

KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: Applicant states the following: “I was unaware and was not given a deadline before my clearance was revoked.” To the extent that he is raising an issue of due process, we find no reason to conclude that Applicant was denied the due process afforded by the Directive. See, e.g., Directive ¶ 4.3 for a concise description of an applicant’s due process rights. Furthermore, the Applicant and the Judge had a lengthy discussion of how the process works after a hearing, including the possibility that the Judge might deny or revoke Applicant’s clearance. Adverse decision is affirmed.

CASE NO: 18-02131.a1

DATE: 05/13/2020

DATE: May 13, 2020

In Re:	)	
	)	
-----	)	ISCR Case No. 18-02131
	)	
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 September 4, 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 February 6, 2020, after the hearing, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) Administrative Judge Philip J. Katauskas denied Applicant’s request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant’s brief raises no issue of harmful error by the Judge. Rather, he discusses his professional background, his having held a clearance for many years, and his efforts at resolving the delinquent debts alleged in the SOR. He argues that this case is based upon a misunderstanding of his true situation. Applicant’s brief contains information from outside the record, which we cannot consider. Directive ¶ E3.1.29. In addition, he states the following: “I was unaware and was not given a deadline before my clearance was revoked.” Appeal Brief at 1. To the extent that he is raising an issue of due process, we find no reason to conclude that Applicant was denied the due process afforded by the Directive. *See, e.g.*, Directive ¶ 4.3 for a concise description of an applicant’s due process rights. Furthermore, the Applicant and the Judge had a lengthy discussion of how the process works after a hearing, including the possibility that the Judge might deny or revoke Applicant’s clearance. (Tr. pp. 61-67).

We do not review case *de novo*. Our authority to review a case is limited to cases in which the appealing party has alleged that the Judge committed harmful error. *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 19-00307 at 2 (App. Bd. Jan. 23, 2020). Applicant has made no such allegation. Therefore, the decision of the Judge 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