



**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
DEFENSE OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS**



In the matter of:

-----

Applicant for Security Clearance

)  
)  
)  
)  
)

ISCR Case No. 14-03632

**Appearances**

For Government: Philip J. Katauskas, Esq., Department Counsel  
For Applicant: *Pro se*

06/16/2015

**Decision**

HARVEY, Mark, Administrative Judge:

Applicant's statement of reasons (SOR) alleges 28 delinquent, charged-off, or collection accounts totaling \$59,257. He failed to provide sufficient documentation of his progress resolving his financial problems. Financial considerations concerns are not mitigated. Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

**Statement of the Case**

On March 27, 2013, Applicant submitted an Electronic Questionnaires for Investigations Processing (e-QIP) version of security clearance application (SF 86). (Item 6) On August 18, 2014, the Department of Defense (DOD) Consolidated Adjudications Facility (CAF) issued an SOR to Applicant, pursuant to Executive Order 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information Within Industry*, dated February 20, 1960, as amended; DOD Directive 5220.6, *Defense Industrial Personnel Security Clearance Review Program* (Directive), dated January 2, 1992, as amended; and the adjudicative guidelines (AG), which became effective on September 1, 2006.

The SOR alleged security concerns under Guideline F (financial considerations). (Item 1) The SOR detailed reasons why DOD could not make the affirmative finding under the Directive that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue a security clearance for Applicant and recommended referral to an

administrative judge to determine whether Applicant's clearance should be granted, continued, denied, or revoked. (Item 1)

On September 16, 2014, Applicant responded to the SOR allegations, and on October 10, 2014, Applicant sent an email to the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals and waived his right to a hearing. (Items 4, 5) A complete copy of the file of relevant material (FORM), dated March 4, 2015, was provided to him on April 20, 2015.<sup>1</sup> Applicant did not respond to the FORM. The case was assigned to me on June 8, 2015.

### **Findings of Fact<sup>2</sup>**

In Applicant's SOR response, he admitted responsibility for all of the SOR debts.<sup>3</sup> He also provided extenuating and mitigating information. Applicant's admissions are accepted as findings of fact.

Applicant is a 28-year-old engineering draftsman, who worked for a defense contractor since March 2013.<sup>4</sup> From February 2012 to March 2013, he worked for a technical staffing company; and from December 2011 to February 2012, he was unemployed. From July 2010 to December 2011, he was a building engineer. From March 2010 to July 2010, he was unemployed. From December 2005 to July 2010, he worked in heating and air conditioning. He has never served in the military. He recently married, and his spouse is pregnant. (Item 4)

In June 2006, Applicant graduated from high school, and from 2006 to 2008, he attended a university. From 2009 to 2011, he attended a technical institute, and in 2011, he received an associate's degree. There is no evidence of security violations or use of illegal drugs. He disclosed some of his financial problems on his March 27, 2013 SF 86.

### **Financial Considerations**

Applicant's credit reports and SOR allege 28 delinquent, charged-off, or collection accounts totaling \$59,257. (Items 1, 8, 9) Ten of Applicant's SOR debts are education loans, totaling \$53,880 as follows: ¶ 1.a for \$20,844; ¶ 1.b for \$8,046; ¶ 1.c for \$7,700; ¶ 1.d for \$4,943; ¶ 1.e for \$3,237; ¶ 1.f for \$2,920; ¶ 1.g for \$2,482; ¶ 1.h for \$1,957; ¶ 1.i for \$1,747; and ¶ 1.k for \$1,004.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) transmittal letter is dated April 6, 2015, and Applicant's receipt is dated April 20, 2015. The DOHA transmittal letter informed Applicant that he had 30 days after his receipt to submit information.

<sup>2</sup>Some details have not been included in order to protect Applicant's right to privacy. Specific information is available in the cited exhibits.

<sup>3</sup>The source for the information in this paragraph is Applicant's SOR response. (Item 4)

<sup>4</sup>Unless stated otherwise, Applicant's March 27, 2013 Electronic Questionnaires for Investigations Processing (e-QIP) version of security clearance application (SF 86) is the source for the facts in this paragraph and the next paragraph. (Item 6)

Thirteen of Applicant's SOR debts are medical accounts, totaling \$2,659 as follows: ¶ 1.l for \$307; ¶ 1.n for \$237; ¶ 1.p for \$168; ¶ 1.q for \$148; ¶ 1.r for \$148; ¶ 1.s for \$102; ¶ 1.t for \$90; ¶ 1.u for \$54; ¶ 1.v for \$919; ¶ 1.y for \$239; ¶ 1.z for \$127; ¶ 1.aa for \$70; and ¶ 1.bb for \$50. Three of Applicant's SOR debts are telecommunications accounts, totaling \$1,474 as follows: ¶ 1.m for \$292; ¶ 1.w for \$640; and ¶ 1.x for \$542. Two of Applicant's SOR debts are financial accounts, totaling \$1,244 as follows: ¶ 1.j for \$1,037; and ¶ 1.o for \$207.

