pipeline, LLC, Kinder Morgan Treating, LP, and Chesapeake Energy Corporation, Case No 4:11-cv-0910 (E.D. Ark. Dec. 23, 2011)

This class action with 10 named plaintiffs was brought on behalf of all citizens, residents, and property owners who lived or owned property within a one mile radius of defendants’ Point

²⁴ In the Third Amended Complaint in the *Beck* case, Plaintiff Ada Smith alleges a cause action for fraud, claiming that she signed a release, releasing any damages caused to her water well. She alleges that she signed the release due to duress and coercion from Defendants’ agents who allegedly advised that the delivered water would be stopped if she did not sign.

Remove Compressor Station. Plaintiffs sought injunctive relief to stop defendants' operation of the station which allegedly was causing pollution or contamination of the air, groundwater, and soil as well as creating "incessant and constant noise pollution." Plaintiffs set out causes of action for strict liability, nuisance, trespass, and negligence. Each plaintiff requested compensatory damages of \$1,000,000 and punitive damages of \$5,000,000.

On March 5, 2012, the Court stayed this lawsuit pending a decision on class certification in the *Ginardi* case, *supra*. With the *Ginardi* court denying class certification on April 19, 2012, this lawsuit was re-opened and the Court entered a Scheduling Order. The parties filed a joint motion and stipulation of voluntary dismissal which the Court signed on September 17, 2012.

***Teekell v. Chesapeake Operating, Inc., Crow Horizons Company, JPD Energy, Inc., and Chesapeake Louisiana, L.P.*, No. 5:12-cv-00044 (W.D. La. Jan. 12, 2012) (originally filed in the First District Court of Caddo Parish, La., Cause No. 555,703, Dec. 6, 2011)**

Scott and Patricia Teekell ("Plaintiffs") filed their Petition for Injunctive Relief and Damages in the First Judicial District Court of Caddo Parish, Louisiana (Cause No. 555,703) on December 6, 2011. On the basis of diversity, the case was removed to federal court on January 12, 2012, by Defendant Chesapeake Operating, Inc. (the unit operator), with allegations that the other defendants (Crow Horizons Company, JPD Energy, Inc., and Chesapeake Louisiana, L.P.) were fraudulently joined.

On June 6, 2012, the Court denied Plaintiffs' motion to remand and dismissed all claims against Chesapeake Louisiana, JPD Energy, and Crow Horizons stating that these defendants were not properly joined to the lawsuit.

Plaintiffs alleged that the groundwater beneath their property was contaminated as a result of Defendant Chesapeake Operating, Inc.'s natural gas drilling and production operations on adjacent property. Plaintiffs had two water wells on their property. The first water well was replaced with a new well in 2010. In January of 2011, after noticing a bad taste in the water from the new well, Plaintiffs had the water tested. The water was found to have high concentrations of sodium salts and iron, as well as dissolved solids at over twice the suggested maximum contaminant level set by the EPA. At that point, Plaintiffs went back to using their original well. In November of 2011, the water from this well began to smell and Plaintiffs determined that the well was holding hydrogen sulfide gas.

Plaintiffs asserted that Defendants were "liable under a number of theories including general negligence...and the obligations of neighborhood." Plaintiffs sought damages for the loss of use of their water wells, loss of usable water, costs to obtain a usable water supply, inconvenience, and mental anguish. In addition, Plaintiffs asked the Court for an injunction to stop Defendants' activities.

On August 20, 2012, the Court signed an order in which the parties agreed to the entry of a “Lone Pine” order²⁵ whereby Plaintiffs “will attempt to make a prima facie case as to causation through expert witnesses prior to engaging in full discovery.” The Plaintiffs advised the Court on January 29, 2013 that they had run “into difficulty with the selection and hiring of expert witnesses. The Court extended the dates for “Lone Pine” discovery. All this became moot when the lawsuit was voluntarily dismissed on June 25, 2013.

***Mangan v. Landmark 4, LLC*, No. 1:12-cv-00613 (N.D. Ohio, March 12, 2012)**

***Boggs v. Landmark 4, LLC*, No. 1:12-cv-00614 (N.D. Ohio, March 12, 2012)**

Plaintiffs Mark and Sandra Mangan and William and Stephanie Boggs (“Plaintiffs”) filed their Complaints on March 12, 2012, alleging that Defendant Landmark 4, LLC (“Landmark”) had contaminated their properties and persons with toxic, carcinogenic, and ultra-hazardous materials by releasing, spilling, or discharging these materials during hydraulic fracturing on wells located within 2,502 feet of Plaintiffs’ property, homes, and water well supplies.

Seeking injunctive relief to prevent continuing and future contamination, Plaintiffs assert causes of action for medical monitoring, negligence, strict liability, private nuisance, unjust enrichment, negligence per se, battery, and intentional fraudulent concealment. Defendant filed motions to dismiss several of Plaintiffs’ causes of action. On August 13, 2012, the Court dismissed Plaintiffs’ claims for battery and intentional fraudulent concealment; and on March 11, 2013, the Court dismissed Plaintiffs’ claim for negligence per se.

In the unjust enrichment claim, Plaintiffs state that Landmark has been unjustly enriched by its acts and omissions in causing contaminants to enter their properties. “These acts and omissions allowed Defendant to save millions of dollars in costs that should have been expended to properly contain and control the substances emanating from their facility.”

On August 13, 2012, the Court denied Defendants’ request for a “Lone Pine” order,²⁶ stating that “at this stage of the proceedings...there are no extraordinary circumstances that would render the normal discovery and motion practice procedures insufficient in this case.” Expert reports from Plaintiffs and Defendants are due December 30, 2013, and February 17, 2014, respectively. Dispositive motions must be filed by April 7, 2014. A status conference is scheduled for February 27, 2014.

²⁵ See footnote #16, *supra*.

²⁶ See footnote #16 *supra*.

***Manning v. WPX Energy Inc. and The Williams Companies, Inc., et al.*, No. 3:12-cv-00646 (M.D. Pa. April 9, 2012)**

Tammy Manning, Matthew Manning, Bryanne Burton, Amada Grondin, and Robert Lee, Jr. (“Plaintiffs”) filed their complaint on April 9, 2012. The Court immediately issued an order requiring Plaintiffs to amend their complaint to properly allege diversity jurisdiction. An amended complaint was filed on May 3, 2012, but once again the Court ordered Plaintiffs to properly allege diversity jurisdiction. The Second Amended Complaint filed on May 17, 2012 was accepted by the Court. On October 3, 2013, Plaintiffs filed their Third Amended Complaint, adding WPX Energy Appalachia, LLC as a defendant. A Case Management Order has been entered, with trial scheduled for January 2015.

Plaintiffs complain that, beginning in March 2011, Defendants engaged in drilling and hydraulic fracturing at 15 wells, with well pads within 1,000 to 7,390 feet of Plaintiffs’ properties, homes, and water supplies. They argue that, because their water supplies are contaminated, they are exposed to hazardous chemicals, their property values have decreased, and they have lost the use and enjoyment of their properties.

Causes of action include violations of the Hazardous Sites Cleanup Act, negligence, private nuisance, strict liability, trespass, and medical monitoring trust funds. In the negligence claim, Plaintiffs accuse Defendants of failing to prevent and/or contain releases and migration of hazardous chemicals and combustible gases, and failing to prevent contamination of the water supplies. Plaintiffs seek compensatory and punitive damages for remediation, loss of property value, loss of use and enjoyment of their property, loss of quality of life, emotional distress, inconvenience, and discomfort in an unspecified amount.

Prior to filing their lawsuit, in December 2011, the Mannings complained to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PDEP) about their water supply containing methane. The PDEP launched an investigation to determine the source of the methane. The PDEP tested the water wells and compared it with the chemical make-up of natural gas samples taken from near-by drilling rigs and also with samples from water wells in the near-by Salt Springs State Park. In April 2013, the PDEP released the testing results. The testing showed that the methane in the water of the private wells contained a similar isotopic make-up to the samples from the State Park, indicating that the methane in the wells is naturally occurring shallow gas. The PDEP concluded that the methane in the private wells was not production gas from the near-by gas wells being drilled by WPX Energy.

Despite the conclusion of the PDEP, the Mannings are continuing their lawsuit and filed an appeal of the PDEP’s determination (Environmental Hearing Board Docket No. 2013-067-M) on May 29, 2013. The PDEP has ordered all discovery to be completed by January 15, 2014, and all dispositive motions filed by February 14, 2014.

Roth v. Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation and Gas Search Drilling Services Corporation, No. 3:12-cv-00898 (M.D. Pa. May 14, 2012) (originally filed in the Court of Common Pleas of Susquehanna County, Pa., Case No. 2012-324, March 19, 2012)

Plaintiffs Frederick and Debra Roth filed their lawsuit on March 19, 2012, in the Court of Common Pleas of Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania, Case No. 2012-324. The case was removed to federal court on May 14, 2012.

Plaintiffs complained of environmental contamination and pollution caused by releases, spills, and discharges of combustible gases, hazardous chemicals, and industrial wastes from Defendants’ oil and gas facilities and their drilling and exploration activities, including hydraulic fracturing. According to Plaintiffs, these releases, spills, discharges, and activities damaged the natural resources in and around their home, including the contamination of their drinking water supply.

In their First Amended Complaint filed on August 6, 2012, Plaintiffs set out nine causes of action: (1) Hazardous Sites Cleanup Act; (2) negligence; (3) negligence per se, (4) private nuisance, (5) strict liability, (6) trespass, (7) inconvenience and discomfort, (8) breach of contract, and (9) fraudulent misrepresentation, with the last two against Defendant Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation (“Cabot”). For breach of contract, Plaintiffs alleged that Cabot failed to perform in accordance with lease provisions by not conducting their operations as required by state regulations, not taking the necessary steps to return Plaintiffs’ water supply to pre-drilling conditions, and not constructing the wells in a manner which would minimize soil erosion. On January 30, 2013, the Court dismissed Plaintiffs’ claims of trespass, inconvenience and discomfort, and fraudulent misrepresentation.

On December 12, 2013, the court signed a Rule 54(b) Final Judgment, dismissing the lawsuit with prejudice.

Haney, et al v. Range Resources Appalachia, LLC., et al., No. 2012-3534 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., May 25, 2012)

The 180+ page complaint was filed by three families against 17 defendants,²⁷ including the drilling operator, the manufacturers of the impoundment pond liners, the suppliers of fracking fluids, the engineers who constructed the well sites, the companies that tested the drinking water supplies, and the trucking companies who transported water to and waste water away from the

²⁷ Range Resources Appalachia, LLC.; Carla L. Suszkowski, P.E., individually and on behalf of Range Resources Appalachia, LLC.; The Gateway Engineers, Inc.; Scott Rusmiser, P.E., individually and on behalf of The Gateway Engineers, Inc.; New Dominion Construction, Inc.; Terrafox Environmental Technology, Inc.; Skaps Industries, Inc.; Engineered Synthetic Products, Inc.; Red Oak Water Transfer NE, LLC.; Microbac Laboratories, Inc.; Multi-Chem Group, LLC; Universal Well Services, Inc.; Halliburton Energy Services, Inc.; Saxon Drilling, L.P.; Highland Environmental, LLC; EAP Industries, Inc.; and Test America, Inc.

wells. This case is one of the first to name as defendants the operator and/or driller and the supporting supply and service companies for the well and hydraulic fracturing activities.

The causes of action include strict liability, negligence, negligent and intentional infliction of emotional distress, battery, private nuisance, trespass, Medical Monitoring Trust Fund, violations of Hazardous Sites Clean Up Act, professional liability against the engineering companies and individuals, civil conspiracy, and fraud. The last two claims of civil conspiracy and fraud are against Range Resources Appalachia, LLC (“Range Resources”) and the two companies that were taking water samples at Plaintiffs’ homes. Plaintiffs allege that the water reports were modified to intentionally provide incomplete information so that Range Resources could continue its fracking operations.

Despite objections from the *Haney* Plaintiffs, on June 26, 2013, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PDEP) issued permits to Range Resources Corporation, allowing the company to begin hydraulic fracturing operations at two wells in Washington County. The Plaintiffs filed an appeal of the PDEP’s decision on July 25, 2013. In the Notice of Appeal (*Haney, et al v. Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection*, Case No. 2013-112, before the Pennsylvania Environmental Hearing Board), the landowners claim that the PDEP is conducting on-going investigations into violations at the site of the operating well which was drilled in 2009. These alleged violations include a series of spills, contamination of drinking water sources, and numerous leaks in 2010 and 2011 from an impoundment used to store water, drilling fluids, and other chemicals. The landowners argue that the Pennsylvania Oil and Gas Act allows for the denial of a permit where the operators have previously been found to have violated environmental regulations, and they point to an April 2010 notice of violation issued to Range for failing to properly control or dispose of drilling fluids and violations at other drilling sites. They also claim that Range’s applications for the permits were incomplete. The landowners seek a reversal of the PDEP’s permits “as [being] arbitrary and capricious and as an abuse of discretion.” The PDEP has scheduled a hearing for October 21, 2014.

***Butts, et al. v. Southwestern Energy Production Company*, No. 3:12-cv-01330 (M.D. Pa. July 10, 2012)**

Three families brought this lawsuit, complaining that the use and enjoyment of their vacation homes in Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania have been destroyed by Southwestern Energy Production Company’s (“Southwestern”) drilling and hydraulic fracturing activities. Plaintiffs set out causes of action for private nuisance and negligence and seek a permanent injunction to stop unreasonable drilling activities. These unreasonable drilling activities include mobilizing heavy equipment, maintaining a constant flow of truck traffic day and night, using large flood lights, drilling, fracking, blasting, and low-level flying of helicopters over their homes. These activities have caused deforestation, dust, high decibel noises, high pressure venting noises, and loud gas flaring that emits air pollutants. Plaintiffs’ well water is no longer safe for drinking,

cooking, and other residential uses. They can no longer enjoy the peace and serenity of their vacation homes and have seen the value of their homes decrease.

Southwestern filed a motion to dismiss on September 10, 2012, asserting that each of Plaintiffs' claims is flawed and barred by Pennsylvania's economic loss rule. In particular, Southwestern asserted that Plaintiffs have not alleged a cause of action for private nuisance and have not properly plead causation. This motion was denied on May 14, 2013.

Currently pending before the court are two motions filed by Southwestern, a motion for summary judgment and a motion to strike the expert report and testimony of Joseph C. Fisher.

The case is set for trial in February 2014.

Smith, et al v. Southwestern Energy Company, No. 4:12-cv-00423 (E.D. Ark., July 11, 2012)

William and Margaret Smith (the "Smiths") sued Southwestern Energy Company in connection with the Puma North Compressor Station, which is located about 900 feet from their home. At the station, compressor units powered by engines gather, treat, and recompress natural gas produced by hydraulic fracturing operations to ensure the gas' continued flow through the pipeline. The Smiths complain of noise, vibration, and emissions from the compressor station and assert causes of action for strict liability, nuisance, trespass, and negligence.

In a Second Amended Complaint filed on January 14, 2013, seven plaintiffs²⁸ and several claims relating to royalty payments were added. These royalty claims included: (a) breach of statutory duty of good faith to correctly pay royalties associated with the production of natural gas; (b) unfair and deceptive trade practices by knowingly withholding information concerning royalty calculations; and (c) unjust enrichment.

The Smiths sought \$2,500,000 for compensatory damages (loss of use and enjoyment of their property, soil and groundwater contamination, physical damage to property as a result of vibration, diminution in property value, personal injuries, and severe mental distress, annoyance and discomfort) per household and \$5,000,000 in punitive damages per household.

On February 19, 2013, SEECO Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of Southwestern and a citizen of Arkansas, filed a motion to intervene, arguing that it was the lessor and the party responsible for the payment of royalties. The Smiths filed a Third Amended Complain which did not include SEECO on April 8, 2013. Southwestern then filed a motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. On May 13, 2013, the Court ruled that the case could not proceed without joinder of

²⁸ Actually fifteen plaintiffs were added, eight of which were complaining about the Scotland CPF II, not the Puma North Compress Station. The Court ordered these Scotland CPF II plaintiffs removed from the *Smith* lawsuit. Counsel for these Scotland CPF II plaintiff filed a separate lawsuit, *Pruitt v. Southwestern, infra*.

SEECO, the non-diverse, necessary party. Because the joinder of that party would destroy diversity, the Court dismissed the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

***Hill, et al. v. Southwestern Energy Company, et al.*, No. 4:12-cv-00500 (E.D. Ark., Aug. 10, 2012)**

This class action lawsuit was filed on August 10, 2012, with two plaintiffs against Southwestern Energy Company (“Southwestern”). On October 4, 2012, the complaint was amended to add thirteen plaintiffs (nine families total) and to add Chesapeake Energy and XTO Energy, Inc. as defendants. According to Plaintiffs, Defendants have injected fracking flowback and other oilfield waste fluids into vertical wells drilled into rock formations both above and below the Fayetteville Shale. Plaintiffs complain that this fluid flows out horizontally and is permanently deposited into the rock formation. There are several oilfield waste disposal wells in the vicinity of their residences.

Plaintiffs assert causes of action for RICO and Arkansas Deceptive Trade Practices Act (DTPA) violations, fraud, civil conspiracy, strict liability, contract-based claims, conversion, trespass, and unjust enrichment. In an order dated September 26, 2013, the court dismissed the RICO and DTPA claims, the good faith and fair dealing breach of contract claim, and the claims for fraud, civil conspiracy, strict liability, and conversion.

Plaintiffs seek damages for loss of use and enjoyment of their property, for contamination, disturbance and dislocation of their property, for severe diminution in property value, and for the creation of a toxic waste site on their property. Each plaintiff family seeks \$2,000,000 in compensatory damages and \$15,000,000 in punitive damages. The court has tentatively set a jury trial for December 15, 2014.

On November 6, 2013, Southwestern filed a motion for joinder of SEECO (an Arkansas corporation which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Southwestern) as a required party, arguing that SEECO primarily or exclusively performs the activities about which Plaintiffs complain. On December 10, 2013, the court agreed with Southwestern that SEECO must be joined to the lawsuit and asked that the parties come to the December 19, 2013 status conference prepared to discuss “whether the Court must decline to exercise jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(4)(A) or § 1332(d)(4)(B) or should decline under § 1332(d)(3).” Plaintiffs amended their complaint on January 10, 2014 to include SEECO, Inc. as a defendant, alleging jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act because “minimal diversity exists between the parties, there are at least 100 members of the putative class, and the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000...”

On December 20, 2013, the court issued a scheduling order with “phase one discovery produced” due by February 3, 2014 and a trial setting of April 6, 2015.

Pruitt, et al v. Southwestern Energy Company, No. 4:12-cv-00690 (E.D. Ark., Nov. 2, 2012)

The eight Plaintiffs in this lawsuit sued Southwestern Energy Company in connection with the Scotland CPF II Compressor Station.²⁹ This compressor station is used to gather, treat, and transport the shale gas that is produced through the hydraulic fracturing process. As in the *Smith v. Southwestern* case, *supra.*, the Plaintiffs complained of noise, vibration, and emissions from the compressor station and asserted causes of action for strict liability, nuisance, trespass, and negligence. Six of the Plaintiffs also alleged unjust enrichment and unfair deceptive trade practices relating to the payment and calculation of royalties.

Plaintiffs sought \$3,000,000 per household for compensatory damages (loss of use and enjoyment of their property, soil and groundwater contamination, physical damage to property as a result of vibration, diminution in property value, personal injuries, and severe mental distress, annoyance and discomfort) and \$5,000,000 per household in punitive damages. As in the *Smith v. Southwestern* case, *supra.*, the Court found that the lawsuit could not proceed without the joinder of the non-diverse, necessary party. Because the joinder of that party would destroy diversity, the Court dismissed the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction on May 14, 2013.

Magers, et ux v. Chesapeake Appalachia, L.L.C., CNX Gas Company, L.L.C., and Columbia Gas Transmission, L.L.C., No. 5:12-cv-00049-FPS (N.D. W.Va., Sept. 4, 2012)

Jeremiah and Andrea Magers (“Plaintiffs”) allege that the oil and gas operations of Chesapeake Appalachia, L.L.C. (“Chesapeake”), CNX Gas Company, L.L.C. (dismissed on August 13, 2013), and Columbia Gas Transmission, L.L.C (“Columbia Gas”) contaminated their water well with methane gas. Chesapeake drilled Marcellus gas wells on land near or adjacent to the acreage where Plaintiffs’ water well was located. Columbia Gas drilled several gas storage wells near or adjacent to that same acreage.

Plaintiffs assert a cause of action for negligence, arguing that Chesapeake and Columbia Gas released methane gas and other contaminants into their water well and into Fish Creek while constructing the gas wells and during the processes of producing gas from those wells. They have been forced to purchase and haul water from third parties to their home to supply their needs. Plaintiffs seek damages for diminution in the value of their property.

²⁹ This lawsuit was filed as a direct result of *Smith v. Southwestern Energy Company, supra.* On August 27, 2012, the Smiths amended their complaint to add fifteen plaintiffs, including the eight now in the *Pruitt* lawsuit. Ruling on a motion to sever filed by Southwestern, the Court in *Smith* ordered the eight Scotland CPF II Compressor Station plaintiffs to file a separate lawsuit, which is this *Pruitt* case.

Scoggin, et al v. Southwestern Energy Company, No. 4:12-cv-763 (E.D. Ark., December 7, 2012)

This class action lawsuit was filed by the Scoggin family³⁰ on behalf of all residents and property owners who live or own property within a 500 foot radius of any drilling/hydraulic fracturing operation being performed by Southwestern Energy Company (“Southwestern”). The action is brought against Southwestern for allowing its drilling/fracking operations to allegedly cause a noxious and harmful nuisance, contamination, physical harm, trespass, property damage, and diminution of property values. Plaintiffs seek \$10,000,000 in compensatory damages and \$15,000,000 in punitive damages. Southwestern has filed a Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State A Claim and Motion for More Definite Statement, seeking dismissal of all Plaintiffs’ claims of alleged contamination of their cistern, dismissal of the strict liability claim, and a more definite statement of all remaining claims. The Court denied the motion to dismiss and for more definite statement on March 15, 2013.

On March 29, 2013, Southwestern filed a motion for joinder of SEECO (a wholly owned subsidiary of Southwestern) as a required party, arguing that SEECO primarily or exclusively performs that activities about which Plaintiffs complain. The Court agreed with Southwestern and ordered that SEECO be joined to the lawsuit. Because SEECO is a citizen of Arkansas, its joinder to the lawsuit destroyed diversity. The Court dismissed the lawsuit without prejudice on May 29, 2013.

Litigation Involving Earthquakes and Hydraulic Fracturing

On March 23, 2011, Jacob Sheatsley³¹ filed a class action lawsuit claiming that “Central Arkansas has seen an unprecedented increase in seismic activity, occurring in the vicinity of” wastewater disposal injection wells³² which are part of hydraulic fracturing operations. According to the Arkansas Geological Survey, there had been 599 seismic events in Guy, Arkansas between September 20, 2010 and the date of the lawsuit. The largest earthquake in 35 years occurred on February 28, 2011, and measured 4.7 in magnitude. On that same day, the U.S. Geological Survey recorded as many as 29 earthquakes around Greenbrier and Guy, Arkansas, that ranged in magnitude from 1.7 to 4.7.³³ Mr. Sheatsley alleged causes of action for public nuisance, private nuisance, absolute liability, negligence, and trespass, all based on the

³⁰ See *Scoggin v. Cudd Pumping Services, Inc., et al., supra*.

³¹ *Sheatsley v. Chesapeake Operating, Inc. and Clarita Operating, LLC*, Cause No. 2011-28, In the Circuit Court of Perry County, Arkansas 16th Division, removed to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Western Division, Case No. 4:11-cv-00353-JLH, on April 4, 2011.

³² See U.S. EPA Technical Program Overview: Underground Injection Control Regulations, rev. July 2001, for information relating to injection wells.

³³ This earthquake information is referenced in the *Sheatsley* Class Action Complaint. See also Arkansas Geological Survey’s Earthquake Master List, found at www.geology.arkansas.gov/xl/Earthquake_Archive.xls and U.S. Geological Survey found at <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/recenteqs/>.

interference with the use and enjoyment of property and on the risk of serious personal harm and property damage from the earthquakes.

Four additional class actions complaints quickly followed, with the same allegations. All were originally filed in state court and removed to federal court.³⁴ On August 31, 2011, all four lawsuits were consolidated under Case No. 4:11-cv-00474, *Hearn v. BHP Billiton Petroleum (Arkansas) Inc., et al.* With the filing of these additional class actions, on July 13, 2011, Mr. Sheatsley voluntarily dismissed his lawsuit, in “an effort to streamline these cases and further judicial economy.”

