KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: In his appeal brief, Applicant makes assertions that are not contained in the record. The Appeal Board is prohibited from considering new evidence. Directive \P E3.1.29. His brief raises no allegation of error that is based on evidence that we can consider. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 17-03640.a1

DATE: 08/27/2019

DATE: August 27, 2019

In Re:

ISCR Case No. 17-03640

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 November 27, 2017, 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 June 19, 2019, after the hearing, Administrative Judge Gregg A. Cervi denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

In his appeal brief, Applicant makes assertions that are not contained in the record. The Appeal Board is prohibited from considering new evidence. Directive \P E3.1.29. His brief raises no allegation of error that is based on evidence that we can consider.

The Board does not review cases *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. Because Applicant has not made an allegation of error that we can consider, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is affirmed.

Order

The Decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Signed: Michael Ra'anan Michael 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