

PRESENTED AT

2016 Fundamentals of Oil, Gas and Mineral Law

April 14, 2016
Houston, Texas

Implied Covenants

Elizabeth N. “Becky” Miller

Author Contact Information:
Elizabeth N. “Becky” Miller
Scott Douglass & McConnico LLP
303 Colorado Street, Suite 2400
Austin, TX 78701

bmiller@scottdoug.com
512-495-6300

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	1
	A. Historical Basis	1
	B. Must Arise From Express Contract.....	1
III.	DEFINITION OF THE IMPLIED COVENANTS.....	2
	A. Definition.....	2
	B. Standard of Care.....	2
	C. Executive Rights Duty: Is it an Implied Covenant?.....	3
IV.	SPECIFIC COVENANTS	4
	A. Implied Covenant to Develop.....	4
	1. Actions Required.....	4
	a. To Drill Initial Well?	4
	b. To Develop After Initial Well.....	5
	c. No Distinction Between Subsequent Development or Exploratory Wells	5
	2. Remedies.....	5
	a. Lost Royalty.....	5
	b. Conditional Cancellation of Lease.....	6
	B. Implied Covenant to Protect.....	7
	1. Actions Required.....	7
	a. In General.....	7
	b. To Protect in Whatever Means Appropriate.....	8
	(1) Drilling Offset Wells.....	8
	(2) Seeking Administrative Relief.....	8
	(3) Pooling in Good Faith.....	8
	c. Each Lease Entitled to Protection.....	10
	2. Remedies.....	10
	a. Drainage Damages.....	10
	b. Pooling Damages.....	11
	(1) Unit Cancellation and Attendant Damages.....	11
	(2) Partial Cancellation?.....	12
	(3) Damages Based on Hypothetical Unit?	12
	3. Implied Protective Covenant Versus Express Lease Terms.....	13
	a. Implied Covenants Compliments Express Terms.....	13
	b. Implied Covenants Do Not Negate Express Clauses.....	14
	C. Implied Covenant to Manage and Administer the Lease.....	14
	1. Actions Required.....	14
	2. Duty to Market.....	14
	a. The Covenant and “Proceeds” Leases	15
	b. “Market Value” Leases Distinguished.....	16
	(1) Sales to Affiliates.....	19
	(2) Sales to Third Parties.....	20
	3. Settlement of Contract Disputes	20
	4. Implied Covenants Enforceable by Assignees.....	20
	5. Class Actions	21
	6. Other Obligations to Manage and Administer.....	22
	a. Notice.....	22
	b. Release of Lease	23
	7. Force Majeure	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Alameda Corp. v. TransAmerican Natural Gas Corp.,
950 S.W.2d 93 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1997, writ denied) 6, 20

Amoco Prod. Co. v. Alexander,
622 S.W.2d 563 (Tex. 1981)..... passim

Amoco Prod. Co. v. First Baptist Church of Pyote,
579 S.W.2d 280 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.), *per curiam*,
611 S.W.2d 610 (Tex. 1980)..... 9, 15, 16

Andretta v. West,
415 S.W.2d 638 (Tex. 1967)..... 4

Atl. Richfield Co. v. Gruy,
720 S.W.2d 121 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1986, writ ref’d n.r.e.)..... 5

Batex Oil Co. v. La Brisa Land and Cattle Co.,
352 S.W.2d 769 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1961, writ dism’d.)..... 7

Bolton v. Coats,
533 S.W.2d 914 (Tex. 1975)..... 20

Bowden v. Phillips Petroleum Co.,
247 S.W.3d 690 (Tex. 2008)..... 21

Browning Oil Co. v. Lueke,
38 S.W.3d 625 (Tex.App. – Austin, 2000, pet. den.)..... 12

Bryant v. Clark,
358 S.W.2d 614 (Tex. 1962)..... 13

Cabot Corp. v. Brown,
754 S.W.2d 104 (Tex. 1987)..... 15, 16, 17

Circle Dot Ranch, Inc. v. Sidwell Oil & Gas, Inc.,
891 S.W.2d 342 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 1995, writ denied) 9

Clifton v. Koontz,
160 Tex. 82, 325 S.W.2d 684 (Tex. 1959)..... 5, 8

Coastal Oil & Gas Corp. v. Garza Energy Trust,
268 S.W.3d 1 (Tex. 2008)..... 11

Cole Petroleum Co. v. U. S. Gas & Oil Co.,
121 Tex. 59, 41 S.W.2d 414 (Tex. 1931)..... 14, 20

