

---

## 29 C.F.R. § 4.187

---

### Recovery of underpayments.

---

(a) The Act, in section 3(a), provides that any violations of any of the contract stipulations required by sections 2(a)(1), 2(a)(2), or 2(b) of the Act, shall render the party responsible liable for the amount of any deductions, rebates, refunds, or underpayments (which includes non-payment) of compensation due to any employee engaged in the performance of the contract. So much of the accrued payments due either on the contract or on any other contract (whether subject to the Service Contract Act or not) between the same contractor and the Government may be withheld in a deposit fund as is necessary to pay the employees. In the case of requirements-type contracts, it is the contracting agency, and not the using agencies, which has the responsibility for complying with a withholding request by the Secretary or authorized representative. The Act further provides that on order of the Secretary (or authorized representatives), any compensation which the head of the Federal agency or the Secretary has found to be due shall be paid directly to the underpaid employees from any accrued payments withheld. In order to effectuate the efficient administration of this provision of the Act, such withheld funds shall be transferred to the Department of Labor for disbursement to the underpaid employees on order of the Secretary or his or her authorized representatives, an Administrative Law Judge, or the Administrative Review Board, and are not paid directly to such employees by the contracting agency without the express prior consent of the Department of Labor. (See Decision of the Comptroller General, B-170784, February 17, 1971.) It is mandatory for a contracting officer to adhere to a request from the Department of Labor to withhold funds where such funds are available. (See Decision of the Comptroller General, B-109257, October 14, 1952, arising under the Walsh-Healey Act.) Contract funds which are or may become due a contractor under any contract with the United States may be withheld prior to the institution of administrative proceedings by the Secretary. (*McCasland v. U.S. Postal Service*, 82 CCH Labor Cases ¶ 33,607 (N.D. N.Y. 1977); *G & H Machinery Co. v. Donovan*, 96 CCH Labor Cases ¶ 34,354 (S.D. Ill. 1982).)

(b) *Priority to withheld funds.* The Comptroller General has afforded employee wage claims priority over an Internal Revenue Service levy for unpaid taxes. (See Decisions of the Comptroller General, B-170784, February 17, 1971; B-189137, August 1, 1977; 56 Comp. Gen. 499 (1977); 55 Comp. Gen. 744 (1976), arising under the Davis-Bacon Act; B-178198, August 30, 1973; B-161460, May 25, 1967.)

(1) As the Comptroller General has stated, “[t]he legislative histories of these labor statutes [Service Contract Act and Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act, 41 U.S.C. 327, *et seq.*] disclose a progressive tendency to extend a more liberal interpretation and construction in successive enactments with regard to worker's benefits, recovery and repayment of wage underpayments. Further, as remedial legislation, it is axiomatic that they are to be liberally construed”. (Decision of the Comptroller General, B-170784, February 17, 1971.)

This document is only available to subscribers. Please log in or purchase access.

[Purchase Login](#)