

Applicant’s appeal brief contains new evidence, *i.e.*, documents from outside the record, that we cannot consider. Directive ¶ E3.1.29. A portion of her brief focuses on the loans for her house and new car. Both of those debts, which were addressed in the decision, were not alleged in the SOR. The Judge, however, noted, “Any derogatory information that was not alleged in the SOR will not be considered for disqualifying purposes, but may be considered in the application of mitigating conditions, in making a credibility determination, and in a whole-person analysis.” Decision at 4-5. We find no error in the Judge’s consideration of the house and car loans. *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 15-07369 at 3 (App. Bd. Aug. 16, 2017) (setting forth the limited purposes for which non-alleged matters may be considered).

The remainder of Applicant’s arguments amount to a disagreement with the Judge’s weighing of the evidence. These arguments fail 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 failed to establish that the Judge committed any harmful error or that he warrants any remedial action. 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 the interests of the national security.’” *Department of the Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518, 528 (1988). *See also* AG ¶ 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: Gregg A. Cervi
Gregg A. Cervi
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

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