Computer Assocs. Int’l, Inc. v. Altai, Inc.,
918 S.W.2d 453 (Tex. 1996)..... 22

Implied Covenants

<i>Condovest Corp. v. John Street Builders, Inc.</i> , 662 S.W.2d 138 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, no writ).....	13
<i>Condra v. Quinoco Petroleum, Inc.</i> , 954 S.W.2d 68 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1997, writ denied).....	6, 20, 21
<i>Cook v. Tompkins</i> , 713 S.W.2d 417 (Tex. App.—Eastland 1986, no writ).....	20
<i>Crim Truck & Tractor v. Navistar Int’l Corp.</i> , 823 S.W. 2d 591 (Tex. 1992).....	3
<i>Danciger Oil & Refineries, Inc. v. Hamill Drilling Co.</i> , 141 Tex. 153, 171 S.W.2d 321 (Tex. 1943).....	18
<i>Danciger Oil & Refining Co. of Texas v. Powell</i> , 154 S.W.2d 632 (Tex. 1941).....	1, 2
<i>Elliott v. Davis</i> , 553 S.W.2d 223 (Tex. Civ. App.—Amarillo, 1977 writ ref’d n.r.e.)	9
<i>Enron Oil & Gas Co. v. Joffrion</i> , 116 S.W.3d 215 (Tex. App.—Tyler 2003, no pet.)	3
<i>Expando Prod. Co. v. Marshall</i> , 407 S.W.2d 254 (Tex. Civ. App.—Fort Worth 1966, writ ref’d n.r.e.)	9
<i>Exxon Corp. v. Atl. Richfield Co.</i> , 678 S.W.2d 944 (Tex. 1984).....	14
<i>Exxon Corp. v. Middleton</i> , 613 S.W.2d 240 (Tex. 1981).....	16, 18, 19
<i>Freeport Sulphur Co. v. Am. Sulphur Royalty Co.</i> , 117 Tex. 439, 6 S.W.2d 1039 (Tex. 1928).....	1, 6, 14
<i>Frost Nat’l Bank v. Matthews</i> , 713 S.W.2d 365 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1986, writ ref’d n.r.e.).....	24
<i>Glassell v. Ellis</i> , 956 S.W.2d 676 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1997, review dism’d w.o.j.)	21, 22
<i>Good v. TXO Prod. Corp.</i> , 763 S.W.2d 59 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 1988, writ denied)	8
<i>Grubb v. McAfee</i> , 109 Tex. 527, 212 S.W. 464 (Tex. 1919).....	1
<i>Gulf Prod. Co. v. Kishi</i> , 129 Tex. 487, 103 S.W.2d 965 (Tex. 1937).....	14
<i>HECI Exploration Co. v. Neel</i> , 982 S.W.2d 881 (Tex. 1998).....	passim

Implied Covenants

<i>Heritage Res., Inc. v. NationsBank</i> , 939 S.W.2d 118 (Tex. 1996) <i>rehr’g overruled</i> , 960 S.W.2d 619 (Tex. 1997)	16, 18, 19
<i>Holbein v. Austral Oil Co., Inc.</i> , 609 F.2d 206 (5th Cir. 1980)	18
<i>Holman v. Meridian Oil, Inc.</i> , 988 S.W.2d 802 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1999, <i>pet. denied</i>)	23
<i>Hooks v. Samson Lone Star, Ltd. Partnership</i> , 457 S.W.3d 52 (Tex. 2014).....	22
<i>Hurd Enters. Ltd. v. Bruni</i> , 828 S.W.2d 101 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1992, <i>writ denied</i>).....	6, 20
<i>In Re: Bass</i> , 113 S.W.3d 735 (Tex. 2003).....	4
<i>Johnson v. Snell</i> , 504 S.W.2d 397 (Tex. 1973).....	13
<i>Jones v. Killingsworth</i> , 403 S.W.2d 325 (Tex. 1965).....	8, 11
<i>Judice v. Mewbourne Oil Co.</i> , 939 S.W.2d 133 (Tex. 1996).....	18, 19
<i>KCM Financial LLC v. Bradshaw</i> , 457 S.W.3d 70 (Tex. 2015).....	3
<i>Kerr-McGee Corp. v. Helton</i> , 133 S.W.3d 245 (Tex. 2004).....	11
<i>Kidd v. Hoggett</i> , 331 S.W.2d 515 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1959, <i>writ ref’d n.r.e.</i>).....	23
<i>Killam Oil Co. v. Bruni</i> , 806 S.W.2d 264 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1991, <i>writ denied</i>).....	6, 20
<i>Kodiak 1981 Drilling Partnership v. Delhi Gas Pipeline Corp.</i> , 736 S.W.2d 715 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1987, <i>writ ref’d n.r.e.</i>).....	24
<i>Le Cuno Oil Co. v. Smith</i> , 306 S.W.2d 190 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1957, <i>writ ref’d n.r.e.</i>), <i>cert. denied</i> , 356 U.S. 974, 78 S. Ct. 1137, 2 L.Ed.2d 1147 (Jun. 02, 1958).....	18
<i>Lenape Res. Corp. v. Tenn. Gas Pipeline Co.</i> , 925 S.W.2d 565 (Tex. 1996).....	5
<i>Lesley v. Veterans Land Board</i> , 352 S.W.3d 479 (Tex. 2011).....	4

