

00727

**DECISION**



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

FILE: B-185024

DATE: October 22, 1976

MATTER OF: Johnstone D. Cockerille--Claim for  
miscellaneous expense

DIGEST: Employee requests reconsideration of decision B-185024, July 9, 1976, wherein his claim for miscellaneous expense in amount of \$182, representing cost of new hall runner, was denied on basis that cost of new items are specifically prohibited by regulation. Additional information provided indicates that cost of hall runner represents only small part of \$182 claimed. Amount claimed included charges for cutting and fitting rugs moved from residence at former duty station. Accordingly, upon submission of itemized bill showing amounts charged to each item, employee may be reimbursed amount representing cost of cutting and fitting old rugs.

This action results from a letter dated July 31, 1976, from Johnstone D. Cockerille requesting reconsideration of that part of our decision 55 Comp. Gen. \_\_\_\_ (B-185024, July 9, 1976), which disallowed \$182 of Mr. Cockerille's claim for miscellaneous expense incurred incident to his transfer to Washington, D.C.

Mr. Cockerille's request for reconsideration is based on his allegation that the facts pertaining to the \$182 claimed as the cost of obtaining and installing new rugs represented in our July 9, 1976, decision are incorrect. He states:

"The facts are that the \$182 includes only a small hall runner, exactly 40" x 168" long, which was so inconsequential that the bill did not contain a breakout for this item. The bill actually was for re-cutting, re-sewing, re-laying, and re-shaping my own rug to fit the new apartment rooms, which were decidedly different than those of my previous residence."

B-185024

In view of the new information provided by Mr. Cockerille we would have no objection to reimbursement being made for that portion of the \$182 which represents the cost of cutting and fitting rugs which were moved from his residence at his former duty station to his residence at his new duty station. However, reimbursement of that portion of the \$182 claimed which represents the cost of purchasing and installing the new hall runner is of the type that is specifically prohibited by Federal Travel Regulations (FPMR 101-7) para. 2-3.1.c(5)(May 1973).

Accordingly, Mr. Cockerille should submit the documentation required by FTR para. 2-3.3.b (May 1973), specifically, an itemized statement from the carpet dealer showing the amount attributable to the cutting and refitting of Mr. Cockerille's old rugs and the amount attributable to the purchase and installation of the new hall runner. Upon submission of such information to our Claims Division, further consideration will be given to that part of his claim.

  
Deputy Comptroller General  
of the United States