Since inception, there have been changes to both Plaintiffs and Defendants. On September 15, 2011 and on November 1, 2011 respectively, defendants Clarita Operating LLC and BHP Billiton Petroleum (Arkansas) Inc. were dismissed. Plaintiffs Sam and April Lane and plaintiffs Randy and Joyce Palmer dismissed their claims on November 18, 2011; and Peggy Freeman, Tony and Karen Davis, and Jason and Misty Spiller were added as plaintiffs.

On December 15, 2011, Plaintiffs filed their First Amended and Consolidated Class Action Complaint, adding Deep Six Water Disposal Services, LLC (“Deep Six”) as a defendant and expanding their claims to include damages for (1) physical damage to their homes and commercial real estate; (2) losses attributable to the purchase of earthquake insurance; (3) losses in the fair market value of their real estate; (4) economic loss due to temporary stoppage of business operations; and (5) emotional distress.

On May 4, 2012, Defendant Deep Six filed a motion for summary judgment, arguing Plaintiffs’ inability to sustain their burden of proof regarding causation. Deep Six pointed to testimony from seismologist Dr. Haydar Al-Shukri before the Arkansas Oil & Gas Commission who stated that the seismic events were not caused by hydraulic fracturing.³⁵ On June 25, 2012, the Court granted a Joint Motion for the Voluntary Dismissal of Deep Six and denied the motion for summary judgment as moot.

³⁴ *Frey v. BHP Billiton Petroleum (Arkansas) Inc., et al.*, Case No. 23CV-11-488, In the Circuit Court of Faulkner County, Arkansas, 2nd Division (May 23, 2011), removed to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Western Division, Case No, 4:11-cv-0475-JLH, on June 9, 2011.

Hearn v. BHP Billiton Petroleum (Arkansas) Inc., et al., Case No. 23CV-11-492, In the Circuit Court of Faulkner County, Arkansas, 2nd Division (May 24, 2011), removed to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Western Division, Case No. 4:11-cv-00474-JLH, on June 9, 2011.

Lane v. BHP Billiton Petroleum (Arkansas) Inc., et al., Case No. 23CV-11-482, In the Circuit Court of Faulkner County, Arkansas, 3rd Division (May 20, 2011), removed to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Western Division, Case No. 4:11-cv-00477-JLH, on June 9, 2011.

Palmer v. BHP Billiton Petroleum (Arkansas) Inc., et al., Case No. 23CV-11-491, In the Circuit Court of Faulkner County, Arkansas, 3rd Division, Case No. 4:11-cv-00476-JLH, on June 9, 2011.

³⁵ For Dr. Al-Shukri’s testimony, see Exhibit C to Deep Six’s Statement of Material Facts As to Which There is No Genuine Issue to Be Tried which was filed with the motion for summary judgment.

Another earthquake lawsuit was filed on March 11, 2013,³⁶ and three more were filed on April 1, 2013.³⁷ The Court has tentatively set a separate trial date for each case beginning in the fall of 2014. The Plaintiffs claim property damage to their homes “due to Defendants’ disposal well operations, which caused thousands of earthquakes in mini-clusters and swarms in central Arkansas in 2010 and 2011.” They allege causes of action for public nuisance, private nuisance, absolute liability, negligence, trespass, Deceptive Trade Practices, and outrage. They seek compensation for physical damage to their homes (cracking or separation in concrete, tiles, walls, ceilings, brick facings, hardwood floors, the un-leveling of foundations, doors that will not properly close, and cracks in swimming pool), losses in the fair market value of their real estate due to earthquakes caused by Defendants’ activities, and emotional distress.

The *Hearn* case proceeded as a class action until April 9, 2013 with the filing of the Second Amended and Consolidated Complaint when all class action allegations were dropped. Because of settlements with some *Hearn* Plaintiffs, the Court ordered that the claims of Jesse and Susan Frey (Case No. 4:11-cv-00475-JLH) be transferred and consolidated with the *Mahan* lawsuit (Case No. 4:13-cv-00184-JLH). On August 29, 2013, the Court dismissed the claims of the remaining *Hearn* Plaintiffs and closing the lawsuit. On October 17, 2013, the *Mahan* lawsuit was referred to the U.S. Magistrate Judge for a settlement conference. On January 9, 2014, an Amended Complaint was filed in the *Mahan* lawsuit, adding three new defendants as well as including Jesse and Susan Frey in the style of the case.

On July 30, 2013, four residents of Alvarado, Johnson County, Texas filed a class action lawsuit alleging that their homes were damaged by earthquakes caused by hydraulic fracturing.³⁸

Studies Concerning Possible Connections between Earthquakes and Fracking

Before the lawsuits were filed, in December 2010, the Arkansas Oil & Gas Commission (“AOGC”) Staff was concerned about a possible connection between hydraulic fracturing and the unusual seismic activity in Arkansas. The Staff requested that the AOGC establish an immediate moratorium on any new or additional disposal wells in certain counties.³⁹ Shortly

³⁶ *Miller v. Chesapeake Operating, Inc. and BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville) LLC*, No. 4:13-cv-131-JMM (E.D. Ark., March 11, 2013).

³⁷ *Thomas v. Chesapeake Operating, Inc. and BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville) LLC*, No. 4:13-cv-182-JLH (E.D. Ark., April 1, 2013).

Sutterfield v. Chesapeake Operating, Inc. and BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville) LLC, No. 4:13-cv-183-JLH (E.D. Ark., April 1, 2013).

Mahan v. Chesapeake Operating, Inc. and BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville) LLC, No. 4:13-cv-184-JLH (E.D. Ark., April 1, 2013).

³⁸ *Finn v. EOG Resources, Inc., et al*, Cause No. C2013-00343, In the 18th Judicial District Court of Johnson County, Texas.

³⁹ Letter dated December 2010 from director Lawrence Bengal to the Commissioners of the Arkansas Oil & Gas Commission regarding amended request for an immediate moratorium on any new or additional Class II disposal well or Class II disposal well in certain areas (Faulkner, Conway, Van Buren, Cleburne and White counties). See <http://www.aogc2.state.ar.us/Hearing%20Applications%20Archive/2010/December/602A-2010-12.pdf>.

after the large earthquakes in February 2011, the AOGC had a special hearing and ordered the cessation of disposal wells operated by Clarita Operating LLC and Chesapeake Operating, Inc.⁴⁰ In July 2011, the AOGC held a hearing and determined that there was sufficient documentary and expert witness⁴¹ proof to order a moratorium on drilling disposal wells in the earthquake area.⁴²

Other organizations besides the AOGC have been studying the possible connections between drilling and earthquakes. In August 2011, the Oklahoma Geological Survey (“OGS”) drafted an Open-File Report entitled “Examination of Possibly Induced Seismicity from Hydraulic Fracturing in the Eola Field, Garvin County, Oklahoma.”⁴³ This group concluded that

[D]etermining whether or not earthquakes have been induced [by drilling] ...is problematic, because of our poor knowledge of historical earthquakes, earthquake processes and the long recurrence intervals in the stable continent. In addition, understanding fluid flow and pressure diffusion in the unique geology and structures of an area poses real and significant challenges... The number of historical earthquakes in the area and uncertainties in hypocenter locations make it impossible to determine with a high degree of certainty whether or not hydraulic fracturing induced these earthquakes.⁴⁴

A study was commissioned by Cuadrilla Resources Ltd. to evaluate the relationship between Cuadrilla’s operations and two small earthquakes that occurred in Lancashire, United Kingdom,

⁴⁰ Order No. 602A-2010-12, February 8, 2011, Class II Commercial Disposal Well or Class II Disposal Moratorium, available at <http://www.aogc2.state.ar.us/Hearing%20Orders/2011/Jan/602A-2010-12.pdf>; see also Edward McAllister, *Avoiding Fracking Earthquakes May Prove Expensive*, *Scientific American* (Jan. 3, 2012), available at <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=avoiding-fracking-earthquakes-expensive>; see also <http://www.intellectualtakeout.org/library/articles-commentary-blog/avoiding-fracking-earthquakes-expensive-venture>.

⁴¹ Researchers with the Arkansas Geological Survey say that, while there is no discernible link between earthquakes and gas production, there is “strong temporal and spatial” evidence for a relationship between the Arkansas earthquakes and the injection wells. Campbell Robertson, “A Dot on the Map, Until the Earth Started Shaking,” *N.Y. Times*, Feb. 5, 2011, found at http://www.nytimes.com/2011/02/06/us/06earthquake.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0. Dr. Haydar al-Shukri, director of the Arkansas Earthquake Center at the University of Arkansas testified before the Commission that, because only 280 of the more than 10,000 small seismic events occurred within three miles of the well, these events were not caused by hydraulic fracturing. See <http://apps.americanbar.org/litigation/committees/energy/articles/spring2012-0512-frackings-alleged-links-water-contamination-earthquakes.html>.

⁴² “Natural Gas: Arkansas Commission Votes to Shut Down Wells,” *HuffPost Green*, July 27, 2011; Order No. 180A-2-2011-07, August 2, 2011, Class II Commercial Disposal Well or Class II Disposal Moratorium, found at http://www.fossil.energy.gov/programs/gasregulation/authorizations/Orders_Issued_2012/64_AOGC_Hearing.pdf

⁴³ Holland, “Examination of Possibly Induced Seismicity from Hydraulic Fracturing in the Eola Field, Garvin County, Oklahoma,” Oklahoma Geological Survey, Open File Report OF-1 2011, available at http://www.ogs.ou.edu/pubsscanned/openfile/OF1_2011.pdf. This report examined 43 earthquakes occurring in the Eola Field of southern Garvin County, Oklahoma, in mid-January 2011. Allegedly the earthquakes began to occur about seven hours after the first and deepest hydraulic fracturing stage at Picket Unit B well 4-18.

⁴⁴ *Id.*

in April 2011.⁴⁵ The group concluded that the probability of a single factor, such as hydraulic fracturing, inducing a seismic event “with similar magnitude is quite low.”⁴⁶ Cuadrilla stated that the “seismic events [in Lancashire] were due to an unusual combination of geology at the well site coupled with the pressure exerted by water injection as part of operations.”⁴⁷ This combination of geological factors was extremely rare and would be unlikely to occur together again at future well sites. In response, the company modified the amount of fluid used and installed a seismic early warning system.⁴⁸

The UK Department of Energy and Climate Change (“DECC”) commissioned three independent experts to review Cuadrilla’s study and other information and to make appropriate recommendations for the mitigation of seismic risks in the conduct of future hydraulic fracturing operations. The report⁴⁹ which was published on April 17, 2012, supported Cuadrilla’s determinations and concluded that fracking in Lancashire could continue as long as a new set of recommended safety measures were followed.⁵⁰

Pre-dating the Arkansas, Oklahoma, and United Kingdom studies, the U.S. Geological Survey (“USGS”) prepared a 1990 report entitled “Earthquake Hazard Associated With Deep Well Injection – A Report to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.”⁵¹ This report evaluates the “probable physical mechanism for the triggering of and the criteria for predicting whether earthquakes will be triggered, based on the local state of stress in the Earth’s crust, the injection pressure, and the physical and the hydrologic properties of the rocks into which the fluid is being injected.” The report recommends care in selecting the locations of deep injection wells, namely “the desirability of high permeability and porosity in the injection zone and a site situated away

⁴⁵ Dr. C. J. De Pater and Dr. S. Baisch, *Geomechanical Study of Bowland Shale Seismicity: Synthesis Report*, Nov. 2, 2011, available at http://www.cuadrillaresources.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Final_Report_Bowland_Seismicity_02-11-11.pdf.

⁴⁶ *Id.*

⁴⁷ *Id.*

⁴⁸ *Id.*

⁴⁹ Green, Styles, and Baptie, *Preese Hall Shale Gas Fracturing – Review & Recommendations for Induced Seismic Mitigation*, available at <http://og.decc.gov.uk/assets/og/ep/onshore/5075-preese-hall-shale-gas-fracturing-review.pdf>.

⁵⁰ *Id.* Recommendations for continued hydraulic fracturing in Lancashire included the following: (1) pre-injection and monitoring before the main injection; (2) monitoring of fracturing growth and direction during the injection; (3) seismic monitoring; and (4) operations must be halted if events of magnitude of 0.5 or above are detected.

Recommendations for all future fracturing activities include: (1) assessment of seismic hazards before injection begins; (2) establish baseline seismic monitoring; (3) locate any possible active faults in the region; and (4) apply suitable ground motion prediction models to assess the potential impact of any induced earthquakes.

⁵¹ Craig Nicholson and Robert L. Wesson, “Earthquake Hazard Associated With Deep Well Injection – A Report to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,” available at <http://foodfreedom.files.wordpress.com/2011/11/earthquake-hazard-associated-with-deep-well-injection-report-to-epa-nicholson-wesson-1990.pdf>.

from known fault structures,” which would make the possibility of “induced earthquakes...less likely.”⁵²

The USGS has continued its research into earthquakes and hydraulic fracturing, and its scientists presented a report to the Seismological Society of America (“SSA”) in mid-April 2012.⁵³ The study, led by USGS geophysicist William Ellsworth, found that, since 2001, the frequency of 3.0+ magnitude earthquakes has increased from 50 in 2009, to 87 in 2010, and to 134 in 2011.⁵⁴ The scientists stated that “the acceleration in activity that began in 2009 appears to involve a combination of source regions of oil and gas production, including the Guy, Arkansas region, and in central and southern Oklahoma...A naturally-occurring rate change of this magnitude is unprecedented outside of volcanic settings or in the absence of a main shock, of which there were neither in this region. While the seismicity rate changes described here are almost certainly manmade, it remains to be determined how they are related to either changes in extraction methodologies or the rate of oil and gas production.”⁵⁵

At the same SSA meeting, University of Memphis’ seismologist Steve Horton presented his paper entitled “Deep Fluid Injection Near the M5.6 Oklahoma Earthquake of November 2011,” in which he opined that the build-up of seismic activity in Oklahoma was triggered by fluid injection into the subsurface.⁵⁶ He concluded that, “[b]ased on the previous injection history, proximity of the wells to the earthquakes and the previous seismic activity [in Oklahoma], the M5.6 earthquake was possibly triggered by fluid injection at these wells.”⁵⁷

Dr. Horton has also studied the earthquake swarms in Arkansas, and observed that the geological fault line is a danger independent of any injection well.⁵⁸ What Dr. Horton concludes is that a

⁵² *Id.*

⁵³ Mike Soraghan, ‘Remarkable’ Spate of Man-Made Quakes Linked to Drilling, USGS Team Says, EnergyWire March 29, 2012, available at <http://eenews.net/public/energywire/2012/03/29/1>.

⁵⁴ *Id.*; see also Ellsworth, *Are Seismicity Rate Changes in the Midcontinent Natural or Manmade*, available at http://www.fossil.energy.gov/programs/gasregulation/authorizations/Orders_Issued_2012/65_Are_Seismicity_Rate_or_Manmade_.pdf.

⁵⁵ *Id.*

⁵⁶ Horton, S. (2012), Deep Fluid Injection Near the M5.6 Oklahoma Earthquake of November, 2011, available at http://www2.seismosoc.org/FMPro?-db=Abstract_Submission_12&-sortfield=PresDay&-sortorder=ascending&-sortfield=Special+Session+Name+Calc&-sortorder=ascending&-sortfield=PresTimeSort&-sortorder=ascending&-op=gt&PresStatus=0&-lop=and&-token.1=ShowSession&-token.2=ShowHeading&-recid=631&-format=%2Fmeetings%2F2012%2Fabstracts%2Fsessionabstractdetail.html&-lay=MtgList&-find.

⁵⁷ *Id.*

⁵⁸ Horton, S., Disposal of Hydrofracking-Waste Fluid by Injection into Subsurface Aquifers Triggers Earth Quake Swarm in Central Arkansas with Potential for Damaging Earthquake, *Seismological Research Letters* 83, 250-260 2012; see also S. Horton, Seismic Hazard and Class 2 UIC Disposal Wells, presentation made February 22, 2012, available at <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/about/workshops/CEUS-WORKSHP/2.22.2012/Horton2012TriggeredEqs.pdf>.

reasonable seismic risk strategy is needed to monitor earthquake activity and to reduce or stop the injection rate/pressure when seismic activity warrants.⁵⁹

From March through November 2011, there were nine microearthquakes near Youngstown, Ohio,⁶⁰ within an eight-kilometer radius of a waste water injection well.⁶¹ Because earthquakes are rare in the Youngstown area, the Ohio Department of Natural Resources asked scientists with Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory ("LDEO") to place mobile seismographs in the vicinity to better determine what was occurring. Four seismographs were installed on November 30, 2011.⁶² Two earthquakes measuring 2.7 and 4.0 on the Richter scale hit Youngstown on December 24, 2011, and December 31, 2011, respectively.⁶³ Scientific American⁶⁴ reported that, "[b]y triangulating the arrival time of shock waves at the four stations, [the LDEO] determined with 95% certainty that the epicenters of the two holiday quakes were within 100 meters of each other, and within 0.8 kilometer of the injection well. The team also determined that the quakes were caused by slippage along a fault at about the same depth as the injection site, almost three kilometers down."⁶⁵

The LDEO scientists did not go so far as to say that the pumping caused the quakes, but indicated that "fluids can act as lubricants between two abutting rock faces, helping them to suddenly slip along the boundary."⁶⁶ Nevertheless, on December 31, 2011, Ohio Governor John Kasich shut down five storage wells in the vicinity pending additional investigation.⁶⁷ As requested by the Governor, the Ohio Department of Natural Resources ("ONDR") researched and issued in March 2012, "A Preliminary Report on the Northstar 1 Class II Injection Well and the Seismic Events in the Youngstown, Ohio, Area."⁶⁸ This preliminary report recommends reforms to carefully monitor and stringently regulate Class II deep injection wells⁶⁹ and

⁵⁹ *Id.*, see also Richard A. Kerr, *Learning how to NOT Make Your Own Earthquakes*, Science, March 23, 2012, available at <http://ceriblog.files.wordpress.com/2012/03/learning-how-to-not-make-your-own-earthquakes.pdf>.

⁶⁰ Ohio Department of Natural Resources website, <http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/tabid/8144/Default.aspx>.

⁶¹ Henry Fountain, *Ohio: Sites of Two Earthquakes Nearly Identical*, N.Y. Times, Jan. 3, 2012, available at http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/03/science/earth/ohio-sites-of-two-earthquakes-nearly-identical.html?_r=1&ref=us

⁶² *Id.*

⁶³ *Id.*

⁶⁴ Mark Fischette, *Ohio Earthquake Likely Caused by Fracking Wastewater*, Scientific American, Jan. 4, 2012.

⁶⁵ *Id.*

⁶⁶ *Id.*; see also "Ohio Quakes Probably Triggered by Waste Disposal Well, Say Seismologists," available at <http://www.ldeo.columbia.edu/news-events/seismologists-link-ohio-earthquakes-waste-disposal-wells>

⁶⁷ Maggie Schneider CNN, "Ohio Fracking Wells Closed in Wake of Quake," Jan. 2, 2012, available at <http://www.cnn.com/2012/01/01/us/ohio-earthquake>; Joe Vardon, *State links quakes to work on wells*, The Columbus Dispatch, Jan. 1, 2012, available at <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/local/2012/01/01/state-links-quakes-to-work-on-wells.html>

⁶⁸ Report is available at <http://ohiodnr.com/downloads/northstar/UICreport.pdf>.

⁶⁹ *Id.* Some of the required reforms sought by the ODNR include: a review of existing geologic data for known faulted areas; a complete suite of geophysical logs to be run on newly drilled Class II disposal wells; operators must plug back with cement, prior to injection; a measurement of original downhole reservoir pressure prior to initial injection; installation of an automatic shut-off system set to operate if the fluid injection pressure exceeds a

recommends that an outside expert with experience in seismicity, induced seismicity and Class II injection wells conduct an independent review of all technical information available relating to earthquakes and injection wells.

A similar situation has arisen in West Virginia, which experienced 10 quakes in 2010 and another one in January 2012.⁷⁰ After the initial quakes in 2010, the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (“WVDEP”) worked with Chesapeake Energy Corporation to reduce the amount of fluid being injected into disposal wells in the area.⁷¹ The WVDEP claimed that Chesapeake Energy had begun to slowly increase the amount of injected fluid when the latest earthquake struck.⁷² While the WVDEP believes that there is a link between the earthquake and Chesapeake Energy’s alleged increased volume of fluid, there is no evidence to prove this conclusion because no seismic monitors were present at the site.⁷³ Chesapeake Energy denies increasing the volume of underground injections and has stated that it is skeptical that any link exists, given that the earthquake occurred six miles from the disposal well, nearly three miles below the well’s disposal zone, and 25 earthquakes have been reported within 100 miles of the current seismic activity since 2000, one of which struck before the injection well was even drilled.⁷⁴

Seismologist Arthur McGarr at the USGS has presented a model for calculating the highest magnitude earthquake that an operation injecting fluid deep underground, (i.e., hydraulic fracturing) could induce.⁷⁵ Dr. McGarr and his team studied seven cases of quakes induced by fluid and uncovered a link between the volume of injected fluid and an earthquake’s magnitude.⁷⁶ They found that every time the volume of fluids doubles, the magnitude increases by about 0.4.⁷⁷ While the model cannot determine the likelihood of a quake occurring, it does assist engineers in knowing what to expect.⁷⁸

On June 15, 2012, the National Research Council issued its report concerning the scale, scope and consequences of induced seismicity (earthquakes attributable to human activities) relating to

maximum pressure set by the ODNr; and installation of an electronic data recording system to track all fluids brought by a brine transporter for injection.

⁷⁰ The Associated Press, *W.Va. DEP: Injection, quakes could be tied*, Star Gazette, Jan. 13, 2012, available at <http://www.stargazette.com/article/20120113/NEWS11/120113015/W-Va-DEP-Injection-quakes-could-tied>.

⁷¹ *Id.*

⁷² *Id.*

⁷³ *Id.*

⁷⁴ The Associated Press, *Chesapeake Skeptical of Quake-Drilling Connection*, Saturday Gazette-Mail, Jan. 13, 2012, available at <http://www.wvgazette.com/News/Business/201201130127>.

⁷⁵ Zoe Corbyn, *Method Predicts Size of Fracking Earthquakes*, Nature, Dec. 9, 2011, available at <http://www.nature.com/news/method-predicts-size-of-fracking-earthquakes-1.9608>; see also, McGarr, A. (1976), Seismic Moments and Volume Changes, *J. Geophys. Res.* 81(8), 1487-1494, doi: 10.1029/JB081i008p01487, abstract available at <http://www.agu.org/pubs/crossref/1976/JB081i008p01487.shtml>.

⁷⁶ *Id.*

⁷⁷ *Id.*

⁷⁸ *Id.*

energy technologies that involve fluid injection or withdrawal from the earth’s subsurface, including activities such as shale gas recovery, the use of hydraulic fracturing, and the disposal of waste water.⁷⁹ The main findings of this study are: (1) the process of hydraulic fracturing as presently implemented does not pose a high risk for inducing seismic events; and (2) injection for disposal of waste water into the subsurface does “pose some risk for induced seismicity, but very few events have been documented over the past several decades relative to the large number of disposal wells in operation...”⁸⁰

Studies attempting to link earthquakes to underground injection are ongoing. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has not yet weighed in on this issue, but as the news media continues to focus on the issue and public concerns continue to rise, that may change. Unless more studies reveal a clear-cut relationship, the causal connection may not be resolved for many years. With the Arkansas and Texas cases in the early stages of litigation, a court’s decision regarding the connection is also several years away.

Litigation Concerning Local Bans of Hydraulic Fracturing

Northeast Natural Energy, LLC and Enrout Properties, LLC v. The City of Morgantown, West Virginia, Civil Action No. 11-C-411; In the Circuit Court of Monongalia County, West Virginia (June 23, 2011)

Northeast Natural Energy, LLC (“Northeast”) had signed several lease agreements with landowners in the Morgantown area, including one lease with Enrout Properties, LLC. (“Enrout”) (collectively, Northeast and Enrout, “Plaintiffs”). In March 2011, Northeast obtained drilling permits from the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (“WVDEP”). In May 2011, the Morgantown Utility Board questioned certain aspects of the permits as to the wells’ impact on the Monongahela River, specifically as to spill containment, spill prevention, well integrity, waste disposal, and fracking fluid containment. Northeast agreed to comply with the Board’s requests for additional safeguards. On June 7, 2011, the City of Morgantown began the process of enacting an Ordinance completely prohibiting “drilling a well for the purpose of extracting or storing oil or gas using horizontal drilling with fracturing or fracking methods within the limits of the City...or within one mile of the corporate limits of the City...”

