



**DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY  
DEFENSE OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS  
APPEAL BOARD**



Date: April 22, 2026

\_\_\_\_\_ )  
 In the matter of: )  
 )  
 )  
 ----- )  
 )  
 Applicant for Security Clearance )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

ISCR Case No. 24-01546

**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 November 25, 2024, 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 March 24, 2026, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Administrative Judge Roger C. Wesley denied Applicant national security eligibility. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

**Discussion**

The SOR alleged that Applicant carried five delinquent consumer debts totaling approximately \$50,000. In response to the SOR, Applicant admitted all allegations with explanation and requested that his case be decided based on the written record. He received a complete copy of the Government’s File of Relevant Material on January 22, 2026, and was notified of his ability to respond with any objections or additional information for the Judge to consider. Applicant did not respond to the FORM and the Judge resolved all allegations adversely.

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, and he instead requests reconsideration of the decision and additional time to demonstrate that he will resolve his debts. Applicant also provides new evidence in the form of an explanation for his failure to respond to the FORM and narrative updates about his financial problems. The Appeal Board does not review cases *de novo* and is prohibited from considering new evidence on appeal. Directive ¶ E3.1.29. Accordingly, the Judge's decision is affirmed.

### **Order**

The decision in ISCR Case No. 24-01546 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