

Thomas E Lauria
State Bar No. 11998025
Craig H. Averch
State Bar No. 01451020
WHITE & CASE LLP
Wachovia Financial Center
200 South Biscayne Blvd.
Miami, FL 33131
Telephone: (305) 371-2700
Facsimile: (305) 358-5744

Robin Phelan
State Bar No. 15903000
Judith Elkin
State Bar No. 06522200
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street
Suite 3100
Dallas, TX 75202
Telephone: (214) 651-5000
Facsimile: (214) 651-5940

ATTORNEYS FOR THE DEBTORS AND DEBTORS-IN-POSSESSION

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

_____)	
In re)	Chapter 11 Case
)	
MIRANT CORPORATION, <u>et al.</u> ,)	Case No. 03-46590 (DML)
)	Jointly Administered
Debtors.)	
_____)	

**MOTION OF DEBTORS TO REJECT THE INFORMATION
SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN MIRANT CORPORATION AND
NETSCAN iPUBLISHING INC.**

Mirant Corporation ("Mirant") and its affiliated debtors (collectively, the "Debtors"), as debtors-in-possession, file this Motion (the "Motion") pursuant to section 365(a) of title 11, United States Code (11 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq.) (the "Bankruptcy Code") for authority to reject the "Information Services Agreement" (the "Contract") between Mirant and Netscan iPublishing Inc. ("Netscan"), which is described below in greater detail and attached hereto as Exhibit B.¹ In support thereof the Debtors represent as follows:

¹ Not all parties were served with the Contract. Any party may request a copy of the Contract by making a written request to the Debtors' counsel.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has jurisdiction to consider this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334. This is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b). Venue is proper before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

2. The Cases. Commencing on July 14, 2003, and concluding in the early morning hours of July 15, 2003, (the “Petition Date”), certain of the Debtors (collectively, the “Initial Debtors”) filed voluntary petitions in this Court for relief under chapter 11 of title 11 of the United States Code, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1330, as amended (the “Bankruptcy Code”).² On August 18, 2003, Mirant EcoElectrica Investments I, Ltd. and Puerto Rico Power Investments, Ltd. (collectively, the “New Debtors”) commenced chapter 11 cases under the Bankruptcy Code. On October 3, 2003, the following additional Debtors filed voluntary petitions in this Court for relief under chapter 11: (i) Mirant Wrightsville Management, Inc.; (ii) Mirant Wrightsville Investments, Inc.; (iii) Wrightsville Power Facility, L.L.C.; and (iv) Wrightsville Development Funding, L.L.C. (collectively, the “Wrightsville Debtors”). On November 18, 2003, the following additional Debtors filed voluntary petitions in this Court for relief under chapter 11: (i) Mirant Americas Energy Capital, LP; and (ii) Mirant Americas Energy Capital Assets, LLC (the “MAEC Debtors” and collectively with the Initial Debtors, the New Debtors, and the Wrightsville Debtors, the “Debtors”). The Debtors continue to manage and operate their businesses as debtors-in-possession pursuant to sections 1107 and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code.

² Concurrently, Mirant caused two of its Canadian subsidiaries, Mirant Canada Energy Marketing, Ltd and Mirant Canada Energy Marketing Investments, Inc. (collectively, the “Canadian Debtors”) to commence plenary insolvency proceedings (the “Canadian Proceedings”) in the Court of Queen’s Bench of Alberta Judicial District of Calgary (the “Canadian Court”) pursuant to the *Companies’ Creditors Arrangement Act*. The Canadian Debtors are subject to the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the Canadian Court.

3. The Cases are Jointly Administered. On July 15, 2003, this Court granted the motion for an order requesting that the bankruptcy estates of the Initial Debtors be jointly administered. On September 8, 2003, this Court entered an order approving joint administration of the cases of the New Debtors with those of the Initial Debtors. On October 20, 2003, this Court entered an order approving the joint administration of the cases of the Wrightsville Debtors with those of the Initial Debtors. On November 20, 2003, this Court entered an order approving the joint administration of the cases of the MAEC Debtors with those of the Initial Debtors.