Plaintiffs challenged the Ordinance, claiming that the City violated their constitutional rights by adopting a regulation in derogation of state laws promulgated by the WVDEP which regulates natural gas extraction. Plaintiffs contended that the WVDEP regulations preempted and precluded enforcement of the City’s Ordinance. The City argued that it had the authority to enact and enforce the Ordinance under the “Home Rule” provision in the West Virginia Constitution by characterizing the hydraulic fracturing process as a nuisance.

⁷⁹ See “Induced Seismicity Potential in Energy Technologies,” at http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13355).

⁸⁰ *Id.*

The Court found that the state legislature had given the WVDEP the “primary responsibility for protecting the environment; other governmental entities, public and private organizations and our citizens have the primary responsibility of supporting the state in its role as protector of the environment.” W.Va. Code § 22-1-1(a)(2) (1994). Additionally, the WVDEP was formed to “consolidate environmental regulatory programs in a single state agency, while also providing a comprehensive program for the conservation, protection, exploration, development, enjoyment and use of the natural resources of the state of West Virginia.” W.Va. Code § 22-1-1(b)(2)-(3) (1994). The WVDEP controls the development of oil and gas in the state, including the issuance of permits. While acknowledging that the City has an interest in the control of its land, on August 12, 2011, the Court held that, in light of the state’s interest in oil and gas development and operations throughout the state and the all-inclusive authority given to the WVDEP, the City’s Ordinance was preempted by state legislation and was invalid. This decision of the Court was not appealed.⁸¹

Weiden Lake Property Owners Association, Inc. v. Jeff A. Klansky and Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation, 2011 N.Y. Misc. LEXIS 4081 (Sup. Ct.-Sullivan County, Aug. 18, 2011)

The Weiden Property Owners Association, Inc. (“Plaintiff”) was formed in 1999 to oversee and manage the subdivision and to maintain Weiden Lake and Dam. In May 2008, Plaintiff affirmed that the Protective Covenants it established prohibited commercial uses of the properties. The Covenants included provisions restricting the premises to single family homes and to agricultural and/or recreational use.

In June 2007, Jeff A Klansky (“Klansky”) purchased one of the lots in the subdivision. In July 2008, he entered into a lease that granted Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation (“Cabot”) the exclusive right to “explore for, drill for, produce and market oil, gas and other hydrocarbons” from Klansky’s lot for five years. Klansky received \$99,255 as a signing bonus. The lease provided that Klansky made no representation as to the “permitted use(s) of the subject property and/or the legality of the use(s) contemplated” in the lease agreement.

Upon hearing of Klansky’s lease, Plaintiff filed this lawsuit and sought summary judgment that the activities under the lease were prohibited by the Protective Covenants. The Court agreed with Plaintiff and ruled that the Covenants unambiguously restricted the use of land in the community to single family residential, agricultural or recreational use. The Court also determined that Klansky did not have to return the signing bonus because of the “no representation” clause and because Cabot was a sophisticated business entity and knowingly decided to enter into the lease, approve title and pay the signing bonus with full knowledge of the Protective Covenants and Plaintiff’s position.

⁸¹ The City of Wellsburg, West Virginia which had enacted a similar ban in May 2011, rescinded its ordinance following the Court’s decision in the *Northeast Natural Gas* case.

***Anschutz Exploration Corporation v. Town of Dryden and Town of Dryden Town Board*, 35 Misc.3d 450, 940 N.Y.S.2d 458 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2012)**

The Town of Dryden amended its Zoning Ordinance on August 2, 2011 to ban all activities related to the exploration for, and production or storage of, natural gas and petroleum within the town’s limits. Section 2104[5] of the Ordinance provided that “[n]o permit issued by any local, state or federal agency, commission or board for a use which would violate the prohibitions shall be deemed valid within the Town.”

Prior to the Amended Zoning Ordinance, Anschutz Exploration Corporation (“Anschutz”) had acquired gas leases covering approximately 22,000 acres in Dryden and had already invested approximately \$5.1 million in activities within the town. On September 6, 2011, Anschutz filed its lawsuit (Case No. 2011-0902), requesting the court to nullify Dryden’s Ordinance under New York Environmental Conservation Law § 23-0303(2) (ECL).⁸²

On February 21, 2012, after a careful and detailed analysis of the legislative history of ECL § 23-0303(2), the court determined that generally the Town of Dryden’s Amended Zoning Ordinance was not preempted by the State laws, but ordered Section 2104[5] to be severed and stricken from the Ordinance. This decision was affirmed on May 2, 2013,⁸³ with the appellate court stating that the ordinance “simply establishes permissible and prohibited uses of land within the Town for the purpose of regulating land generally.”

The New York State Court of Appeals granted Norse Energy Corporation USA (successor in interest to Anschutz) leave to appeal the lower courts’ decision.⁸⁴ Since there was no right to appeal, in granting this leave to appeal, the court sends a strong signal that the legal issues will get a fresh look by New York’s highest court. The court also gave leave for the Washington Legal Foundation, the American Petroleum Institute, the New York Farm Bureau, and the Associated General Contractors of New York State LLC to file amicus briefs.

The movant filed its brief on October 28, 2013, asserting that “the Appellate Decision allows every municipality in the State of New York to ban any and all oil and gas development. The inevitable result is zero resource recovery, the ultimate in waste, and the obliteration of mineral owners’ correlative rights. This result starkly conflicts with the language and policies of the OGSM [Oil, Gas, and Solution Mining Law] and the Energy Law and, therefore, cannot stand.”

⁸² “The provisions of this article shall supersede all local laws or ordinances relating to the regulation of the oil, gas and solution mining industries; but shall not supersede local government jurisdiction over local roads or the rights of local governments under the real property law.” New York State ECL § 23-0303(2).

⁸³ The case was affirmed under the name *In the Matter of Norse Energy Corporation USA v. Town of Dryden, et al.*, Case No. 515227, In the State of New York, Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department. Norse Energy Corporation USA’s predecessor in interest was Anschutz Exploration Corporation.

⁸⁴ *Norse Energy Corp. USA v. Town of Dryden, et al.*, Case No. 2013-00245, In the New York State Court of Appeals.

The Town of Dryden responded in a brief dated December 13, 2013, arguing that the “OGSML does not expressly preempt a locality’s right to enact a zoning ordinance that regulates land use generally and designates oil and gas mining as a prohibited use within municipal borders.” The Town urges that the two separate, distinct regulatory schemes (the Town’s zoning ordinances and the policies of the OGSML) can “harmoniously coexist.”

On December 13, 2013, the court received an amici curiae brief that was filed on behalf of 52 towns and villages in New York, the Association of Towns of the State of New York, the New York Conference of Mayors, and the New York Planning Federation. These interested parties asserted that a local municipality has “the constitutionally guaranteed right...to create and preserve its own community character through generally applicable land use planning and zoning laws.” New York’s energy law “preempts only local regulation of the operations of the oil and gas industry, not local land use laws that govern whether and where such operations may take place within a municipality’s borders.”

The reply brief is due January 6, 2014. Both sides have requested oral arguments.

***Cooperstown Holstein Corporation v. Town of Middlefield*, 35 Misc.3d 767, 943 N.Y.S.2d 722 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2012)**

The Town of Middlefield, Otsego County, New York, enacted a zoning law on June 14, 2011, which effectively banned oil and gas drilling within the geographical borders of the township by stating that “heavy industry and all oil, gas or solution mining and drilling are prohibited uses...” of property within the Town. Cooperstown Holstein Corporation (“Plaintiff”) had signed two leases with Elexco Land Services, Inc. in 2007 with respect to property Plaintiff owned in Middlefield. Plaintiff asserted that the purposes of those leases would be frustrated by the new zoning law.

As in the *Town of Dryden* case, Plaintiff brought a lawsuit to have Middlefield’s zoning law overturned, claiming that New York Environmental Conservation Law § 23-0303(2) (ECL) preempted any regulations emanating from local authorities with respect to the regulation of gas, oil, and solution drilling or mining. On February 24, 2012, after examining the legislative history of ECL § 23-0303(2), the Court ruled that this clause did not “preempt a local municipality...from enacting land use regulation within the confines of its geographical jurisdiction and, as such, local municipalities are permitted to permit or prohibit oil, gas and solution mining or drilling in conformity with such constitutional and statutory authority.” This ruling was confirmed by the New York appellate court on May 2, 2013. As in the *Town of Dryden* lawsuit, *infra.*, New York’s highest court has agreed to review this decision.

Jeffrey, et al v. Matthew T. Ryan, in his official capacity as Mayor, City of Binghamton, and the City Council, City of Binghamton, No CA2012-001254, 37 Misc.3d 1204(A), 2012 WL 4513348). (N.Y. Supreme Court, Broome Co. Oct. 2, 2012)

On December 22, 2011, the Mayor of the City of Binghamton, New York signed Local Law No. 6, prohibiting all natural gas exploration and extraction activities and all natural gas support activities within the city limits and at all sites within 500 feet of any city boundary. The Plaintiffs (an individual landowner, an owner of an 11-acre industrial site, two unincorporated associations of landowners, and the owner of a Holiday Inn) filed a lawsuit in late May 2012, alleging that the Mayor signed this law without the required approval of the Broome County Department of Planning and Economic Development and that New York law prohibits the City from banning or regulating any oil and gas exploration and extraction activities.

The Plaintiffs claim that this ban adversely affects their opportunities to lease their land for natural gas exploration and extraction as well as their business opportunities.⁸⁵ They seek a court order that Local Law No. 6 be declared jurisdictionally defective and therefore null and void because the City did not obtain the mandatory approval of the Broome County Department of Planning and Economic Development; because New York’s Oil, Gas and Solution Mining Law, ECL § 23-303[2] prohibits local governments from directly regulating the mining industry or its activities; and because neither New York’s Municipal Home Rule Charter nor the City’s general police power authorizes the City to adopt a moratorium banning otherwise permissible land-use and development activities.

Defendants filed a motion to dismiss and a motion for summary judgment on July 27, 2012. On October 2, 2012, the Supreme Court determined that the “City cannot just invoke its police power solely as a means to satisfy certain segments of the community.” The local law failed to meet the criteria for a properly enacted moratorium because there was “no showing of dire need since the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation has not yet published the new regulations that are required before any natural gas exploration or drilling can occur in this state.” Without actual drilling, there is no emergency and, therefore, no need for a moratorium. The Court invalidated the local ban.

Penneco Oil Co., Inc., et al. v. County of Fayette, Pennsylvania, et al., 4 A.3d 722 (Pa. Commw. Ct. June 22, 2010), appeal denied, 2012 Pa. LEXIS 40, 41 (Pa. Jan. 6, 2012)

In May of 2008, Penneco Oil Company, Inc., Range Resources-Appalachia, LLC, and the Independent Oil & Gas Association of Pennsylvania filed a lawsuit against Fayette County and the county agency responsible for zoning administration claiming that the Fayette County zoning code provisions applicable to oil and gas development were preempted by the Pennsylvania Oil

⁸⁵ For example, the owners of the Holiday Inn and the industrial site had anticipated renting rooms and/or storage space to the oil field companies and their workers.

and Gas Act (the “Act”). A county zoning ordinance allowed oil and gas development as a permitted use in some areas but required special exception approval in other areas within Fayette County. The ordinance provided that wells may not be located within the flight path of an airport runway, wells may not be located closer than 200 feet of a residence or 50 feet of a property line or right-of-way; fencing and shrubbery must surround the pump head and support equipment; and the zoning hearing board may attach additional conditions to protect the public’s health, safety and welfare. The gas operator plaintiffs argued that the county’s ordinance was preempted by the Act because (a) surface or deep mining did not require a special exception in the same areas, (b) it gives the zoning hearing board discretion to impose conditions for oil and gas wells, (c) it requires a costly well permit, (d) there is no guarantee of a special exception even if all the special exception requirements are met, and (e) the purposes of the zoning ordinance are the same as the Act.

The trial court found that the zoning ordinance was not preempted by the Act. That decision was upheld on appeal to the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania which determined that the ordinance did not pertain to the technical aspects of well operations, but rather to preservation of the character of residential neighborhoods. The appeals court also determined that the zoning board did not impose unreasonable conditions on the grant of a special exception and could attach additional conditions to protect the public’s health, welfare and safety and that these provisions did not reflect an attempt by Fayette County to enact a comprehensive regulatory scheme relative to oil and gas development in the county.

Lenape Resources, Inc. v. Town of Avon, Town of Avon Board, and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Index No. 1060-2012, In the Superior Court of the State of New York, County of Livingston (November 13, 2012)

In the summer of 2012, the town of Avon passed Local Law T-A-5-2012 entitled “Moratorium on and Prohibition of Gas and Petroleum Exploration and Extraction Activities Underground Storage of Natural Gas and Disposal of Natural Gas or Petroleum Extraction Exploration and Production Wastes.” The one-year moratorium on natural gas extraction and underground storage began in June 2012 and includes a “grandfather clause” for existing wells. Lenape Resources, Inc. (“Lenape”) who operates 16 to 20 wells in the Avon area on about 5,000 acres sought to overturn the moratorium, asserting that the local law was preempted by state law, invalid, unreasonable, arbitrary, oppressive, and unconstitutional. Lenape requested an injunction to stop enforcement of the law and sought actual and compensatory damages of no less than \$50 million.

On March 15, 2013, Judge Robert B. Wiggins of the State of New York, Supreme Court, County of Livingston, entered an order dismissing Lenape’s 10-count lawsuit. The Court determined that New York state court precedents have established that local bans based on zoning laws do not amount to attempts to regulate the oil and gas industry and therefore are not preempted by the state’s Oil, Gas and Solution Mining Law. Lenape has appealed this decision.

Litigation Concerning State vs. Local Zoning Regulation of Hydraulic Fracturing

***Robinson Township, et al v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, et al*, No. 284 M.D. 2012 (Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania, March 29, 2012), which is being appealed, 63-MAP-2012 (Supreme Court, Middle District, August 17, 2012)**

Seven municipalities in three counties,⁸⁶ the Delaware Riverkeeper Network, and Dr. Mehernosh Kahn⁸⁷ (“Plaintiffs”) filed a lawsuit against the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and three state agencies⁸⁸ (“Defendants”) seeking an injunction to prevent the state from putting into effect the Act of February 14, 2012, P.L. ___, 58 Pa. C.S. §§2301-3504 (“Act 13”).⁸⁹ Plaintiffs challenge whether the state is authorized to supersede local regulation of gas drilling by restricting the municipalities’ ability to zone natural gas drilling and barring them from keeping natural gas wells out of residential zones.

Act 13 is a substantial re-write of the Commonwealth’s Oil and Gas Act and applies to unconventional natural gas operations involving either hydraulic fracturing or the use of multilateral well bores or techniques that expose more of the geological formation to the well bore. Act 13 imposes statewide standards that dictate where wells, compressor stations and other drilling-related structures can be built. It requires all local drilling regulations to be reasonable and that any questions of reasonableness would be determined by the Public Utility Commission. 58 Pa. C.S. §§ 3302-3309.

Section 3309 provides that Act 13 applies to all ordinances existing on April 14, 2012 (the effective date of the Act) and that municipalities had 120 days from the effective date to “review and amend an ordinance in order to comply with” the Act. 58 Pa. C.S. §3309 (a) - (b). In their motion for preliminary injunction, the municipalities argued that due to the requirements of the Municipalities Planning Code 53 P.S. § 10101 *et seq.*, 120 days was insufficient time to amend their ordinances and that “the oil and gas industry has taken the position that it has free reign for the installation of any and all of its infrastructure as of April 14, 2012.”⁹⁰ The Court agreed with Plaintiffs and issued a limited preliminary injunction on April 11, 2012, stating:

⁸⁶ Robinson Township, Peters Township, Cecil Township, and Mount Pleasant Township in Washington County; Yardley Borough and Nockamixon Township in Bucks County; and South Fayette Township in Allegheny County.

⁸⁷ Dr. Kahn questions a section of Act 13 (the legislation that is under scrutiny in this lawsuit) which provides that, except in an emergency, a physician who needs proprietary information about chemicals used in natural gas drilling to assess a patient must provide “a written statement” to a company and must sign a confidentiality agreement. 58 Pa. C.S. §3222.1(b)(11).

⁸⁸ Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Office of the Attorney General of Pennsylvania, and Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection.

⁸⁹ For a complete summary of Act 13, see Janet L. McQuaid, Megan E. Smith Miller, Kristen Roche, Stefanie A. Lepore, and Michael P. Gaetani, “Pennsylvania Act 13 (BH1950) Rewrites Law Governing Oil and Gas Activities,” *Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P. Briefing*, March 2012.

⁹⁰ Motion for Preliminary Injunction ¶19.

While the ultimate determination on the constitutionality of Act 13 is not presently before the Court, the Court is of the view that municipalities must have an adequate opportunity to pass zoning laws that comply with Act 13 without the fear or risk that development of oil and gas operations under Act 13 will be inconsistent with later validly passed local zoning ordinances. For that reason, pre-existing ordinances must remain in effect until or unless challenged pursuant to Act 13 and are found to be invalid... [T]he Court agrees with petitioners that 120 days is not sufficient time to allow for amendments of local ordinances and, therefore, will preliminarily enjoin the effect date of Section 3309 for a period of 120 days.

On May 3, 2012, the Commonwealth agencies filed a notice of appeal with the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, Middle District (Case No. 40 MAP 2012), questioning the issuance of the injunction. On the remaining issues, the Court of Common Pleas issued an order on July 26, 2012, in response to the Commonwealth's preliminary objections and cross-motions for relief. The Court found that section 3304 violated substantive due process because it forced municipalities to enact zoning ordinances that permit oil and gas operations in all zoning districts, including residential areas. This order of the Commonwealth Court is also being appealed (Case Nos. 63 MAP 2012, 64 MAP 2012, 72 MAP 2012 and 73 MAP2012). These four appeals were argued on October 17, 2012, with Case No. 40 MAP 2012 stayed pending the decision in these appeals.

A word on Case No. 63 MAP 2013: After the July 26, 2013 decision, the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission ("PUC") started reviewing local zoning ordinances under a section of the law not specifically mentioned in the Commonwealth Court's ruling. In a short order dated October 26, 2012, the Commonwealth Court stated that the PUC did not have the authority to review local oil and gas drilling ordinances under the terms of the injunction while the high court was deliberating on the portion of the law that would prevent municipalities from banning natural gas drilling.

The PUC appealed this decision to the state Supreme Court (Case No. 63 MAP 2012). On July 25, 2013, in a one-page decision, the state Supreme Court with six justices (one justice suspended and now a convicted felon on public corruption charges) rejected the appeal, Upholding the Commonwealth Court's October 26th ruling. With seven justices now sitting on the Supreme Court, on August 6, 2013, the PUC and the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection ("PDEP") filed an Application to Resubmit Case and an Application for Reconsideration Before Entire Court. The agencies argue that the matter should be considered by the full court "because of the importance of the issues pending in this appeal, and in light of the fierce divide among the commissioned judges of the Commonwealth Court as to the constitutionality of the [provision]."

Without ruling on the motion for seven justices to re-hear the appeals arguments, on December 19, 2013, in a 4-2 decision, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, Middle District issued its opinion and mandate affirming the lower court’s decision. In a 162-page opinion, three justices held that the law preventing local governments from passing zoning ordinances prohibiting natural gas drilling was unconstitutional, violating the Environmental Rights Amendment of the state’s constitution. A fourth justice, concurring with the majority, found that the law violated due process rights by “unconstitutionally, as a matter of substantive due process, usurp[ing] local municipalities’ duty to impose and enforce community planning...”

On January 2, 2014, Defendants filed an application for re-argument, asking the Court to reconsider its decision.

Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission v. City of Longmont, Colorado, Case No. 2012-0730, In the District Court, Boulder County, Colorado (July 30, 2012)

Colorado Oil & Gas Association v. City of Longmont, Colorado, Case No. _____, In the District Court, Weld County, Colorado (December 17, 2012), transfer of venue to Boulder County, Colorado on March 8, 2013

The City Council of Longmont, Colorado passed several ordinances relating to banning and/or restricting hydraulic fracturing activities in the area around the city. The ordinances include provisions that the city would decide whether directional and horizontal drilling were “possible and appropriate,” what set-backs would be used, how to protect wildlife and their habitat, and where drilling could take place as well as requiring chemical reporting, visual mitigation methods, and water quality testing and monitoring. In November 2012, the City amended its charter to prohibit hydraulic fracturing and the disposal of fracking wastes anywhere within the city limits.

The Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (COGCC) sued the city, arguing that only the COGCC had the authority to establish regulations concerning hydraulic fracturing and the city’s ordinances were preempted by the COGCC’s authority. The Colorado Oil & Gas Association (COGA) presented the same argument, stating that the city ordinances constitute an “illegal ban on oil and gas drilling, they deny private mineral owners the right to develop their property, they attempt to prohibit operations that the state laws permit, and they purport to regulate technical aspects of oil and gas operations in a manner that is preempted by the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Act and its implementing regulations.”

In early July 2013, the COGA asked the Court to join the COGCC as a co-plaintiff in its lawsuit, stating that the Commission has “a broader interest in its ability to protect its plenary and regulatory authority to regulate the technical aspects of oil and gas drilling, generally, in Colorado.” The COGCC agreed to the joinder. The Court has allowed other parties to join, including TOP Operating, the Sierra Club, Food & Water Watch, Earthworks, and Our Health,

Our Future, Our Longmont, but with a warning not to go beyond the issues set out in COGA’s complaint.

State of Ohio ex rel. Jack Morrison, Jr., Law Director of Munroe Falls, Ohio et al. v. Beck Energy Corporation, et al., Case No. 2013-0465, In the Supreme Court of Ohio

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Mineral Resources Management (later reorganized as the Division of Oil and Gas Resources Management issued a permit to Beck Energy Corporation (“Beck Energy”). The permit was issued under R.C. 1509.02 which gives the state “sole and exclusive authority to regulate the permitting, location, and spacing of oil and gas wells and production operations within the state” in order to achieve “uniform statewide regulation.” Claiming that the drilling would violate various city ordinances, the City of Munroe Falls filed a lawsuit for permanent injunctive relief seeking to prevent Beck Energy from drilling. The trial court granted the injunction.

Beck Energy appealed this injunction to the Court of Appeals, Ninth Appellate District, Summit County, Ohio (Case No. 25953). The appeals court issued its opinion on February 6, 2013,⁹¹ reversing the lower court decision. The court found that the city’s drilling ordinances (requiring the drilling company to comply with all ordinances, obtain a conditional zoning certificate, hold a public hearing at least three weeks before beginning drilling, and pay a performance bond of \$2,000) were in direct conflict with R.C. 1509.02 and therefore preempted by state law. But, the court stated that the city could enforce its ordinances governing rights-of-way and excavations as long as these ordinances are enforced fairly, in a way that does not discriminate against, unfairly impede, or obstruct oil and gas activities and operations.

The city of Munroe Falls has appealed this decision to the Ohio Supreme Court. Several other Ohio municipalities, as well as environmental groups including the Natural Resources Council, have filed briefs in support of Munroe Falls, while industry groups such as the American Petroleum Institute have sided with the state. Oral arguments are scheduled for February 26, 2014.

Vermillion, et al v. Mora County, New Mexico, Mora County Board of County Commissioners, et al., No. 1:13-cv-01095 (N.M. (November 11, 2013)

On April 29, 2013, the members of the Mora County Board of County Commissioners voted 2-1 to enact an ordinance, entitled “Mora County Community Water Rights and Local Self-Government Ordinance.” The Ordinance is described as being “a local bill of rights for Mora County that protects the natural sources of water from damage related to the extraction of oil, natural gas or other hydrocarbons...” According to plaintiffs (landowners and the Independent Petroleum Association of New Mexico), the real purpose of this ordinance is to prevent the

⁹¹ 989 N.E.2d 85 (Ohio Ct App 9th Dist 2013).

lawful development of oil and natural gas resources located in Mora County and to ban hydraulic fracturing within the County.

The plaintiffs argue that the Ordinance deprives them of their “fundamental property rights” to lease their minerals, in violation of substantive due process and the first and fourteenth amendments. In addition, they assert that the Ordinance is preempted by the New Mexico Oil and Gas Act, which confers authority over oil and natural gas extraction within the state to the Oil Conservation Commission and the Oil Conservation Division.

