



UNITED STATES
CIVILIAN BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS

May 15, 2013

CBCA 2672-TRAV

In the Matter of GAIL K. PECHULI

Gail K. Pechuli, Washington, DC, Claimant.

Olivette M. Hooks, Deputy Director, Office of International Conferences, Department of State, Washington, DC, appearing for Department of State.

DANIELS, Board Judge (Chairman).

In March 2013, we resolved a claim by Gail K. Pechuli, an employee of the Department of State, regarding amounts payable by the two parties on Ms. Pechuli's temporary duty assignment in May 2011. We held that Ms. Pechuli owed the department \$639.40 in airfare resulting from her having traveled by an indirect route and on an interrupted basis, and that the department owed her \$89.31 for other costs of the trip. Considering both elements at issue, Ms. Pechuli owed the department a net amount of \$550.09.

Mr. Pechuli has filed a "request for reconsideration based on my inability to obtain a medical certificate and omission of the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEOC) cases which are yet dispositive." Neither of these bases is justification for reconsidering our decision in the case.

One of the issues raised by the claimant was that she left the assignment (at a resort near Bozeman, Montana) because she was ill. We originally found that Ms. Pechuli had presented no records of medical treatment during the period in question and did not explain why any necessary medical treatment could not have been obtained in Bozeman. The claimant now makes two contentions about a "medical letter" she says she received from the Ada County (Idaho) Hospital in July 2011. First, she intimates that she had such a letter and

that it was in a folder which was taken from her cubicle at work. Second, she says that the hospital told her it sent her medical records to the Indian Health Service in Arizona. Neither of these contentions helps Ms. Pechuli's position, for even if she received medical treatment in Idaho, this does not demonstrate that she needed to travel from Bozeman to receive it. We note that in opposing the motion for reconsideration, the department shows us that medical care was available at the conference site, as arranged by the department with a local clinic.

Any cases involving Ms. Pechuli which may be pending at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission have no bearing on our evaluation of this travel expense claim. We consider and settle such claims on their own merits.

The motion for reconsideration is consequently denied.

In separate correspondence, Ms. Pechuli complains that the State Department has harassed her by demanding that instead of paying the net amount we directed, she must pay the \$639.40 she owes the department and receive separately the \$89.31 the department owes her. The department says that this procedure is required by the department's accounting system. We make no comment on this matter. We settle claims by federal civilian employees for travel expenses. 31 U.S.C. § 3702(a)(3) (2006). We do not evaluate claims of harassment or issues regarding the vagaries of government accounting systems.

STEPHEN M. DANIELS
Board Judge