

KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: Applicant’s appeal brief contains no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Rather, it contains a document that is not included in the record. The Appeal Board cannot consider new evidence. Directive ¶ E3.1.29. Adverse decision is affirmed.

CASENO: 19-00307.a1

DATE: 01/23/2020

DATE: January 23, 2020

)	
In Re:)	
)	
-----)	ISCR Case No. 19-00307
)	
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 June 14, 2019, 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 decision on the written record. On October 31, 2019, after considering the record, 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 appeal brief contains no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Rather, it contains a document that is not included in the record. The Appeal Board cannot consider new evidence. Directive ¶ E3.1.29.

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 sustainable.

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