



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



Date: June 2, 2026

In the matter of:

-----

Applicant for Security Clearance

ISCR Case No. 24-02107

**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 February 18, 2025, 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 April 9, 2026, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Administrative Judge Eric Price denied Applicant national security eligibility. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

**Discussion**

Under Guideline F, the SOR alleged that Applicant had eight delinquent debts totaling about \$27,000. The Judge found that the evidence established all eight debts. He applied disqualifying conditions AG ¶¶ 19(a) and 19(c), and all allegations were found against Applicant.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> AG ¶ 19(a): inability to satisfy debts; AG ¶ 19(c): a history of not meeting financial obligations.

On appeal, Applicant argues that the Judge failed to properly apply the mitigating conditions in AG ¶¶ 20(c) and 20(d) and Whole-Person Concept.<sup>2</sup> Applicant contends that she “completed a government-approved financial-counseling course” and that she “initiated and adhered to good-faith repayment efforts for the two most recent collection accounts.” Appeal Brief at 1. With her brief, she attached receipts for payments made on those two collection accounts. However, the payments post-date the Decision and represent new evidence. The Appeal Board does not review cases *de novo* and is prohibited from considering new evidence on appeal. Directive ¶ E3.1.29.

Applicant’s disagreement with the Judge’s weighing of the evidence is not sufficient to show that the Judge weighed the evidence in a manner that was arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law. *See* ISCR Case No. 04-08975, 2006 WL 2725032 at \*1 (App. Bd. Aug. 4, 2006) (citation omitted). The decision reflects that the Judge considered the record before him, weighed the disqualifying and mitigating conditions, noted “there are no clear indications that her financial problems are being resolved or under control,” and reasonably determined that the concerns about Applicant’s finances were unmitigated. Decision at 7.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant has not established that the Judge’s conclusions were arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law. Rather, the Judge examined and weighed the disqualifying and mitigating evidence and articulated a satisfactory explanation for the decision. The record is sufficient to support that the Judge’s findings and conclusions are sustainable. “The general standard is that a clearance may be granted only when ‘clearly consistent with the interests of the national security.’” *Dep’t 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)

---

<sup>2</sup> AG ¶ (c): the person has received or is receiving financial counseling for the problem from a legitimate and credible source, such as a non-profit credit counseling service, and there are clear indications that the problem is being resolved or is under control; AG ¶ (d): the individual initiated and is adhering to a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or otherwise resolve debts.

**Order**

The decision in ISCR Case No. 24-02107 is **AFFIRMED**.

Signed: Moira Modzelewski

Moira Modzelewski  
Administrative Judge  
Chair, Appeal Board

Signed: Jennifer I. Goldstein

Jennifer I. Goldstein  
Administrative Judge  
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: Allison Marie

Allison Marie  
Administrative Judge  
Member, Appeal Board