

Additionally, the Judge noted Applicant failed to provide documentation corroborating some of his claims and concluded that doubts remained about his security clearance eligibility.

On appeal, Applicant takes issue with the Judge’s finding about his trips, asserts that circumstances were overlooked in his clearance determination, and provides explanations regarding his financial difficulties. 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 mentions that he needs a security clearance to continue in his job. On this last point, the Directive does not permit us to consider the impact of an unfavorable decision. *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 17-03024 at 3 (App. Bd. Jan. 9, 2020).

Applicant failed to establish that 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 the national security.”

Order

The decision is **AFFIRMED**.

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

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

Signed: Gregg A. Cervi
Gregg A. Cervi
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board