

KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: Applicant’s submission on appeal includes a copy of his written response to interrogatories that the DoD Consolidated Adjudications Facility propounded to him. This document is included in the record in Government Exhibit 3. The appeal submission also includes documents not contained in the record, new evidence which we cannot consider. Applicant’s brief does not assert that the Judge committed any harmful error. We do not review cases *de novo*. Our authority to review cases is limited to those in which the appealing party alleges that the Judge committed harmful error. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 18-01778.a1

DATE: 10/11/2019

DATE: October 11, 2019

)	
In Re:)	
-----)	ISCR Case No. 18-01778
)	
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 July 26, 2018, DoD issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that decision—security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) of Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested a hearing. On July 23, 2019, after the hearing, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) Administrative Judge Paul J. Mason denied Applicant’s request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant’s submission on appeal includes a copy of his written response to interrogatories that the DoD Consolidated Adjudications Facility propounded to him. This document is included in the record in Government Exhibit 3. The appeal submission also includes documents not contained in the record, new evidence which we cannot consider. Directive ¶ E3.1.29. Applicant’s brief does not assert that the Judge committed any harmful error. We do not review cases *de novo*. Our authority to review cases is limited to those in which the appealing party alleges that the Judge committed harmful error. Directive ¶ E3.1.32. *See* ISCR Case No. 17-03640 at 2 (App. Bd. Aug. 27, 2019). Because Applicant has not raised an issue that we are authorized to consider, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is affirmed.

Order

The Decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Signed: Michael Y. Ra'anan
Michael Y. 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