



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: April 10, 2025

In the matter of:)	
)	
)	
-----)	ISCR Case No. 23-00256
)	
Applicant for Security Clearance)	
)	

APPEAL BOARD DECISION

APPEARANCES

FOR GOVERNMENT

Andrea M. Corrales, Esq., Deputy Chief Department Counsel

FOR APPLICANT

Pro se

The Department of Defense (DoD) declined to grant Applicant a security clearance. On March 13, 2023, DoD issued a Statement of Reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis of 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 June 8, 2017) and DoD Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). On February 13, 2025, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Administrative Judge Philip J. Katauskas denied Applicant national security eligibility. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Discussion

Under Guideline F, the SOR alleged twelve delinquent debts totaling approximately \$65,500. In response to the SOR, Applicant denied some of the allegations and admitted others with explanations for how the debts were incurred and became delinquent. Two of the allegations were withdrawn and the Judge found favorably for Applicant on three others. He found against Applicant on the remaining allegations. On appeal, Applicant makes no allegation that the Judge

erred, but instead asserts that she provided evidence that she had set up payment arrangements and, therefore, “did what was asked of [her].” Appeal Brief at 1. In his decision, the Judge noted that Applicant had contacted two creditors in an effort to secure settlement offers and had contacted another for a balance inquiry. Despite this, he concluded that she had not acted responsibly because these efforts were taken after the hearing. Decision at 9–10.

The Appeal Board does not review cases *de novo* and its authority to review a case is limited to cases in which the appealing party has alleged the judge committed harmful error. Directive ¶ E3.1.29. Because Applicant has not made such an allegation of error, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is sustainable. Accordingly, the Judge’s decision is affirmed.

Order

The decision in ISCR Case No. 23-00256 is **AFFIRMED**.

Signed: Moira Modzelewski

Moira Modzelewski
Administrative Judge
Chair, Appeal Board

Signed: Allison Marie

Allison Marie
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: James B. Norman

James B. Norman
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board