Applicant attributed his financial problems to underemployment and unemployment. (Item 4) He said six student loans went into deferment and "[o]nce that was accepted I had to call them back to establish a monthly payment." (Item 4) He listed the following student loans as being in this payment program: ¶ 1.b for \$8,046; ¶ 1.c for \$7,700; ¶ 1.d for \$4,943; ¶ 1.e for \$3,237; ¶ 1.f for \$2,920; and ¶ 1.h for \$1,957. (Item 4) He said he "was only able to make small payments towards [his] debt at this time." (Item 4) He did not describe the amounts or timing of the "small payments." He notified DOHA that he had a court date for a non-SOR landlord-tenant dispute about damage claims and costs of repairs. (Item 4)

Applicant's FORM repeated the admonition about the absence of corroborating documentation and other mitigating information and explained that Applicant had 30 days from the receipt of the FORM "in which to submit a documentary response setting forth objections, rebuttal, extenuation, mitigation, or explanation, as appropriate. If you do not file any objections or submit any additional information . . . your case will be assigned to an Administrative Judge for a determination based solely" on the evidence set forth in this FORM. (FORM at 3) Applicant did not respond to the FORM.

### **Policies**

The U.S. Supreme Court has recognized the substantial discretion of the Executive Branch in regulating access to information pertaining to national security emphasizing, "no one has a 'right' to a security clearance." *Department of the Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518, 528 (1988). As Commander in Chief, the President has the authority to control access to information bearing on national security and to determine whether an individual is sufficiently trustworthy to have access to such information." *Id.* at 527. The President has authorized the Secretary of Defense or his designee to grant applicant's eligibility for access to classified information "only upon a finding that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to do so." Exec. Or. 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information within Industry* § 2 (Feb. 20, 1960), as amended.

Eligibility for a security clearance is predicated upon the applicant meeting the criteria contained in the adjudicative guidelines. These guidelines are not inflexible rules of law. Instead, recognizing the complexities of human behavior, these guidelines are applied in conjunction with an evaluation of the whole person. An administrative judge's overarching adjudicative goal is a fair, impartial, and commonsense decision. An administrative judge must consider all available, reliable information about the person, past and present, favorable and unfavorable.

The Government reposes a high degree of trust and confidence in persons with access to classified information. This relationship transcends normal duty hours and endures throughout off-duty hours. Decisions include, by necessity, consideration of the possible risk the applicant may deliberately or inadvertently fail to safeguard classified information. Such decisions entail a certain degree of legally permissible extrapolation about potential, rather than actual, risk of compromise of classified information. Clearance decisions must be “in terms of the national interest and shall in no sense be a determination as to the loyalty of the applicant concerned.” See Exec. Or. 10865 § 7. See also Executive Order 12968 (Aug. 2, 1995), § 3.1. Thus, nothing in this Decision should be construed to suggest that I have based this decision, in whole or in part, on any express or implied determination about applicant’s allegiance, loyalty, or patriotism. It is merely an indication the applicant has not met the strict guidelines the President and the Secretary of Defense have established for issuing a clearance.

Initially, the Government must establish, by substantial evidence, conditions in the personal or professional history of the applicant that may disqualify the applicant from being eligible for access to classified information. The Government has the burden of establishing controverted facts alleged in the SOR. See *Egan*, 484 U.S. at 531. “Substantial evidence” is “more than a scintilla but less than a preponderance.” See *v. Washington Metro. Area Transit Auth.*, 36 F.3d 375, 380 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994). The guidelines presume a nexus or rational connection between proven conduct under any of the criteria listed therein and an applicant’s security suitability. See ISCR Case No. 95-0611 at 2 (App. Bd. May 2, 1996).

Once the Government establishes a disqualifying condition by substantial evidence, the burden shifts to the applicant to rebut, explain, extenuate, or mitigate the facts. Directive ¶ E3.1.15. An applicant “has the ultimate burden of demonstrating that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue his [or her] security clearance.” ISCR Case No. 01-20700 at 3 (App. Bd. Dec. 19, 2002). The burden of disproving a mitigating condition never shifts to the Government. See ISCR Case No. 02-31154 at 5 (App. Bd. Sep. 22, 2005). “[S]ecurity clearance determinations should err, if they must, on the side of denials.” *Egan*, 484 U.S. at 531; see AG ¶ 2(b).

