

Board of Contract Appeals

General Services Administration
Washington, D.C. 20405

December 8, 2004

GSBCA 16534-TRAV

In the Matter of ROBERT V. RUMPLE

Robert V. Rumble, Gulfport, MS, Claimant.

Douglas P. Knowles, Sr., District Trial Attorney, Baltimore District, Army Corps of Engineers, appearing for Department of the Army.

DANIELS, Board Judge (Chairman).

At the invitation of the Army Corps of Engineers, Robert V. Rumble traveled round-trip from his home in Gulfport, Mississippi, to Washington, D.C., to interview for a position with the Corps. The Corps paid some, but not all, of the transportation costs Mr. Rumble incurred in making this trip.

Mr. Rumble then filed a case with the Board, asking us to direct the Corps to reimburse him for the remainder of his transportation costs. In response, the Corps paid the entire amount at issue and asked that we dismiss the case.

Mr. Rumble objects to the agency's request. He asks that we adjudicate the matter, "issue a strong written admonishment to the agency for its conduct," direct the agency to reimburse him for costs he allegedly incurred in filing the case, and render "any and all additional declaratory, injunctive, and monetary relief the Board deems appropriate."

We decline Mr. Rumble's invitation.

The Board's authority, as to claims involving expenses incurred by federal civilian employees for official travel and transportation, is to settle those claims. 31 U.S.C. § 3702(a)(3) (2000); GSA Order ADM P 5450.39C CHGE 78 (Mar. 21, 2002) (delegation of authority from Administrator of General Services). For the purpose of this decision, we assume, without deciding, that this authority extends to claims involving expenses incurred for pre-employment interview travel by invitees who are not selected for employment. (If an agency agrees to pay any such expenses, it must pay all expenses to which the interviewee would be entitled if he were a Government employee traveling on official business. 41 CFR 301-75.100, -75.101 (2003).)

At this point, Mr. Rumble has received all the money that he has claimed, so nothing remains for us to settle. We have nothing to adjudicate. We consequently make no findings of fact and have no basis for admonishing the agency. Additionally, the statute under which we settle claims does not provide for the award to a claimant of any costs incurred in filing a case or any relief other than amounts due under a claim. Consequently, as the agency suggests, there is now no course of action available to us other than to dismiss the case.

STEPHEN M. DANIELS
Board Judge