



In the Matter of:

VASANTH GOVINDARAJAN,

ARB CASE NO. 2020-0032

PROSECUTING PARTY,

ALJ CASE NO. 2020-LCA-00001

v.

DATE: October 8, 2021

N2 SERVICES, INC.

RESPONDENT.

**Before: James D. McGinley, *Chief Administrative Appeals Judge*, and
Thomas H. Burrell, *Administrative Appeals Judge***

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION

PER CURIAM. On March 17, 2021, the Administrative Review Board (ARB or Board) dismissed this case on the grounds that Vasanth Govindarajan (Complainant) failed to abide by the requirements of the Board's Briefing Schedule and Complainant did not proffer any explanation for his failure to follow the Briefing Schedule in response to the Board's Order to Show Cause.

On March 17, 2021, Complainant requested the Board to reconsider our decision. On May 25, 2021, the Board denied Complainant's Motion for Reconsideration because none of Complainant's arguments for reconsideration fell within the limited circumstances for reconsideration.¹

¹ *Govindarajan v. N2 Services, Inc.*, ARB No. 2020-0032, ALJ No. 2020-LCA-00001, slip op. at 2-3 (ARB May 25, 2021) (per curiam) (Order Denying Motion for Reconsideration).

On May 26, 2021 and October 6, 2021, Complainant filed additional Motions for Reconsideration, which raise similar arguments to Complainant's first Motion for Reconsideration. However, the Board has already considered these arguments and they still do not meet the standard for reconsideration cited in the Board's Order dated May 25, 2021.² Thus, Complainant's Motions for Reconsideration fail to demonstrate a ground upon which the Board will grant reconsideration.

Accordingly, we **DENY** the Complainant's Motions for Reconsideration.

SO ORDERED.

² *Gupta v. Headstrong, Inc.*, ARB Nos. 2015-0032, -0033, ALJ No. 2014-LCA-00008, slip op. at 2 (ARB Feb. 14, 2017) (Order Denying Motion for Reconsideration) (citation omitted).