



after his wages were garnished for credit card debt. The alleged student loan debts are not mitigated. Decision at 5.

Applicant's appeal brief does not assert that the Judge committed any harmful error. Rather, it reargues the case that was raised in the FORM and discusses new evidence. Appeal Brief at 1. The Appeal Board is prohibited from considering new evidence on appeal. Directive ¶ E3.1.29.

The Appeal Board does not review cases *de novo*. The Board's authority to review a case is limited to cases in which the appealing party has alleged the Judge committed harmful error. Directive ¶ E3.1.32. Because Applicant has not alleged such a harmful error, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant security clearance eligibility is sustainable.

### **Order**

The decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Signed: Moira Modzelewski

Moira Modzelewski  
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