Colorado Oil and Gas Association v. City of Fort Collins, Colorado, Case No. 2013CV031385, In the District Court, Larimer County, Colorado (December 3, 2013)

Colorado Oil and Gas Association v. City of Lafayette, Colorado, Case No. 2013CV031746, In the District Court, Boulder County, Colorado (December 3, 2013)

In November 2013, the citizens of Fort Collins, Colorado and Lafayette, Colorado voted to ban hydraulic fracturing from their cities. In Fort Collins, a five-year ban on hydraulic fracturing was approved with 55% of the vote. Sixty percent (60%) of the voters in Lafayette approved an indefinite ban on all oil and gas development, including the deposit, storage, or transportation of fracking wastewater through “the land, air or waters” of the city. In both cities, the City Councils had opposed the bans.

On December 3, 2013, the Colorado Oil & Gas Association (COGA) filed a lawsuit against each city, challenging the validity of the bans. COGA argues that a conflict exists between the bans and state law since the cities have no constitutional or statutory authority to implement regulations on oil and gas development techniques, such as hydraulic fracturing. COGA points to Colorado Supreme Court precedent and state law to support its stance that hydraulic fracturing cannot be blocked by municipalities.

According to COGA, the state’s General Assembly has declared it to be in the public’s interest for the state to “foster the responsible and balanced development, production, and utilization of the natural resources of oil and gas in Colorado in a manner consistent with protection of public health, safety, and welfare, including protection of the environment and wildlife resources.” The Oil and Gas Conservation Act created the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (COGCC) to administer all “rules, regulations and orders with respect to operations for the production of oil and gas,” including “permitting, drilling production, plugging, spacing and chemical treatment of wells.”

Litigation Claiming Moratorium on Hydraulic Fracturing Affected Investment

***Wallach, et al. v. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, et al.*, Case No. _____, In the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Albany (December 17, 2013)**

On December 17, 2013, the trustee for a bankrupt energy company and a shareholder in that company sued New York State’s Department of Environmental Conservation (“DEC”) and other state officials, including the governor, asserting that the shareholder has lost almost his entire investment of \$21,305.52 due to the decrease in the value of the company’s stock and that the company has lost more than \$100 million due to the hydraulic fracturing moratorium that has been in place since 2008.

The energy company has 27 well-permit applications pending before the DEC. As part of the bankruptcy proceedings, the trustee tried to sell these assets at auction, but received no bids. According to the complaint, “the only way to salvage the value of [the company’s] assets is to complete the SGEIS [Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement] Process.” The Plaintiffs seek a mandamus to compel completion of the SGEIS Process and a determination that government officials have “arbitrarily and capriciously, abused their discretion.”

In 2008, the New York legislature passed regulations covering hydraulic fracturing. Then-governor David Patterson ordered the DEC to conduct an environmental evaluation of fracking and ordered the well approval process halted until the study was completed which was anticipated to be November 2009. A draft report was published in September 2009, but the DEC spent more than one year reviewing public comments. In December 2010, Patterson issued an executive order requiring further environmental review. Gov. Andrew Cuomo kept the order in place when he took office. In September 2012, the DEC and the Department of Health began a study of the health impacts associated with hydraulic fracturing.

At a news conference on December 16, 2013, Gov. Cuomo and Dr. Nirav R. Shah, the New York State Health Commissioner, stated that there was no time-line to complete the study. Mr. Cuomo said, “My timeline is whatever commissioner Shah needs to do it right and feel comfortable.” The governor said he did not want “to put undue pressure on them that would artificially abbreviate what they’re doing.” Dr. Shah indicated that he was still conducting his review, collecting “new data from Texas and Wyoming.” When asked about transparency of the study, he stated that “the process needs to be transparent at the end, not during.”⁹²

⁹² See Jesse McKinley, *Still Undecided on Fracking, Cuomo Won’t Press for Health Study’s Release*, N.Y. Times, December 16, 2013.

Litigation Involving Oil and Gas Lease Disputes

Coastal Oil and Gas Corp. v. Garza Energy Trust, 268 S.W.3d 1 (Tex. 2008)

In this case, the Plaintiff attempted to recover damages from an operator using hydraulic fracturing on a neighboring mineral lease by alleging that the hydraulic fracturing fluids unlawfully drained the Plaintiff's mineral resources.⁹³ Plaintiff's case was based on the theory that hydraulic fracturing fluids entered the property and caused damage in the form of enhanced drainage of hydrocarbons from the Plaintiff's property to the Defendant's property.

In previous cases, Texas courts established that if an operator drills a well that originates on the Defendant's land but crosses underneath the surface into another person's mineral rights (a "slant well"), the neighboring landowner has a cause of action against the operator.⁹⁴ However, the court distinguished hydraulic fracturing from slant drilling because hydraulic fracturing merely enhances the flow of hydrocarbons from one mineral lease to another where it is lawfully extracted. In contrast, a slant well actually crosses into the neighbor's property, extracting the minerals directly from the neighbor.⁹⁵

Ultimately, the court ruled that drainage caused by hydraulic fracturing is not a form of trespass, but rather is permitted by the rule of capture, which under the common law allows a mineral leaseholder to collect all of the oil that it can through a well drilled on its own lease, even if the result is to drain hydrocarbons out from under another's lease.⁹⁶ As noted above, a claim for trespass in Texas requires the claimant to establish that he has been injured by the Defendant's actions.⁹⁷ Here, the Plaintiff could not show injury because damages for drainage were barred by the rule of capture.⁹⁸ Thus, the court did not have the opportunity to rule on whether the entry of hydraulic fracturing fluid into another's land that causes injury is a trespass.

Because the Court left this issue open, property owners who believe that they have been injured by hydraulic fracturing will continue to attempt to bring claims for trespass. If a Court were to rule that pumping hydraulic fracturing fluid into another's land is actionable, potential damage claims could include damages for injury to (1) groundwater/well water, (2) the subsurface mineral interest, or (3) in very unusual cases, the surface estate. The practice of horizontal drilling increases the length of the bore hole and thereby increases the area potentially affected

⁹³ In *Garza*, the parties agreed that hydraulic fracturing fluids and proppants had crossed the property line. *Garza*, 268 S.W.3d at 7. The parties disagreed on whether the "effective length" (the area where the hydraulic fracturing cracks are actually increasing production at the well) crossed the property line. *Id.* However, the distinction did not factor into the court's ruling.

⁹⁴ *Id.* at 14.

⁹⁵ *Id.*

⁹⁶ *Id.* at 13.

⁹⁷ *Id.* at 12.

⁹⁸ *Id.* at 13.

by hydraulic fracturing. In this regard, the practice of horizontal drilling may increase the sphere of potential plaintiffs who may bring an action for trespass.

Wiser, et al v. EnerVest Operating LLC and Belden & Blake Corporation, No. 3:10-cv-00794-DEP (N.D. N.Y., July 2, 2010)

In 1999 and 2000, numerous property owners entered into 10-year oil and gas lease agreements with EnerVest Operating LLC and Belden & Blake Corporation (“Defendants”). Landowners were paid \$3.00 per acre to sign and offered 12.5% royalty payments.⁹⁹ The leases were subject to an indefinite extension should drilling occur, and Defendants were required to pay annual delay rentals.

RENTAL PAYMENT – This lease is made on the condition that it will become null and void and all rights hereunder shall cease and terminate unless work for the drilling of a well is commenced on the leased premises or lands pooled herewith within ninety (90) days from the date of this lease..., or unless the Lessee shall pay to the Lessor, in advance, every twelve (12) months until work for the drilling of a well is commenced, the sum of \$_____ [calculated on the basis of number of acres] for each twelve (12) months during which the commencement of such work is delayed.

During the 10-year term, Defendants did not develop the land nor did they drill or have any operations on the properties. Seeking to extend the leases, Defendants asserted claims to the land under the “force majeure” clause of the lease. The alleged “force majeure” is New York Governor David Paterson’s 2008 moratorium on drilling, which Defendants argue exempted them from paying the delay rentals and would keep the leases open until the end of the moratorium.

On March 22, 2011, the U.S. District Court ruled for the Plaintiffs, declaring that the leases were null and void for non-payment of delay rentals under the “unless” leases.

Pollock, et al. v. Energy Corporation of America, No. 2:10-cv-01553 (W.D. Pa. Nov. 30, 2010)

This lawsuit was originally filed by ten landowners on November 22, 2010 and was amended as a class action on March 4, 2011. On September 16, 2013, U.S. Magistrate Judge Robert C. Mitchell determined that two subclasses of plaintiffs met class certification requirements: (1) landowners who allegedly had interstate pipeline charges withheld from their royalty payments and (2) landowners who allegedly had marketing fees deducted after the gas had been sold. The U.S. District Judge approved this certification on September 30, 2013.

⁹⁹ Plaintiffs alleged that, at the time of the filing of the complaint, land in the Marcellus Shale was being leased at a rate of \$5,700 to \$7,000 per acre in bonus payments and between 20% and 25% royalty payments.

In January 2013, the court partially granted ECA’s motion for summary judgment by dismissing plaintiffs’ claims that ECA used the wrong gas prices, took excessive or unauthorized expense deductions, and underpaid oil and gas royalties. As for plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment, the court ruled that ECA improperly deducted charges for interstate transportation costs incurred after ECA sold and transferred title to the gas.

On December 18, 2013, the court ordered the parties to schedule further mediation and set a status conference for March 19, 2014.

Richard L. Cain v. XTO Energy Inc. and Waco Oil & Gas Co. Inc., No. 1:11-cv-00111-IMK, (N.D. W. Va., July 22, 2011) (originally filed in the Circuit Court of Marion County, W.Va., Case No. 11-c-165, June 21, 2011)

Richard L. Cain (“Plaintiff”) filed a lawsuit in West Virginia state court on June 21, 2011 against XTO Energy Inc. (“XTO”) and Waco Oil & Gas Co. Inc. (dismissed on March 29, 2012). *Cain v. XTO Energy Inc. and Waco Oil & Gas Co. Inc., No. 11-c-165* (Circuit Court of Marion County, West Virginia, June 21, 2011). The case was removed to federal court on July 22, 2011. On March 29, 2012, the Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand was denied.

On April 26, 2012, the Plaintiff filed his First Amended Complaint where he asserts causes of action for trespass, excess user, acts and omissions beyond the contemplation of the parties, unjust enrichment, and quantum meruit, as well as seeking injunctive relief. For trespass, the Plaintiff claims that XTO has no right to (1) enter his property for any purpose relating to oil and gas exploration and production, (2) drill well bores horizontally into neighboring oil and gas tracts, (3) frac geological formations on neighboring tracts from his land, (4) pipe gas from neighboring tracts across his land, and (5) build or alter roads for any oil and gas activities.

Plaintiff’s excess user and acts and omissions beyond the contemplation of the parties claims rest on a severance deed signed in 1907. According to the Plaintiff, XTO’s use of his property exceeds any rights granted under the 1907 deed and that “XTO’s activities are beyond those in usage and custom of the natural gas industry at the time of the 1907 deed.” The Plaintiff also claims that XTO’s activities will disturb more acreage, destroy more property, create more hazards, take more time, and cause more traffic with heavy equipment than was contemplated by the parties to the 1907 deed.

For unjust enrichment, the Plaintiff seeks all of XTO’s “profits and monies obtained in contravention of Plaintiff’s rights.” Under quantum meruit, the Plaintiff “expects to be paid for the properties which XTO used and continues to use for its exclusive financial benefit.” XTO filed a Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s claims, arguing that the unjust enrichment and quantum meruit are not allowed under West Virginia law and that the excess user and contemplation claims are not recognized as independent causes of action under West Virginia law. This motion was denied on August 9, 2013.

On July 2, 2012, the Plaintiff filed a Motion to Certify Questions of Law to the Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia (“First Certification Motion”). The questions that Plaintiff sought to certify are:

Is a person who obtains a benefit by an act of trespass or conversion, by comparable interference with other protected interests in tangible property, or in the consequence of such an act by another, liable in restitution to the victim of the wrong?

May a defendant be liable for interference with real property in an amount that exceeds quantifiable injury to the property owner on the principle that restitution is justified because the advantage acquired by the wrongdoer is one that should properly have been the subject of negotiation and payment?

In addition, on that same date, the Plaintiff filed a Motion to Certify Question or In the Alternative for Partial Summary Judgment and Permanent Injunctive Relief (“Second Certification Motion”), with the question being whether XTO “has the right to use Mr. Cain’s surface for well pads, access roads, and other disturbance and operations to drill gas well bore holes into neighboring mineral tracts that did not underlie his surface at the time of the severance of his surface from the minerals, where those severance deeds expressly limit the Defendant’s rights to gas within and underlying the tract.” XTO filed its opposition to each of Plaintiff’s motions on July 16, 2012 and August 6, 2012 respectively.

In an Order dated March 28, 2013, the Court denied the First Certification Motion as not being ripe for disposition in that “the question of damages...is highly fact-specific, and the factual record on the issue of damages is, as of yet, underdeveloped.” The Court did order certification of the question raised in the Second Certification Motion as to whether the severance deed gives XTO the right to drill horizontal wells on Plaintiff’s property “in order to extract oil and gas from a shared pool of oil and gas estates.” At a hearing on May 10, 2013 and by written order dated May 16, 2013, the Court withdrew its March 28th Order, deeming that the certification to the Court of Appeals of West Virginia “is premature at this time.”

This case was settled at mediation in November 2013. On December 11, 2013, the Court granted the parties’ joint motion for an extension of time to file a draft dismissal order.

***Alexander, et al v. Chesapeake Appalachia LLC and Statoilhydro USA Onshore Properties, Inc.*, No. 3:11-cv-00308-DNH-ATB (N.D. N.Y., March 18, 2011)**

***Aukema, et al v. Chesapeake Appalachia LLC and Statoilhydro USA Onshore Properties, Inc.*, No. 3:11-cv-00489-DNH-ATB (N.D. N.Y., April 29, 2011)**

More than 250 Plaintiffs sued Chesapeake Appalachia LLC (“Chesapeake”) and Statoilhydro USA Onshore Properties, Inc. (“Statoilhydro”) (collectively, “Defendants”), complaining that the Defendants violated New York’s deceptive trade practices statutes concerning extension of the terms of approximately 200 oil and gas leases in several New York counties. One group of leases was executed in 1999 or 2000 and had a 10-year term, paying \$3.00 per acre/year, and another group of leases executed in 2004 and 2005 with a five-year term, paying \$5.00 per acre/year.¹⁰⁰ All of the leases expired. No wells were drilled on any of the properties. No oil or gas in paying quantities was ever extracted. No royalties were paid to the Plaintiffs.

As each lease expired, the Defendants filed notices and affidavits of extension of the leases claiming that continued tender of delay rentals under a “Delay in Marketing” clause maintained the leases in full force and effect. Alternatively, the Defendants claimed that under a “covenants” or “force majeure” clause, the leases were not subject to termination “due to failure to comply with obligations if compliance is prevented by federal, state, local law, regulation, or decree.” The Defendants asserted that a suspension of the granting of generic permits to use high-volume hydrofracking with horizontal drilling in the Marcellus Shale is a force majeure event which extends the leases. The Plaintiffs objected to these extensions, but encumbrances remain against their property. The Plaintiffs sought the termination of their leases and compensatory damages.

In the *Alexander* case, on March 20, 2012, the Court ordered that all Plaintiffs with arbitration clauses in their lease contracts must arbitrate their claims and that the case was stayed pending the arbitration. On February 15, 2013, the parties provided the Court with an update, explaining that no arbitration had taken place because both sides believed it was the burden of the other party to initiate the arbitration process. On February 21, 2013, the Court issued a Decision and Order, dismissing the case and directing the parties to arbitrate.

The *Aukema* case was dismissed on November 15, 2012, with the Court concluding that “the leases terminated at the conclusion of their primary terms, and Defendants cannot invoke force majeure, the doctrine of frustration of purpose, or the prescribed payments clauses to extend the leases.” This order was appealed by the Defendants and cross-appealed by the Plaintiffs to the Second Circuit, Case No. 12-5092 and Case No. 12-5108 respectively. On September 3, 2013,

¹⁰⁰ In their petition, Plaintiffs allege that in November 2008, Statoilhydro paid about \$5,800 per net acre for 32.5% of Chesapeake’s interests in the leases. Based on this, the Plaintiffs assert that the true market value of their leaseholds was approximately \$17,400 per acre.

the parties advised the Second Circuit that they had reached a settlement agreement. Chesapeake agreed to release the leases.

Koonce v. Chesapeake Exploration, LLC and CHK Utica, LLC, No. 2012CV00136 (Ohio Ct. Com. Pl., March 7, 2012)

This lawsuit was originally filed in the Court of Common Pleas, Columbiana County, Lisbon, Ohio, Cause No. 2012CV00136 on March 7, 2012, and then removed to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio on March 27, 2012 (Case No. 4:12-cv-00736-BYP). The parties filed a Stipulation to Remand on April 9, 2012, sending the case back to state court.

In the Second Amended Complaint filed on October 10, 2012, a group of approximately 50 landowners (“Plaintiffs”) sought to void their oil and gas leases with Chesapeake Exploration, LLC, CHK Utica, LLC, and Total E&P U.S.A., Inc. (collectively all three referred to as “Defendant Companies”), four land agents, five notary publics, and the Columbiana County Recorder. The Plaintiffs alleged that the Defendant Companies misrepresented environmental disruptions caused by hydraulic fracturing and concealed the land rights’ true profit potential. The Plaintiffs claimed that the land agents failed to present “truthful and accurate information” about the leases, resulting in many landowners receiving less than 1% of the fair market value for signing bonus payments. The Plaintiffs also claimed that they were tricked into signing leases without appropriate lease clauses to protect them from the risks and disruptions associated with horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing. As for the notary publics, the Plaintiffs claimed that they did not appear nor execute the leases before these officials, making the leases null and void; and then the Columbiana County Recorder incorrectly filed these void leases in the county’s deed records.

The Plaintiffs’ original leases with Anschutz Exploration Corporation were executed between 2008 and 2010, with primary terms of three to five years, continuing in effect if the Defendant Companies were conducting operations or have an active well on the land. These leases have a “fair value right” clause (or “Preferential Right to Renew” clause). This clause allowed landowners to seek fair value from a third-party offeror for the leases, with the leaseholder having the chance to match or better that third-party offer. After acquiring the leases in 2010, the Plaintiffs contend that the Defendant Companies intentionally modified this clause in order to prevent landowners from receiving third-party offers and that the Defendant Companies publicly stated they would not honor the fair value clause in the original leases. The Plaintiffs alleged that they relied on this clause when signing the leases and the Defendant Companies’ actions constituted a material breach and repudiation of the leases.

On January 25, 2012, Chesapeake Exploration LLC (“Chesapeake”) and CHK Utica LLC filed a separate declaratory judgment action¹⁰¹ concerning the “fair value right” provision. This declaratory action was filed against numerous landowners who threatened to terminate the leases unless Chesapeake matched or “bettered” third-party offers that they have received. On October 30, 2012, the Court found no ambiguity in the provision and ruled that Chesapeake has the right to match a bona fide offer and renew the lease; and if Chesapeake chose not to match the offer, the lease runs its course. This lawsuit was closed on November 20, 2012. The landowners filed appeals with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (Case Nos. 12-4466 and 12-4517). Arguments were held on August 1, 2013.

Meanwhile, in state court, on September 12, 2012, the parties in the *Koonce* case and two other cases (*Coniglio, et al v. Chesapeake Exploration LLC, et al.*, Case No. 2012CVH27102, in the Carroll County, Ohio Court of Common Pleas and *William R. Green vs. Chesapeake Exploration, et al.*, Case No. 2012CV01223, in Stark County Common Pleas Court) signed a Letter Agreement providing that, at the time of a ruling in any one of these three related cases concerning the “fair value right” provision (Paragraph 14 in the lease), all other claims filed by the parties in that case would be dismissed without prejudice to allow the “fair value right” ruling to be a final appealable order.

On November 15, 2012, in a combined opinion and order in the *Koonce* and *Coniglio* cases that denied both sides’ motions for summary judgment, the Court ruled that, “as a matter of law...paragraph 14 of the...lease gives the plaintiff-landowner-lessors a right to accept a competitor’s offer during the primary term and during the first year after all other lease rights end, if Chesapeake fails to match that competitor’s offer pursuant to paragraph 14, provided that the replacement lease cannot interfere with Chesapeake’s rights to maintain inactive speculation during the primary term, or its rights to maintain continuing operations or production under” other provisions of the lease. A final judgment was signed on January 11, 2013.

***Canaan Wildlife Preserve, Inc., et al v. Chesapeake Energy Corporation, et al.*, Case No. 2:13-cv-02064-RTD (W.D. Ark., March 6, 2013)**

In this class action lawsuit, the Plaintiffs allege that Defendants¹⁰² fraudulently skimmed \$5 million off royalty payments to thousands of oil and gas leaseholders over a 25 year period.

¹⁰¹ *Chesapeake Exploration LLC and CHK Utica, LLC v. Catlett Quality Plumbing & Heating, Inc., et al*, No. 5:12-cv-00188 (N.D. Ohio, Jan. 25, 2012), on appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 6th Circuit, Case No. 12-4466 and Case No. 12-4517, filed Dec. 6, 2012 and Dec. 17, 2012 respectively, consolidated on May 1, 2013. The case was argued before the 6th Circuit on August 1, 2013. On October 30, 2013, the 6th Circuit ruled that the landowners had no right to terminate Chesapeake’s oil and gas leases if the company refused to match third-party offers to lease the land. See *Chesapeake Exploration LLC and CHK Utica, LLC v. Catlett Quality Plumbing & Heating, Inc., et al*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 156169, 2012 WL 5364259 (N.D. Ohio Oct. 30, 2012).

¹⁰² Chesapeake Energy Corporation, Chesapeake Operating, Inc., Chesapeake Energy Marketing, Inc. Chesapeake Midstream Operation, LLC, Arkansas Midstream Gas Services Corp., Chesapeake Midstream Gas Services, LLC,

They claim that the Defendants underpaid royalties, added fraudulent fees and charges to billing statements, misreported gas volume purchases, and paid less than the materials were actually worth. They seek more than \$5,000,000 in damages.

In a motion to dismiss, the Defendants argue that Plaintiffs do not allege that any particular Defendant has caused them harm, only that they have been injured by “one of more Defendants.” On October 1, 2013, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendations denying the motion, finding that the Plaintiffs had sufficiently stated their claims. The Defendants have objected to the Magistrate’s report and recommendations.

May, et al. v. BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville) LLC, No. 4:13-cv-0494 (E.D. Ark., August 23, 2013)

This is a class action lawsuit in which Plaintiffs allege that, by failing to drill more than one well per lease, BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville) LLC (“BHP Billiton”) breached an implied covenant requiring an oil and gas lessee to act with reasonable diligence to develop the lease. Plaintiffs seek cancellation of the leases.

BHP Billiton has filed a motion to dismiss and to strike class allegations, arguing that the Plaintiffs’ claims are barred by the terms of the leases which contain language that is inconsistent with the implied covenant of reasonable development. The leases state that the leases will remain in effect according to their terms so long as production continues on the property, notwithstanding any other contractual provision, whether express or implied, to the contrary. BHP Billiton asserts that, since it drilled at least one producing well on each leased property, the terms of the lease are satisfied.

Demchak Partners Limited Partnership, et al. v. Chesapeake Appalachia, L.L.C., No. 3:13-cv-02289 (M.D. Pa. Aug. 30, 2013)

In October 2012, the class action Plaintiffs confronted Chesapeake Appalachia LLC (“Chesapeake”) with allegations that Chesapeake violated leases by deducting from their royalty checks post-production costs for gathering, dehydration and compression of the gas taken from their property. Plaintiffs argued that their leases contained a “Market Enhancement Clause,” which expressly precluded Chesapeake from charging them for transforming the gas into its “marketable” form or make the gas ready for sale or use, but would allow Chesapeake to deduct a pro-rata share of these costs after the gas had been placed in a marketable form or is ready for sale or use. Plaintiffs contended that the gas is not actually “marketable” until it meets the quality and pressure specifications of the interstate pipeline into which it is delivered; and that, by deducting costs that were incurred prior to the gas entering the transmission pipeline, Chesapeake underpaid the royalties due under the lease. In opposition, Chesapeake contended

BP America Production Company, BP Energy Company, BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville), LLC, BHP Billiton Petroleum (Arkansas), Inc., and BHP Billiton Marketing, Inc.

that the gas produced or to be produced under plaintiffs' leases was marketable at the wellhead and thus was entitled to make the deductions.

