



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: July 14, 2025

In the matter of:

Applicant for Security Clearance

ISCR Case No. 24-01632

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 September 27, 2024, 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) of Security Executive Agent Directive 4 (effective June 8, 2017) and DoD Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive).

Applicant submitted an answer to the SOR in which he elected “a decision based on the administrative (written) record, without a hearing before an Administrative Judge.” A File of Relevant Material (FORM) was prepared. A copy of the FORM was provided to Applicant, and he was given an opportunity to respond to the FORM and submit additional information for consideration in his case. No response was received from Applicant. On May 20, 2025, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Administrative Judge Marc E. Curry denied Applicant national security eligibility. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

On appeal, there is no presumption of error below, and the appealing party must raise claims of error with specificity and identify how the judge committed factual or legal error. Directive ¶ E3.1.32. In Applicant's appeal, he failed to identify any specific error. Instead, he provided documentation of actions he has taken to resolve the allegations. To the extent that he provides new details about his financial status in his appeal, the Appeal Board does not review cases *de novo* and is prohibited from considering new evidence on appeal. Directive ¶ E3.1.29. 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. 24-01632 is **AFFIRMED**.

Signed: Moira Modzelewski

Moira Modzelewski
Administrative Judge
Chair, Appeal Board

Signed: Allison Marie

Allison Marie
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: Jennifer Goldstein

Jennifer Goldstein
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board