4. The Committees. Three official committees have been appointed by the Office of the United States Trustee for the Northern District of Texas in these administratively consolidated cases. Specifically, an official unsecured creditors' committee and an official committee of equity security holders have been appointed for Mirant Corporation and an official unsecured creditors' committee has been appointed for Mirant Americas Generation, LLC (collectively, the "Committees").

RELIEF REQUESTED

2. By this Motion, the Debtors respectfully request pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 365(a) authority to reject the Contract listed below in paragraph 5 hereof, effective ten (10) business days from the date of service of this Motion.

BASIS FOR RELIEF

3. On August 14, 2003, the Court entered an amended order (the "Order") approving procedures (the "Rejection Procedures") for the rejection of Contracts and Leases from time to time in furtherance of the reorganization efforts of the Debtors.

4. In summary, the procedures Order allows the Debtors, in the exercise of their business judgment, to reject any Contract or Lease determined to be unnecessary and/or

burdensome to the Debtors' ongoing business operations following ten (10) business days from service via facsimile or overnight mail, to: (i) the counterparty under the respective Contract at the last known address available to the Debtors; (ii) counsel for the counterparty under the respective Contract who has appeared in these cases and has specifically requested notice of any rejection notice; and (iii) counsel for any statutory committees appointed in these cases. A copy of the Order is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

5. Pursuant to the terms of the Order and N.D. TX L.B.R. 9014.1, unless a written objection hereto is filed and served in accordance with the terms of the Order, the following Contract will be deemed rejected pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 365(a) effective upon the expiration of the ten (10) business day notice period described above (the "Effective Date"):

- (a) **Title of the Contract:** "Information Service Agreement," dated December 11, 2002, between Netscan and Mirant.

Effective Date of Rejection:

January 20, 2004, subject to paragraph 6 hereof

Parties to the Contract:

Mirant Corporation
Netscan iPublishing Inc.

Contact Information for Non-Debtors:

Netscan iPublishing Inc.
Attn: Jeff Adler
803 West Broad Street
Fourth Floor
Falls Church, VA 22046

6. If an objection to this Motion is timely filed and served upon: White & Case, LLP, Wachovia Financial Center, 200 South Biscayne Blvd., Miami, Florida 33131, Attention: Thomas E Lauria, Esq. and Haynes and Boone, LLP, 901 Main Street, Suite 3100, Dallas, Texas 75202, Attention: Judith Elkin, Esq., counsel for the Debtors, not later than ten (10) business days from the date of service of this Motion, the Debtors shall seek a hearing on

the objection at the Court's earliest convenience. If such an objection to the Motion is timely received, and the Court ultimately upholds the Debtors' determination to reject the Contract, then the Contract shall be deemed rejected as of the date of the determination by the Court unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Debtors and the counterparty to the respective Contract.

7. Pursuant to the Order, claims arising out of the rejection of the Contract must be filed with the Court, or any Court approved claims processing agent, by the later of (i) the deadline for filing proofs of claims established by the Court or (ii) thirty (30) days after the Effective Date of Rejection, or the date of the Order of the Court upholding the Debtors' determination to reject the Contract, unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Debtors and the counterparty to the Contract (the "Rejection Claims Deadline").

8. Pursuant to the Order, any holder of a claim allegedly arising from the rejection of the Contract who fails to timely file a proof of such claim on or before the expiration of the Rejection Claims Deadline shall be (a) forever barred from asserting such claim against any of the Debtors; (b) forever barred from sharing in any distribution of the Debtors' estates or assets under any confirmed plan of reorganization or order of the Court authorizing distributions from the Debtors' estates; and (c) bound by the terms of any plan of reorganization confirmed in these chapter 11 cases and any order of the Court authorizing distributions from the Debtors' estates.

General Description Relating to the Contract.

9. The Contract provides Mirant with a nonexclusive licensing to access, store, and retrieve data on the Netscan database. The Netscan system is a specialized news and information service providing state regulations, legislation and other similar information. Mirant agreed to pay Netscan \$25,500 per year for the right to access the Netscan system. The term of the Contract expires January 1, 2005.

The Contract May Be Rejected.