Implied Covenants

<i>Mandell v. Hammon Oil and Refining Co.</i> , 822 S.W.2d 153 (Tex. App.—Houston [1 st Dist.] 1991, writ denied)	6, 20
<i>Manges v. Guerra</i> , 673 S.W.2d 180 (Tex. 1984).....	3, 4
<i>Marrs and Smith P’ship v. D.K. Boyd Oil and Gas Co., Inc.</i> , 223 S.W.3d 1 (Tex.App.—El Paso 2005, pet. denied)	3
<i>Martin v. Glass</i> , 571 F. Supp. 1406; (N.D. Tex. 1983), <i>aff’d</i> , 736 F.2d 1524 (5th Cir. 1984).....	18
<i>Modern Exploration, Inc. v. Maddison</i> , 708 S.W.2d 872 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 1986, no writ)	23
<i>Occidental Permian Ltd. v. French</i> , 391 S.W.3d 215 (Tex. App.—Eastland, pet. granted)	16
<i>Parker v. TXO Prod. Corp.</i> , 716 S.W.2d 644 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 1986, no writ)	18, 19
<i>Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Johnson</i> , 155 F.2d 185 (5th Cir. 1946)	16
<i>Pickens v. Hope</i> , 764 S.W.2d 256 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1988, writ denied).....	5
<i>Rhoads Drilling Co. v. Allred</i> , 123 Tex. 229, 70 S.W.2d 576 (Tex. 1934).....	14
<i>Roberts v. Lone Star Prod. Co.</i> , 369 S.W.2d 373 (Tex. Civ. App.—Eastland 1963, no writ).....	11
<i>ROCA Resource Company, Inc. v. Devon Energy Production L.P.</i> , 2015 WL 4479118 (United States District Court, W.D. Texas, Pecos Division)	3
<i>Rogers v. Ricane Enters., Inc.</i> , 772 S.W.2d 76 (Tex. 1989) (“ <i>Ricane I</i> ”).....	7
<i>Rogers v. Ricane Enters., Inc.</i> , 884 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1994) (“ <i>Ricane II</i> ”)	7
<i>Rogers v. Westerman Farm Company</i> , 29 P.3d 887 (Colo. 2001).....	18
<i>Schlittler v. Smith</i> , 128 Tex. 628, 101 S.W.2d 543 (1937).....	3
<i>Shell Oil Co. v. Ross</i> , 356 S.W.3d 924 (Tex. 2011).....	23

