UNITED STATE	ES COURT OF	APPEALS F	OR THE FEDERAI	L CIRCUIT
	No	19-2326		
	0	RACLE AMERICA	, INC.	
		v.		
	UNITED STATES	S and AMAZON WE	EB SERVICES, INC.	
	DOCKI	ETING STATE	MENT	
This Docketing Statement of docketing. When the U completed by all counsel as or the statement will be rej	nited States or its o nd filed with the cou	fficer or agency	is a party, this Docketing	g Statement must be
Name of the party you represe	ent Oracle America, In	с.		
Party is (select one)	x Appellant/	Petitioner	Cross-Appella	nt
	Appellee/F	Respondent	Intervenor	
Tribunal appealed from and C	Case No. U.S. Cou	rt of Federal Claims	, Case No. 1:18-cv-01880-EGB	
$\mathbf{R}$	17/2019 versal, entry of judgment ernative		Pre-Award Bid Protest, 28 U.S. nation of any award under the s	
Relief awarded below (if dama				
Briefly describe the judgment. Opinion and Order (subsequently regarding the Joint Enterprise Defer on an inapplicable exception to the l not suffer prejudice. The Court also Criterion 1,2 is lawful. Nature of judgment (select one	eissued publicly), and the a nse Infrastructure ("JEDI") large, single award, indefinit o erred in its treatment of m	Associated entry of jud Cloud procurement. te-delivery, indefinite of	gment. COFC erroneously deniec Although COFC correctly determir quantity contract prohibition, COFC	Oracle's pre-award protest ned that DoD errantly relied C erred in finding Oracle did
X Final Judgment, 28	USC 1295			
Rule 54(b)				
Interlocutory Order	(specify type)			
🗌 Other (explain; <i>see</i> F	ed. Cir. R. 28(a)(5))			

Case: 19-2326 Document: 16 Page: 2 Filed: 09/26/2019 FORM 26. Docketing Statement Form 26
Rev. 10/16 Name and docket number of any related cases pending before this court plus the name of the writing judge
if an opinion was issued.
If none, please state none.
Brief statement of the issues to be raised on appeal (1) Whether COFC erred in finding that DoD's violation of
10 U.S.C. § 2304a(d)(3) did not prejudice Oracle; (2) Whether COFC erred in finding solicitation Gate Criterion 1.2 enforceable and
consequently failing to redress Oracle's claims; (3) Whether COFC properly denied Oracle's conflicts of interest allegations despite (among other things) admitted violations of FAR 3.101-1 and potential violations of 18 U.S.C. § 208.
Have there been discussions with other parties relating to settlement of this case? $\Box$ Yes $\underline{x}$ No If "yes," when were the last such discussions?
☐Before the case was filed below?
During the pendency of the case below?
☐Following the judgment/order appealed from?
If "yes," were the settlement discussions mediated? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No
If they were mediated, by whom? N/A
Do you believe that this case may be amenable to mediation? $\Box$ Yes $x$ No
Please explain why you believe the case is or is not amenable to mediation.
T lease explain with you believe the case is of is not amenable to mediation.
To date, DoD has not acknowledged and continues to defend the illegal single award approach, flawed gate criteria, and conflicts of interest that taint the involved procurement.
Provide any other information relevant to the inclusion of this case in the court's mediation program.
Oracle is willing to participate in mediation.

	l served a copy on counsel of record		
26th	day of September	, 2019	
electroni	c delivery (case filing system)		
Craig A. Holman	(mann	er of service)	
Name of Counsel		/s/ Craig A. Holman Signature of Counsel	
		0	
Law Firm			
	Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP		
Address			
	601 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.		
City, State, ZIP			
	Washington, D.C. 20001		
elephone Number	(202) 942-5722		
FAX Number			
	(202) 0.12 5000		
	(202) 942-5999		
E-mail Address			
	craig.holman@arnoldporter.com		
		Reset Fields	