10. Section 365(a) of the Bankruptcy Code provides that a debtor in possession, "subject to the court's approval, may assume or reject any executory contract or unexpired lease of the debtor." 11 U.S.C. § 365(a). An executory contract has been defined as one where material performance is due on both sides such that the failure of either party to complete performance would constitute a material breach of the contract excusing performance of the non-breaching party. *See In re Liljeberg Enterprises, Inc.*, 304 F.3d 410, 436 (5th Cir. 2002); *In re Murexco Petroleum, Inc.*, 15 F.3d 60, 62-63 (5th Cir. 1994). The Contract is an executory contract because it requires (i) Netscan to provide Mirant with the on-going right to use the Netscan information system and (ii) Mirant to pay for this right. Moreover, Netscan's failure to allow Mirant to use its information system would constitute a material breach of the Contract, excusing the performance of the other party. Therefore, the Contract is undoubtedly an executory contract that may be rejected under section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code. *See, e.g., In re El Paso Refinery, L.P.*, 220 B.R. 37, 39 n.1 (Bankr. W.D. Tex. 1998) (contract requiring debtor to provide jet fuel to government held to be executory); *In re Cajun Elec. Power Coop., Inc.*, 230 B.R. 693, 702 (Bankr. D. La. 1999) (supply contracts entered into by debtor electric cooperative held executory).

Rejection Of The Contract is Within the Debtors' Business Judgment.

11. Rejection of an executory contract requires court approval. A debtor's decision to assume or reject will be approved provided that it meets the "business judgment" test, pursuant to which rejection of an executory contract is appropriate if such rejection would benefit the estate. *See Richmond Leasing v. Capital Bank, N.A.*, 762 F.2d 1303, 1309 (5th Cir. 1985); *In re G.I. Indus., Inc.*, 204 F.3d 1276, 1282 (9th Cir. 2000) ("[A] bankruptcy court applies the business judgment rule to evaluate a trustee's rejection decision . . ."); *In re Food Barn Stores, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 558, 567 n. 16 (8th Cir. 1997) (debtor's request to assume or reject contract

should be approved where not manifestly unreasonable or made in bad faith). The "business judgment" test is satisfied where the assumption or rejection of an executory contract enhances the value of the estate. *See Richmond Leasing*, 762 F.2d at 1309. Upon a finding that a debtor has exercised sound business judgment in determining whether to assume or reject an executory contract, a court should approve the decision pursuant to section 365(a) of the Bankruptcy Code. *See NLRB v. Bildisco & Bildisco*, 465 U.S. 513, 523 (1984).

12. "The fundamental purpose of reorganization is to prevent a debtor from going into liquidation, with an attendant loss of jobs and possible misuse of economic resources." *Bildisco*, 465 U.S. at 528 (citing H.R.Rep. No. 95-595, p. 220 (1977)). Since Mirant entered into the Contract, the Debtors' business operations have changed and, after due inquiry, the Debtors have determined that the Contract is burdensome to their estates.

13. The Debtors have determined, in their reasonable business judgment, that the Contract should be rejected as uneconomical and an impediment to their ongoing business operations. Since Mirant entered into the Contract, the Debtors' business operations have changed and the Debtors no longer require or use information services such as those provided by the Netscan system. The Debtors are paying \$25,500 per year for a service that provides no use or benefit to the estates. Therefore the Debtors have determined that it is in their best interest to reject the Contract.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that she provided a true and correct copy of the forgoing to Bankruptcy Services, LLC and directed them to effect service upon all persons on the Limited Service List (without exhibits) via U.S. mail, and the addressees set forth below via overnight mail (with exhibits) on the 5th day of January, 2004.

