

the debt in SOR ¶ 1.k, while a credit report dated August 26, 2021 (FORM Item 6 at 2) lists the debt in SOR ¶ 1.d as a collection account. The amounts of the two debts are close but not exact. In responding to the SOR, Applicant admitted both debts, indicated he was making payments on both debts, noted he did not have a copy of the payment agreement for one of them, and did not assert they were duplicate debts. In short, Applicant has failed to demonstrate these two allegations are duplicates. Moreover, even if these two allegations were duplicates, it is unlikely such an error would have had changed the outcome of this case.

The remainder of Applicant's brief is an update on the status of the alleged debts. In providing this update, Applicant makes assertions and submits documents embedded in the brief that were not presented to the Judge for consideration. The Appeal Board is prohibited from receiving or considering new evidence on appeal. Directive ¶ E3.1.29.

The Board does not review cases *de novo*. The Appeal Board's authority to review a case is limited to cases in which the appealing party has alleged the Judge committed harmful error. Because Applicant has not alleged any harmful error, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant security clearance eligibility is sustainable.

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 D. Modzelewski
Moira D. Modzelewski
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board