



United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

Office of the General Counsel

B-256233

May 12, 1994

Dear Mr. :

This responds to your letter of November 23, 1993, in which you appeal our Claims Group's Settlement Z-2868622, August 3, 1993, which allowed partial reimbursement of your relocation expenses and denied reimbursement of the balance.

Upon review of the record, we find no error of law or fact in the Claims Group's action. You transferred on July 6, 1992, from a position with the Department of the Navy, Puget Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, to a position with the Corps of Engineers, Portland, Oregon. You were authorized relocation expenses and received a travel advance of \$6,100. However, you were dissatisfied with your new position and requested your job back with the Navy. The Navy granted your request and you were notified of the acceptance on August 24, 1992, and you departed Portland on August 28, 1992.

The Corps of Engineers reimbursed you for your relocation expenses up to the date that you were notified that you could have your old job back. The total amount reimbursed was \$4,130.32, leaving a balance due on the advance of \$1,969.68. Subsequently, the agency allowed an additional amount for the rental truck used to transport personal furnishings to Portland, upon your furnishing a receipt.

We agree with our Claims Group that you are not entitled to further reimbursement. The balance of your expenses relate to the shipment of your household goods which were placed in storage in Bremerton and never shipped to Portland. The household goods were later returned to your home in Bremerton. An employee who transfers in the interest of the government and later retransfers to another duty station at his own request for his own convenience relinquishes his right to any further reimbursement for transportation expenses under his first transfer orders. 27 Comp. Gen. 748 (1948). Further, you are not entitled to actual expenses for the storage of your household goods as you request since you were authorized to use the commuted rate basis, and payment can only be made on that basis.

B-226666, Nov. 23, 1987.

As to your allegations that you were harassed on your job by fellow workers, the appropriate remedy would have been to file a complaint with your employing agency or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Accordingly, our Claims Group's settlement is affirmed.

Sincerely yours,

Seymour A. Gross

Robert P. Murphy
Acting General Counsel