

Applicant's brief does not specifically assert the Judge committed any error in the decision. Rather, it asserts that he knows other individuals who apparently hold clearances and have relatives in Iraq. In this regard, the Directive provides that each case must be judged on its own merits. *See* Directive, Encl. 2, App. A ¶ 2(b). The fact that other individuals with relatives in Iraq may have been granted clearances does not establish the Judge erred in adjudicating Applicant's security clearance eligibility.

Applicant also contends that the fact he has in-laws living in Iraq is not a sufficient reason to deny him a security clearance. As the Appeal Board has previously stated, "[a]s a matter of common sense and human experience, there is a rebuttable presumption that a person has ties of affection for, or obligation to, the immediate family members of the persons' spouse." *See, e.g.,* ISCR Case No. 14-03112 at 3, n.1 (App. Bd. Nov. 3, 2015). It was not unreasonable for the Judge to conclude that security concerns arose from Applicant's in-laws Iraq. In short, none of Applicant's arguments are sufficient to show the Judge committed any harmful error in the decision.

The decision is sustainable on the record. "The general standard is that a clearance may be granted only when 'clearly consistent with national security.'" *Department of the Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518, 528 (1988). *See also*, Directive, Encl. 2, App. A ¶ 2(b): "Any doubt concerning personnel being considered for national security eligibility will be resolved in favor of national security."

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