Implied Covenants

<i>Shell Oil Co. v. Stansbury</i> , 401 S.W.2d 623 (Tex. Civ. App.—Beaumont 1966, writ ref’d n.r.e.) <i>per curiam</i> 410 S.W.2d 187 (Tex. 1966).....	10, 13
<i>Shivers v. Texaco Exploration and Prod., Inc.</i> , 965 S.W.2d 727 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1998, writ denied)	22
<i>Sinclair Oil & Gas Co. v. Bryan</i> , 291 S.W. 692 (Tex. Civ. App.—Galveston 1927, writ ref’d).....	10
<i>Slaughter v. Cities Serv. Oil Co.</i> , 660 S.W.2d 860 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 1983, no writ)	5, 6, 7
<i>Southeastern Pipe Line Co., Inc. v. Tichacek</i> , 997 S.W.2d 166 (Tex. 1999).....	8, 9, 10, 13
<i>Southland Royalty Co. v. Humble Oil & Refining Co.</i> , 249 S.W.2d 914 (Tex. 1952).....	11
<i>Southwest Gas Prod. Co., Inc. v. Seale</i> , 191 So.2d 115 (Miss. 1966).....	12
<i>Sun Exploration and Prod. Co. v. Jackson</i> , 783 S.W.2d 202 (Tex. 1989).....	5
<i>Sun Operating Ltd. P’ship v. Holt</i> , 984 S.W.2d 277 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 1998, pet. denied).....	24
<i>Tana Oil & Gas Co. v. Bates</i> , 978 S.W.2d 735 (Tex. App.—Austin 1998, no pet.)	21
<i>Texas Co. v. Davis</i> , 113 Tex. 321, 254 S.W. 304 (Tex. 1923).....	7
<i>Texas Oil & Gas Corp. v. Hagen</i> , 1987 WL 47847 (Tex. 1987), <i>opinion withdrawn, case settled</i> , 760 S.W.2d 960 (Tex. 1988).....	2, 9, 19
<i>Texas Oil & Gas Corp. v. Vela</i> , 429 S.W.2d 866 (Tex. 1968).....	16, 17
<i>Texas Pac. Coal & Oil Co. v. Barker</i> , 117 Tex. 418, 6 S.W.2d 1031 (Tex. 1928).....	5, 6, 8, 16
<i>TransAmerican Natural Gas Corp. v. Finkelstein</i> , 933 S.W.2d 591 (Tex. App.—San Antonio, 1996, writ denied).....	6, 20
<i>Union Pac. Res. Group, Inc. v. Hankins</i> , 111 S.W.3d 69 (Tex. 2003).....	21
<i>W. T. Waggoner Estate v. Sigler Oil Co.</i> , 118 Tex. 509, 19 S.W.2d 27 (Tex. 1929).....	1, 6

Implied Covenants

West-Tex Land Co. v. Simmons,
566 S.W.2d 719 (Tex. Civ. App.—Eastland 1978, writ ref'd. n.r.e.) 6, 7, 20

Witherspoon v. Green,
274 S.W. 170 (Tex. Civ. App.—Dallas 1925, no writ)..... 23

Yzaguirre v. KCS Res., Inc.,
53 S.W.3d 368 (Tex. 2001)..... 16, 17

Treatises

H. Williams & C. Meyers, 5 *Oil and Gas Law* § 853, (1981) 14

H. Williams & C. Meyers, 8 *Oil and Gas Law* § 46 (Supp. 1995) 19

Koontz, 4 *The Law of Oil & Gas*, § 48.3 (1972)..... 9

R. Hemmingway, *The Law of Oil and Gas*, § 8.1 (1971) 2

IMPLIED COVENANTS

I. INTRODUCTION

An oil, gas and mineral law practitioner in Texas requires a clear understanding of implied covenant law in order to understand, analyze, protect and enforce the rights and obligations of parties to oil, gas and mineral leases here and in many other jurisdictions. While that law has been well established and fairly well understood for several years, its application to specific facts continues to evolve. This paper will discuss the historic background of those principles and will look at what changes may yet come. In addition, this paper briefly addresses the duty owed by an executive to its non-participating interest owner, how that duty is different from duties owed under the implied covenants, and why.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Historical Basis.

Implied covenants are a part of all Texas mineral leases and have been recognized as enforceable, contractual obligations since early in the twentieth century. *W. T. Waggoner Estate v. Sigler Oil Co.*, 118 Tex. 509, 19 S.W.2d 27, 29 (Tex. 1929) (when lease fails to define lessee's duty as regards development after discovery of paying production, the law implies the obligation to continue to develop and produce oil or gas with reasonable diligence); *Freeport Sulphur Co. v. Am. Sulphur Royalty Co.*, 117 Tex. 439, 6 S.W.2d 1039, 1042 (Tex. 1928) (an implied covenant for diligent and reasonable development and operation exists in a lease which makes the lessor's compensation depend upon development and operations); *Grubb v. McAfee*, 109 Tex. 527, 212 S.W. 464, 465 (Tex. 1919) (approving lower court holding that the law implies the obligation to exercise reasonable diligence to continue drilling after oil encountered in first well).

