



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



In the matter of:

)
)
)
)
)

ISCR Case No. 15-01514

Applicant for Security Clearance

Appearances

For Government: Andre M. Gregorian, Esq., Department Counsel
For Applicant: *Pro se*

05/17/2016

Decision

HARVEY, Mark, Administrative Judge:

Applicant's statement of reasons (SOR) alleges eight delinquent debts totaling \$22,228. He failed to provide sufficient information about his finances and demonstrate progress resolving his SOR debts. Financial considerations security concerns are not mitigated. Access to classified information is denied.

History of the Case

On August 1, 2014, Applicant completed and signed an Electronic Questionnaire for National Security Positions (e-QIP) (SF 86). (Item 2) On September 3, 2015, the Department of Defense (DOD) Consolidated Adjudications Facility (CAF) issued Applicant an SOR pursuant to Executive Order (Exec. Or.) 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 set forth security concerns arising under the financial considerations guideline.

On September 28, 2015, Applicant provided a response to the SOR, and he requested a decision without a hearing. On November 30, 2015, Department Counsel completed the File of Relevant Material (FORM). On February 21, 2016, Applicant received the FORM. Applicant did not respond to the FORM. On May 2, 2016, the case was assigned to me. The Government's case consisted of five exhibits. (Items 1-5)

Findings of Fact¹

In Applicant's SOR response, he admitted the debt in SOR ¶ 1.a, and he denied the remaining SOR allegations. He also provided extenuating and mitigating information. Applicant's admissions are accepted as findings of fact.

Applicant is a 47-year-old security guard currently employed by the same defense contractor since March 2014.² From September 2010 to present, he has been employed as a security guard for various companies. In 1988, he graduated from high school. He has never served in the military. From 1989 to 2009, he was employed at a corporation as a press operator. In 1999, he married, and in 2007, he divorced. His daughter is 17 years old.

Financial Considerations³

Applicant's history of delinquent debt is documented in his credit reports, October 9, 2014 Office of Personnel Management (OPM) personal subject interview (PSI), SF 86, and SOR response. (Items 1-5) He was unemployed from September 2009 to September 2010. (Item 3) His SOR alleges eight delinquent debts totaling \$22,228, and their status is as follows:

SOR ¶ 1.a is a telecommunications debt for \$231. (Item 1) Applicant recognized the debt. (Item 3) He told the OPM investigator that he would look into it and pay it. (Item 3) In his SOR response, he said he settled the debt. (Item 1) Applicant is credited with resolving this debt.

SOR ¶ 1.b is a tax lien owed to a state for \$11,072 filed in 2006. SOR ¶ 1.d is a judgment filed in 2008 for \$1,086. SOR ¶ 1.e is a judgment filed in 2008 for \$1,801. Applicant said his former spouse collected unemployment in his name; however, he said the debt was paid off. Applicant did not list any periods of his unemployment from 1989 to 2009. He said all three judgments pertain to the same debt. In his SOR response, he denied all three debts and commented that they were no longer on his credit report. (Item 1) He did not provide the credit report he was discussing with his SOR response.

SOR ¶ 1.c is a judgment filed in 2008 for \$1,188. He denied responsibility for this debt, and he said it was not on his credit report. (Item 1)

¹Some details have been excluded in order to protect Applicant's right to privacy. Specific information is available in the cited exhibits.

²Unless stated otherwise, the source for the information in this paragraph is Applicant's August 1, 2014 Electronic Questionnaire for National Security Positions (e-QIP) (SF 86). (Item 2)

³Unless stated otherwise the information in this section is from October 9, 2014 Applicant's Office of Personnel Management (OPM) personal subject interview. (Item 3)

SOR ¶ 1.f is a child support debt owed to a court in collections for \$2,560. SOR ¶ 1.g is a medical collection debt for \$4,160. Applicant told the OPM investigator that he did not recognize these two debts, and he would look into them. (Item 3) In his SOR response, he said he paid the debt in SOR ¶ 1.f, and he denied responsibility for the debt in SOR ¶ 1.g because it was not on his credit report. (Item 1) He is not credited with paying his child support debt in SOR ¶ 1.f without corroborating documentation.

SOR ¶ 1.h is an insurance debt placed for collection for \$130. (Item 1) Applicant recognized the debt. (Item 3) He told the OPM investigator that he would look into it and pay it. (Item 3) In his SOR response, he denied responsibility for this debt, and said it was not on his credit report. (Item 1)

The only delinquent debt disclosed on his SF 86 was his child support being delinquent in the amount of \$1,523; however, he said the arrearage was being paid by his employer out of his paycheck. (Item 2)

Applicant's August 13, 2014 combined Experian, TransUnion, and Equifax credit report includes the following derogatory financial entries: SOR ¶ 1.a is a telecommunications debt for \$231 (Experian); SOR ¶ 1.b is a judgment filed in 2006 for \$11,072 (TransUnion); SOR ¶ 1.d is a judgment for \$1,086 (Experian and TransUnion); SOR ¶ 1.e is a judgment for \$1,801 (Experian); SOR ¶ 1.f is a child support collection debt for \$2,560 (Experian); SOR ¶ 1.g is a medical collection debt for \$4,160 (Experian); and SOR ¶ 1.h is an insurance debt placed for collection for \$130 (TransUnion). (Item 4) His August 13, 2014 combined Experian, TransUnion, and Equifax credit report does not include the SOR ¶ 1.c judgment filed in 2008 for \$1,188. (Item 4)

Applicant's January 22, 2015 Equifax credit report includes the following derogatory entries: SOR ¶ 1.a is a telecommunications debt for \$231; ¶ 1.b is a judgment filed in 2006 for \$11,072; and SOR ¶ 1.c is a judgment filed in 2008 for \$1,188. His credit report indicates Applicant is disputing the debt in SOR ¶ 1.c. (Item 5)

There is no evidence that Applicant received financial counseling. There is no evidence that he violated security rules, abused alcohol, or used illegal drugs.

