

DECISION

**THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES**
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

FILE: B-219987.3

DATE: April 7, 1986

MATTER OF: W. H. Smith Hardware Co.--Request for
Reconsideration

DIGEST:

Review of an agency's decision to cancel a solicitation is based on whether that action is supported by the record, not on whether the agency listed every possible justification for the cancellation. Where protester in its reconsideration request does not show that original decision approving the agency's cancellation was in error, fact that there may have been another unstated reason for canceling the solicitation provides no basis for reconsideration.

W. H. Smith Hardware Company requests reconsideration of our decision, W. H. Smith Hardware Co., B-219987.2, Jan. 21, 1986, 86-1 CPD ¶ 62, in which we denied Smith's protest of the cancellation of solicitation No. DLA700-85-B-1167, issued by the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA). DLA canceled the solicitation after bids were opened, when it determined that the solicitation did not contain adequate quality inspection procedures.

We deny the request for reconsideration.

In our original decision we concluded that DLA had properly canceled the solicitation after it found that the inspection scheme in the solicitation was inadequate to insure that defective parts were not accepted.

The protester argues that it has now discovered that the agency did not cancel the solicitation because its inspection scheme was inadequate, but because the agency actually wanted to change the procurement from one set aside for small businesses to an unrestricted one.

B-219987.3

2

Our review of a decision to cancel a solicitation is based on whether the action is supported by the record, not on whether the agency listed every possible justification for the cancellation. See Military Base Management, Inc., B-216309, Dec. 4, 1984, 84-2 CPD ¶ 619. We concluded in our original decision that DLA had the required compelling reason to cancel the solicitation because of the inadequate quality control procedures and Smith has not shown that our conclusion was in error or that the reissued solicitation does not contain a more stringent quality inspection provision. We have been informed by DLA, in fact, that the solicitation has been reissued with higher level inspection procedures. Thus, it is irrelevant whether there may have been another, unstated reason for canceling the solicitation.

The request for reconsideration is denied.

for Seymour E. Gies
Harry R. Van Cleve
General Counsel