

## **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY
DEFENSE OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS
APPEAL BOARD
POST OFFICE BOX 3656
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22203
(703) 696-4759

		Date: March 18, 2024
In the matter of:	)	
	) )	ISCR Case No. 23-00118
Applicant for Security Clearance	) ) )	

#### APPEAL BOARD DECISION

# **APPEARANCES**

#### FOR GOVERNMENT

Julie R. Mendez, Esq., Chief Department Counsel

# FOR APPLICANT Pro se

The Department of Defense (DoD) declined to grant Applicant a security clearance. On March 28, 2023, DoD issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that decision—security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) of the National Security Adjudicative Guidelines (AG) in Appendix A of Security Executive Agent Directive 4 (effective Jun. 8, 2017) and DoD Directive 5220.6 (January 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested a decision based on the written record in lieu of a hearing. On December 5, 2023, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) Administrative Judge Edward W. Loughran denied Applicant's security clearance eligibility. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

The SOR alleged that Applicant had three delinquent consumer debts; that he filed for Chapter 7 bankruptcy in 2014 that was discharged in 2015; and that he filed for Chapter 13

bankruptcies in 2019 and 2021 that were dismissed. In responding to the SOR, Applicant admitted each allegation with explanations. The Judge found against him on all of the allegations. In summarizing the decision, the Judge acknowledged that Applicant was supporting a large family with inconsistent income and employment, has health issues, but paid some debts and received financial counseling. However, after getting a fresh start from a 2015 bankruptcy, he financially overextended himself. Applicant still owes a number of debts, including three alleged in the SOR. His intentions to resolve financial problems in the future are not a substitute for a track record of debt repayment or other responsible approaches. He does not have a track record that would enable the Judge to trust that he will pay the remaining SOR debts, and he failed to act responsibly under the circumstances or make a good-faith effort to pay his debts.

Applicant's appeal reargues the case that was raised in response to the Government's File of Relevant Material and discusses new evidence. He does not assert that the Judge committed any harmful error, but that the Judge was not "privy to the ongoing efforts by myself to correct past circumstances and behavior which led to this my financial circumstances." Appeal Brief (AB) at 1. Applicant reiterated his personal and professional responsibilities and reliability despite his financial problems, the hardship reasons for his financial difficulties, the financial "mentorship" he is receiving, and his current efforts to resolve debts. AB at 1-2. He attached various documents attesting to his debt resolution efforts since the decision was issued.

We note that 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.

Our review of the record indicates that the Judge examined the relevant evidence and articulated a satisfactory explanation for the decision. "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*, AG  $\P$  2(b): "Any doubt concerning personnel being considered for national security eligibility will be resolved in favor of the national security." Because Applicant has not alleged 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: James B. Norman James B. Norman Administrative Judge Member, Appeal Board

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