

provides no further explanation and provides no substantiating documentation showing any action he had taken to resolve or address his accounts.” Decision at 4.

On appeal, Applicant provides additional information about his security clearance history and requests reconsideration of the decision or a new investigation. The Appeal Board does not review cases *de novo* and is prohibited from considering new evidence on appeal. Directive E3.1.29.¹ Applicant also argues that the denial of his clearance was “not valid,” as it was based upon “old debts that have been charged off of [his] credit report.” Appeal Brief at 1. It is well established, however, that an applicant’s ongoing, unpaid debts demonstrate a continuing course of conduct and can be viewed as recent for purposes of the Guideline F mitigating conditions. *See, e.g.,* ISCR Case No. 15-06532 at 3 (App. Bd. Feb. 16, 2017).

Applicant failed to establish that the Judge committed any harmful error or that he should be granted any relief on appeal. 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
Chair, Appeal Board

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

Signed: Allison Marie
Allison Marie
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

¹ Applicant also states that letters of recommendation are attached, but they were not included with his appeal brief. Regardless, the Board is prohibited from considering new evidence.