

DECISION



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

FILE: B-219028.4

DATE: February 24, 1986

MATTER OF: W.B. Jolley

DIGEST:

Second request for reconsideration is denied where protester merely reiterates argument raised in first request for reconsideration.

W.B. Jolley for the second time requests reconsideration of our decision in W.B. Jolley, B-219028, June 27, 1985, 85-1 CPD ¶ 737, dismissing Jolley's protest against any award under solicitation No. AT/TC 19827, issued by the General Services Administration (GSA) for travel management services for employees of federal agencies in six locations. We deny the request for reconsideration.

The original protest involved the competitive selection by GSA of a contractor to make travel arrangements for federal employees on a no-cost, no-fee basis. We dismissed the protest based on our decision in Omega World Travel, Inc., et al., 64 Comp. Gen. 551 (1985), 85-1 CPD ¶ 590, in which we held that the selection of a travel management services contractor was exempt from the procurement statutes and regulations and our bid protest jurisdiction. Subsequently, that decision was reversed in T.V. Travel, Inc., et al., --Request for Reconsideration, B-218198.6, et al., Dec. 10, 1985, 65 Comp. Gen. _____, 85-2 CPD ¶ 640.

In his first request for reconsideration, the protester maintained that we should consider the original protest on the merits in light of the T.V. Travel decision. We denied the request for reconsideration because it had not been timely filed. Our Bid Protest Regulations--including the requirement that requests for reconsideration be filed within 10 working days--allow protesters a fair opportunity to present their objections to government procurement actions without unduly disrupting the procurement process. It would have been inconsistent with this goal to reopen the protest when the first request for reconsideration was filed, almost 6 months after the original protest was dismissed. We also rejected the protester's argument that our

034637

reversal of the Omega decision in T.V. Travel constituted a new basis on which to request reconsideration of the dismissal, since the T.V. Travel decision does not apply retroactively to Jolley's protest.

In this, his second request for reconsideration, the protester does no more than reiterate the argument made in the first request for reconsideration. Since the protester has not shown any error of law or fact in our decision, we again affirm our original decision and deny the request for reconsideration.

Harry R. Van Cleve
Harry R. Van Cleve
General Counsel