Eric J. Taube
Mark C. Taylor
Hohmann, Taube & Summers, L.L.P.
100 Congress Avenue
Suite 1600
Austin, TX 78701

Deborah D. Williamson
Thomas Rice
Cox & Smith Incorporated
112 East Pecan Street
Suite 1800
San Antonio, TX 78205-1505

Howard L. Siegel
Brown Rudnick Berlack Israels LLP
City Place I, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3401

Bruce R. Zirinsky
Gregory Petrick
Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft
100 Maiden Lane
New York, NY 10038

William R. Baldiga
Brown Rudnick Berlack Israels LLP
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111

Mark Thompson
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett
425 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017-3954

Edward S. Weisfelner
Leslie H. Scharf
Brown Rudnick Berlack Israels LLP
120 West 45th Street
New York, NY 10036

Netscan iPublishing Inc.
Attn: Jeff Adler
803 West Broad Street
Fourth Floor
Falls Church, VA 22046

Paul N. Silverstein
Andrews & Kurth, L.L.P.
805 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Jason S. Brookner
Andrews & Kurth, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street
Suite 3700
Dallas, TX 75201

/s/ Michelle C. Campbell

EXHIBIT A

U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT,
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH DIVISION

ENTERED
TAWANA J. MARSHALL, CLERK
THE DATE OF ENTRY IS
ON THE COURT'S DOCKET

In re)	Chapter 11 Case
MIRANT CORPORATION, <u>et al.</u> ,)	Case No. 03-46590-DML-11
Debtors.)	Jointly Administered

**AMENDED ORDER REGARDING MOTION OF DEBTORS FOR AN ORDER
PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 365 AND 554 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE
AUTHORIZING AND APPROVING A PROCEDURE FOR THE REJECTION OF
CERTAIN EXECUTORY CONTRACTS**

Upon the Motion of Debtors for an Order Pursuant to Sections 365 and 554 of the Bankruptcy Code Authorizing and Approving a Procedure for the Rejection of Certain Executory Contacts (the "Motion") filed by the above-captioned debtors and debtors-in-possession (collectively, the "Debtors") in these Chapter 11 cases; and it appearing that this Court has jurisdiction over this matter; and it appearing that due and proper notice has been given; and upon due deliberation and sufficient cause appearing therefor, it is hereby

ORDERED that the Motion is granted; and it is further

ORDERED that the Rejection Procedures referenced on Exhibit "A" attached hereto are hereby approved; and it is further

ORDERED that this Court shall, and hereby does, retain jurisdiction with respect to all matters arising or related to the implementation of this Order; and it is further

ORDERED that the last date to file timely proofs of claim against the Debtors arising from the rejection of any Contracts and Leases (the "Rejection Claims Deadline") will be and hereby is the later of: (i) the deadline for filing proofs of claims established by this Court; and (ii) thirty (30) days after the Rejection Effective Date, as such term is defined in the

Rejection Procedures, unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Debtors and the counterparty to a particular Contract or Lease; and it is further


ORDERED that any holder of a claim allegedly arising from the rejections authorized in accordance with the Rejection Procedures who fails to timely file a proof of such claim on or prior to the expiration of the Rejection Claims Deadline be: (i) forever barred from asserting such claim against any of the Debtors or their estates; (ii) forever barred from sharing in any distribution of the Debtors' estates or assets under any plan of reorganization confirmed in these chapter 11 cases or order of the Court authorizing distributions from the Debtors' estates; and (iii) bound by the terms of any plan of reorganization confirmed in these chapter 11 cases and/or any order of the Court authorizing distributions from the Debtors' estates; and it is further

ORDERED that the procedures established by this Order, including the Rejection Claims Deadline, shall not apply to (a) any executory contract or unexpired lease between any of the Debtors and (i) PEPCO and any of its affiliates; (ii) WGES; (iii) Kern; (iv) 285 Venture; (v) Unitil; (vi) the NSTAR Companies (as each entity is defined it is respective objection or joinder to objections to the Motion) (vii) the Cape Light Compact Agreements, including the Pilot Electric Supply Agreement by and between the Cape Light Compact and Mirant Americas Retail Energy Marketing, LP; or (b) leases and lease-related contracts pertaining to the Dickerson and Morgantown power plants operated by Mirant Mid-Atlantic, LLC and its subsidiaries (in which the lease counterparties are certain limited liability companies affiliated with Bank One, N.A., Union Bank of California, N.A. and Verizon Capital Corp.); and it is further

ORDERED that, to the extent that any provision contained in this Order is inconsistent with this Court's Interim Order Authorizing the Debtors to (i) Comply With Terms of Prepetition Trading Contracts, (ii) Enter Into Postpetition Trading Contracts in the Ordinary Course of Business, (iii) Provide Credit Support Relating to Both Pre- and Post-Petition Trading

Contracts, and (iv) Setting a Final Hearing to Consider the Entry of a Final Order Affirming the Interim Order and Authorizing Assumption of Prepetition Trading Contracts entered on July 17, 2003 (the "Trading Order"), the Trading Order shall control.

