



Jerrick Hernandez &lt;jhernandez@guamopa.com&gt;

---

**OPAPA21-011**

---

**GPE INC** <guampacific@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 27, 2021 at 3:02 PM

To: Jerrick Hernandez &lt;jhernandez@guamopa.com&gt;, "Camacho, Anthony" &lt;arcamacho@triton.uog.edu&gt;, "Gumataotao, Emily" &lt;eggumataotao@triton.uog.edu&gt;, Cynthia Guerrero &lt;cguerrero@triton.uog.edu&gt;


Dear Mr Hernandez,

Please see attached reply to UOGS reply and please confirm receipt of this email.

Very Respectfully,  
Sedfrey M Linsangan  
PresidentGuam Pacific Enterprise, Inc.  
Tel: (671) 649-6994/7/8

*This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this email. Please notify the sender immediately by email if you have received this email by mistake and delete this email from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.*

---

 **12 27 2021.pdf**  
732K

Sedfrey M Linsangan  
P.O. Box 23128  
Barrigada Guam 96921  
Pro Se

BEFORE THE PUBLIC AUDITOR  
PROCUREMENT APPEALS  
TERRITORY OF GUAM

In the Appeal of	Appeal No. OPA-PA 21-011
Guam Pacific Ent. Inc. Appellant	Reply to Reply to UOG'S Motion to Dismiss
v. University of Guam	

Memorandum of Points and Authorities

UOG Counsel should know better. Since the OPA was established, Pro Se or Representative of the Company were permitted by OPA to represent their company. There are numerous precedent setting cases that Pro Se were allowed such as OPA-PA 09-003 and OPA-PA-15-010. I represented my company in the before mentioned cases.


I also represented my company in the Small Claims Court several times with no resistance from the Judges. Tribunal is not a Superior Court of Guam. OPA only deals with procurement Appeal. It is true, Legal Counsel is needed in the Superior Court and highest Court when it comes to a corporation. There are precedent cases that justified the requirement of Legal Counsel for Corporation in the Superior Court. But in O.P.A. and Small Claims Court, Legal Counsel is discretionary.

Same with Hearing Proceedings, Subsection (d) of Section 12108 provides that <sup>11</sup>hearings shall be as informal as maybe reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances and shall not be bound by statutory rules of evidence or by technical or formal rules of procedure

except as provided by the Guam Procurement Law, Chapter 5 of Title 3, GCA and with these procurement appeals regulation. There is nothing in the Guam Procurement Law and Appeals that provides the requirement of Legal Counsel for any Appellant.

VOG Counsel is just regurgitating the jurisdiction, untimely and unauthorized filing issues that ~~were~~ already resolved by OPA Cruz. OPA Cruz action was justified by Section 5501, Federal Funds and other provisions in Chapter 5 Guam Procurement Law

Date: December 27, 2021

Respectfully Submitted  
  
Sedfrey M. Linsangan