



**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: June 4, 2025

In the matter of:

Applicant for Security Clearance

ISCR Case No. 23-02231

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 December 11, 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 May 2, 2025, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Administrative Judge LeRoy F. Foreman denied Applicant national security eligibility. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Discussion

The SOR alleged 16 delinquent debts totaling approximately \$63,300 and an IRS notice of payment due in the approximate amount of \$7,200. In her response to the SOR, Applicant admitted all allegations, although she disputed the amount of one debt. The Judge found favorably on 10 of the alleged debts and on the IRS balance. He found adversely on the remaining six delinquent

debts, which totaled about \$55,600, based largely on the timing of Applicant's debt resolution efforts and lack of evidence demonstrating debt repayment.

There is no presumption of error below and the appealing party has the burden of raising claims of error with specificity. Directive ¶ E3.1.30. On appeal, Applicant makes no assertion of error, but rather reiterates her explanation for the debts and her resolution efforts and provides additional context for her financial issues. The Appeal Board does not review cases *de novo* and is prohibited from considering new evidence on appeal. Directive ¶ E3.1.29. Additionally, Applicant argues that she is not a threat to national security and highlights that she requires a security clearance to retain her job. The Directive does not permit us to consider the impact of an unfavorable decision.

The Board's authority to review a case is limited to cases in which the appealing party has alleged the judge committed harmful error. Because Applicant has not made such an allegation of error, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant national security eligibility is sustainable.

Order

The decision in ISCR Case No. 23-02231 is **AFFIRMED**.

Signed: Moira Modzelewski

Moira Modzelewski
Administrative Judge
Chair, Appeal Board

Signed: Allison Marie

Allison Marie
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: Jennifer I. Goldstein

Jennifer I. Goldstein
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board