KEYWORD: Guideline F

## APPEAL BOARD SUMMARY DISPOSITION

## **APPEARANCES**

## FOR GOVERNMENT

James B. Norman, Esq., Chief Department Counsel

## FOR APPLICANT

Pro se

The Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) declined to grant Applicant a security clearance. On October 2, 2010, 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 February 28, 2011, after the hearing, Administrative Judge Edward W. Loughran denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to the Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant's appeal brief makes no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Applicant made factual assertions implying improvements in her finances which she asserts support a granting of her security clearance. However, the Board may not consider new evidence on appeal.

See Directive ¶ E3.1.29. Applicant also requests additional time to make further progress. The Board does not have such authority. See, e.g., ISCR Case No. 06-24458 at 2 (App. Bd. Jan. 14, 2008). The Appeal Board's authority to review a case is limited to cases in which the appealing party has alleged the Judge committed harmful error. See Directive ¶ E3.1.32. The Board does not review cases de novo. Therefore, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is AFFIRMED.

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

Signed: Michael D. Hipple
Michael D. Hipple
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

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