Dated August 14, 2007



HONORABLE D. MICHAEL LYNN
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

Exhibit "A"

Rejection Procedures

- a. Unless a timely objection is filed, any Contract or Lease determined by the Debtors, in the exercise of their business judgment, to be unnecessary and/or burdensome to the Debtors' ongoing business operations shall, unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Debtors and the counterparty to a particular Contract or Lease, be deemed rejected ten (10) business days from service of a motion to reject such Contract or Lease (the "Rejection Motion"), via facsimile or overnight mail, to: (i) the counterparty under the respective Contract or Lease at the last known address available to the Debtors; (ii) counsel for the counterparty under the respective Contract or Lease who has appeared in these cases and has specifically requested notice of any rejection notice; and (iii) counsel for any statutory committees appointed in these cases (each, a "Committee").
- b. The Rejection Motion shall be substantially in the form of the Rejection Motion attached hereto as Exhibit A-1 and shall include a copy of the Order approving this Motion.
- c. If an objection to a Rejection Motion is filed by a counterparty to a Contract or Lease, or by any Committee, and timely served upon, and actually received by, counsel to the Debtors prior to the expiration of the ten (10) business day notice period, the Debtors will seek a hearing to consider the objection at the Court's earliest convenience.
- d. If no objections by either a counterparty to a Contract or Lease or by any Committee, are timely received, then the applicable Contract or Lease shall be deemed rejected as of the expiration of the ten (10) business day notice period described above unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Debtors and the counterparty to a particular Contract or Lease. The Rejection Effective Date for any rejection shall be the later of (a) the expiry of the ten (10) business day notice period if no objection is filed; (b) the entry of an order ultimately approving rejection if an objection to rejection is filed; and (c) such other date upon which the debtor and the objection party may agree.
- e. If an objection to a Rejection Motion is timely received, and the Court ultimately upholds the Debtors' determination to reject the applicable Contract or Lease, then the applicable Contract or Lease shall be deemed rejected as of the date of the Order unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Debtors and the counterparty to the applicable Contract or Lease.
- f. Claims arising out of the rejection of Contracts and Leases must be filed with the Bankruptcy Court or any Court approved claims processing agent by the later of (i) the deadline for filing proofs of claim established by this Court or (ii) thirty (30) days after the Rejection Effective Date, unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Debtors and the counterparty to a particular Contract or Lease.

Exhibit "A-1"

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

_____)	
In re)	Chapter 11 Case
MIRANT CORPORATION, <u>et al.</u> ,)	Case No. 03-46590-DML-11
Debtors.)	Jointly Administered
_____)	

**MOTION OF DEBTORS TO REJECT EXECUTORY CONTRACTS OR
UNEXPIRED LEASES OF NONRESIDENTIAL REAL PROPERTY
OF [NAME OF COUNTERPARTY]**

TO THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE:

Mirant Corporation ("Mirant") and its affiliated debtors (collectively, the "Debtors"), as debtors in possession, file this Motion (the "Motion") pursuant to section 365(a) of title 11, United States Code (11 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq.) (the "Bankruptcy Code") for authority to reject certain executory contracts (each, a "Contract") or unexpired leases of real property (each, a "Lease"), and in support thereof represent as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has jurisdiction to consider this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334. This is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b). Venue is proper before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

2. The Cases. Commencing on July 14, 2003 and concluding in the early morning hours of July 15, 2003, (the "Petition Date"), each of the Debtors filed a voluntary petition in this court for relief under chapter 11 of title 11 of the United States Code, 11 U.S.C.

§§ 101-1330, as amended (the "Bankruptcy Code").¹ The Debtors continue to manage and operate their businesses as debtors-in-possession pursuant to sections 1107 and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code.

3. The Cases are Jointly Administered. On July 15, 2003, this Court granted the Debtors' motion for an order requesting that the Debtors' bankruptcy estates be jointly administered.

