

EVANS



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

Decision

Matter of: Federal Relocation Services, Inc.--
Reconsideration

File: B-240145.2

Date: September 25, 1990

John C. McManus, Esq., and Arthur B. Seymour, Esq., for the protester.
Catherine M. Evans and John M. Melody, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

DIGEST

Request for reconsideration of decision is denied where protester fails to show that prior decision may contain errors of fact or law warranting its reversal or modification.

DECISION

Federal Relocation Services, Inc. (FRS) requests reconsideration of our decision, Federal Relocation Servs., Inc., B-240145, Sept. 4, 1990, 90-2 CPD ¶ , in which we dismissed its protest of the Farm Credit Administration's decision to contract for the relocation services it currently performs in-house.

We deny the request for reconsideration.

In its protest, FRS stated that it is an approved household goods carrier under the agency's current relocation program, and complained that its economic interests will be adversely affected if the agency awards a contract for the services it currently performs in-house. We dismissed the protest pursuant to our Bid Protest Regulations, 4 C.F.R. § 21.0(a) (1990), because FRS is not an actual or prospective offeror under the protested solicitation and therefore is not an interested party to maintain the protest. We also noted that, regardless of FRS' standing to protest, our Office generally does not review agency decisions to contract out for services rather than perform them in-house. Federal Relocation Servs., Inc., B-240145, supra.

049589 / 142921

In its reconsideration request, FRS states, without explanation or supporting information, that it is in fact a prospective offeror, and then proceeds to reassert the arguments from its protest to the effect that the agency should not contract for these services.

Under our Bid Protest Regulations, to obtain reconsideration the requesting party must show that our prior decision may contain 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). FRS has not met this standard. FRS' assertion that it is a prospective offeror under the protested solicitation is in conflict with its prior assertion of its status as a household goods carrier under the agency's current program and its objection to any award of a contract under the solicitation. In the absence of any support for FRS' position, we have no basis for changing our conclusion. We note, furthermore, that FRS has not addressed the statement in our prior decision that we generally will not review agency decisions to contract out for services.

The request for reconsideration is denied.



Ronald Berger
Associate General Counsel