



UNITED STATES
CIVILIAN BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS

February 26, 2026

CBCA 8762-RELO

In the Matter of JEFFREY C.

Jeffrey C., Claimant.

Marc E. Mandel, Office of the General Counsel, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, DC, appearing for Department of Justice.

NEWSOM, Board Judge.

Claimant requests reconsideration of our decision denying his challenge to the effort of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to collect overpayments of the cost to move the claimant's household effects (HHE).¹ *Jeffrey C.*, CBCA 8762-RELO (Feb. 19, 2026).

The FBI paid a transportation carrier to move and store claimant's HHE after he separated from service. Claimant's HHE exceeded the applicable weight allowance. The FBI sought to recoup the costs attributed to the overage which the FBI asserted was \$4900. We denied claimant's challenge, concluding that claimant was obligated to repay the cost attributed to the portion of claimant's HHE that exceeded the weight allowance.

¹ This dispute is governed by the Foreign Affairs Manual (FAM), which uses the term "household effects" (instead of "household goods") to refer to property associated with "the home and all personal effects belonging to an employee and immediate family members." 14 FAM 611.3.

Board Rule 407 authorizes motions for reconsideration of relocation claims in certain circumstances. 48 CFR 6104.407 (2024). In seeking reconsideration, claimant acknowledges that his HHE exceeded the allowable weight. He challenges the calculation of the extra cost, asserting that the record does not contain sufficient evidence explaining how that figure was derived. Claimant asserts that the FBI has not established that it actually cost the FBI more to move his overweight HHE than it would have cost to move the allowable HHE weight.

The claimant has raised this argument for the first time in his motion for reconsideration, thus it is untimely. In general, the Board will not grant reconsideration based on arguments that were or should have been raised during the original proceeding. *See, e.g., Jerie Renee Holliday, CBCA 3931-RELO, 15-1 BCA ¶ 35,911, at 175,538 (2014).*

Moreover, as the underlying decision explains, the record shows that it did, indeed, cost the FBI more to move the claimant's overweight HHE. As we explained, that additional cost figure came from a quote provided by the transportation carrier to the FBI prior to claimant's move. FBI Exhibit AE-3 at 9. The carrier quoted a cost of \$12,400 to move and store the estimated weight of claimant's HHE of 12,000 pounds, and it quoted a cost of \$7500 to move and store the HHE at the allowed weight of 7200 pounds. The quote shows that the FBI incurred additional costs of \$4900—the difference between the allowed weight of HHE and the actual weight of HHE—because claimant's HHE exceeded the weight allowance.

Claimant asserts that the FBI did not demonstrate how the carrier calculated the amounts that it quoted and, later, charged. That may be so, but it is the claimant's burden to prove his claim. *Christopher R. Chin-Young, CBCA 3734-RELO, 14-1 BCA ¶ 35,688, at 174,684; Rule 401(c).* While claimant questions the calculation, he has not alleged any specific errors. Mere conjecture is insufficient to meet his burden. *See Katrina A. Semick, CBCA 5202-TRAV, 16-1 BCA ¶ 36,347, at 177,208.*

Moreover, the genesis of this issue is that claimant's HHE exceeded the allowable weight. He was notified of this fact before the move and was warned that if he exceeded the weight allowance he “would be responsible for payment of the overage that is shipped.” FBI Exhibit AE 1. Claimant apparently did not reduce the weight of his HHE prior to the move, so he must pay the overage as required by the FAM. 14 FAM 612.3(a).

Elizabeth W. Newsom

ELIZABETH W. NEWSOM
Board Judge