

Board of Contract Appeals

General Services Administration
Washington, D.C. 20405

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION DENIED: January 27, 2005

GSBCA 16470-R

HOOK CONSTRUCTION, INC.,

Appellant,

v.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,

Respondent.

Kenneth R. Hook, Vice President of Hook Construction, Inc., Solon, IA, appearing for Appellant.

Mark R. Warnick, Office of Regional Counsel, General Services Administration, Kansas City, MO, counsel for Respondent.

Before Board Judges **DANIELS** (Chairman), **PARKER**, and **DeGRAFF**.

DeGRAFF, Board Judge.

Hook Construction moves the Board to reconsider its January 24, 2005 decision denying the appeal. In the appeal, Hook alleged the General Services Administration (GSA) improperly required Hook to supply cabinets manufactured by a specific company, and would not allow Hook to supply cabinets manufactured by another supplier. We denied the appeal because Hook did not establish the cabinets it proposed to supply fulfilled the requirements of the contract. We now deny Hook's motion for reconsideration.

In its motion, Hook asserts it should not have been required to submit shop drawings for the cabinets it proposed to supply because its proposed supplier would have manufactured the cabinets to meet the requirements set out in the specifications. As we explained in our January 24 decision, GSA was not required to accept Hook's assurances regarding the capability of its supplier to comply with the specifications. The contract required Hook to supply shop drawings and full information regarding the cabinets it proposed to supply, and the essential purpose of such submittals is to show the Government the proposed product conforms to contract requirements. Because Hook's shop drawings did not show the cabinets it proposed to supply would meet the contract requirements and because Hook did not supply

GSA with any other information to make such a showing, GSA was not required to approve the use of the proposed product.

The motion for reconsideration merely reargues points previously made, which were considered and rejected by the Board. Arguments previously made and considered are not sufficient grounds for granting reconsideration. Rule 132(a) (48 CFR 6101.32(a) (2003)); Long Lane Limited Partnership v. General Services Administration, GSBCA 15334-R, 04-2 BCA ¶ 32,751.

The motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

MARTHA H. DeGRAFF
Board Judge

We concur:

STEPHEN M. DANIELS
Board Judge

ROBERT W. PARKER
Board Judge