



The Comptroller General
of the United States

Washington, D.C. 20548

Decision

Matter of: C&L Diversified Enterprises, Inc.--Request
for Reconsideration
File: B-224912.2
Date: March 10, 1987

DIGEST

Request for reconsideration is denied where protester basically reiterates arguments previously made; does not challenge the facts upon which initial decision was based; and does not identify errors of law allegedly made.

DECISION

C&L Diversified Enterprises, Inc. requests reconsideration of our decision in C&L Diversified Enterprises, Inc., B-224912, Jan. 30, 1987, 87-1 CPD ¶ _____. C&L had protested the Forest Service's determination that C&L was ineligible for award of a contract because of its affiliation with C.R. Jones, a debarred contractor. In our decision, we held that the Forest Service reasonably concluded that C.R. Jones had a substantial interest in C&L, based on the facts that C.R. Jones had served as company president up until his debarment; the firm is operated and partially owned by his wife, Linda M. Jones, as its current president; and C.R. Jones continues, as a company employee, to perform an active and substantial role in the company's business.

In its request for reconsideration, C&L asserts that we overlooked the facts that C&L was performing on government contracts for several years prior to when C.R. Jones was debarred, and that C.R. Jones has never owned any stock in the company and therefore, has never held any "interest" in C&L. The protester argues, in effect, that for purposes of determining whether a debarred contractor has a "substantial interest" in a firm seeking a government contract, "interest" should be defined as "ownership interest."

This argument basically reiterates the protester's position in the initial protest. C&L has not in any way challenged those facts on which our decision was based. Specifically,

no evidence has been presented which questions our conclusion that C.R. Jones served as company president, that he is married to the company's current president and part-owner, and that he continues to perform an active and substantial role in the company business. In fact, as we pointed out in our prior decision, C.R. Jones would be the sole company employee at the job site were C&L to be awarded this contract. Accordingly, we do not find that the facts C&L presents affect our prior holding that it was not unreasonable for the Forest Service to conclude that C.R. Jones had a substantial interest in C&L.

C&L also asserts that our decision is "contrary to the laws." It does not, however, elaborate on this assertion.

Our Office will not consider any request for reconsideration which does not contain a detailed statement of the factual or legal grounds upon which reversal is deemed appropriate, specifying any errors of law made or information not previously considered. 4 C.F.R. § 21.12(a) (1986).

The request for reconsideration is denied.

for Seymour Efron
Harry R. Van Cleve
General Counsel