



**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 21, 2025

\_\_\_\_\_  
In the matter of: )  
)  
)  
)  
----- )

ISCR Case No. 24-00928

)  
)  
)  
)  
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 September 17, 2024, DoD issued a Statement of Reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis of that decision – security concerns raised under Guideline G (Alcohol Consumption) and Guideline J (Criminal Conduct) 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 21, 2025, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Administrative Judge John Bayard Glendon denied Applicant national security eligibility. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

**Discussion**

Under Guideline G and cross-alleged under Guideline J, the SOR alleged that Applicant had been arrested and convicted of driving while intoxicated on three occasions in the last ten years. Applicant admitted all allegations and the Judge found adversely under both Guidelines.

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 on the part of the Judge, but rather requests reconsideration based on her “performance as an employee” and dedication to her employer. Appeal Brief at 1. The Appeal Board does not review cases *de novo* and our authority to review a case is limited to matters in which the appealing party has raised a claim of harmful error.

The record supports a conclusion that the Judge examined the relevant evidence and articulated a satisfactory explanation for the decision. The decision is sustainable on this record. “The general standard is that a clearance may be granted only when ‘clearly consistent with the interests of the national security.’” *Department of the Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518, 528 (1988). “Any doubt concerning personnel being considered for national security eligibility will be resolved in favor of the national security.” AG ¶ 2(b). Accordingly, the Judge’s decision is affirmed.

### **Order**

The decision in ISCR Case No. 24-00928 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