4. Unsecured Creditors' Committees. On July 25, 2003, the Office of the United States Trustee for the Northern District of Texas formed two official committees of unsecured creditors. The first Committee is comprised of certain bondholders of Mirant Americas Generation, LLC. The Second Committee is comprised of certain creditors of Mirant Corporation and the remaining Debtors.

RELIEF REQUESTED

4. By this Motion, the Debtors respectfully request pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 365(a) authority to reject certain Contracts and/or Leases listed below, effective 10 (ten) business days from the date upon service of this Motion.

¹ Concurrently, Mirant caused two of its Canadian subsidiaries, Mirant Canada Energy Marketing, Ltd and Mirant Canada Energy Marketing Investments, Inc. (collectively, the "Canadian Debtors") to commence plenary insolvency proceedings (the "Canadian Proceedings") in the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta Judicial District of Calgary (the "Canadian Court") pursuant to the *Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act* (the "CCAA"). The Canadian Debtors are subject to the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the Canadian Court.

BASIS FOR RELIEF

5. On _____, 2003, the Court entered an order (the "Order") approving procedures (the "Rejection Procedures") for the rejection of Contracts and Leases from time to time in furtherance of the reorganization efforts of the Debtors.
6. In summary, the procedures Order allows the Debtors, in the exercise of their business judgment, to reject any Contract or Lease determined to be unnecessary and/or burdensome to the Debtors' ongoing business operations following ten (10) business days from service via facsimile or overnight mail, to: (i) the counterparty under the respective Contract or Lease at the last known address available to the Debtors; (ii) counsel for the counterparty under the respective Contract or Lease who has appeared in these cases and has specifically requested notice of any rejection notice; and (iii) counsel for any statutory committees appointed in these cases. A copy of the Order is attached hereto as Exhibit "A".
7. Pursuant to the terms of the Order and N.D. TX L.B.R. 9014.1, unless a written objection hereto is filed and served in accordance with the terms of the Order, the following Leases and/or Contracts will be deemed rejected pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 365(a) effective upon the expiration of the ten (10) business day notice period described above (the "Effective Date"):

**Title of Lease/Contract:
Effective Date of Rejection:
Parties to the Lease/Contract
and Contact Information:**

8. If an objection to this Motion is timely filed and served upon: White & Case, LLP, Wachovia Financial Center, 200 South Biscayne Blvd., Miami, Florida 33131, Attention: Thomas E Lauria, Esq. and Haynes and Boone, LLP, 901 Main Street, Suite 3100,

Dallas, Texas 75202, Attention: Judith Elkin, Esq., counsel for the Debtors, not later than ten (10) business days from the date of service of this Motion, the Debtors shall seek a hearing on the objection at the Court's earliest convenience. If such an objection to a Rejection Motion is timely received, and the Court ultimately upholds the Debtors' determination to reject the applicable Contract or Lease, then the applicable Contract or Lease shall be deemed rejected as of the date of such determination by the Court unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Debtors and the counterparty to the applicable Contract or Lease.

9. Pursuant to the Order, claims arising out of the rejection of Contracts and Leases must be filed with the Court, or any Court approved claims processing agent, by the later of: (i) the deadline for filing proofs of claims established by this Court or (ii) thirty (30) days after the Effective Date, or the date of the Order of the Court upholding the Debtors' determination to reject the applicable Contract or Lease, unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Debtors and the counterparty to a particular Contract or Lease (the "Rejection Claims Deadline").

10. Pursuant to the Order, any holder of a claim allegedly arising from the rejection of a Contract or Lease who fails to timely file a proof of such claim on or before the expiration of the Rejection Claims Deadline shall be (a) forever barred from asserting such claim against any of the Debtors; (b) forever barred from sharing in any distribution of the Debtors' estates or assets under any confirmed plan of reorganization or order of the Court authorizing distributions from the Debtors' estates; and (c) bound by the terms of any plan of reorganization confirmed in these chapter 11 cases and any order of the Court authorizing distributions from the Debtors' estates.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, the Debtors respectfully request the relief requested herein and such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: Fort Worth, Texas
_____, 2003

