

FILED  
SUPERIOR COURT  
OF GUAM

2026 JAN -8 PM 4: 00

CLERK OF COURT

By: MP

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF GUAM**

DONNA E. LAWRENCE,

Petitioner,

v.

DOUGLAS B. MOYLAN, as a Public Official  
capacity as the elected ATTORNEY  
GENERAL OF GUAM, JOSEPH GUTHRIE,  
as a Public Official in the OFFICE OF THE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF GUAM, GARY  
W.F. GUMATAOTAO, as a Public Official in  
the OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL OF GUAM, and D. GRAHAM  
BOTH, as a Public Official in the OFFICE  
OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF  
GUAM.

Respondents.

SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS CASE NO.  
SP0136-23

**DECISION AND ORDER**

**INTRODUCTION**

This case poses a straightforward question with weighty consequences: What should a court do when a litigant repeatedly ignores its orders, misses hearings, and takes no steps to move her case forward? Petitioner Donna E. Lawrence ("Petitioner") brought this Sunshine Reform Act suit seeking transparency from public officials. But after filing her pleadings, she stopped participating in her own case—failing to comply with court directives, failing to file

1 required notices, and failing to appear at hearings despite clear warnings. Respondents Douglas  
2 B. Moylan, Joseph Guthrie, Gary W.F. Gumataotao, and D. Graham Botha—all officials with  
3 the Office of the Attorney General of Guam—moved to dismiss under GRCP 41(b), arguing  
4 that Petitioner’s abandonment of the litigation and disregard of court orders leave no path  
5 forward. The motion came before the Honorable Arthur R. Barcinas on October 17, 2025.  
6 Respondents appeared through counsel; Petitioner did not. The rules governing dismissal for  
7 failure to prosecute exist for a reason. Courts cannot resolve cases when parties do not  
8 participate. They cannot manage dockets when litigants disregard deadlines. And they cannot  
9 protect the integrity of the judicial process when orders carry no consequences. So the question  
10 before the Court is narrow but decisive: Has Petitioner’s prolonged noncompliance and repeated  
11 failure to appear reached the point where dismissal under Rule 41(b) is warranted?  
12 For the reasons explained below, the answer is yes.

### 15 BACKGROUND

16 On October 23, 2023, Petitioner filed a Complaint under the Sunshine Reform Act,  
17 alleging that the Office of the Attorney General of Guam (“OAG”) failed to produce public  
18 records required by law. *See, Opp’n to Mot. to Dismiss 1–3* (Feb. 29, 2024). Her request sought  
19 OAG electronic communications policies, personnel-file maintenance procedures, grievance  
20 procedures, and records-retention materials. *Id.* at 2–4.

22 Petitioner filed an Amended Complaint on December 7, 2023, adding new Sunshine  
23 Reform Act requests unrelated to her original filing. *Id.* at 5.

25 Respondents moved to dismiss under GRCP 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6). *See, Mot. to Dismiss*  
26 *Am. Compl.* (Feb. 1, 2024). Petitioner opposed, arguing that no “pending litigation” exception  
27  
28

1 under the Sunshine Reform Act applied because no lawsuit was filed that would justify  
2 withholding the requested records. *See*, Opp’n to Mot. to Dismiss 5–7 (Feb. 29, 2024).

3 After oral argument on April 23, 2024, the Court denied the motion. *See*, Decision &  
4 Order (July 19, 2024). The Court held that Petitioner’s Sunshine Act claims were not moot and  
5 that Respondents improperly treated “potential litigation” as equivalent to “pending litigation”  
6 under 5 GCA § 10108(a).  
7

8 On April 17, 2025, Petitioner’s counsel, Attorney Jacqueline T. Terlaje, moved to  
9 withdraw, citing a breakdown in communications. *See*, Mot. to Withdraw as Counsel (Apr. 17,  
10 2025). The Court granted the motion on June 5, 2025, and ordered Petitioner to (1) retain new  
11 counsel or notify the Court of her intent to precede pro se within 30 days, and (2) appear at a  
12 status and scheduling conference on August 21, 2025. *Id.* at 2. The Court warned that failure to  
13 comply could result in sanctions or dismissal. *Id.*  
14

