



Additionally, she states that she has made efforts to re-establish a solid credit history and requests further consideration of the credit report she submitted to the Administrative Judge.

Turning first to her status as FSO, the SOR did not allege a failure-to-report, and a review of the record confirms that no evidence or argument referenced any such failure on her part. Nor does the Judge's decision. Moreover, although the record does not establish how Applicant received her notice of denial of her security clearance, the record does confirm that she filed a Notice of Appeal, was duly provided with instructions on how to appeal, and subsequently filed her appeal, after one extension was granted. A review of the entire record discloses no basis to conclude that Applicant was denied the rights due her under the Directive or that she had not been adequately advised of those rights. *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No 15-04472 at 3 (App. Bd. Feb. 9, 2017).

Turning next to Applicant's request for further consideration of a previously-submitted credit report, the Appeal Board does not review cases *de novo*. Our authority to review is limited to cases in which the appealing party has raised a claim of harmful error. *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 18-01962 at 2 (App. Bd. Aug. 29, 2019). Applicant has made no such allegation. The decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is affirmed.

**Order**

The decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Signed: James F. Duffy  
James F. Duffy  
Administrative Judge  
Chairperson, Appeal Board

Signed: James E. Moody  
James E. Moody  
Administrative Judge  
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: Moira Modzelewski  
Moira Modzelewski  
Administrative Judge  
Member, Appeal Board