DIGEST: Applicant's appeal brief contains new evidence on appeal. Adverse decis	
CASENO: 15-00623.a1	
DATE: 05/24/2017	
	DATE: May 24, 2017
In Re:	
) ADP Case No. 15-00623
Applicant for Public Trust Position)))

KEYWORD: Guideline F

APPEAL BOARD SUMMARY DISPOSITION

APPEARANCES

FOR GOVERNMENT

James B. Norman, Esq., Chief Department Counsel

FOR APPLICANT Pro se

The Department of Defense (DoD) declined to grant Applicant a trustworthiness desigation. On December 30, 2015, DoD issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that decision—trustworthiness concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) of Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested a decision on the written record. On February 23, 2017, after considering the record, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) Administrative Judge Arthur E. Marshall, Jr., denied Applicant's request for a trustworthiness designation. Applicant appealed pursuant to

Applicant's appeal brief contains no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Rather, it contains new evidence in the form of a narrative statement about the status of certain debts and documents not previously submitted to the Judge, most of which post-date the Judge's decision. The Board cannot consider Applicant's new evidence on appeal. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.29.

The Board does not review a case *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. Applicant has not made an allegation of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Therefore, the decision of the Judge is AFFIRMED.

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

Signed: William S. Fields
William S. Fields
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

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