15 Petitioner did not file the required notice and failed to appear at the August 21, 2025  
16 status hearing. *See*, Min. Entry (Aug. 21, 2025). Respondents filed the present Motion to  
17 Dismiss for Failure to Prosecute under GRCP 41(b) on August 26, 2025. *See*, Mot. to Dismiss  
18 (Aug. 26, 2025). They argued that Petitioner violated the Court’s June 5, 2025 Order, failed to  
19 appear at the status hearing, and has abandoned prosecution of this case. *Id.* at 1–4.  
20

21 The Court held a hearing on October 17, 2025. Petitioner did not appear. The Court took  
22 the matter under advisement.  
23

### 24 ANALYSIS

25 In reaching its decision, the Court first considers whether dismissal is appropriate under  
26 GRCP Rule 41 (b). The Court begins by outlining the governing legal standard and the five-  
27 factor test adopted in *Santos* evaluating dismissals based on inaction. The Court then applies  
28

1 these factors to the procedural history of this case—specifically, Petitioner’s repeated  
2 noncompliance with the Court’s June 5, 2025 Order, her failure to appear at the August 21,  
3 2025 status hearing, and her continued absence at the October 17, 2025 motion hearing—to  
4 determine whether dismissal is warranted. In doing so, the Court balances the interests of  
5 judicial efficiency, fairness to the parties, and the public policy favoring resolution of cases on  
6 their merits before rendering its ruling.  
7

8 **I. Petitioner Has Failed To Prosecute And Comply With The Rules And Order Of**  
9 **The Court.**

10 Rule 41(b) permits dismissal when a plaintiff fails to prosecute or comply with the rules  
11 or a court order. Although the rule does not define “failure to prosecute,” courts apply five  
12 factors to determine whether dismissal is appropriate: (1) the public’s interest in expeditious  
13 resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the  
14 defendants; (4) the public policy favoring resolution on the merits; and (5) whether less drastic  
15 sanctions are available. *Santos v. Carney*, 1998 Guam 4 ¶ 5.  
16

17 Respondents argue that Petitioner has stopped prosecuting this case and ignored this  
18 Court’s orders. The record supports that assertion. On June 5, 2025, the Court ordered Petitioner  
19 to notify the Court within 30 days whether she had retained counsel or intended to precede pro se  
20 and to appear at the August 21, 2025 status hearing. She did neither. She also did not appear at  
21 the October 17, 2025 hearing on this motion. Rule 41(b) allows dismissal under exactly these  
22 circumstances.  
23

24 The first two *Santos* factors—the public’s interest in timely resolution and the court’s  
25 interest in managing its docket—strongly favor dismissal. This case has been pending since  
26 October 23, 2023 and has remained stagnant since the Court’s July 19, 2024 order. Courts cannot  
27  
28

1 allow litigants to ignore deadlines and orders without consequence; doing so undermines judicial  
2 efficiency and fairness to other litigants.

3 The third factor—prejudice to the defendants—also weighs in favor of dismissal.  
4 Prejudice is presumed when a plaintiff's inaction delays litigation and leaves claims unresolved.  
5 That presumption applies here, especially where public officials remain subject to open  
6 allegations with no effort by the Petitioner to advance the case.  
7

8 The fourth factor—public policy favoring resolution on the merits—typically weighs  
9 against dismissal, but carries little weight when the plaintiff is the reason the case cannot move  
10 forward. Petitioner was given clear opportunities and warnings. Her deliberate inaction makes a  
11 merits-based resolution impossible.  
12


13 The fifth factor—the availability of less drastic sanctions—supports dismissal. The Court  
14 warned Petitioner that failure to comply with its June 5, 2025 order or to appear at the status  
15 hearing could result in dismissal. She ignored that warning and has taken no steps to prosecute  
16 her claims. No lesser sanction would be effective.  
17

18 Because all *Santos* factors, collectively, favor dismissal, the Court finds that Lawrence  
19 has failed to prosecute this action and has violated the Court's orders.  
20

### 21 CONCLUSION

22 For the reasons set forth above, the Court **GRANTS** Respondents' Motion to Dismiss.

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED** JAN 08 2026  
24

25  
26  
27  
28  
  
HONORABLE ARTHUR R. BARCINAS  
Judge, Superior Court of Guam