With an arbitration clause in the leases, the parties hired retired Judge Edward N. Cahn, a mediator with Blank Room LLP, to help settle the questions raised. Judge Cahn met with the parties on June 18, 2013, and then for more than two months negotiated with each side to reach a proposed \$7.5 million settlement. On August 30, 2013, the plaintiffs filed their Class Action Complaint and the Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. The proposed settlement agreement requires Chesapeake to pay the class action plaintiffs 55% of post-production costs for gathering, dehydration and compression prior to September 1, 2013 and 27.5% of post-production costs until the effective date of the settlement. After the settlement is approved, Chesapeake will implement a revised royalty calculation methodology that provides a 27.5% reduction in costs for gathering, dehydration, and compression borne by the class action plaintiffs. These plaintiffs will continue to bear 100%, on a pro-rata basis, of the transportation costs that are incurred after the gas has entered the interconnect point of a transmission pipeline.

Note that, after many discussions in the Pennsylvania legislature, on July 9, 2013, Governor Tom Corbett signed into law S.B. 259 which requires royalty check "transparency." Royalty check statements must provide a range of details, including well identification information, the price received per barrel, Mcf or gallon, the net value of total sales after deductions, the owners' percent of interest in production and share of the total value of the sales prior to deductions, and the total amount of taxes and deductions permitted under the lease.

***Wisdahl, et al. v. XTO Energy, Inc.*, Case No. 53-2013-cv-01188 (In District Court of Williams County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00136, on Nov. 15, 2013**

***Wisdahl, et al. v. Crescent Point Energy U.S. Corp.*, Case No. 53-2013-cv-01189 (In District Court of Williams County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00139, on Nov. 15, 2013**

***Miller Family Partnership, et al. v. HRC Operating, LLC*, Case No. 53-2013-cv-01190 (In District Court of Williams County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00137, on Nov. 15, 2013**

***Sorenson, et al. v. Burlington Resources Oil & Gas Company, LP*, Case No. 27-2013-cv-00242 (In District Court of McKenzie County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00132, on Nov. 14, 2013**

***Singer, et al. v. Statoil Oil & Gas LP*, Case No. 27-2013-cv-00243 (In District Court of McKenzie County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00138 on Nov. 15, 2013**

Kummer, et al. v. Continental Resources, Inc., Case No. 27-2013-cv-00244 (In District Court of McKenzie County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00135, on Nov. 15, 2013

Border Farm Trust, et al. v. SM Energy Company, Case No. 27-2013-cv-00245 (In District Court of McKenzie County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00140, on Nov. 15, 2013

Border Farm Trust, et al. v. Samson Resources Company, Case No. 12-2013-cv-00067 (In District Court of Divide County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00141, on Nov. 15, 2013

Vogel, et al. v. WPX Energy Williston, LLC, Case No. 31-2013-cv-00162 (In District Court of Mountrail County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00133, on Nov. 15, 2013

Vogel, et al. v. Marathon Oil Company, Case No. 31-2013-cv-00163 (In District Court of Mountrail County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District)

Ten class actions were filed in North Dakota by mineral owners alleging lost income due to the flaring of natural gas by various oil and gas producers, including XTO Energy, Burlington Resources Oil and Gas, Continental Resources, Crescent Point Energy, HRC Operating, Marathon Oil, Samson Resources, SM Energy, Statoil, and WPX Energy.

The lawsuits allege that the producers have violated several North Dakota Industrial Commission rules relating to flaring and paying royalties for flared gas. After an oil well begins to produce, North Dakota allows limited flaring during the first year. After one year, the producer must apply for a written exemption for any future flaring. If the producer does not ask for the exemption, royalties and state taxes on the flared gas must be paid. The lawsuits allege that these various producers have flared gas without the proper authorization and therefore, owe royalties on “(a) gas flared from a well one year after the first production without applying for and obtaining a flaring exemption; (b) gas flared from a well within the first year of production under an order issued by the Industrial Commission limiting the maximum barrels of oil to be produced per day until the well is connected to a gathering system and processing plant...; and (c) gas flared within the first year of production even though the operator reported the well was physically connected to a gathering system and processing plant.” The Plaintiffs claim that they lost millions of dollars in royalties due to producers’ practice of burning off large quantities of gas rather than selling it.

Lawsuits Brought by Citizens, States, and Environmental Groups

Hamblet v. James Martin, in his official capacity as Director, Office of Oil and Gas, West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection; Office of Oil and Gas, West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection; and EQT Production Company, Case No. 10-P-15 (Circuit Court of Doddridge County, W. Va., May 21, 2010)

EQT Production Company (“EQT”) holds a valid oil and gas lease executed in 1905 which encompasses the property owned by Matthew Hamblet. On March 22, 2010, EQT filed a permit application with the West Virginia Office of Oil and Gas of the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (“WVDEP”) to drill a shallow well with a “horizontal leg into the Marcellus” Shale formation. As part of the permit application, EQT provided notice to the surface owners, including Hamblet. On April 7, 2010, Hamblet submitted comments to the WVDEP in which he complained of prior damage and disturbance to his property from at least four other wells in the area. He further complained that the erosion and sediment control plan was inadequate and that the proximity of drilling waste to surface water presented a failure to protect fresh water resources. Thereafter, EQT submitted additional information in response to Hamblet’s comments. The WVDEP conducted an inspection of the site and found that all the application requirements were satisfied.

On May 21, 2010, Hamblet filed his “Petition for Appeal of Issuance of a Well Permit,” seeking to nullify the drilling permit and stating that the state regulators had not done enough to protect his land and environment. He asserted that EQT’s personnel are “driving around and off the access roads, parking in the meadows in an unorganized way, taking more time than is reasonably necessary to construct the well site, leaving chemicals and trash all over the ground, allowing for the silting of creeks which washes away meadow and destroys creek life and habitat.”

The WVDEP and EQT filed motions to dismiss, arguing that Hamblet did not have the right to appeal the issuance of the permit under any relevant statutory authority. While the Circuit Court concluded that Hamblet did have the right to appeal, it also granted the defendants’ request to submit its ruling to the Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia. In answer to the certified question, the appeals court determined that surface owners have no statutorily-defined right to seek judicial review with respect to a permit issued by the WVDEP.

Ouachita Watch League, et al v. Judith L. Henry, Forest Supervisor, Ozark-St. Francis National Forests. United States Forest Service, et al, No. 4:11-cv-425 (E.D. Ark., May 19, 2011)

The Plaintiffs consist of individual citizens residing in Arkansas and several not-for-profit organizations established for “enjoyment, protection, and preservation of the environment and natural resources,” including the Ozark-St. Francis National Forest and Greers Ferry Lake in

Arkansas. Seeking an injunction to prevent any additional wells from being drilled in the forest and lake area, the Plaintiffs assert that the United States Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, United States Army Corps of Engineers, United States Department of Agriculture, United States Department of the Interior, and their directors and managers (“collectively “Defendants”) failed to comply with the National Forest Management Act, the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands, the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”), and the rules and regulations implementing NEPA issued by the White House Council on Environmental Quality when the Defendants approved oil and gas exploration activities in or under the lake on September 21, 2010, in a Supplemental Information Report (“SIR”).

Ruling on Plaintiffs’ discovery motions, the Court ordered Defendants to produce the administrative record of documents and information leading to the SIR. Defendants filed the administrative record on December 14, 2012 and then a supplement to that record on November 18, 2013. Currently pending before the Court is Defendants’ motion to dismiss.

***State of New York v. United States Army Corps of Engineers, et al*; No. 1:11-cv-02599 (E.D.N.Y., May 31, 2011)**

***Delaware Riverkeeper Network, et al v. United States Army Corps of Engineers, et al*; No. 1:11-cv-03780 (E.D.N.Y., Aug. 4, 2011)**

***State of New York v. United States Army Corps of Engineers, et al*; No. 1:11-cv-03857 (E.D.N.Y., Aug. 10, 2011)**

In all three lawsuits (which were consolidated for pre-trial purposes), the Plaintiffs¹⁰³ sought to compel the Defendants¹⁰⁴ to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (“NEPA”) by requiring them to prepare and make available for public comment a draft environmental impact statement (“EIS”) before proceeding to adopt federal regulations to be administered by the Delaware River Basin Commission (“DRBC”) that would authorize natural

¹⁰³ In the first *State of New York* case, the Plaintiff is the State of New York. In the second *State of New York* lawsuit, the Plaintiffs are the State of New York and Damascus Citizens for Sustainability, Inc. In the *Delaware Riverkeeper Network* case, the Plaintiffs are Delaware Riverkeeper Network, Inc., Delaware Riverkeeper, Inc., the Hudson Riverkeeper, and National Parks Conservation Associations.

¹⁰⁴ In both *State of New York* cases, the Defendants are the United States Army Corps of Engineers; Colonel Christopher Larsen, in his official capacity as Division Engineer, North Atlantic Division of the United States Army Corps of Engineers; United States Fish and Wildlife Service; Rowan W. Gould, in his official capacity as Acting Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; United States National Park Service; Jonathan B. Jarvis, in his official capacity as Director of the United States National Park Service; United States Department of the Interior; Kenneth Salazar, in his official capacity as Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior; United States Environmental Protection Agency; Lisa Jackson, in her official capacity as Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency; Delaware River Basin Commission; and Carol Collier, in her official capacity as Executive Director of the Delaware River Basin Commission. In the *Delaware Riverkeeper Network*, the Defendants are the United States Army Corps of Engineers; Brig. Gen. Peter A. DeLuca, Division Engineer, North Atlantic Division of the United States Army Corps of Engineers; the Delaware River Basin Commission; and Carol Collier, in her official capacity as Executive Director of the Delaware River Basin Commission.

gas development within the Basin.¹⁰⁵ The DRBC anticipates between 15,000 and 18,000 natural gas wells to be developed using hydraulic fracturing within the Basin. The Delaware River Basin comprises 13,539 square miles, draining parts of New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. The Upper Delaware River within the Basin serves as the primary source of clean unfiltered drinking water for 9,000,000 New Yorkers each day and is federally designated as a scenic and recreational river by the United States Park Service.

On June 4, 2012, the Defendants filed motions to dismiss, arguing lack of subject matter jurisdiction, Plaintiffs’ lack of standing, actions not ripe for adjudication, and inapplicability of NEPA to these Defendants. The Court granted these motions on September 24, 2012 and dismissed all three lawsuits.

San Juan Citizens Alliance; Colorado Environmental Coalition, Colorado Wild; Oil and Gas Accountability Project, and The Wildness Society v. Mark Stiles, in his official capacity as San Juan National Forest Supervisor and BLM Center Manager of the San Juan Public Lands Center; et al.¹⁰⁶; 654 F.3d 1038 (10th Cir. 2011)

The lawsuit filed by several environmental groups (“Plaintiffs”) concerns the Northern San Juan Coal Bed Methane Project (“Project”), which was approved by the federal government Defendants. The Project contemplates the construction of numerous gas wells within the San Juan National Forest and other federal lands. The Plaintiffs claim that the 2007 Record of Decision (“ROD”) approving the Project was unlawful, that the ROD-approved wells violated the Forest’s standards and guidelines protecting riparian areas, and that the environmental impact statement (“EIS”) assessing the Project’s environmental consequences was not adequate under the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”).

The District Court ruled in favor of the Defendants. The Plaintiffs appealed this decision to the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals. The Court of Appeals determined that the Plaintiffs’ claims were not ripe, that the Project was inconsistent with the Forest’s plan and guidelines, and that Plaintiffs’ NEPA claims were rejected on the merits.

¹⁰⁵ In addition to the Plaintiffs and Defendants, numerous groups have intervened on behalf of defendants (American Petroleum Institute, the Independent Petroleum Association of America, and the US Oil & Gas Association) and/or have filed amicus briefs (the City of New York, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, and Susquehanna River Basin Commission).

¹⁰⁶ Other defendants are Rick Cables, in his official capacity as Regional Forester of the Rocky Mountain Region of the United States Forest Service; United States Forest Service; Thomas Vilsack, in his official capacity as Secretary of the Department of Agriculture; United States Bureau of Land Management; and Kenneth Salazar, in his official capacity as Secretary of the Department of Interior.

Citizens for Pennsylvania’s Future v. Ultra Resources, Inc., No. 4:11-cv-01360-RDM (M.D. Pa. July 21, 2011)

Citizens for Pennsylvania’s Future (“Plaintiff”) seeks declaratory and injunctive relief from Ultra Resources, Inc.’s (“Defendant”) alleged violations of the Clean Air Act (“CAA”) (42 U.S.C. § 7604(a)(3)), Pennsylvania’s Implementation Plan (“SIP”), and Pennsylvania’s New Source Review Regulations, 25 Pa. Code Chapter 127, Subchapter E. Plaintiff alleges that since 2008 the Defendant has operated an extensive network of natural gas wells, pipelines, compressor stations, and associated equipment without obtaining all the necessary permits and without achieving the lowest achievable emissions rate as required by Pennsylvania’s regulations. Plaintiff claims that the environment has been and is being damaged by large amounts of nitrogen oxides and related pollution that create fine particulate matter in the atmosphere.

Arguing that it obtained all the appropriate permits from the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Defendant has filed a motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, asserting that the Plaintiff’s claims should be heard by the Pennsylvania Environmental Hearing Board. The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection has filed an *amicus curiae* brief in support of the Defendant’s motion. The motion to dismiss was denied on September 24, 2012.

A Case Management Order set a fact discovery deadline of November 30, 2013. Dispositive motions are to be filed by February 28, 2014. Plaintiff must designate experts by March 14, 2014, with Defendant’s designation due by April 15, 2014.

The Ozark Society v. United States Forest Service; Judith Henry, Supervisor of the Ozark-St. Francis National Forest; the Bureau of Land Management; John Lyon, Eastern States Director, Bureau of Land Management; and Bruce Dawson, Eastern States Field Manager, Bureau of Land Management; No. 4:11-cv-00782 (E.D. Ark., October 31, 2011)

The Ozark Society (“Plaintiff”), a non-profit corporation with over 850 dues-paying members, describes its mission as conservation, education, and recreation. In the complaint, the Plaintiff states that its members utilize the Ozark National Forest’s wilderness areas and wild and scenic rivers for hiking, boating, and other outdoor activities. The Plaintiff asserts that the United States Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and their directors and managers (“collectively “Defendants”) failed to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) and other federal environmental and procedural statutes in approving gas leases for exploration and development in the Ozark National Forest. More than 60 gas wells have been drilled in the forests, with many more anticipated, creating a number of environmental impacts including the construction of roads, increased traffic, storage of drilling fluids, noise, venting gas, storm water runoff, and increased water usage for hydraulic fracturing use.

The Plaintiff sought an injunction stopping all natural gas exploration and development in the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests. On March 1, 2012, the Court heard arguments on the preliminary injunction. In denying the injunction on March 23, 2012, the Court found that the Plaintiff failed to establish that it is likely to succeed on the merits or that it likely will suffer irreparable harm absent preliminary relief.

On November 2, 2012, this case was re-assigned to the Court handling the *Ouachita Watch League* lawsuit, *supra*. See *Ouachita Watch League* lawsuit, *supra* for current status.

Center for Biological Diversity and Sierra Club v. The Bureau of Land Management and Ken Salazar, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, No. 5:11-cv-06174 (N.D. Cal., December 8, 2011)

The Center for Biological Diversity and the Sierra Club (“Plaintiffs”) filed this lawsuit to overturn the Bureau of Land Management’s “illegal and unwise lease sale” to allow oil and gas development on sensitive California lands without analyzing the full environmental effects of such development. The Plaintiffs claim violations of the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) and the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (“MLA”).

NEPA requires the preparation of an environmental impact statement (“EIS”) to consider the effects of each activity on the properties while the MLA requires the lessee to conduct its operations using all reasonable precautions to prevent waste of oil or gas developed in the land. Expressing concern about endangered species living in the area (San Joaquin kit fox, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, steelhead trout, and the California condor), the “highly controversial and dangerous drilling method” of hydraulic fracturing, and the impacts of oil spills, habitat contamination, and methane leaks, the Plaintiffs argue in their motion for summary judgment that the Bureau of Land Management (“BLM”) failed to consider and fully analyze the impacts of oil and gas development on the area in its environmental assessment (“EA”) and in its finding of no significant impact.. Plaintiffs want the leases set aside. BLM countered in a cross-motion for summary judgment that it was premature to evaluate the impacts at this stage, that the impacts must be evaluated in the site-specific assessments conducted in relation to applications for permits to drill.

On March 31, 2013, U.S. Magistrate Judge Paul S. Grewal ruled that the BLM violated NEPA by leasing land for oil and gas extraction without assessing the risks posed by hydraulic fracturing. He stated that NEPA required federal agencies to conduct the impact review at the earliest possible time to allow for proper consideration of environmental values. The BLM unreasonably relied on an earlier single-well development scenario and failed to take into account all reasonably foreseeable effects of its actions in categorically refusing to consider the effects of hydraulic fracturing. The BLM could not shirk its NEPA responsibilities by labeling discussion of hydraulic fracturing as a “crystal ball” inquiry. Therefore, Magistrate Judge Grewal ruled that the BLM failed to conduct the “hard look” analysis required by NEPA by

dismissing any development scenario involving hydraulic fracturing when used in combination with technologies such as horizontal drilling. The EA and the finding of no significant impact were found to be erroneous as a matter of law.

The Court ordered the parties to meet and confer and submit to the court an appropriate judgment on remedy issues. On September 16, 2013, the parties advised the Court that they had reached a tentative resolution. The parties are working to finalize the settlement and are to report back to the Court on January 17, 2014.

Powder River Basin Resource Council, Wyoming Outdoor Council, and National Wildlife Federation v. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Kenneth Salazar in his official capacity as Secretary of the Interior, Mike Pool in his official capacity as Acting Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Donald Simpson in his official capacity as Wyoming State Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and Duane Spencer in his official capacity as the Buffalo Field Office Manager of the Bureau of Land Management, Case No. 1:12-cv-00996 (D.C. June 19, 2012)

Environmentalists have sued the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (and affiliated government officials) over the approval of a resource management plan that they claim will endanger elk and other wildlife in Wyoming’s Powder River Basin area which contains more than 100,000 acres of remote and steep terrain called the Fortification Creek Planning Area. They request the court to void and suspend all approved and future natural gas drilling activities in the Powder River Basin area until the Bureau is brought into compliance with the National Energy Protection Act. According to the complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief, the Bureau failed to “take a hard look at direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to the environment” of its oil and gas development plan; failed to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or to justify its decision to forego an EIS; failed to provide a reasonable basis for comparatively analyzing and choosing between alternatives; and failed to comply with its duty to take a hard look at potentially significant new circumstances and information and to prepare a supplemental NEPA analysis. The State of Wyoming and Lance Oil & Gas Company (who holds federal leases) have intervened in the lawsuit.

On October 26, 2012, the court ordered the Federal Defendants, the State of Wyoming, and Lance Oil to notify all parties of “any ground-disturbing activity (spudding)” that will take place on certain well sites. In July 2013, three notices of ground-disturbing activity were filed. Currently pending before the court are Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment, and Defendants’ cross-motions.

Sierra Club, et al. v. The Village of Painted Post, et al., Index No. 2012-0810CV, In the State of New York, Supreme Court, County of Steuben (June 25, 2012)

The Sierra Club, People for a Healthy Environment, Inc., Coalition to Protect New York, and several residents of Painted Post and other surrounding towns (“Plaintiffs”) filed suit to prevent the transportation of water from the municipal water system to gas drilling sites in Pennsylvania “until such time as Respondents shall have fully complied with the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act, Environmental Conservation Law,” the New York State Water Supply Law, and other state and federal statutes. The Plaintiffs complain that the Village “failed to consider even one of the significant adverse environmental impacts of water transports from the proposed water loading facility” and that the Village failed to adequately prepare the Environmental Assessment Form required to be filed with the State by not identifying potential significant adverse environmental consequences, including the significant increase in truck traffic, noise, and depletion of water supplies.

The Village signed a five-year agreement with a Shell subsidiary, allowing the company to withdraw over 1 million gallons of water per day from a local aquifer. In return, the Village would make a minimum of \$3.2 million. The water shipping stopped in September 2012 due to a slowdown in drilling/fracking operations in Pennsylvania.

A hearing on the injunction request was held on March 1, 2013. On March 25, 2013, the Judge issued his decision, voiding the agreement and enjoining any further shipments because the Village had not done the required environmental review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act. This decision is on appeal (Case No. 13-01558) to the state’s Supreme Court’s Appellate Division, Fourth Department in Rochester, New York, with an oral argument scheduled for February 24, 2014.

Center for Biological Diversity, Earthworks, Environmental Working Group, and Sierra Club v. California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, and DOES I through X, Case No. RG12652054, In the Superior Court for the State of California for the City and County of Alameda (October 16, 2012)

The Plaintiffs who are several well-known environmental groups want a declaratory judgment and an injunction prohibiting any new oil and gas permit approvals until the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (“DOGGR”) “complies with its legal requirements to evaluate and mitigate the significant environmental and public health impacts caused by hydraulic fracturing.” The Plaintiffs claim that the DOGGR has issued permits “without any environmental analysis” of “contamination of domestic and agricultural water supplies, the use of massive amounts of water, the emission of hazardous air pollutants, and the potential for induced seismic activity” allegedly created by hydraulic fracturing.

Western States Petroleum Association (“WSPA”), the California Independent Petroleum Association, and the Independent Oil Producers Agency have intervened as defendants in the lawsuit.

On October 21, 2013, WSPA filed a motion to dismiss citing the provisions of California’s new hydraulic fracturing law (S.B. 4).¹⁰⁷ WSPA argues that the complaint is now irrelevant because the law requires the DOGGR “to conduct an EIR [environmental impact report] addressing any potential environmental impacts from hydraulic fracturing in the state” by July 15, 2015. According to WSPA, the law releases oil and gas companies from any need to go through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) until the EIR is completed. The DOGGR has filed pleadings concurring with WSPA, stating that “the regulatory framework adopted in S.B. 4, including new provisions for well stimulation permits and for environmental review, render plaintiff’s claims regarding the Department’s alleged past pattern and practices for environmental review of hydraulic fracturing moot.”

A hearing on the pending motions is scheduled for January 13, 2014.

Center for Biological Diversity and Sierra Club v. The Bureau of Land Management and Sally Jewell, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, No. 5:13-cv-01749 (N.D. Cal., April 18, 2013)

The Center for Biological Diversity and the Sierra Club have sued the Bureau of Land Management (“BLM”), claiming that the BLM violated the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by leasing nearly 18,000 acres for oil and gas development without assessing the risks posed by hydraulic fracturing. As in Case No. 5:11-cv-06174, *Center for Biological Diversity v. The Bureau of Land Management, supra.*, the groups assert that a detailed environmental impact study (EIS) was needed to investigate how potential hydraulic fracturing could affect the local groundwater and endangered species living in the area. They allege that the BLM unreasonably and arbitrarily relied on an environmental assessment that only looked at the environmental impact of a single well on one acre of land, even though the lease covered almost 18,000 acres.

As a related case, this lawsuit was reassigned to the U.S. Magistrate Judge handling Case No. 5:11-cv-06174, *Center for Biological Diversity v. The Bureau of Land Management, supra.* On September 16, 2013, the parties advised the Court that they had reached a tentative resolution and would file dismissal papers or provide the Court with a status report by January 17, 2014.

¹⁰⁷ See <http://legiscan.com/CA/bill/SB4/2013>.

Litigation Involving Enforcement

In Re U.S. Energy Development Corp., File No. 11-57 (New York Department of Environmental Conservation, filed Jan. 24, 2012)

U.S. Energy Development Corporation (“EDC”) is a privately owned oil and natural gas exploration and development company with oil and gas drilling operations in McKean County, Pennsylvania and in a watershed that contains Yeager Brook which flows into New York. The New York Department of Environmental Conservation (“NYDEC”) filed a complaint against EDC, seeking an order requiring EDC to pay \$187,500 for water quality violations associated with fracking activities. These violations include contamination problems associated with poor storm water controls around the roads used to access the wells. NYDEC seeks the maximum penalty because of EDP’s failure to comply with two previous consent orders from August and November 2010.

EDP filed a motion to dismiss the complaint, arguing that there was no subject matter jurisdiction because the Clean Water Act preempted the application of New York law to an out-of-state source of water pollution. On August 23, 2013, the Administrative Law Judge denied EDP’s motion and also dismissed many of EDP’s affirmative defenses, pointing to the fact that EDP made the business decision to settle with the NYDEC despite knowing of the federal preemption defense. Therefore, the Judge concluded that EDP voluntarily consented to New York’s standards to resolve the claims.