The file lacks supporting documentary evidence that Applicant paid, arranged to pay, settled, compromised, or otherwise resolved any of the delinquent accounts alleged in the SOR. There is no evidence of Applicant's income, and he did not provide a budget or personal financial statement. The record lacks corroborating or substantiating documentation and detailed explanations of the causes for his financial problems and other mitigating information. The FORM noted 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)

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 revised 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. Thus, nothing in this decision should be construed to suggest that it is based, 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 (4th 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.” Applicant’s history of delinquent debt is documented in his credit reports, SF 86, OPM PSI, and SOR response. Applicant’s SOR alleges eight delinquent debts totaling \$22,228. His credit reports list the eight delinquent SOR debts. AG ¶ 19(g) reads, “failure to file annual Federal, state, or local income tax returns as required or the fraudulent filing of the same.” AG ¶ 19(g) does not apply because the record does not establish how Applicant’s \$11,072 state tax lien was generated. 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;⁴ and

(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 security." Directive, Enclosure 2 ¶ 2(b).

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

Applicant's stated efforts to resolve his delinquent debt do not warrant full application of any mitigating conditions to all of his SOR debts; however, he presented some important mitigating information. He was unemployed from September 2009 to September 2010. He was also divorced in 2007. He had some medical debts. Unemployment, medical problems, and divorce are circumstances beyond his control that adversely affected his finances. He did not provide enough details about what he did to address his SOR debts after he became employed in 2010, and the degree of impact of these circumstances beyond his control to establish full mitigation. He did not describe receipt of financial counseling.

⁴The 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].

(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)).

I have credited Applicant with resolving the telecommunications debt in SOR ¶ 1.a for \$231. Applicant did not provide sufficient documentation relating to the other SOR debts: (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 creditors; (2) correspondence to or from any creditors to establish maintenance of contact with creditors;⁵ (3) credible debt disputes indicating he did not believe he was responsible for the debts and why he held such a belief; (4) attempts to negotiate payment plans, such as settlement offers or agreements to show that he was attempting to resolve these debts; or (5) other evidence of progress or resolution of his debts.

Applicant told an OPM investigator that several of the SOR judgments were duplications of each other. His 2015 credit report indicates he disputed the judgment in SOR ¶ 1.c and it does not appear in his 2014 credit report. I have credited Applicant with mitigating the debt in SOR ¶ 1.c. He failed to establish mitigation under AG ¶ 20(e) for any other SOR debts because he did not provide documented proof to substantiate the existence, basis, or the result of any debt disputes.

There is insufficient evidence about why Applicant was unable to make greater progress resolving more of his SOR debts. There is insufficient assurance 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 considerations security 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.

⁵"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 whether he or she maintained contact with creditors and attempted to negotiate partial payments to keep debts current.

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.

Applicant is a 47-year-old security guard employed by the current defense contractor since March 2014. From September 2010 to present, he has been employed as a security guard. From 1989 to 2009, he was employed at a corporation as a press operator. In 1999, he married, and in 2007, he divorced. He was unemployed from September 2009 to September 2010; he was also divorced in 2007; and he had some medical debts. Unemployment, medical problems, and divorce are circumstances beyond his control that adversely affected his finances. There is no evidence of abuse of alcohol, security violations, or use of illegal drugs.

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 eight delinquent debts totaling \$22,228. I have credited him with paying the debt in SOR ¶ 1.a for \$231 and with disputing the debt in SOR ¶ 1.c for \$1,188.⁶ He provided insufficient corroborating or substantiating documentary evidence of payments to his other SOR creditors, payment plans, or his communications to those creditors. He did not provide documentation showing his attempts to resolve any of his SOR debts in good faith. His failure to provide more documented evidence of progress resolving his SOR debts 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, financial history, 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 for 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.

I have carefully applied the law, as set forth in *Egan*, Exec. Or. 10865, the Directive, and the AGs, to the facts and circumstances in the context of the whole

⁶It is important to be mindful of the Appeal Board's admonition that "an applicant who begins to resolve debts only after an SOR placed him on notice that his clearance was in jeopardy may lack the judgment and self-discipline to follow rules and regulations over time or when there is no immediate threat to his own interests." ISCR Case No. 14-05476 at 4 (App. Bd. Mar. 25, 2016) (citing ISCR Case No. 14-03358 at 4 (App. Bd. Oct. 9, 2015)). Here, the record lacked evidence of payments of any debts, except for Applicant's statement that he paid the debt in SOR ¶ 1.a.

person. I conclude that financial consideration concerns are not mitigated, and it is not clearly consistent with the national interest to grant Applicant security clearance eligibility at this time. 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
Subparagraph 1.a:	For Applicant
Subparagraph 1.b:	Against Applicant
Subparagraph 1.c:	For Applicant
Subparagraphs 1.d through 1.h:	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