## **Analysis**

### **Financial Considerations**

AG ¶ 18 articulates the security concern relating to financial problems:

Failure or inability to live within one’s means, satisfy debts, and meet financial obligations may indicate poor self-control, lack of judgment, or unwillingness to abide by rules and regulations, all of which can raise questions about an individual’s reliability, trustworthiness, and ability to protect classified information. An individual who is financially overextended is at risk of having to engage in illegal acts to generate funds.

AG ¶ 19 provides two disqualifying conditions that could raise a security concern and may be disqualifying in this case: “(a) inability or unwillingness to satisfy debts;” and “(c) a history of not meeting financial obligations.” In ISCR Case No. 08-12184 at 7 (App. Bd. Jan. 7, 2010), the Appeal Board explained:

It is well-settled that adverse information from a credit report can normally meet the substantial evidence standard and the government’s obligations under [Directive] ¶ E3.1.14 for pertinent allegations. At that point, the burden shifts to applicant to establish either that [he or] she is not responsible for the debt or that matters in mitigation apply.

(internal citation omitted). Applicant’s history of delinquent debt is documented in his credit reports and SOR response. Applicant’s SOR alleges 28 delinquent, charged-off, or collection accounts totaling \$59,257. The Government established the disqualifying conditions in AG ¶¶ 19(a) and 19(c), requiring additional inquiry about the possible applicability of mitigating conditions.

Five mitigating conditions under AG ¶ 20 are potentially applicable:

(a) the behavior happened so long ago, was so infrequent, or occurred under such circumstances that it is unlikely to recur and does not cast doubt on the individual’s current reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment;

(b) the conditions that resulted in the financial problem were largely beyond the person’s control (e.g., loss of employment, a business downturn, unexpected medical emergency, or a death, divorce or separation), and the individual acted responsibly under the circumstances;

(c) the person has received or is receiving counseling for the problem and/or there are clear indications that the problem is being resolved or is under control;

(d) the individual initiated a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or otherwise resolve debts;<sup>5</sup> and

---

<sup>5</sup>The Appeal Board has previously explained what constitutes a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or otherwise resolve debts:

In order to qualify for application of [the good-faith mitigating condition], an applicant must present evidence showing either a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or some other good-faith action aimed at resolving the applicant’s debts. The Directive does not define the term “good-faith.” However, the Board has indicated that the concept of good-faith “requires a showing that a person acts in a way that shows reasonableness, prudence, honesty, and adherence to duty or obligation.” Accordingly, an applicant must do more than merely show that he or she relied on a legally available option (such as bankruptcy) in order to claim the benefit of [the good-faith mitigating condition].

(e) the individual has a reasonable basis to dispute the legitimacy of the past-due debt which is the cause of the problem and provides documented proof to substantiate the basis of the dispute or provides evidence of actions to resolve the issue.

The Appeal Board concisely explained Applicant's responsibility for proving the applicability of mitigating conditions as follows:

Once a concern arises regarding an Applicant's security clearance eligibility, there is a strong presumption against the grant or maintenance of a security clearance. See *Dorfmont v. Brown*, 913 F. 2d 1399, 1401 (9th Cir. 1990), *cert. denied*, 499 U.S. 905 (1991). After the Government presents evidence raising security concerns, the burden shifts to the applicant to rebut or mitigate those concerns. See Directive ¶ E3.1.15. The standard applicable in security clearance decisions is that articulated in *Egan, supra*. "Any doubt concerning personnel being considered for access to classified information will be resolved in favor of the national interest." Directive, Enclosure 2 ¶ 2(b).

ISCR Case No. 10-04641 at 4 (App. Bd. Sept. 24, 2013).

Applicant's conduct in resolving his delinquent debt does not warrant full application of any mitigating conditions to all of his SOR debts. He did not provide sufficient information about his finances to establish his inability to make greater progress paying his creditors. Underemployment and unemployment damaged his family finances and is a circumstance largely beyond his control; however, he did not act responsibly under the circumstances. He recently married, and his spouse is pregnant, resulting in additional financial responsibilities. He explained in his SOR response that he had placed six of his student loans into a repayment plan and was making small payments to his creditors; however, he did not provide any evidence of payments to his student loan creditors.

Applicant did not provide documentation showing his income and expenses, and he did not a budget. He presented insufficient evidence about what he has done over the last three years to pay his SOR debts or his other debts. He did not provide any of the following documentation relating to the SOR creditors: (1) proof of payments, such as checking account statements, photocopies of checks, or a letter from the creditor proving that he paid or made any payments to the creditor; (2) correspondence to or from the creditor to establish maintenance of contact with the creditor;<sup>6</sup> (3) a credible

---

(internal citation and footnote omitted) ISCR Case No. 02-30304 at 3 (App. Bd. Apr. 20, 2004) (quoting ISCR Case No. 99-9020 at 5-6 (App. Bd. June 4, 2001)).