Litigation Challenging Government Regulations

Independent Petroleum Association of America and U.S. Oil & Gas Association v. United States Environmental Protection Agency, No. 10-1233 (D.C. Aug. 12, 2010)

The Independent Petroleum Association of America and U.S. Oil & Gas Association (“Plaintiffs”) filed this lawsuit against the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”), seeking review of a statement made on the EPA’s website that any service company performing hydraulic fracturing using diesel fuel must receive prior authorization from the Underground Injection Control (“UIC”) program and that injection wells using diesel fuel as a hydraulic fracturing additive are Class II wells under the UIC program.

The parties settled on February 23, 2012, when the EPA agreed to modify its on-line statement to read that “[a]ny service company that performs hydraulic fracturing using diesel fuel must receive prior authorization through a permit under the applicable UIC program. For more information on how the UIC regulations apply to hydraulic fracturing using diesel fuels, please see EPA’s Guidance issued for public comment...” It was agreed that another paragraph on the website would read: “State oil and gas agencies may have additional regulations for hydraulic fracturing. In addition, states or EPA have authority under the Clean Water Act to regulate

discharge of produced waters from hydraulic fracturing operations.” This lawsuit was voluntarily dismissed on May 10, 2012.

Coalition for Responsible Growth and Resource Conservation, et al v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, No. 12-566 (2nd Cir., Feb. 28, 2012)

The Coalition for Responsible Growth and Resource Conservation, Damascus Citizens for Sustainability, and the Sierra Club (“Plaintiffs”) sought to overturn the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“FERC”) approval of Central New York Oil and Gas Company LLC’s proposal to construct and operate a 39 mile long pipeline with related facilities, including compressors, to transport gas from Pennsylvania’s Marcellus Shale formation. Plaintiffs asserted that FERC did not properly consider the environmental impact and ecological damage that the pipeline would have on the areas where the pipeline would be constructed and operated.¹⁰⁸

Plaintiffs petitioned the Second Circuit Court of Appeals to review FERC’s order and to stay any pipeline construction pending a hearing. The Second Circuit denied the request for a stay but agreed to an expedited briefing and argument schedule for the Plaintiffs’ petition for review. On June 12, 2012, the Second Circuit denied the petition for review, stating that FERC’s 296-page environmental assessment thoroughly considered the issues and that FERC reasonably concluded that the cumulative impacts of development in the Marcellus Shale region were not sufficiently causally related to the project to warrant a more in-depth analysis.

Litigation Challenging Disclosure Regulations

Powder River Basin Resource Council, Wyoming Outdoor Council, Earthworks, and OMB Watch v. Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission, Case No. 94650, In the Seventh Judicial District Court of the State of Wyoming, in and for the County of Natrona; March 22, 2012

The four environmental group Plaintiffs in this lawsuit assert that the Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission has unlawfully withheld the identification of hydraulic fracturing chemicals used by various oil and gas producers, including Baker Hughes, BJ Services Company, CESI Chemical, Champion Technologies, Core Laboratories, Halliburton Energy Services, Inc., NALCO Company, SNF, Inc., and Weatherford International, under the trade secret exception of its disclosure rules. Plaintiffs complain that the oil and gas producers did not provide sufficient factual support to uphold their claim of trade secret and want all the chemicals publicly disclosed. Halliburton Energy Services, Inc., who intervened in this litigation, warned that uncovering the hydraulic fracturing formula could hamstring project development efforts in the state.

¹⁰⁸ The Pennsylvania Game Commissioner has described the area through which the pipeline would be built as undisturbed forest habitat “where the abundance and species richness of various area-sensitive forest bird species are among the highest in the state.”

On March 21, 2013, the Court ruled that the Commissioner “acted reasonably when he established a policy for evaluating trade secret requests and that policy is in accordance with the Wyoming Public Records Act” and that the Plaintiffs failed to demonstrate that the Commissioner’s “decisions to grant trade secret protection requests were arbitrary, capricious, or not in accordance with the law.” The Commission’s decision to withhold the hydraulic fracturing formula information was upheld by the Court. In its conclusion, the Court expressed its awareness of the “important issues of public policy” implicated in the parties’ positions. The Plaintiffs’ position that the “identity of hydraulic fracturing chemicals is key to understanding the potential environmental and health impacts of hydraulic fracturing” and the Defendant’s position that hydraulic fracturing has a positive economic impact on Wyoming and that disclosure would adversely affect the industry have “substantial merit, however the Court feels these competing concerns are best addressed through legislative action, or further rule promulgation and are not properly within the Court’s purview.” The Court’s order is now on appeal in the Wyoming Supreme Court (Case No. S-13-0120).

Wyoming’s hydraulic fracturing disclosure rules require owners, operators or service companies to disclose to the Commission the chemical additives, compounds and concentrations or rates proposed to be mixed and injected. Wyo. Oil & Gas Comm’n Ch. 3, § 45 (d)-(f). The required information includes additive type, compound name and Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) numbers, and proposed rate or concentration for each additive. The Commission retains discretion to request the formulary disclosure for the chemical compounds. However, this formulary information only needs to be disclosed to the Commission and confidentiality protection shall be provided for trade secrets. Before granting trade secret exemptions, the Commission requires the party seeking the exemption to submit details of the chemicals whose identities they want to withhold, along with a cover letter justifying their trade secret position. The Commission staff then reviews the chemical information and the justification to ensure compliance with the disclosure rule and the Wyoming Public Records Act. If there is compliance, the Commission withholds the information.

Dr. Alfonso Rodriguez v. Michael L. Krancer, in his official capacity as Secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection; Robert F. Powelson, in his official capacity as Chairman of the Public Utility Commission; and Linda L. Kelly, in her official capacity as Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Case No. 3:12-cv-01458, (M.D. Pa. July 27, 2012

On February 14, 2012, the Pennsylvania Governor signed into law Act 13 of 2012 which regulates the disclosure of hydraulic fracturing chemical components. Section 3222.1(b)(10) of the Act requires that companies engaged in hydraulic fracturing disclose information regarding chemicals used in the process to medical providers contingent on the medical provider agreeing to keep certain proprietary information confidential.

A vendor, service company or operator shall identify the specific identity and amount of any chemicals claimed to be a trade secret or confidential proprietary information to any health professional who requests the information in writing if the health professional executes a confidentiality agreement and provides a written statement of need for the information indicating all of the following: (i) the information is needed for the purpose of diagnosis or treatment of an individual; (ii) the individual being diagnosed or treated may have been exposed to a hazardous chemical; and (iii) knowledge of information will assist in the diagnosis or treatment of an individual.

Section 3222.1(b)(11) imposes similar disclosure requirements on the oil and gas industry in emergency situations contingent on oral representations of the medical provider where it is not feasible to obtain immediate written agreement to Act 13's confidentiality provisions.

In his lawsuit, Dr. Alfonso Rodriguez ("Plaintiff"), a licensed medical physician "who has treated patients that have been exposed to toxic fluids and/or environmental contamination caused by oil and gas operations," complained that the "medical gag" provisions of Pennsylvania's Act 13 of 2012 improperly restricts his First Amendment freedom of speech rights. He argued that the "practice of medicine requires a free and open exchange of questions, answers and information between" the doctor and the patient, medical community, researchers and insurance companies, among others. Plaintiff sought an injunction from requiring him to sign any confidentiality agreement.

On October 23, 2013, the court granted Defendants' motions to dismiss, ruling that Plaintiff lacked standing because his "alleged injury...is too conjectural to satisfy the injury in fact requirement of [U.S. Constitution] Article III standing." "Plaintiff has not alleged that he has been in a position where he was required to agree to any sort of confidentiality agreement under the act. Therefore...he has not yet...been prevented from engaging in any sort of communication as a result of the act. Similarly, plaintiff has failed to indicate that he has been forced to waive any of his fundamental constitutional rights."

Litigation Involving Antitrust Issues

Cherry Canyon Resources, L.P. v. Halliburton Company, et al., Case No. 2:13-cv-00238, In the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division

On July 31, 2013, Cherry Canyon Resources, L.P. filed a federal class action lawsuit against Halliburton Co., Schlumberger Ltd., and Baker Hughes, Inc., claiming that these companies conspired to raise prices for hydraulic fracturing services and limit competition in the market for fracking pressure pumping services. According to the complaint, Cherry Canyon purchased pressure pumping services from one or more of the defendants who control approximately 60% of the North American market of fracking services. Cherry Canyon alleges that in 2011, after

many new, small competitors entered the industry and threatened to drive down prices, these "Defendants colluded to restrict and manipulate supply in order to increase prices and market share toward their pre-entry 'boom year' levels.," referring to the period before competitors entered the market. "They succeeded." Cherry Canyon believes that these companies participated in "meetings, conversations and communications" where they agreed on prices and output, and later held similar meetings to enforce the illegal agreements.

This complaint was filed in the wake of confirmation by the Department of Justice that in May, Baker Hughes and Halliburton received civil investigative demands concerning an antitrust investigation regarding their pressure pumping services.

On October 15, 2013, the court signed a final judgment, dismissing the lawsuit without prejudice on the motion for voluntary dismissal filed by Cherry Canyon

Settlements Involving Hydraulic Fracturing and Shale Drilling

Settlement with Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation (related to *Fiorentino* case)

A settlement related to the *Fiorentino* matter was reported on December 16, 2010, when the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection ("PDEP") announced a resolution of its action against Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation. The action by PDEP was related to claims that 19 resident families' water wells were allegedly affected by methane contamination as a result of nearby drilling activities. The families collectively were entitled to receive \$4.1 million in compensation and other concessions, and a \$500,000 penalty was to be paid to the PDEP. The settlement allows Cabot to continue its hydraulic fracturing operations, and the families were allowed to maintain their individual tort claims against the company, which allege claims for health and property damage.¹⁰⁹

Settlement with Chesapeake Energy Corporation (related to *Armstrong* case)

Similarly, on May 17, 2011, the PDEP and Chesapeake Energy Corporation reached a settlement agreement relating to complaints of water contamination from the *Armstrong* plaintiffs¹¹⁰ and others.¹¹¹ A joint review between Chesapeake and the PDEP to study possible natural gas drilling violations produced inconclusive results. Under the settlement, Chesapeake agreed to pay a \$900,000 penalty for alleged contamination of the water supply and an additional \$188,000 for violations regarding unrelated tank fires. Chesapeake may continue operations and drilling

¹⁰⁹ See *Fiorentino v. Cabot Oil*, *supra*. See also Greenwire: Pennsylvania, Cabot reach settlement over methane contamination (Dec. 16, 2010), available at <http://www.eenews.net/Greenwire/2010/12/16/20/> (last visited Apr. 14, 2011).

¹¹⁰ See *Armstrong v. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, et al.*, *supra*.

¹¹¹ See Chesapeake Settles Pa. Water Pollution Claims for \$1M (May 17, 2011), available at http://www.law360.com/energy/articles/245667?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=energy (last visited June 3, 2011).

subject to obtaining approval from the PDEP for a condensate management plan for each well site.

Brockway Borough Municipal Authority Settlement

In another unique action, the Brockway Borough Municipal Authority (“Brockway”) sued Flatiron Development Force, Inc. and New Growth Resources (collectively, “Defendants”) in November 2010 in Pennsylvania State Court. Brockway owns reservoirs, groundwater wells, and surface rights in the watershed area for the purpose of providing drinking water to the Borough. The Defendants own the mineral rights and planned to clear timber from 23 acres in preparation for drilling activities. The Defendants also planned to construct a 10 million gallon impoundment to store resultant wastewater. Brockway requested an injunction against further site preparation or drilling, claiming that the Defendants did not have a proper easement for the drilling activities and that the activities constituted a public nuisance.¹¹²

After winning a temporary injunction, Brockway settled the case. The terms of settlement require the Defendants to provide drinking water to the Borough’s residents within 24 hours if drilling activities pollute ground or surface waters. If groundwater is polluted, the Defendants must drill a new water well for the Borough within 45 days. If surface water is polluted, the Defendants must provide filtration systems to remedy the pollution. Additionally, the Defendant companies are prohibited from disposing of drill cuttings or other wastes on the property. Hydraulic fracturing fluids cannot be stored on-site, and the Defendants must maintain insurance policies to ensure that they can meet their financial obligations to the Borough if contamination occurs.¹¹³

Regulatory Investigations

In addition to civil lawsuits, government regulatory investigations have been spawned by environmental concerns about hydraulic fracturing. The Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) recently asked shale companies to provide detailed information regarding the chemicals used in hydraulic fracturing.¹¹⁴ While the SEC is requesting that companies provide this information privately in light of proprietary concerns over fracturing techniques and chemical formulas, it is expected that the SEC will require shale companies to disclose at least some additional information publicly.¹¹⁵ Recent letters to shale companies have sought information

¹¹² See Municipal Authority Files Suit Over Drilling Activity, McLean Publishing Co. (Nov. 24, 2010) available at <http://www.thecourierexpress.com/courierexpresscourierexpresslocal/900518-349/municipal-authority-files-suit-over-drilling-activity.html> (last visited Apr. 14, 2011).

¹¹³ See Brockway Watershed Deal Reached, McLean Publishing Co. (Jan. 21, 2011) available at <http://www.thecourierexpress.com/courierexpresscourierexpresslocal/906223-349/brockway-watershed-deal-reached.html> (last visited Apr. 14, 2011).

¹¹⁴ See Tom Fowler, “What Is the SEC Really Looking For From Shale Gas Producers?,” *FuelFix.com*, September 22, 2011.

¹¹⁵ See Deborah Solomon, “SEC Bears Down on Fracking,” *The Wall Street Journal*, August 25, 2011.

about the chemicals being injected into the ground and efforts to mitigate environmental impacts and reduce water usage.¹¹⁶ The current SEC Enforcement inquiry is in its early stages, and it is difficult to predict how long or widespread the investigation will be or whether the SEC will ultimately bring an enforcement action against any company in the industry.

In June 2011, the New York Attorney General issued subpoenas to five shale operators for documents relating to the companies' public disclosures about the environmental risks of hydraulic fracturing.¹¹⁷ The New York Attorney General also sued the Environmental Protection Agency and several other federal agencies in May 2011 in an effort to force a full environmental review of hydraulic fracturing under the National Environmental Policy Act before the Delaware River Basin Commission approves new regulations for natural gas extraction.¹¹⁸

Potential for Shareholder Litigation

Shale operators and other publicly traded companies involved in the production of shale gas and shale oil could also face the potential risk of private shareholder litigation arising from issues relating to reserve reporting, financial projections, or environmental issues.¹¹⁹

Conclusion

As detailed above, hydraulic fracturing and shale drilling litigation has rapidly increased since 2009. While merely speculation, the rise in such litigation evidenced by the cases discussed may be attributed, at least in part, to increased drilling in proximity to populated areas and heightened media scrutiny of the process. With most cases in the early stages of litigation, it likely will be a number of years before they are resolved. It will be interesting to see whether courts ultimately address the issue of the alleged water contamination before the final results of pending environmental studies and congressional investigations.

¹¹⁶ *Id.*

¹¹⁷ See Ian Urbina, "New York Subpoenas Energy Firms," *The New York Times*, June 1, 2011.

¹¹⁸ See Lawrence Hurley, "N.Y. Natural Gas Fracking Lawsuit Raises NEPA Questions," *The New York Times*, June 1, 2011.

¹¹⁹ See Gerard G. Pecht and Peter A. Stokes, "Securities Litigation and Enforcement Risks for Shale Operators," *Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P. White Paper*.

About the Author

Barclay R. Nicholson is a partner at Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P. (Norton Rose Fulbright), Houston, Texas, and is a member of the firm's Shale and Hydraulic Fracturing Task Force. Barclay serves as Editor of www.frackingblog.com, the firm's blog devoted to hydraulic fracturing and shale development issues. His complete biography can be found at <http://www.nortonrosefulbright.com/people/90049/barclay-richard-nicholson>, and he can be reached at barclay.nicholson@nortonrosefulbright.com or (713) 651-3662.

Financial institutions
Energy
Infrastructure, mining and commodities
Transport
Technology and innovation
Life sciences and healthcare

 NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT

Appendix A

Table of Cases Listed Alphabetically



Table of Cases
in Alphabetical Order

Case Name	Pages	State
<i>Alexander, et al v. Chesapeake Appalachia LLC and Statoilhydro USA Onshore Properties, Inc .</i> , No. 3:11-cv-00308-DNH-ATB (N.D. N.Y., March 18, 2011)	64-65	NY
<i>Andre v. EXCO Resources, Inc. and EXCO Operating Co.</i> , No. 5:11-cv-00610-TS-MLH (W.D. La. April 15, 2011)	22-23	LA
<i>Anschutz Exploration Corp. v. Town of Dryden</i> , 35 Misc.3d 450, 940 N.Y.S.2d 458 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2012).	50-51	NY
<i>Armstrong v. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, Chesapeake Energy Corp., and Nomac Drilling, LLC</i> , No. 10-cv-000681 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Oct. 27, 2010), removed to M.D. Pennsylvania, No. 3:10-cv-002453, on Dec. 6, 2010, remanded to Pa. Ct. Com. Pl. on July 29, 2011.	8-9	PA
<i>Aukema, et al v. Chesapeake Appalachia LLC and Statoilhydro USA Onshore Properties, Inc.</i> , No. 3:11-cv-00489-DNH-ATB (N.D. N.Y., April 29, 2011)	64-65	NY
<i>Baker v. Anschutz Exploration Corp., Conrad Geoscience Corporation, and Pathfinder Energy Services, Inc.</i> , No. 6:11-cv-06119 (W.D.N.Y. March 9, 2011)	18-19	NY
<i>Bartlett v. Frontier Gas Services, LLC, Crestwood Arkansas Pipeline, LLC, Kinder Morgan Treating, LP, and Chesapeake Energy Corporation</i> , Case No 4:11-cv-0910 (E.D. Ark. Dec. 23, 2011)	31-32	AR
<i>Beck v. ConocoPhillips Company</i> , No. 2011-484 (Dist. Ct. Panola County Tex., Dec. 1, 2011)	30-31	TX
<i>Becka v. Antero Resources a/k/a Antero Resources Appalachain [sic] Corp. s/k/a Antero Resources Appalacia [sic], LLC</i> ; No. 2:11-cv-01040 (W.D. Pa. August 12, 2011)	29	PA
<i>Beckman v. EXCO Resources, Inc. and EXCO Operating Co.</i> , 5:11-cv-00617-TS-MLH (W.D. La. April 18, 2011)	22-23	LA
<i>Berish v. Southwestern Energy Production Co. and Southwestern Energy Co.</i> , No. 3:10-cv-01981 (M.D. Pa., Sept. 29, 2010)	6-8	PA
<i>Berry v. Southwestern Energy Co., XTO Energy, Chesapeake Energy Corp., and BHP Billiton Petroleum</i> , No. 1:11-cv-0045-DPM (E.D. Ark. May 17, 2011)	24	AR
<i>Bidlack v. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, Chesapeake Energy Corporation, and Nomac Drilling, LLC</i> , No. 3:11-cv-00129-ARC (M.D. Pa. (Scranton), Jan. 19, 2011)	12-13	PA
<i>Boggs v. Landmark 4, LLC</i> , No. 1:12-cv-00614 (N.D. Ohio, March 12, 2012)	33	OH
<i>Border Farm Trust, et al. v. Samson Resources Company</i> , Case No. 12-2013-cv-00067 (In District Court of Divide County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00141, on Nov. 15, 2013	68-69	ND

Table of Cases
in Alphabetical Order

Case Name	Pages	State
<i>Border Farm Trust, et al. v. SM Energy Company</i> , Case No. 27-2013-cv-00245 (In District Court of McKenzie County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00140, on Nov. 15, 2013	68-69	ND
<i>Butts, et al v. Southwestern Energy Production Co.</i> , No. 3:12-cv-01330 (M.D. Pa. July 10, 2012)	36-37	PA
<i>Cain v. XTO Energy Inc. and Waco Oil & Gas Co. Inc.</i> , No. 1:11-cv-00111-IMK, (N.D. W. Va., July 22, 2011)	62-63	WV
<i>Canaan Wildlife Preserve, Inc., et al v. Chesapeake Energy Corporation, et al.</i> , Case No. 2:13-cv-02064-RTD (W.D. Ark., March 6, 2013)	66-67	AR
<i>Center for Biological Diversity and Sierra Club v. The Bureau of Land Management and Ken Salazar, Secretary of the Department of the Interior</i> , No. CV-11-06174 (N.D. Cal., December 8, 2011)	74-75	CA
<i>Center for Biological Diversity and Sierra Club v. The Bureau of Land Management and Sally Jewell, Secretary of the Department of the Interior</i> , No. CV-13-01749 (N.D. Cal., April 18, 2013)	77	CA
<i>Center for Biological Diversity, et al v. California Department of Conservation, et al</i> , Case No. RG12652054, In the Superior Court for the State of California for the City and County of Alameda (October 16, 2012)	76-77	CA
<i>Cherry Canyon Resources, L.P. v. Halliburton Company, et al.</i> , Case No. 2:13-cv-00238, In the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division	81-82	TX
<i>Chesapeake Exploration LLC and CHK Utica, LLC v. Catlett Quality Plumbing & Heating, Inc., et al</i> , No. 5:12-cv-00188 (N.D. Ohio, Jan. 25, 2012), on appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 6th Circuit, Case No. 12-4466 and Case No. 12-4517, filed Dec. 6, 2012 and Dec. 17, 2012 respectively, consolidated on May 1, 2013. Opinion issued Octoaber 30, 2013, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 156169, 2012 WL 5364259 (N.D. Ohio Oct. 30, 2012).	66	OH
<i>Citizens for Pennsylvania’s Future v. Ultra Resources, Inc.</i> , No. 4:11-cv-01360-RDM (M.D. Pa. July 21, 2011)	73	PA
<i>Coalition for Responsible Growth and Resource Conservation, et al v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission</i> , No. 12-566 (2 nd Cir., Feb. 28, 2012)	79	PA
<i>Coastal Oil and Gas Corp. v. Garza Energy Trust</i> , 268 S.W.3d 1 (Tex. 2008)	60-61	TX
<i>Colorado Oil and Gas Association v. City of Fort Collins, Colorado</i> , Case No. 2013CV031385, In the District Court, Larimer County, Colorado (December 3, 2013)	58	CO
<i>Colorado Oil and Gas Association v. City of Lafayette, Colorado</i> , Case No. 2013CV031746, In the District Court, Boulder County, Colorado (December 3, 2013)	58	CO

Table of Cases
in Alphabetical Order

Case Name	Pages	State
<i>Colorado Oil and Gas Association v. City of Longmont, Colorado</i> , Case No. _____, In the District Court of Weld County, Colorado (Dec. 17, 2012)	56-57	CO
<i>Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission v. City of Longmont, Colorado</i> , Case No. 2012-0730, In the District Court of Boulder County, Colorado (July 30, 2012)	56-57	CO
<i>Coniglio, et al v. Chesapeake Exploration LLC, et al.</i> , Case No. 2012CVH27102, in the Carroll County, Ohio Court of Common Pleas	65-66	OH
<i>Cooperstown Holstein Corporation v. Town of Middlefield</i> , 35 Misc.3d 767, 943 N.Y.S.2d 722 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2012)	51	NY
<i>Delaware Riverkeeper Network, et al v. United States Army Corps of Engineers, et al</i> ; No. 1:11-cv-03780 (E.D.N.Y., Aug. 4, 2011	71-72	NY
<i>Demchak Partners Limited Partnership, et al. v. Chesapeake Appalachia, L.L.C.</i> , No. 3:13-cv-02289 (M.D. Pa. Aug. 30, 2013)	67-68	PA
<i>Dillon v. Antero Resources a/k/a Antero Resources Appalachain [sic] Corp. s/k/a Anero Resources Appalacia [sic], LLC</i> ; No. 2:11-cv-01038 (W.D. Pa. August 11, 2011)	29	PA
<i>Evenson v. Antero Resources Corporation, Antero Resources Piceance Corporation, and John Doe Well Service Providers</i> ; No. 2011-cv-5118 (Denver County Dist. Ct., July 20, 2011)	27	CO
<i>Finn v. EOG Resources, Inc., et al, Cause No. C2013-00343</i> , In the 18th Judicial District Court of Johnson County, Texas.	42	TX
<i>Fiorentino v. Cabot Oil & Gas Corp.and Gas Search Drilling Services Corp.</i> , No. 3:09-cv-02284 (M.D. Pa., Nov. 19, 2009)	3-4	PA
<i>Frey v. BHP Billiton Petroleum (Arkansas) Inc., et al.</i> , Case No. 4:11-cv-0475-JLH (E.D. Ark., June 9, 2011)	41	AR
<i>Ginardi v. Frontier Gas Services, LLC, Kinder Morgan Treating LP, Chesapeake Energy Corporation, and BHP Billiton Petroleum</i> , No 4:11-cv-0420 BRW (E.D. Ark. May 17, 2011)	23	AR
<i>Green vs. Chesapeake Exploration, et al.</i> , Case No. 2012CV01223, in Stark County, Ohio Common Pleas Court	66	OH
<i>Hagy v. Equitable Production Co., Warren Drilling Co., Inc., BJ Services Co., USA, and Halliburton Energy Services, Inc.</i> , No. 2:10-cv-01372 (S.D. W. Va., Dec. 10, 2010)	10-11	WV
<i>Hallowich v. Range Resources Corporation, Williams Gas/Laurel Mountain Midstream, Markwest Energy Partners, L.P., Markwest Energy Group, LLC, and Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection</i> , Case No. 2010-3954 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl. May 27, 2010)	5-6	PA
<i>Hamblet v. James Martin, in his Official capacity as Director, Office of Oil and Gas, West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection; Office of Oil and Gas, West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection; and EQT Production Company</i> , Case No. 10-P-15 (Circuit Court of Doddridge County, W. Va., May 21, 2010)	70	WV

