

2017. The Judge found against Applicant on the falsification allegation and for Applicant on the termination allegation.

On appeal, Applicant appears to have misread the Judge's findings, as he challenges the Judge's findings regarding his federal tax delinquencies and re-states his efforts to resolve those delinquencies. The Judge found favorably for Applicant on the federal tax allegations. Other than that issue, Applicant's appeal brief makes no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Rather, he notes that he requires a security clearance to retain his job and to continue to repay his tax debt. The Directive does not permit us to consider the impact of an unfavorable decision. *See, e.g.,* ISCR Case No. 19-01206 at 2 (App. Bd. May 13, 2020).

Applicant requests reconsideration of the decision. The Appeal Board does not review cases *de novo*. The Board's authority to review a case is limited to cases in which the appealing party has alleged the Judge committed harmful error. Directive ¶ E3.1.32. Because Applicant has not made such an allegation of error, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is sustainable.

Order

The decision is **AFFIRMED**.

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

Signed: Jennifer I. Goldstein
Jennifer I. Goldstein
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

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