

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY DEFENSE OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS APPEAL BOARD POST OFFICE BOX 3656 ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22203 (703) 696-4759

KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: Applicant's appeal brief makes no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. It does contain assertions and documents that were not presented to the Judge for consideration. At least one document postdates the Judge's decision and others are undated. The Appeal Board is prohibited from considering new evidence on appeal. Directive ¶ E3.1.29. Adverse Decision is Affirmed.

CASE NO: 20-02718.a1

DATE: 11/29/2021

		Date: November 29, 2021
In the matter of:)	
)	ISCR Case No. 20-02718
Applicant for Security Clearance)))	

APPEAL BOARD DECISION

APPEARANCES

FOR GOVERNMENT

James B. Norman, Esq., Chief Department Counsel

FOR APPLICANT

Pro se

The Department of Defense (DoD) declined to grant Applicant a security clearance. On November 10, 2020, DoD issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that decision—security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) of DoD Directive 5220.6 (January 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested a decision on the written record. On August 20, 2021, after considering the record, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) Administrative Judge Gregg A. Cervi denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant's appeal brief makes no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. It does contain assertions and documents that were not presented to the Judge for consideration. At least one document postdates the Judge's decision and others are undated. The Appeal Board is prohibited from considering new evidence on appeal. Directive ¶ E3.1.29. Applicant also indicates that her loss of security clearance will create a financial hardship. The Directive, however, does not permit us to consider the impact of an unfavorable decision. *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 19-01206 at 2 (App. Bd. May 13, 2020).

The Board does not review cases *de novo*. The Appeal Board's authority to review a case is limited to cases in which the appealing party has alleged the Judge committed harmful error. Because Applicant has not made such an allegation of error, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is sustainable.

Order

The decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Signed: Michael Ra'anan Michael Ra'anan Administrative Judge Chairperson, Appeal Board

Signed: James E. Moody James E. Moody Administrative Judge Member, Appeal Board

Signed: James F. Duffy James F. Duffy Administrative Judge Member, Appeal Board