Table of Cases
in Alphabetical Order

Case Name	Pages	State
<i>Haney, et al. v. Range Resources Appalachia, LLC, et al</i> , No. 2012-3534 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., May 25, 2012)	35-36	PA
<i>Harris v. Devon Energy Prod. Co., L.P.</i> , No. 4:10-cv-00708 (E.D. Tex., Dec. 22, 2010)	13-14	TX
<i>Hearn v. BHP Billiton Petroleum (Arkansas) Inc., et al</i> , Case No. 4:11-cv-00474-JLH (E.D. Ark., June 9, 2011)	41	AR
<i>Heinkel-Wolfe v. Williams Production Co., LLC, Mockingbird Pipeline, LP, XTO Energy, Inc., Gulftex Operating, Inc., Trio Consulting & Mgmt., LLC, and Enexco Inc.</i> , No. 2010-40355-362 (362nd Dist. Court, Denton County, Texas, Nov. 3, 2010)	10	TX
<i>Hill, et al. v. Southwestern Energy Company, et al.</i> , No. 4:12-cv-500 (E.D. Ark., Aug. 10, 2012)	38	AR
<i>Hiser v. XTO Energy, Inc.</i> , No. 4:11-cv-00517-KGB (E.D. Ark. June 24, 2011)	25	AR
<i>In Re U.S. Energy Development Corp.</i> , File No. 11-57 (New York Department of Environmental Protection, filed Jan. 24, 2012)	78	NY
<i>In the Matter of Norse Energy Corporation USA v. Town of Dryden, et al.</i> , Case No. 515227, In the State of New York, Supreme Court, Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department	50	NY
<i>Independent Petroleum Association of America and US Oil & Gas Association v. United States Environmental Protection Agency</i> , No. 10-1233 (D.C. Aug. 12, 2010)	78-79	DC
<i>Jeffrey, et al v. Matthew T. Ryan, in his official capacity as Mayor, City of Binghamton, and the City Council, City of Binghamton</i> , No CA2012001254, 37 Misc.3d 1204(A), 2012 WL 4513348 (N.Y. Supreme Court, Broome Co., Oct. 2, 2012)	52	NY
<i>Kamuck v. Shell Energy Holdings GP, LLC, Shell Energy Holdings LP, LLC and SWEPI, LP (d/b/a Shell Western Exploration and Produccion, LP</i> ; No. 4:11-cv-01425-MCC (M.D. Pa. August 3, 2011)	27-28	PA
<i>Kartch v. EOG Resources</i> , No. 4:10-cv-00014 (D. N.D. March 4, 2010)	4-5	ND
<i>Koonce v. Chesapeake Exploration, LLC and CHK Utica, LLC</i> , No. 4:12-cv-00736-BYP (N.D. Ohio, March 27, 2012)	65-66	OH
<i>Kummer, et al. v. Continental Resources, Inc.</i> , Case No. 27-2013-cv-00244 (In District Court of McKenzie County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00135, on Nov. 15, 2013	68-69	ND
<i>Lane v. BHP Billiton Petroleum (Arkansas) Inc., et al</i> , Case No. 4:11-cv-00477 (E.D. Ark., June 9, 2011)	41	AR
<i>Lenape Resources, Inc. v. Town of Avon, Town of Avon Board, and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation</i> , Index No. _____, In the Superior Court of the State of New York, County of Livingston (November 13, 2012)	53	NY

Table of Cases
in Alphabetical Order

Case Name	Pages	State
<i>Lipsky v. Durant, Carter, Coleman LLC, Silverado on the Brazos Development Company #1 Ltd., Jerry V. Durant, James T. Coleman, Estate of Preston Carter, Range Production Company, and Range Resources Corp.</i> , Cause No. CV11-0798 (Parker County Dist. Ct., June 20, 2011); on appeal Case No. 02-12-00098-CV, Second Court of Appeals, Fort Worth, Texas.	25-26	TX
<i>Magers, et ux v. Chesapeake Appalachia, L.L.C., CNX Gas Company, L.L.C., and Columbia Gas Transmission, L.L.C.</i> , No. 5:12-cv-00049-FPS (N.D. W.Va., Sept. 4, 2012)	39	WV
<i>Mahan, et al. v. Chesapeake Operating, Inc. and BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville) LLC</i> , Case No. 4:13-cv-184 JLH, April 1, 2013)	42	AR
<i>Mangan v. Landmark 4, LLC</i> , No. 1:12-cv-00613 (N.D. Ohio, March 12, 2012)	33	OH
<i>Manning, et al v. WPX Energy Inc. and The Williams Companies, Inc.</i> , No. 3:12-CV-00646 (M.D. Pa., April 9, 2012)	34	PA
<i>Maring v. John Nalbone, Jr., Universal Resource Oil & Gas, Enervest Operating LLC, and Dallas Morris Drilling Inc.</i> , No. K12009001499 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Aug. 27, 2009)	2	NY
<i>May, et al. v. BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville) LLC</i> , No. 4:13-cv-0494 (E.D. Ark. August 23, 2013)	67	AR
<i>Miller Family Partnership, et al. v. HRC Operating, LLC</i> , Case No. 53-2013-cv-01190 (In District Court of Williams County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00137, on Nov. 15, 2013	68-69	ND
<i>Miller, et al. v. Chesapeake Operating, Inc. and BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville) LLC</i> , Case No. 4:13-CV-131 JMM (E.D. Ark., Mar. 11, 2013)	42	AR
<i>Mitchell v. EnCana Oil & Gas (USA), Inc., Chesapeake Operating, Inc., and Chesapeake Exploration, LLC</i> , No. 3:10-cv-02555 (N.D. Tex., Dec. 15, 2010)	11-12	TX
<i>Norse Energy Corp. USA v. Town of Dryden, et al.</i> , Case No. 2013 -00245, In the New York State Court of Appeals.	50	NY
<i>Northeast Natural Energy, LLC and Enrout Properties, LLC v. The City of Morgantown, West Virginia</i> , Civil Action No. 11-C-411; In the Circuit Court of Monongalia County, West Virginia (June 23, 2011)	48-49	WV
<i>Otis v. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, Chesapeake Energy Corporation, and Nomac Drilling, LLC</i> , No. 3:11-cv-00115-ARC (M.D. Pa. (Scranton), Jan. 18, 2011)	12-13	PA
<i>Ouachita Watch League, et al v. Judith L. Henry, Forest Supervisor, Ozark-St. Francis National Forests; United States Forest Service, et al</i> , No. 4:11-cv-425 (E.D. Ark., May 19, 2011)	70-71	AR
<i>Palmer v. BHP Billiton Petroleum (Arkansas) Inc., et al</i> , Case No. 4:11-cv-00476 (E.D. Ark., June 9, 2011)	41	AR

Table of Cases
in Alphabetical Order

Case Name	Pages	State
<i>Parr v. Aruba Petroleum, Inc., Ash Grove Resources, LLC, Encana Oil & Gas (USA), Inc., Halliburton Co., Republic Energy, Inc., Ryder Scott Co., LP, Ryder Scott Oil Co., Tejas Production Services, Inc., and Tejas Western Corp.</i> , No. 11-01650 (Dallas County Ct. at Law, Mar. 8, 2011)	19-20	TX
(Pa. Commw. Ct. June 22, 2010), <i>appeal denied</i> , 2012 Pa. LEXIS 40, 41 (Pa. Jan. 6, 2012)	52-53	PA
<i>Perna v. Reserve Oil & Gas, Inc.</i> , No. 11-c-2284 (Circuit Court of Kanawha County, West Virginia, Dec. 21, 2011)	31	WV
<i>Pollock, et al. v. Energy Corporation of America</i> , No. 2:10-cv-01553 (W.D. Pa. Nov. 30, 2010)	61-62	PA
<i>Powder River Basin Resource Council, Wyoming Outdoor Council, and National Wildlife Federation v. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Kenneth Salazar in his official capacity as Secretary of the Interior, Mike Pool in his official capacity as Acting Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Donald Simpson in his official capacity as Wyoming State Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and Duane Spencer in his official capacity as the Buffalo Field Office Manager of the Bureau of Land Management</i> , Case No. 1:12-cv-00996 (D.C. June 19, 2012)	75	DC
<i>Powder River Basin Resource Council, Wyoming Outdoor Council, Earthworks, and OMB Watch v. Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission</i> , Case No. 94650, In the 7 th Judicial District Court of the State of Wyoming, in and for the County of Natrona	79-80	WY
<i>Pruitt, et al v. Southwestern Energy Company</i> , No. 4:12-cv-00423 (E.D. Ark., Nov. 2, 2012)	39	AR
<i>Robinson Township, et al v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, et al</i> , No. 284 M.D. 2012 (Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania, March 29, 2012)	54-56	PA
<i>Rodriguez, Dr. Alfonso v. Michael L. Krancer, in his official capacity as Secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, et al.</i> , Case No. 3:12-cv-01458 (M.D. Pa. July 27, 2012)	80-81	PA
<i>Roth v. Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation and Gas Search Drilling Services Corporation</i> , No. 3:12-cv-00898 (M.D. Pa. May 14, 2012)	35	PA
<i>San Juan Citizens Alliance, et al v. Mark Stiles, in his official capacity as San Juan National Forest Supervisor and BLM Center Manager of the San Juan Public Lands Center; et al</i> , 654 F.3d 1038 (10 th Cir. 2011)	72	CO
<i>Scoggin v. Cudd Pumping Services, Inc, RPC Inc., and Cudd Energy Services</i> . No. 4:11-cv-00678-JMM (E.D. Ark. Sept. 12, 2011)	30	AR
<i>Scoggin, et al v. Southwestern Energy Company</i> , No. 4:12-cv-763 (E.D. Ark., December 7, 2012)	40	AR
<i>Scoma v. Chesapeake Energy Corp., Chesapeake Operating, Inc., and Chesapeake Exploration, LLC</i> , No. 3:10-cv-01385 (N.D. Tex., July 15, 2010)	6	TX
<i>Sheatsley v. Chesapeake Operating, Inc. and Clarita Operating, LLC</i> , Case No. 4:11-cv-00353-JLH (E.D. Ark., April 4, 2011)	40-41	AR

Table of Cases
in Alphabetical Order

Case Name	Pages	State
<i>Sierra Club, et al. v. The Village of Painted Post, et al.</i> , Index No. 2012-0810CV, In th State of New York, Supreme Court, County of Steuben (June 25, 2012)	76	NY
<i>Singer, et al. v. Statoil Oil & Gas LP</i> , Case No. 27-2013-cv-00243 (In District Court of McKenzie County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-001338 on Nov. 15, 2013	68-69	ND
<i>Sizelove v. Williams Production Co., LLC, Mockingbird Pipeline, LP, XTO Energy, Inc., GulfTex Operating, Inc., Trio Consulting & Mgmt., LLC, and Enexco, Inc.</i> , No. 2010-50355-367 (367th Dist. Court, Denton County, Tex. Nov. 3, 2010)	9-10	TX
<i>Smith v. Devon Energy Production Company, L.P.</i> , Case No. 4:11-cv-00104 (E.D. Texas, March 7, 2011) (originally filed in N.D. Tex., Case No. 3:11-cv-00196, on Jan. 31, 2011)	17-18	TX
<i>Smith, et al v. Southwestern Energy Company</i> , No. 4:12-cv-00423 (E.D. Ark., July 11, 2012)	37-38	AR
<i>Sorenson, et al. v. Burlington Resources Oil & Gas Company, LP</i> , Case No. 27-2013-cv-00242 (In District Court of McKenzie County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00132, on Nov. 14, 2013	68-69	ND
<i>State of New York v. United States Army Corps of Engineers, et al</i> ; No. 1:11-cv-02599 (E.D.N.Y., May 31, 2011)	71-72	NY
<i>State of New York v. United States Army Corps of Engineers, et al</i> ; No. 1:11-cv-03857 (E.D.N.Y., Aug. 10, 2011)	71-72	NY
<i>State of Ohio ex rel. Jack Morrison, Jr., Law Director of Munroe Falls, Ohio et al. v. Beck Energy Corporation, et al.</i> , Case No. 2013-0465, In the Supreme Court of Ohio	57	OH
<i>Strong v. ConocoPhillips Company</i> , No. 2011-487 (Dist. Ct. Panola County Tex, Dec. 2, 2011)	30-31	TX
<i>Strudley v. Antero Resources Corp., Calfrac Well Services, and Frontier Drilling LLC</i> , No. 2011-cv-2218 (Denver County Dist. Ct., Mar. 23, 2011)	20-22	CO
<i>Sutterfield, et al. v. Chesapeake Operating, Inc. and BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville) LLC</i> , Case No. 4:13-cv-183 JLH, April 1, 2013)	42	AR
<i>Teekell v. Chesapeake Operating, Inc., Crow Horizons Company, JPD Energy, Inc., and Chesapeake Louisiana, L.P.</i> , No. 5:12-cv-00044 (W.D. La. Jan. 12, 2012)	32-33	LA
<i>Teel v. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC</i> , No. 5:11-cv-00005-FPS (N.D. W. Va. January 6, 2011)	14-15	WV
<i>The Ozark Society v. United States Forest Service; et al</i> ; No. 4:11-cv-00782 (E.D. Ark., October 31, 2011)	73-74	AR
<i>Thomas, et al. v. Chesapeake Operating, Inc. and BHP Billiton Petroleum (Fayetteville) LLC</i> , Case No. 4:13-cv-182 JLH, April 1, 2013)	42	AR

Table of Cases
in Alphabetical Order

Case Name	Pages	State
<i>Tucker v. Southwestern Energy Co., XTO Energy, Chesapeake Energy Corp., and BHP Billiton Petroleum</i> , No. 1:11-cv-0044-DPM (E.D. Ark. May 17, 2011)	24	AR
<i>United States v. Range Prod. Co., et al.</i> , No. 3:11-cv-00116 (N.D. Tex., Jan. 18, 2011)	15-16	TX
<i>Vermillion, et al. v. Mora County, New Mexico, et al.</i> , No. 1:13-cv-01095 (N.M., Nov. 11, 2013)	57-58	NM
<i>Vogel, et al. v. Marathon Oil Company</i> , Case No. 31-2013-cv-00163 (In District Court of Mountrail County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District)	68-69	ND
<i>Vogel, et al. v. WPX Energy Williston, LLC</i> , Case No. 31-2013-cv-00162 (In District Court of Mountrail County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00133, on Nov. 15, 2013	68-69	ND
<i>Wallach, et al. v. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, et al.</i> , Case No. _____, In the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Albany (December 17, 2013)	59	NY
<i>Weiden Lake Property Owners Association, Inc. v. Jeff A. Klansky and Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation</i> , 2011 N.Y. Misc. LEXIS 4081 (Sup. Ct.-Sullivan County, Aug. 18, 2011)	49	NY
<i>Whiteman v. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC</i> , No. 5:11-cv-00031-FPS (N.D. W. Va. February 23, 2011)	17	WV
<i>Wisdahl, et al. v. Crescent Point Energy U.S. Corp.</i> , Case No. 53-2013-cv-01189 (In District Court of Williams County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00139, on Nov. 15, 2013	68-69	ND
<i>Wisdahl, et al. v. XTO Energy, Inc.</i> , Case No. 53-2013-cv-01188 (In District Court of Williams County, North Dakota, Northwest Judicial District), removed to U.S. District Court for North Dakota, No. 4:13-cv-00136, on Nov. 15, 2013	68-69	ND
<i>Wiser, et al v. EnerVest Operating LLC and Belden & Blake Corporation</i> , No. 3:10-cv-00794-DEP (N.D. N.Y., July 2, 2010)	61	NY
<i>Zimmermann v. Atlas America, LLC</i> , No. 2009-7564 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Sept. 21, 2009)	2-3	PA

Financial institutions
Energy
Infrastructure, mining and commodities
Transport
Technology and innovation
Life sciences and healthcare

 NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT

Appendix B

Resume of Barclay R. Nicholson



Barclay Richard Nicholson

Partner, Houston

Fulbright & Jaworski

+1 713 651 3662

barclay.nicholson@nortonrosefulbright.com



Barclay Nicholson offers clients in-depth knowledge and experience in energy-related and business disputes. As a partner in the Houston office, Barclay has represented a broad range of clients from among the largest of the *Fortune 500* Companies to entrepreneurial business owners. He has significant experience in handling energy related litigation and has represented some of the world's major oil and gas producing and refining companies as well as some of the nation's biggest drilling and E&P companies. Chambers USA, America's Leading Lawyers for Business, noted Barclay is, "intelligent, good natured and more than capable of handling a large-scale case."

Barclay serves on the Shale and Hydraulic Fracturing Task Force and has authored numerous articles and given speeches both across the nation and internationally on all aspects of unconventional oil and gas plays. Barclay is the author of the Analysis of Litigation Involving Shale & Hydraulic Fracturing which details all of the litigation across the country involving shale plays. Barclay also serves as the Editor of www.frackingblog.com, a blog devoted to hydraulic fracturing. Barclay has assisted clients in all of North America's major shale plays, including the Bakken, Barnett, Eagle Ford, Fayetteville, Haynesville, Marcellus, Pearsall and Utica fields. Internationally, Barclay has been chosen to assist the US State Department Bureau of Energy and the US Department of Commerce, through its Commercial Law Development Program, in advising the Countries of India, Chile, and Afghanistan on their unconventional and shale gas resources and the regulatory and legal matters associated with those resources. Most recently Barclay served on the US - Afghanistan Cooperation on Extractive Industries Development Program that took place in Doha, Qatar. Previously, Barclay participated in the US/India Cooperation on Unconventional Natural Gas Consultations in New Delhi, India and the US/Chile Consultations on Unconventional Natural Gas in Santiago, Chile.

Barclay also serves as Chair of the Houston Bar Association's Litigation Section, which has more than 1,200 members.

Barclay has handled commercial cases that involve amounts exceeding one billion dollars. He has represented clients in numerous proceedings both in the United States (in federal and state courts) and abroad (in the LCIA, ICC, UNCITRAL and ICDR). Additionally, he has represented clients before various administrative and congressional oversight boards.

Previously, Barclay served as Briefing Attorney for Justice Alberto Gonzales of the Texas Supreme Court, who later served as the United States Attorney General. Barclay also served as Briefing Clerk for Chief Justice Thomas R. Phillips of the Texas Supreme Court.

Areas of Concentration

- Energy litigation
- Shale and hydraulic fracturing
- International Arbitration
- Construction
- Insurance and Reinsurance
- Environmental
- IP disputes
- Western lands and energy
- Chemicals
- Metals and Mining

Representative Experience

Recent, significant litigation and arbitration activities include:

Energy Related Representations include:

- Class action litigation involving environmental concerns related to unconventional oil and gas drilling operations
- Litigation arising from multiple oil & gas leases and related service contracts
- Counseled companies regarding the disclosure of hydraulic fracturing fluids
- Dispute regarding Joint Operating Agreement between oil and gas operators
- Lawsuits involving claims of groundwater contamination due to hydraulic fracturing operations
- Major oil and gas drilling company in dispute regarding drilling operations
- British LNG provider in commercial dispute concerning multiple multinational JOA and PSA contracts pending before LCIA
- Major oil producer in ICC arbitration involving a failed merger
- Canadian oil and gas company in ICC arbitration dispute concerning West African offshore oil fields
- Major multinational producer and refiner in dispute with government over offshore oil rights
- Multinational oil producer and refiner over government related claims in ICC arbitration
- International gas company in multiple take-or-pay contract disputes
- Regional drilling and exploration company in well damage case in Texas State Court
- Local oil and gas exploration company regarding a deceptive trade practices action pending in Federal Court in Houston

Commercial Litigation Representations include:

- Served as lead trial counsel for national newspaper in complex breach of contract and breach of fiduciary duty case in state court
- Small manufacturing business owner in a state court dispute regarding a buy-sell agreement
- Lead attorney for oil field equipment manufacturer in contractual business dispute regarding a buy-out agreement
- International law firm in a malpractice action
- Major media company in a wrongful death case
- Premises owner in a suit that involved catastrophic personal injury
- Prosecuted over 20 lawsuits on behalf of the City of Houston, as first chair attorney

Construction Related Representations include:

- One of the world's largest oil and gas companies in construction dispute involving multinational EPC contract
- Regional pipeline company in AAA arbitration involving construction delay dispute, served as lead plaintiffs' attorney
- National manufacturing company in bench trial in South Texas that resulted in a take nothing judgment and recovery on counter-claim

Intellectual Property Representations include:

- *Fortune 500* Energy Company in a week long complex patent infringement jury trial in Federal Court for the Eastern District of Texas
- Major media company as defendant in TV related technology matter in Federal Court for the Eastern District of Texas
- International consumer electronics company in patent case involving MP3 players in Federal Court in Southern District of Texas
- International medical device manufacturing company in patent case involving surgical devices in Federal Court for the Eastern District of Texas

First Party Insurance and Bad-Faith Representations include:

- Fortune 500 Insurance Company in coverage and bad-faith lawsuits in state and federal court with exposure totaling over \$250 million
- One of the world's leading insurance companies in a bad-faith trial lasting over four weeks in Jefferson Parrish, State Court in Louisiana
- Multinational insurance company against bad-faith claims brought in Federal Court in Missouri
- International insurance carrier in first party litigation case involving bad-faith claims arising out of excess insurance policy

- National insurance company in appeal involving contractual dispute between companies which resulted widely cited published court of appeals decision
- National insurance company in case of first impression that involved bad-faith; case was won at summary judgment and subsequently upheld at appellate level and published opinion has become widely cited as precedent

Professional Activities

- American Bar Association
 - International Energy & Natural Resources Committee, Vice-Chair (2011 - 2013)
 - Business Torts Litigation Committee, Committee Leadership (2011 - 2012)
 - Environment, Energy and Resources Section
 - Litigation Section
 - Tort and Insurance Practice Section, Former Co-Chair
 - Continuing Legal Education Committee, Standing Committee Member
 - Advisory Panel
- State Bar of Texas
 - Litigation Section
 - Oil, Gas & Energy Resources Section
 - Construction Section
 - Professional Liability Section
- Federal Bar Association
- College of the State Bar of Texas (2006 - 2013)
- Pro Bono College of the State Bar of Texas (2006 - 2013)
- Houston Bar Foundation, Fellow
- Texas Bar Foundation, Fellow
- Houston Bar Association
 - Chair of the Litigation Section (2013 - 2014)
 - Chair-Elect of the Litigation Section (2012 - 2013)
 - Continuing Legal Education Committee (2011 - 2012)
 - Membership Committee (2011 - 2012)
 - Dispute Resolution Committee, Board of Director (2008 - 2010)
 - Speakers Bureau Committee (2008 - 2009, 2011 - 2012)

- Professionalism Committee (2007 - 2009)
- Fee Disputes Committee (2006 - 2008)
- The General Counsel Forum
 - Board Member and Corporate Secretary (2013)
- Houston Young Lawyers Association
 - Bench Book Committee, Chairman and Editor-in-Chief (2005 - 2007)
- World Affairs Council of Houston
- Association of International Petroleum Negotiators
- Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association
- The Institute for Energy Law
 - Member of the Advisory Board
- Independent Petroleum Association of America
 - Member of Land & Royalty Committee
 - Member of Environment & Safety Committee
- Energy & Mineral Law Foundation
- Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation
- Texas Association of Defense Counsel
- Texas Supreme Court Historical Society
- New York State Bar Association
- Colorado State Bar Association
- Strauss Fellow, Next Generation Project Texas, LBJ School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas

Professional Honors

- *Chambers USA, America's Leading Lawyers for Business*, – Chambers and Partners (2011 - 2013)
- *Texas Top Rated Lawyer* – LexisNexis Martindale-Hubbell (2013)
- *Who's Who in Energy, Finalist* -- Houston Business Journal (2013)
- *Top Lawyers in Houston* - H Texas Magazine (2013)
- *Texas Rising Star* – Thomson Reuters (2005 - 2010, 2013)
- *Houston's Top Lawyers* – H Texas Magazine (2006 - 2009)
- *AV Rated Lawyer* – LexisNexis Martindale-Hubbell
- Lawyer on the Fast Track – Commercial Litigation, H Texas Magazine (2004 - 2006)

- Who's Who in America - Marquis (2012 - 2014)

Publications

Barclay has authored a number of articles on hydraulic fracturing litigation. He has also authored articles on other topics including: breach of contract damage issues, construction litigation issues, insurance coverage disputes, insurance bad faith and causation issues and international arbitration case studies. Barclay also has authored several articles for in-house legal departments. Barclay routinely blogs on energy related issues at www.frackingblog.com.

