

Formica



Comptroller General  
of the United States  
Washington, D.C. 20548

# Decision

**Matter of:** IBI Security Service, Inc.--Request for Reconsideration  
**File:** B-236462.4  
**Date:** March 21, 1990

Richard Bie Rowe, for the protester.  
John Formica, Esq., and John Brosnan, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

## DIGEST

Request for reconsideration is denied where request contains no statement of facts or legal grounds warranting reversal, but merely restates arguments considered, and rejected, by the General Accounting Office in denying in part and dismissing in part original protests.

## DECISION

IBI Security Service, Inc., requests reconsideration of our decision, IBI Security Serv., Inc., B-236462 et al., Nov. 14, 1989, 89-2 CPD ¶ 459, in which we denied in part and dismissed in part IBI's protests concerning the Service Contract Act wage rate determination in a Navy solicitation for guard services. We disagreed with IBI's view that the Navy improperly determined which classes of employees required under the solicitation fell within the coverage of the Act, and rejected the protester's argument that the Navy was required to cancel the solicitation because the Department of Labor (DOL) issued a revised wage rate determination applicable to the solicitation approximately 1 month after bid opening but prior to award.


In its reconsideration, IBI argues, as it did in its protests, that the contracting officer improperly determined which classes of employees required under the solicitation fell within the coverage of the Act. IBI also reiterates its argument that the agency was required to cancel the solicitation once it received the revised wage determination

048065/140925

from DOL. IBI obviously disagrees with our decision, but has not presented any evidence or made any new arguments that were not previously considered.

Under our Bid Protest Regulations, a party requesting reconsideration must show that our prior decision contains either errors of fact or law or that the protester has information not previously considered that warrants reversal or modification of our decision. 4 C.F.R. § 21.12(a) (1989). Repetition of arguments made during the original protest or mere disagreement with our decision does not meet this standard. San Sierra Business Sys.--Request for Recon., B-233858.2, Feb. 1, 1989, 89-1 CPD ¶ 104. Here, IBI essentially reiterates two of its original arguments raised during the protests which we have already carefully considered and rejected, and offers no new evidence or information.

The reconsideration request is denied.



for

James F. Hinchman  
General Counsel