



UNITED STATES  
CIVILIAN BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS

---

September 29, 2016

CBCA 5388-RELO

In the Matter of RENA C. DOUGLAS

Rena C. Douglas, Fort Worth, TX, Claimant.

Arthur B. Archambeau, Assistant District Counsel, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth, TX, appearing for Department of the Army.

**SULLIVAN**, Board Judge.

Claimant, Rena C. Douglas, seeks reconsideration of the Board's decision, *Rena C. Douglas*, CBCA 5388-RELO, 16-1 BCA ¶ 36,477, denying her claim for reimbursement of real estate expenses because the settlement date for the purchase of her new house was more than two years after the date she first reported for duty at her new duty station. Ms. Douglas states that the Board should reconsider the decision because the Joint Travel Regulations (JTR) do not identify which date, the date a sales contract is signed or the date the HUD-1 form is completed, is to be used to determine eligibility for reimbursement.

As explained in the Board's decision, the Federal Travel Regulation (FTR) and the JTR, both of which control the disposition of Ms. Douglas' claim, require that the settlement date for a real estate transaction occur no later than one year after the employee reports to duty at the new duty station. This date may be extended by one year, as it was for Ms. Douglas. The settlement date is the date of "closing of the real estate transaction by the payment of the contract price and the conveyance of the deed or title to the purchaser. A contract for sale, which is no more than an agreement to transact the closing in the future, is not a 'settlement' within the meaning of the FTR." *Robert J. Jaske*, B-227466 (Dec. 4, 1987). Therefore, the settlement occurs on the date that the HUD-1 form is completed as part

of the closing of a real estate transaction and the agency properly used that date in denying Ms. Douglas' claim for reimbursement.

Ms. Douglas, while seeking further explanation of the Board's decision, has not provided any new evidence as the basis for her request that the Board sustain her claim for real estate expenses. "Mere disagreement with a decision or re-argument of points already made is not a sufficient ground for seeking reconsideration." Rule 407 (48 CFR 6104.407 (2015)).

Ms. Douglas' request for reconsideration is denied.

---

MARIAN E. SULLIVAN  
Board Judge