Other publications include:

- "Fracking Bans in Colorado and Ohio May Be Unenforceable," *Law 360*, November 21, 2013
- "Shale Gas and Hydraulic Fracturing: The Latest Developments," *Global Infrastructure*, Volume VII - October 2013
- "Hydraulic Fracturing as a Subsurface Trespass," *The Energy Law Advisor*, Volume 7, Number 3 - October 2013
- Interview "Shale We Dance?" *The Oil & Gas Year*, The Who's Who of the Global Energy Industry - Eagle Ford, Texas 2013
- Co-author, "Trade secrets and the regulation of hydraulic fracturing: Toward a global perspective," *Norton Rose and Fulbright White Paper* (March 2013); *reprinted in* 2013 *International Energy Law Review* 154-167 & 203-213 (Issues 4 & 5 2013).
- "Lone Pine Order Overturned in Fracking Lawsuit," International Law Office, online media partner to Association of Corporate Counsel and International Bar Association, September 9, 2013
- Q & A with Barclay Nicholson, Attorney advises oil, gas firms on Fracking Suits, Thomson Reuters, By Mica Rosenberg, August 27, 2013
- "Insight: Arkansas Lawsuits Test Fracking Wastewater Link to Quakes" Reuters, August 27, 2013
- "Shale Gas in The United States: A Revolution" *Infrastructure Journal*, July 12, 2013
- Co-author, "Lone Pine order overturned by Intermediate Appellate Court in Colorado fracking lawsuit" *Norton Rose Fulbright Legal Update*, July 11, 2013
- Co-author, "Analysis of Litigation Involving Shale and Hydraulic Fracturing, Part 2" *International Energy Law Review*, 2013 Vol. 32 Issue 3, June 2013
- Interviewed, "Interior Department Extends Comment Period on Fracking Rule," NPR Radio, June 7, 2013
- Quoted in "Lawsuits linked to fracking increasing," *San Antonio Express News Business Section*, May 29, 2013
- Quoted in, "Shale boom's legal issues bubble to surface," *Houston Chronicle Business Section*, May 28, 2013
- Quoted in "A Fractured Market," *CDR Commercial Dispute Resolution*, May-June 2013

- Co-author, "Pennsylvania Supreme Court Reaffirms that Natural Gas Is Not a 'Mineral' in Private Deed Transfers," *Fulbright Briefing*, April 26, 2013
- Co-author, "Trade secrets and the regulation of hydraulic fracturing - Toward a global perspective," *Energy*, April 11, 2013
- "Energy Multi-Jurisdictional Guide 2013: Oil & Gas Q&A: United States," *Practical Law Company*, April 1, 2013
- Co-author, "Analysis of Litigation Involving Shale and Hydraulic Fracturing, Part 1," *International Energy Law Review*, 2013 Vol. 32 Issue 2, March 2013
- Co-author, "Analysis of Hydraulic Fracturing and Shale Drilling Litigation," *The International Law Firm of Fulbright & Jaworski - Energy*, March 4, 2013
- "Hydraulic Fracturing Frenzy: What's Up?," *ABA Energy and Natural Resources Litigation Committee Newsletter*, February 2013
- "Shale Gas and Other Unconventional Resources: A Practitioners Guide," *Globe Law and Business*, January 9, 2013, also available on Amazon.
- Co-author, "New Drilling and Recycling Regulations Proposed for Fracking" *International Law Office*, November 5, 2012
- Co-author, "Analysis of Litigation Involving Shale and Hydraulic Fracturing," *The International Law Firm of Fulbright & Jaworski - Energy*, November 2012
- Co-author, "New Drilling and Recycling Regulations Proposed by Texas Railroad Commission Relating to Hydraulic Fracturing," *Fulbright Briefing*, October 4, 2012
- "Fracking's Alleged Links to Water Contamination and Earthquakes," *ABA Section of Litigation, Energy Litigation Committee*, May 9, 2012
- "Hydraulic Fracturing As a Subsurface Trespass," *ABA Energy Committee Newsletter*, Vol. 9, No.2, May, 2012
- Co-author, "Landowners Prevail in Dispute with Regulators Over Ownership of Under Ground Water," *Powell Shale Digest*, March 19, 2012
- "Courts Unclear when Fracturing is Subsurface Trespass," *The American Oil & Gas Reporter*, February 2012
- "Fracing Focus Shifts to Water," *Oil & Gas Investor*, February 2012
- "Fracing Focus Shifts to Water," *Unconventional Oil & Gas Center*, February 8, 2012
- Co-author, "Department of Interior Releases Draft Rule of Well Stimulation," *International Law Office*, February 27, 2012
- "States on Standby for Frack Rules," *Energy Bisnow*, February 24, 2012
- Co-author, "Department of Interior Releases Draft Rule of Well Stimulation," *Fulbright Briefing*, February 10, 2012

- Interviewed, "Analysis: Green Groups Find Success Fighting Shale Oil Boom," Reuters, December 27, 2011 also published on Yahoo! News, MSNBC
- "Trends Emerge on Hydraulic Fracturing Litigation," *Oil & Gas Journal*, December 5, 2011 Issue
- Co-author, "Texas Railroad Commission Adopts Hydraulic Fracturing Chemical Disclosure Rule, Effective February 1, 2012," *Fulbright Alert*, December 14, 2011
- Co-author, "Hydraulic Fracturing Studies Release Preliminary Plans and Initial Reports," *Fulbright Briefing*, November 15, 2011
- "Texas Passes Law Requiring Disclosure of Chemicals Used in Hydraulic Fracturing Fluid," *The Houston Lawyer*, September/October 2011
- Co-author, "Tracking Fracking Case Law: Hydraulic Fracturing Litigation," *Natural Resources & Environment Magazine*, Fall 2011
- Co-author, "Texas, Other States Move Forward With Hydraulic Fracturing Disclosure Regulations," *Fulbright Briefing*, October 13, 2011
- Co-author, "Analysis of Litigation Involving Shale & Hydraulic Fracturing," *Fulbright White Paper*, September 28, 2011
- Co-author, "Texas Supreme Court Issues Three Key Energy Opinions in August," *Fulbright Briefing*, September 15, 2011
- Author, "Key Issues Plague the Eagle Ford shale play in South Texas," Houston Business Journal, week of August 19-25, 2011
- Interviewed, "Examining Texas' Hydraulic Fracturing Disclosure Law," *E&P Magazine*, Hart Energy, August 2, 2011
- Co-author, "Texas Joins States Requiring Disclosure of Hydraulic Fracturing Fluids," *International Law Office*, June 27, 2011
- Author, "Hydraulic Fracing: An Overview of the Issues," *Trends in Energy Disputes 2011*, Fulbright & Jaworski, June 8, 2011
- Co-author, "Texas Legislature Joins Growing Number of States in Requiring Disclosure of Hydraulic Fracturing Fluids," *Fulbright Briefing*, June 16, 2011
- Co-author, "U.K. House of Commons Committee Urges Support for Shale Gas Extraction," *Fulbright Briefing*, June 6, 2011
- Co-author, "Duke University Releases Study Reporting Methane Contamination in Areas of Natural Gas Extraction," *Fulbright Briefing*, May 11, 2011
- Co-author, "FracFocus Website Launched As Hydraulic Fracturing Chemical Disclosure Registry," *Fulbright Alert - Shale and Hydraulic Fracturing Task Force*, April 12, 2011
- Co-author, "Texas Supreme Court Defers to Railroad Commission's Interpretation of 'Public Interest' in Injection Well Permit Decisions," *Fulbright Briefing*, March 28, 2011
- "Fracking and the Courts," Oil and Gas Investor, July 2010

- *Harris County Bench Book*
 - Editor in Chief, 2007
 - Editor, 2004 - 2006
- Contributing Writer, Property Loss Research Bureau, (PLRB/LIRB) *First Party Litigation Manual*, 2006
- Contributing Writer, Property Loss Research Bureau, (PLRB/LIRB), *Claims Conference & Insurance Service Expo*, 2004
- Co-author, *The Fourteen Points: How to Prepare for Deposition or Trial Testimony in First Party Insurance Litigation*, American Bar Association Annual Meeting, New York City, 2002

Speeches

Barclay has given speeches on various topics at seminars and conventions as well as in the continuing legal education setting. Barclay has also given in-house presentations to oil and gas companies, construction companies and insurance companies in Houston, New York, London and Chicago on a number of topics including electronic discovery and attorney-client privilege issues in major companies.

- Upcoming conference Co-Chair, 3rd Annual Hydraulic Fracking Seminar, Bacara Resort & Spa - Santa Barbara, California, February 27 - 28, 2013
- "Update on the Conflict Over Hydraulic Fracturing and Best Practices for Minimizing Surface and Groundwater Impacts," Tribal Energy in the Southwest, Sandia Resort & Casino, Albuquerque, New Mexico, December 9 & 10, 2013
- "Damages in the Shale Business: Anything Different from the Usual Oil and Gas Dispute?" 4th Annual Institute for Energy Law and International Bar Association's Section on Energy, Environment, Natural Resources International Oil & Gas Law Conference, London, England, December 4-6, 2103
- "To Drink or Not to Drink? Water Use and Disposal Issues in Hydraulic Fracturing," 2013 AICPA/PDI National Oil and Gas Conference, Denver, Colorado, November 13-15, 2013
- "Ten Things Everybody Should Know About an Oil & Gas Lease," National Oil & Gas Royalty Conference, Houston, Texas, October 22, 2013
- "Hydraulic Fracturing: The Hype and The Realities: A Look at the Regulations and the Lawsuits," 2013 Clean Fracking Communication & Technology Conference, Beaver Creek, Colorado, October 8-9, 2013
- "Reducing Risk in Oil and Gas Development," Oil & Gas Development in Montana, Billings, Montana, October 2, 2013
- Co-presenter, "Fracking: Water Rights, Water Quality, Where/How to Get a Secure Water Supply, Insuring Fracking Operations, Liability Issues, and Environmental Issues," 13th Annual Montana Water Law, Helena, Montana, September 17-18, 2013
- "Fracking Updates," ExxonMobil Global Litigation Retreat, Austin, Texas September 16, 2013
- "Fracturing -- The Hype and the Realities: A Look at Regulations and Lawsuits," 26th Annual Energy Law Institute for Attorneys and Landmen, South Texas College of Law, with AIPN, AAPL, HAPL, Houston, Texas, August 28-29,2013

- "Hydraulic Fracturing: Risks in Water Quality and Supply," Lorman Audio Conference, August 21, 2013
- "What's Fracking in the Courts? A Review of Hydraulic Fracturing Cases and Litigation Strategy," Review of Oil & Gas Law XXVIII - Dallas Bar Association Energy Law Section, Dallas, Texas July 18-19, 2013
- Speaker/Participant U.S. - Afghanistan Cooperation on Extractive Industries Development Program, U.S. Department of Commerce Commercial Law Development Program, Doha, Qatar, June 25 - July 2, 2013
- "Recent Developments in Hydraulic Fracturing," 22 Annual Beach and Bar Symposium - Environmental Hot Topics 2013, Sandestin, Florida June 13-16, 2013
- Co-chair and presenter, "Hydraulic Fracturing Litigation: What's Happening in the Courts," 2nd Hydraulic Fracturing Conference, Houston, Texas, June 14, 2013
- "What the Frac Is Frac'ing? Its Impact and Legal Issues," Houston Association of Legal Professionals, Houston, Texas, June 11, 2013
- Co-chair, Institute for Energy Law's 4th Law of Shale Plays Conference, Fort Worth, Texas, June 6-7, 2013
- "Update on Hydraulic Fracturing Regulations and Litigation", Executive meeting Mountain States Legal Foundation, Denver, Colorado, June 5, 2013
- "Preparing for the Future: How Acting Now – In Advance of Regulation – Will Benefit Workers and Limit Future Liability," 3rd Proppants Summit, Houston, Texas, May 22, 2013
- "Hydraulic Fracturing Litigation: Risks and Rewards," ABA Chemical Products and Toxic Tort Regional Meeting, New York, New York, May 13, 2013
- "What the Frac Is Frac'ing? Its Impact and Legal Issues," Houston Paralegal Association, Galveston, Texas May 3, 2013
- Hydraulic Fracturing Conference, The Seminar Group, Bacara Resort & Spa, Santa Monica, California, February 8, 2013
- Speaker at "Chile/US Cooperation on Unconventional Natural Gas," U.S. Commerce Department Commercial Development Law Program, Santiago, Chile, January 27-29, 2013.
- Interviewed by National Public Radio, "Tracing the Culprit if Fracking Pollutes Water Supplies," January 22, 2013
- "Dealing with Community Challenges," Permian Basin Infrastructure & Development Summit, Dallas, Texas, January 14-16, 2013
- "Investment Opportunities in the Proppants Value Chain," 2nd Proppants Summit, Houston, Texas, December 4-6, 2013
- "User's Perspectives," 2nd Proppants Summit, Houston, Texas, December 4-6, 2012.
- "State and Local Regulations," CLE Austin Hydraulic Fracturing Conference, Austin, Texas, November 30, 2012
- "Current Issues in Hydraulic Fracturing," Lorman Audio Conference, Internet, November 13, 2012

- Speaker at "India/US Cooperation on Unconventional Natural Gas," U.S. State Department Bureau of Energy and U.S. Department of Commerce Commercial Development Law Program, New Delhi, India, November 5-6, 2012
- "Hydraulic Fracturing," ABA Toxic Tort Committee, Mass Tort, New York, New York, October 29, 2012
- "The Exploration, Development and Production of Natural Gas by Hydraulic Fracturing," Unconventional Gas Seminar with Bennett Jones LLP, Toronto, Canada, October 23, 2012
- "Where New Hydraulic Fracturing Techniques in Various Shale Plays Embrace New Regulations," Texas Alliance of Energy Producers, October 17-18, 2012
- "Water Trading Markets for Oil and Gas," Water & Energy Upstream Supply & Demand Management Strategies, Houston, Texas, October 4-5, 2012
- "Overview of Current Developments Concerning Shale Gas and Hydraulic Fracturing," HAPL (Houston Association of Professional Landmen), Houston, Texas October 4, 2012
- "Overview of Current Developments Concerning Shale Gas and Hydraulic Fracturing," HalfMoon Seminars, Houston, Texas, September 20, 2012
- "Hydraulic Fracturing Litigation," In-House Presentation to ExxonMobil, Houston, Texas September 11, 2012
- "Fracking – Rules and Regulations," 25th Energy Law Institute for Attorneys and Landmen Co-Sponsored with AAPL (American Association of Professional Landmen), AIPN (Association of International Petroleum Negotiators), HAPL (Houston Association of Professional Landmen), South Texas College of Law, Houston, Texas August 29-30, 2012
- "Hydraulic Fracturing Litigation," In-House Presentation to ExxonMobil, Fairfax, Virginia August 22, 2012
- "Hydraulic Fracturing: What Is It and Why Should You Care?" 20th Anniversary Conference on Arizona Water Law, Biltmore Resort & Spa, Phoenix, Arizona, August 9-10, 2012
- "Water Pollution and Disposal Issues Related to Hydraulic Fracturing," Institute for Energy Law Conference on Shale Gas, Ft. Worth, Texas, June 6-7, 2012
- Conference Co-Chair and Speaker, "Federal and State Update on Hydraulic Fracturing," Water Law Institute Conference on Hydraulic Fracturing Environmental Quality and America's Energy Future, St. Regis Hotel, Houston, Texas, June 7-8, 2012
- "Hydraulic Fracturing: An Update on the Issues," Houston Bar Association Oil, Gas & Mineral Law Section, Houston, Texas, May 22, 2012
- "What Estate Planners Need to Know About Oil and Gas Leasing" Amarillo Area Estate Planning Council, Twenty-First Annual Institute on Estate Planning, Amarillo College of Business & Industry, May 3-4, 2012
- "Hydraulic Fracturing – Are the Regulators Coming or Not?" Young Professionals in Energy International Summit, Las Vegas, Nevada, April 23-25, 2012
- "Hydraulic Fracturing on Trial: Possibilities, Pollution, and Preemption," Plenary Session of 41st Annual American Bar Association Conference on Environmental Law, Salt Lake City, Utah, March 22-24, 2012

- "Hydraulic Fracking and Other Current Issues Impacting Oil & Gas Leases," 2012 Oil & Gas Conference of Texas Bankers Association, San Antonio, Texas, March 8-9, 2012
- "Preparing for Your Deposition," 13th Annual Windstorm Insurance Conference, Orlando, Florida, January 30-February 2, 2012
- "Hydraulic Fracturing and Shale Gas Update," Breakfast Club of Houston, January 11, 2012
- "Oil and Gas Leasing Disputes & Solutions: *Best Practices for Avoiding Common Issues Arising from Hydraulic Fracturing (Fracking) Extraction Agreements*," LexisNexis® Webinar, December 20, 2011
- "Shale Gas Plays: The Hotbeds," Gas Drilling Operations Conference, HB Litigation Conference, Dallas, Texas, December 13, 2011
- Program Chair and Speech, "Litigation Arising from Various Lease Contacts and Oil and Gas Related Contracts," 13th Annual Energy Contract Management in Oil and Gas, Houston, Texas, December 5-6, 2011
- "Ten Things Everyone Should Know About a Current Oil & Gas Lease," Society of Louisiana Certified Public Accountants Oil & Gas Workshop, Lafayette, Louisiana, November 29-30, 2011
- "Water Issues in Oil and Gas Development: Fracking and Wastewater Disposal Issues," The Second Annual Conference on Tribal Water Law, Las Vegas, Nevada, October 27-28, 2011
- "EPA Announces Plans to Regulate 'Fracking'," Marketplace - American Public Media Radio Interview by Scott Tong, October 21, 2011
- "Next Generation Project Texas Energy Seminar," The Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, The University of Texas at Austin, October 20-21, 2011
- "Shale Gas: the Plays and the Playing Field," Fulbright Seminar, New York, New York, October 18, 2011
- "Ten Things Everybody Should Know About an Oil and Gas Lease," National Oil & Gas Royalty Conference, Houston, Texas, October 17, 2011
- "Overview of Fracking Law: a U.S. Perspective," Fraser Milner Casgrain Fracking Seminar, Calgary, Alberta, October 12, 2011
- "Fracking – Are the Regulators Coming or Not? A Review of the State of the Industry," 57th Annual Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Institute, Santa Fe, New Mexico, July 21-23, 2011
- "Shale Gas: the Plays and the Playing Field. The Transactional, Regulatory and Litigation Landscape," Fulbright & Jaworski Breakfast Seminar, The Houstonian Hotel, June 23, 2011
- "Hydraulic Fracking: An Overview of the Issues," Fulbright Forum: Trends in Energy Disputes 2011, June 7, 2011
- "Gulf Oil Spill: Developments & Economic Losses for Claims," Property Loss Research Bureau, 2011 Claims Conference, Nashville, Tennessee, April 3-6, 2011
- "Case Law Update on Bad Faith Topics from Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Florida," 12th Annual Windstorm Insurance Conference, Houston, Texas, January 24-27, 2011
- "Effective Depositions," given at request of client, Vancouver, B.C., May 7, 2009

- "Update on Texas Bad Faith Law," given to client group attending State Bar of Texas Annual Meeting, Houston, Texas, June 26, 2008
- "Litigation Update on Construction Matters," given to a break out group attending 21st Annual Construction Law Conference, San Antonio, Texas, February 28, 2008
- "Construction Contracts Short Course for Board Members and Administrators," Texas Association of School Boards/Texas Association of School Administrators, Dallas, Texas, September 30, 2007
- "The Fourteen Points on How to Properly Prepare for Deposition," given at request of client, Chicago, Illinois, September 20, 2007
- "Update on Recent Developments in Texas Regarding Construction Contracts," given at request of client, Vancouver, B.C., March 13, 2007

Educational Background

1999 - J.D., magna cum laude, University of Houston

1995 - B.A., honors, The University of Texas

While in law school Barclay was Associate Editor of the *Houston Law Review*. He was also selected to be a member of the Order of the Coif and is also a member of the Order of the Barons. He is licensed to practice law in the State of Texas, the State of New York, the State of Colorado, and in the United States District Courts for the Southern, Northern, Western and Eastern Districts of Texas, and for Eastern and Western Districts of Arkansas, as well as the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Interests

In his time away from the office, Barclay enjoys spending time with his wife and their son. As a native Houstonian, he enjoys all outdoor activities. He especially enjoys bird hunting and fishing in Texas and Louisiana. Barclay is also an avid UT football fan and tries to make as many UT games as possible. Barclay is an amateur cook and wine collector and enjoys going out to eat and spending time with his friends and family.

Civic Involvement

Barclay happily serves as a Wish Grantor for the Make-A-Wish Foundation. In this capacity he tries to help pool resources to grant special requests or "wishes" to children with life threatening illnesses. Also, he is active with the Hobby Center and its *Broadway Across America* series and with Houston's *Theater Under the Stars*. Barclay also leads the firm's participation in the Houston Bar Association's Veterans Clinic. During these monthly clinics, held at the Houston VA Hospital, lawyers assist veterans with various legal issues on a pro bono basis. Because of these, and other efforts, for 2012 and 2013 Fulbright was chosen for the Outstanding Large Firm Contribution to the Houston Volunteer Lawyers Programs. Barclay is also a member of the Rotary Club of West U and is a Paul Harris Fellow. Barclay also serves as a member of the University of Texas Forty Acres Society, a group dedicated to giving four-year, full-ride merit based scholarships to the University of Texas.

Norton Rose Fulbright

Norton Rose Fulbright is a global legal practice. We provide the world's pre-eminent corporations and financial institutions with a full business law service. We have more than 3800 lawyers based in over 50 cities across Europe, the United States, Canada, Latin America, Asia, Australia, Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia.

Recognized for our industry focus, we are strong across all the key industry sectors: financial institutions; energy; infrastructure, mining and commodities; transport; technology and innovation; and life sciences and healthcare.

Wherever we are, we operate in accordance with our global business principles of quality, unity and integrity. We aim to provide the highest possible standard of legal service in each of our offices and to maintain that level of quality at every point of contact.

Norton Rose Fulbright LLP, Norton Rose Fulbright Australia, Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP, Norton Rose Fulbright South Africa (incorporated as Deneys Reitz Inc) and Fulbright & Jaworski LLP, each of which is a separate legal entity, are members ('the Norton Rose Fulbright members') of Norton Rose Fulbright Verein, a Swiss Verein. Norton Rose Fulbright Verein helps coordinate the activities of the Norton Rose Fulbright members but does not itself provide legal services to clients.

References to 'Norton Rose Fulbright', 'the law firm', and 'legal practice' are to one or more of the Norton Rose Fulbright members or to one of their respective affiliates (together 'Norton Rose Fulbright entity/entities'). Save that exclusively for the purposes of compliance with US bar rules, where James W. Repass will be responsible for the content of this publication, no individual who is a member, partner, shareholder, director, employee or consultant of, in or to any Norton Rose Fulbright entity (whether or not such individual is described as a 'partner') accepts or assumes responsibility, or has any liability, to any person in respect of this communication. Any reference to a partner or director is to a member, employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications of the relevant Norton Rose Fulbright entity. The purpose of this communication is to provide information as to developments in the law. It does not contain a full analysis of the law nor does it constitute an opinion of any Norton Rose Fulbright entity on the points of law discussed. You must take specific legal advice on any particular matter which concerns you. If you require any advice or further information, please speak to your usual contact at Norton Rose Fulbright.

