

KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: Applicant's lengthy history of not meeting financial obligations and the ongoing nature of his debts support the Judge's conclusion that Applicant had not demonstrated mitigation. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASE NO: 09-05264.a1

DATE: 02/10/2011

DATE: February 10, 2011

_____)	
In Re:)	
)	
-----)	ISCR Case No. 09-05264
)	
)	
Applicant for Security Clearance)	
_____)	

APPEAL BOARD DECISION

APPEARANCES

FOR GOVERNMENT

James B. Norman, Esq., Chief Department Counsel

FOR APPLICANT

Tobe Lev, Esq.

The Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) declined to grant Applicant a security clearance. On December 15, 2009, DOHA issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that decision—security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) of Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested a hearing. On October 28, 2010, after the hearing, Administrative Judge Robert Robinson Gales denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to the Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant raised the following issue on appeal: whether the Judge's adverse clearance decision is arbitrary, capricious or contrary to law.

Applicant contends that the Judge's adverse decision should be reversed because Applicant's financial problems were due to circumstances beyond his control and the Judge misapplied the whole-person concept. Applicant's arguments do not demonstrate that the Judge's decision is arbitrary, capricious or contrary to law.

The presence of some mitigating evidence does not alone compel the Judge to make a favorable security clearance decision. As the trier of fact, the Judge has to weigh the evidence as a whole and decide whether the favorable evidence outweighs the unfavorable evidence, or *vice versa*. See, e.g., ISCR Case No. 06-10320 at 2 (App. Bd. Nov. 7, 2007). A party's disagreement with the Judge's weighing of the evidence, or an ability to argue for a different interpretation of the evidence, is not sufficient to demonstrate the Judge weighed the evidence or reached conclusions in a manner that is arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law. See, e.g., ISCR Case No. 06-17409 at 3 (App. Bd. Oct. 12, 2007).

In reaching his decision, the Judge noted that conditions beyond Applicant's control had contributed to his financial problems, but reasonably explained why Applicant had failed to act responsibly in addressing those problems. Decision at 12. The Judge also conducted a detailed and extensive whole-person analysis of Applicant's situation which the Board concludes is sustainable. Decision at 13-15.

In this case, the Judge found that Applicant had a lengthy history of not meeting financial obligations. At the time the case was submitted for decision, Applicant still had significant outstanding debts, and was still trying to resolve his financial problems. In light of the foregoing, the Judge could reasonably conclude that those problems were still ongoing. See, e.g., ISCR Case No. 05-07747 at 2 (App. Bd. Jul. 3, 2007). The Judge weighed the mitigating evidence offered by Applicant against the length and seriousness of the disqualifying conduct and considered the possible application of relevant conditions and factors. He found in favor of Applicant with respect to nine of the SOR factual allegations, but reasonably explained why the mitigating evidence was insufficient to overcome all of the government's security concerns.

The Board does not review a case *de novo*. After reviewing the record, the Board concludes that the Judge examined the relevant data and articulated a satisfactory explanation for his decision, "including a 'rational connection between the facts found and the choice made.'" *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of the United States v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983) (quoting *Burlington Truck Lines, Inc. v. United States*, 371 U.S. 156, 168 (1962)). "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). Therefore, the Judge's unfavorable security clearance decision is sustainable.

Order

The decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is AFFIRMED.

Signed: Michael Y. Ra'an
Michael Y. Ra'an
Administrative Judge
Chairperson, Appeal Board

Signed: Jean E. Smallin
Jean E. Smallin
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: William S. Fields
William S. Fields
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board