

In his appeal brief, Applicant asserts the Judge did not take into account that alleged debts were settled or paid off. In support of that claim, he submits documents concerning those debts that were admitted into evidence at the hearing. Most of these documents, however, pertain to SOR allegations that the Judge found in favor of Applicant. This assignment of error has no merit.

Applicant contends that the Judge did not take into account the progress he has made in resolving judgments and asserts that, if his clearance is reinstated, he will stay current on his debts. None of his arguments are enough to rebut the presumption that the Judge considered all of the record evidence or to demonstrate the Judge weighed the evidence in a manner that was arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law. *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 21-01169 at 5 (App. Bd. May 13, 2022). Applicant also asserts that loss of his security clearance would have a negative impact on him. However, the adverse impact of an unfavorable decision is not relevant in evaluating clearance eligibility. *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 17-03024 at 3 (App. Bd. Jan. 9, 2020).

Applicant failed to establish the Judge committed any harmful error. The Judge examined the relevant evidence and articulated a satisfactory explanation for 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