KEYWORD: Guideline F

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 June 16, 2016, DoD issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that

decision—security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) and Guideline J (Criminal Conduct) of Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested a decision on the written record. On April 26, 2018, after considering the record, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) Administrative Judge Philip J. Katauskas denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant's appeal brief contains no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Rather, it contains two credit reports that post-date the Judge's decision and Applicant's arguments concerning her debts based on those credit reports. The credit reports constitute new evidence that the Appeal Board cannot consider. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.29.

Applicant's appeal brief also contains a court document not previously submitted and raises arguments concerning the Guideline J allegation. However, the Judge found in favor of her on that allegation.

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

Signed: Charles C. Hale
Charles C. Hale
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

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