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street
Suite 3100
Dallas, TX 75202
(214) 651-5000

By _____

Robin Phelan
State Bar No. 15903000
Judith Elkin
State Bar No. 06522200
Ian Peck
State Bar No. 24013306

-and-

Thomas E Lauria
State Bar No. 11998025
Michelle C. Campbell
State Bar No. 24001828
WHITE & CASE LLP
Wachovia Financial Center
200 South Biscayne Blvd.
Miami, Florida 33131
(305) 371-2700

PROPOSED ATTORNEYS FOR THE DEBTORS
AND DEBTORS-IN-POSSESSION

EXHIBIT B

Information Services Agreement

This Agreement is between NETSCAN IPublishing ("NETSCAN"), 803 West Broad St. Falls Church, VA 22046 and
Mirant Corporation 1155 Perimeter Center West Atlanta, GA 30338 ("Subscriber")
Subscriber name Street address City, State, and ZIP

General

NETSCAN operates a specialized news and information service ("Service"), processing and transmitting proposed and approved state regulations, legislation and other information ("Content") over electronic communications systems and Subscriber desires access to the Content. The parties agree as follows:

1. Grant of License

NETSCAN hereby grants to Subscriber a nonexclusive nontransferable license during the term of this agreement to use Content per its subscription limits as follows:

- A. Subscriber may retrieve data from NETSCAN database, and may copy and store items so retrieved for use by the Subscriber in its normal course of business.
- B. For each access code assigned, Subscriber may access NETSCAN data from a single workstation within Subscriber's Company at any one time, and may not authorize the simultaneous access of NETSCAN data by company employees.
- C. Subscriber may not provide access codes to unauthorized parties.

2. Ownership

Subscriber agrees that NETSCAN retains all right, title and interest, including copyright and other proprietary rights, in all Content and other material made available as part of the Service.

3. Restrictions on Use

Subscriber agrees that it will not copy, license, sell, transfer, make available or otherwise distribute the Content to any entity or person, except that User may (a) make available to its employees electronic copies of Content, (b) allow its employees to store, manipulate, and reformat Content, and (c) allow its employees to make paper copies of Content, provided that such electronic and paper copies are used internally and in the normal course of business, and (d) as allowed under the fair use portion of the Copyright Act (17 U.S.C. Sec. 107).

4. Services, Payment and Term

Subscriber will receive access to: RegAlert™ 50 States/Federal
LegAlert™ 50 States/Federal Access codes included: 12
PUCAlert™ 50 States/Federal

Subscriber agrees to pay NETSCAN \$ 25,500 per year.

This agreement begins on January 1, 2003 and ends on January 1, 2005. All invoices are due thirty (30) days from date of invoice. This agreement will automatically renew for one year periods, unless cancelled by either party, in writing, 90 days prior to any expiration date.

5. Disclaimer

THE SERVICE AND THE CONTENT ARE PROVIDED "AS IS" WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, WHETHER EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, WRITTEN OR ORAL (INCLUDING ANY WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE). NETSCAN'S TOTAL LIABILITY ARISING HEREUNDER, WHETHER BASED UPON WARRANTY, CONTRACT, TORT OR OTHERWISE, SHALL NOT EXCEED THE ACTUAL PRICE PAID BY SUBSCRIBER FOR THE SERVICE. IN NO EVENT SHALL NETSCAN BE LIABLE TO SUBSCRIBER OR ANY OTHER PERSON OR ENTITY FOR SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, LOSS OF PROFITS, LOSS OF DATA OR LOSS OF USE DAMAGES.

6. Assignment

Neither party may assign its rights or delegate its obligations under this agreement without the prior written consent of the other party, except to any party succeeding to substantially all of the business interests of such party.

7. Entire Agreement

This agreement is a complete expression of the intent of the parties and may not be modified in any way except in writing of later date signed by the parties.

NETSCAN IPublishing Inc:

By: [Signature]
Signature and Typed or Printed Name
Title: President
Date: 12/11/02

Subscriber (Company): Mirant Corporation

By: Thomas J. Auer II
Signature and Typed or Printed Name
Title: Thomas J. Auer II
Date: 11 Dec 02