

Sklarew



Comptroller General  
of the United States

Washington, D.C. 20548

# Decision

**Matter of:** Cajar Defense Support Company

**File:** B-238622

**Date:** February 28, 1990

Mason Ford, for the protester.  
Judith A. Sukol, Esq., and Robert J. Parise, Esq.,  
Department of the Army, for the agency.  
Christina Sklarew, Esq., and Andrew T. Pogany, Esq., Office  
of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation  
of the decision.

## DIGEST

Protest consisting of a copy of a letter to a contracting officer, without any further explanation, is dismissed where the submission fails to set forth a detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds of the protest as required by General Accounting Office Bid Protest Regulations.

## DECISION

Cajar Defense Support Company has submitted to our Office a copy of a letter addressed to the contracting officer assigned to solicitation No. DAAA21-90-R-0005, which was issued by the U.S. Army Armament, Munitions & Chemical Command. Cajar states in its letter that it is protesting this solicitation to the agency and to our Office. We dismiss the protest.

While Cajar states that it "must formally protest this solicitation to [the agency] and the GAO," it does not state any specific basis for its protest. The protester refers to its concerns about a different solicitation and the time it has spent addressing them, and suggests that this has prevented it from responding to the solicitation at issue here. No further complaint is specified in connection with this procurement. The letter is apparently an ongoing exchange between the protester and the contracting officer. Cajar also states in its letter to the contracting officer that it is "hereby formally protesting, to [the agency] and the GAO, the entire process of professional support engineering solicitations, evaluations and awards at . . . Picatinny Arsenal", and "specifically [is] hereby formally protesting, because of special national security

047928/140787

concerns, the entire process of professional support engineering solicitations, evaluations and awards relative to Nuclear Weapons by the U.S. Army groups at Picatinny Arsenal."

We are unable to discern any legal basis for the protest from the limited information before us. Cajar simply fails to allege any specific violation of procurement statutes or regulations or otherwise state a basis for its protest. Cajar has not requested a ruling by the Comptroller General or requested any specific relief.

Our Bid Protest Regulations explicitly require protesters to set forth a detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds of protest. 4 C.F.R. § 21.1(b)(4) (1989). The protester has failed to do so here. In these circumstances, we have no basis upon which to consider its protest. Therefore, pursuant to 4 C.F.R. § 21.3(m), the protest is dismissed.

*Michael R. Golden*

Ronald Berger  
Associate General Counsel