In the Matter of:

Disputes concerning the payment of prevailing wage rates and proper classification by, and proposed debarment (*) for labor standards violations of:

ABHE & SVOBODA, INC., ARB CASE NO. 01-063

and

JEWELL PAINTING, INC.**, ARB CASE NO. 01-066

and

CAMERON JEWELL,** ALJ CASE NOS. 99-DBA-20 through 27

and

BLAST ALL, INC., ARB CASE NO. 01-068

and

GEORGE CAMPBELL PAINTING CORP., ARB CASE NO. 01-069

and

E. DASKAL CORPORATION, ALJ CASE NOS. 99-DBA-20 through 27

and

SHIPSVIEW CORPORATION.*,** ARB CASE NO. 01-070

ALJ CASE NOS. 99-DBA-20 through 27

With respect to work, cleaning and painting of bridges, performed pursuant to contracts issued by the State of Connecticut’s Department of Transportation.

DATE: October 15, 2004
BEFORE: THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW BOARD

Appearances:

For the Respondents Abhe & Svoboda, Inc., and Blast All, Inc.:
Paul M. Lusky, Esq., Kruchko & Fries, Baltimore, Maryland

For the Respondents Jewell Painting, Inc. and Cameron Jewell:
Constantine G. Antipas, Esq., P.E., Antipas Law Firm, Groton, Connecticut

For the Respondents George Campbell Painting Corp. and E. Daskal Corp.:
Jane I. Milas, Esq., Garcia & Milas, P.C., New Haven, Connecticut

For the Respondent Shipsview Corporation:
Chris Deligiannidis, pro se, Plymouth, Massachusetts

For the Administrator, Wage and Hour Division, U.S. Department of Labor:
Ford N. Newman, Esq., Douglas J. Davidson, Esq., Steven J. Mandel, Esq.,
Howard M. Radzely, Esq., Solicitor, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
BY ABHE & SVOBODA, INC.

On July 30, 2004, the Administrative Review Board issued a Final Decision and Order (F. D. & O.) in this case arising under the Davis-Bacon Act (DBA), 4 U.S.C.A. § 3141 et seq. (West Supp. 2003), and Davis Bacon Related Acts (DBRA), 23 U.S.C.A. § 113 (West 2001). The Board affirmed the Administrative Law Judge’s recommended decision (with a revised Appendix) (R. D. & O.) upholding the Administrator’s findings.

On August 27, 2004, Abhe & Svoboda filed a Motion for Reconsideration. No other parties have so moved or filed responses. The Board has inherent authority to reconsider its decisions. See, e.g., Macktal v. Brown and Root, Inc., ARB Nos. 98-112, 98-112A, ALJ No. 86-ERA-23, Order Granting Reconsideration (ARB Nov. 20, 1998). However, Abhe & Svoboda present no new issues of law or of fact that would justify reconsideration. Therefore, its Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

WAYNE C. BEYER
Administrative Appeals Judge

M. CYNTIA DOUGLASS
Chief Administrative Appeals Judge