In *Freeport Sulphur Co.*, the Texas Supreme Court held a covenant will be implied in a lease when it is "so clearly within the contemplation of the parties . . . that they deemed it unnecessary to express, and therefore omitted to do so, or that it is necessary to imply such covenant in order to give effect to and effectuate the purposes of the contract as a whole." *Freeport Sulphur Co.* at 117 Tex. 439, 6 S.W.2d at 1041-42 (Tex. 1928).

B. Must Arise From Express Contract.

Implied covenants arise out of the written agreement of the parties. The implied covenants must be complimentary, but not contrary, to the express provisions of the lease. In *Danciger Oil & Refining Co. of Texas v. Powell*, 154 S.W.2d 632, 635 (Tex. 1941), the Court stated:

[I]t is not enough to say that an implied covenant is necessary in order to make the contract fair, or that without such a covenant it would be improvident or unwise, or that the contract would operate unjustly. It must arise from the presumed

Implied Covenants

intention of the parties as gathered from the instrument as a whole. . . . However, covenants will be implied in fact when necessary to give effect to the actual intent of the parties as reflected by the contract or conveyance as construed in its entirety in the light of the circumstances under which it was made and the purposes sought to be accomplished.

Similarly, in *HECI Exploration Co. v. Neel*, 982 S.W.2d 881 (Tex. 1998) the Court revisited the basis for implied covenants and reiterated the long-standing rule that implied covenants must spring out of the actual terms of the lease and not be contrary to it. “A covenant will not be implied unless it appears from the express terms of the contract that ‘it was so clearly within the contemplation of the parties that they deemed it unnecessary to express it’ and therefore they omitted to do so, or ‘it must appear that it is necessary to infer such a covenant in order to effectuate the full purpose of the contract as a whole as gathered from the written instruments.’” *HECI Exploration Co.*, 982 S.W.2d at 888 (quoting *Danciger Oil & Refining Co. of Texas v. Powell*, 154 S.W.2d at 635).

III. DEFINITION OF THE IMPLIED COVENANTS

A. Definition.

The landmark Supreme Court case describing covenants implied in oil and gas leases is *Amoco Prod. Co. v. Alexander*, 622 S.W.2d 563 (Tex. 1981). In that case, the Texas Supreme Court described the implied covenants as: (1) covenant to develop the lease: which may include an obligation to drill an initial well but is more usually defined as the obligation to develop the lease after production has been acquired; (2) covenant to protect the lease: which includes the obligation to protect against drainage and not to depreciate the lessors’ interest; and (3) covenant to manage and administer the lease: which includes the obligation to produce and market production, to operate with reasonable care, to use successful modern methods of production and development, and—under the appropriate circumstances—to seek favorable administrative action. *Amoco Prod. Co.*, 622 S.W.2d at 567 (quoting R. Hemmingway, *The Law of Oil and Gas*, § 8.1 (1971)).

B. Standard of Care.

Amoco also identifies the standard by which a lessee’s conduct under these implied covenants will be measured. The general duty of the lessee is to conduct operations as a reasonably prudent operator would to carry out the purposes of the oil and gas lease. *Amoco Prod. Co.*, 622 S.W.2d at 568. This standard is known as the “reasonably prudent operator” or “RPO” standard, defined as “what a reasonably prudent operator would do under the same or similar circumstances.” This is not a fiduciary standard. Absent evidence of some special relationship between the lessor and the lessee, separate from the lease, or some duty explicit in the language of the lease, the lessee does not owe a fiduciary duty to the lessor. *Texas Oil & Gas Corp. v. Hagen*, 1987 WL 47847 (Tex. 1987), *opinion withdrawn, case settled*, 760 S.W.2d 960 (Tex. 1988). Because there is no good faith or other fiduciary duty to perform any of the implied

Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the [UT Law CLE eLibrary \(utcle.org/elibrary\)](http://utcle.org/elibrary)

Title search: Implied Covenants

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2016 Fundamentals of Oil, Gas and Mineral Law eConference](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
2016 Fundamentals of Oil, Gas and Mineral Law session
"Implied Covenants"