<sup>6</sup>"Even if Applicant's financial difficulties initially arose, in whole or in part, due to circumstances outside his [or her] control, the Judge could still consider whether Applicant has since acted in a reasonable manner when dealing with those financial difficulties." ISCR Case No. 05-11366 at 4 n.9 (App. Bd. Jan. 12, 2007) (citing ISCR Case No. 99-0462 at 4 (App. Bd. May 25, 2000); ISCR Case No. 99-0012 at 4 (App. Bd. Dec. 1, 1999); ISCR Case No. 03-13096 at 4 (App. Bd. Nov. 29, 2005)). A component is

debt dispute; (4) attempts to negotiate payment plans, such as settlement offers or agreements to show that he was attempting to resolve these SOR debts; (5) evidence of financial counseling; or (6) other evidence of progress or resolution of his SOR debts.

Applicant's failure to prove that he has made more substantial steps to resolve his debts shows a lack of judgment and responsibility that weighs against approval of his security clearance. There is insufficient evidence that he was unable to make greater progress resolving his delinquent debts, or that his financial problems are being resolved, are under control, and will not recur in the future. Under all the circumstances, he failed to establish that financial consideration concerns are mitigated.

### **Whole-Person Concept**

Under the whole-person concept, the administrative judge must evaluate an Applicant's eligibility for a security clearance by considering the totality of the Applicant's conduct and all the circumstances. The administrative judge should consider the nine adjudicative process factors listed at AG ¶ 2(a):

(1) the nature, extent, and seriousness of the conduct; (2) the circumstances surrounding the conduct, to include knowledgeable participation; (3) the frequency and recency of the conduct; (4) the individual's age and maturity at the time of the conduct; (5) the extent to which participation is voluntary; (6) the presence or absence of rehabilitation and other permanent behavioral changes; (7) the motivation for the conduct; (8) the potential for pressure, coercion, exploitation, or duress; and (9) the likelihood of continuation or recurrence.

Under AG ¶ 2(c), the ultimate determination of whether to grant eligibility for a security clearance must be an overall commonsense judgment based upon careful consideration of the guidelines and the whole-person concept. I have incorporated my comments under Guideline F in my whole-person analysis. Some of the factors in AG ¶ 2(a) were addressed under Guideline F, but some warrant additional comment.

There is some evidence supporting approval of Applicant's clearance. Applicant is a 28-year-old engineering draftsman, who worked for a government contractor since March 2013. From March 2010 to July 2010, and from December 2011 to February 2012, he was unemployed. He was also underemployed during the last five years. He recently married, and his spouse is pregnant. These circumstances beyond his control contributed to his financial problems. In 2011, he received an associate's degree. There is no evidence of security violations or use of illegal drugs. He disclosed some of his financial problems on his March 27, 2013 SF 86.

The financial evidence against approval of Applicant's clearance is more substantial at this time. Applicant has a history of financial problems. His SOR alleges

---

whether he or she maintained contact with creditors and attempted to negotiate partial payments to keep debts current.

28 delinquent, charged-off, or collection accounts totaling \$59,257. He failed to provide sufficient documentation of progress to resolve his financial problems. His failure to provide more corroborating documentation shows lack of financial responsibility and judgment and raises unmitigated questions about Applicant's reliability, trustworthiness, and ability to protect classified information. See AG ¶ 18. More information about inability to pay debts or documented financial progress is necessary to mitigate security concerns.

It is well settled that once a concern arises regarding an applicant's security clearance eligibility, there is a strong presumption against the grant or renewal of a security clearance. See *Dorfmont*, 913 F. 2d at 1401. Unmitigated financial considerations concerns lead me to conclude that grant of a security clearance to Applicant is not warranted at this time. This decision should not be construed as a determination that Applicant cannot or will not attain the state of reform necessary to justify the award of a security clearance in the future. With more effort towards documented resolution of his past-due debts, and a track record of behavior consistent with his obligations, he may well be able to demonstrate persuasive evidence of his security clearance worthiness. Based on the facts before me and the adjudicative guidelines that I am required to apply, I conclude that it is not clearly consistent with the national interest to grant Applicant security clearance eligibility at this time.

I have carefully applied the law, as set forth in *Department of Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518 (1988), Exec. Or. 10865, the Directive, and the AGs, to the facts and circumstances in the context of the whole person. Financial considerations concerns are not mitigated.

### **Formal Findings**

Formal findings For or Against Applicant on the allegations set forth in the SOR, as required by Section E3.1.25 of Enclosure 3 of the Directive, are:

Paragraph 1, Guideline F:	AGAINST APPLICANT
Subparagraphs 1.a-1.bb:	Against Applicant

### **Conclusion**

In light of all of the circumstances presented by the record in this case, it is not clearly consistent with the national interest to grant Applicant eligibility for a security clearance. Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

---

Mark Harvey  
Administrative Judge