

Office of the Attorney General **Elizabeth Barrett-Anderson** Attorney General of Guam 590 S. Marine Corps Drive Tel. (671) 475-3324 Fax. (671) 472-2493 www.guamag.org

**Solicitor Division** ITC Bldg., Ste. 802 Tamuning, Guam 96913 ● USA

Attorneys for the Government of Guam

## IN THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY PROCUREMENT APPEAL

IN THE APPEAL OF:	) DOCKET NO. <b>OPA-PA-17-009</b>
CORE TECH INTERNATIONAL CORP.,	) ) ) <b>MOTION FOR</b>
	) SUMMARY JUDGMENT
APPELLANT.	)

Comes Now, the Department of Public Works, Purchasing Agency, by and through the Attorney General of Guam, and moves, pursuant to Civil Rule 56 for summary judgment.

## I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Public Law 34-19 amended the MA KAHAT ACT OF 2013 (the "Act"). The law authorized the government to solicit for the renovation or construction of Simon Sanchez High School ("SSHS") and to award the contract to the "responsive offer submitted by a responsible offeror that is responsive to the solicitation and offers the lowest annual leaseback rate to the government of Guam for a fixed thirty (30) year term." See, P.L. 34-19:3.

On July 7 2017, the Department of Public Works ("DPW") issued an Invitation to Bid

Page 1 of 4 Motion for Summary Judgment In the Appeal of: Core Tech International Office of Public Accountability Docket No. OPA-PA-17-009



RECEIVED OFFICE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY PROCUREMENT APPEALS

TIME: 4:39 DAM MPM BY: C. RUQUE

11/03/17

FILE NO OPA-PA: 17-W9

DATE:

Project No. 730-5-1057-L-YIG Lease Financing for Design, Renovation, Rehabilitation,

Construction and Maintenance of Simon Sanchez High School. The IFB, as authorized by the Act,

contemplated that the contract be awarded to a responsible offeror with a responsive offer with the

lowest annual leaseback rate for a thirty (30) year term.

Core Tech filed a written protest on September 7, 2017, asserting two (2) claims. Core

Tech's first claim was that the IFB failed to include all applicable contractual terms and conditions

as required by Guam's Procurement Law. Its second claim was that it would be improper for DPW

to consider a notice of default/termination as a "Record of Default" in the determination of

responsibility. DPW issued its Agency Decision on September 29, 2017, agreeing to revise the

IFB with regard to the first claim and denying the second claim. DPW canceled the IFB on October

2, 2017 to revise and reissue considering Core Tech's concerns with the IFB. Core Tech appealed

DPW's denial of the second claim as set forth in the Notice of Appeal and Protest.

II. ISSUE

Whether Appellant's claim should be dismissed because Appellant cannot show they have been damaged by the request to provide a record of past

performance including record of default

III. DISCUSSION

Applicable summary judgment standard

"The court may grant summary judgment pursuant to Rule 56 of the Guam Rules of

Civil Procedure when the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions

on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show there is no genuine issue as to any material

fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law. Bank of Guam v.

Flores, 2004 Guam 25, ¶ 8 (Guam Dec. 29, 2004). The party moving for summary judgment

bears the initial responsibility of demonstrating the "absence of a genuine issue of material

fact." Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323, 106 S. Ct. 2548, 91 L. Ed. 2d 265 (1986).

The party opposing a motion for summary judgment cannot rest upon the mere allegations of

Page 2 of 4

his or her pleadings. Instead, the opposing party must set forth specific facts showing that

there is a genuine issue of fact for trial. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 256,

106 S. Ct. 2505, 91 L. Ed. 2d 202 (1986). In this regard, the party opposing the motion has

the burden of presenting "affirmative evidence". Id. at 257.

Whether Appellant's claim should be dismissed because Appellant cannot

show they have been damaged by the request to provide a record of past

performance including record of default

Here Appellant's claim should be dismissed because there is no evidence that the

Appellant has sustained damages by the IFB's request to provide a record of past performance

including record of default has caused them damage. Appellant's protest and subsequent

appeal of this procurement is premature as they have not determined a nonresponsible bidder

and not been rejected as a bidder in this procurement

Bids have not been submitted for evaluation. The evaluation committee has not been

convened to evaluate bids and determine whether the bidders are responsible. In other words,

Appellant has not submitted a bid, their record of performance has not been evaluated, they

have not been determined nonresponsble, and they have not been rejected as a bidder in this

procurement. Appellant has not sustained damages.

Appellant's claim and argument that they are not a responsible bidder is speculative

and conjectural. See Miller v. Likins, 109 Wash. App. 140, 34 P.3d 835 (2001) (The court

found arguments to be speculative or conjectural and affirmed lower court's summary

iudgment dismissal of claims.) The determination of responsibility is vested in the evaluation

committee and not the bidder. It is not known what weight if any would be given to a

termination of default especially if it has not been adjudicated. Since Appellant has not

submitted a bid, has not been evaluated, has not been rejected as nonresponsible, Appellant

Page 3 of 4

Motion for Summary Judgment In the Appeal of: Core Tech International cannot claim they have been damaged.

The construction of a new SSHS campus is urgently needed and a procurement of high priority. Appellant's protest and appeal is spurious and unnecessarily disruptive to this urgently needed procurement to construct a new SSHS campus. This is evident by their premature protest and appeal of this procurement as discussed above.

## IV. CONCLUSION

Purchasing Agency's motion for summary judgment should be granted.

Submitted this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2017.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL Elizabeth Barrett-Anderson, Attorney General

By:

TOM KEELER

Assistant Attorney General