28

Procurement was issued after the receipt of the Protest on February 7, 2014. GDOE Exhibit 16, Bates Stamp No. GDOE0382.

On March 7, 2014, GDOE denied the protest in its entirety. On the same day, GDOE issued a Notice to Lift the Stay of Procurement. GDOE Exhibit 17, Bates Stamp No. GDOE0384. GDOE determined that the stay provision contained in 5 G.C.A. § 5425(g) and 2 G.A.R. Div. 4 § 9101(e) did not apply because J&B filed its protest after JRN was issued a purchase order.

DISCUSSION

A protest is considered timely when it is made in writing to the Director of Education and shall be filed within fourteen working days after the protestor knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto. *See* 5 G.C.A. § 5425(a); Chapter IX, Section 9.2.3.1, DOE Procurement Regulations; See 2 G.A.R. Div. 4 § 9101(c)(1). Under Guam law, in the event a timely protest is made, the Territory shall not proceed further with the solicitation or with the award of the contract prior to final resolution of such protest. 5 G.C.A. § 5425(g).

However, Chapter IX, Section 9.2.5, DOE Procurement Regulations and 2 G.A.R. Div. 4 § 9101(e) further elaborate that the automatic stay provision is triggered only when a timely protest is made and that the protest was filed before an award was made. *See Guam Imaging Consultants, Inc. GMHA*, 2004 Guam 15 ¶24 (The Guam Supreme Court interpreted 5 G.C.A. § 5425(g) along with 26 G.A.R. § 16901(e), which is the Guam Memorial Hospital Authority's automatic stay provision contained in its procurement regulation, and 26 G.A.R. § 16901(e) is substantially similar to both Chapter IX, Section 9.2.5, DOE Procurement Regulations and 2 G.A.R. Div. 4 § 9101(e)).

In *Guam Imaging Consultants*, the Guam Supreme Court read both the Guam Procurement law and the procurement regulations together, and clearly stated that there must be a two-step analysis in order to determine whether the automatic stay provision is triggered. *Id.* at $\P 23 - 24$. The first step is to determine whether there is a timely filing of a protest, and the

second step is to determine whether the protest was filed before an award was made. *Id.* at ¶24. The Guam Supreme Court concluded that the automatic stay provision is triggered only when a protest is timely filed and filed prior to an award being made. *Id.* Therefore, the Guam Supreme Court's interpretation is binding upon the OPA.

J&B heavily relies on the OPA's decision in *In re Appeal of JMI Edison*, OPA-PA-13-010, Order Granting Motion re Automatic Stay. In *JMI Edison*, on July 3, 2013, JMI Edison ("JMI") filed a protest with GDOE before an award had been made. *JMI Edison*, OPA-PA-13-010, Submission of Procurement Record, Exhibit 13, Bates Stamp No. GDOE001854-001856. As a result of the protest, GDOE issued a Notice of Stay of Procurement on July 3, 2013. *Id.* at Exhibit 14, Bates Stamp No. GDOE001857. On July 25, 2013, GDOE issued a written response denying JMI's protest. *Id.* at Exhibit 17, Bates Stamp No. GDOE001882-001925. On the same day, GDOE lifted the stay and fully executed the contract with J&B. Id. at Exhibit 15, Bates Stamp No. GDOE001858 and Exhibit 16, Bates Stamp No. GDOE001859-001881. In *JMI Edison*, JMI's protest was timely filed *before an award was made*. Therefore, the OPA ruled that the automatic stay was triggered when JMI filed its protest.

However, the facts and circumstances in *JMI Edison* are vastly different than in the present case. On February 5, 2014, GDOE issued an Analysis and Recommendation that determined that JRN was the lowest responsible bidder, and recommended JRN be awarded the contract for the IFB On February 5, 2014. GDOE Exhibit 9, Bates Stamp No. GDOE00319. GDOE awarded JRN the contract by issuing Purchase Order No. 20140367-00 in the amount of \$254,501.91 on February 5, 2014. GDOE Exhibit 15, Bates Stamp No. GDOE0381-0382. On February 6, 2014, a day after the award was made to JRN, J&B filed a protest in writing with GDOE.

J&B filed its protest within the 14 days as required by 5 G.C.A. § 5425(a), Chapter IX, Section 9.2.3.1, DOE Procurement Regulations, and 2 G.A.R. Div. 4 § 9101(c)(1). However, it is clear that J&B filed its protest after the issuance of a purchase order to the JRN. Under the

analysis of in *Guam Imaging Consultants*, the automatic stay provisions contained in 5 G.C.A § 5425(g), Chapter IX, Section 9.2.5, DOE Procurement Regulations and 2 G.A.R. Div. 4 § 9101(e) is triggered only when there is a timely protest filed and only if, the protest is filed before an award is made. In the instant case, J&B filed its timely protest *after an award had been made*, and therefore, the automatic stay provision was never triggered.

Based on the Guam Supreme Court's interpretation of the automatic stay provisions of the Guam Procurement Law and Regulations in *Guam Imaging Consultants*, the automatic stay provisions contained in 5 G.C.A. § 5425(g), Chapter IX, Section 9.2.5 of the DOE Procurement Regulations and 2 G.A.R. Div. 4 § 9101(e) were not triggered, and thus, GDOE was not mandated to institute a stay. Therefore, GDOE was permitted to lift the stay on March 7, 2014.

J&B argues that it will suffer irreparable harm if the stay is not instituted. Guam law limits what an aggrieved bidder may recover if its appeal is sustained. See 5 GCA § 5425(h). In addition, Guam law limits the remedies that the OPA may impose either before or after an award has been made. See 5 G.C.A. § 5451 and 5 G.C.A. § 5452. Therefore, J&B is limited to the remedies provided under the law, and is not entitled to an automatic stay.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, GDOE respectfully requests that the Office of Public Accountability deny J&B's Motion to Declare Automatic Stay in Effect.

Dated this 18^h day of April, 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

GUAM DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ANDREW T. PEREZ, ESQ.

Legal Counsel