| KEYWORD: Guideline F                      |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| DIGEST: The Board does not review cases d | de novo. Adverse decision affirmed. |
| CASENO: 05-00775.a1                       |                                     |
| DATE: 03/08/2007                          |                                     |
|   |                                     |
|   |                                     |
|   |                                     |
|   | DATE: March 8, 2007                 |
|   |                                     |
|   | )                                   |
| In Re:                                    | )                                   |
| SSN:                                      | ) ISCR Case No. 05-00775            |
| Applicant for Security Clearance          | )                                   |

## 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 December 12, 2005, 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 September 27, 2006, after the hearing, Administrative Judge Henry Lazzaro 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 contains no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Rather, it contains new evidence, in the form of a statement from the Applicant, which summarizes the favorable evidence he presented below, and explains that he is current on his recent debts and

is continuing his efforts to resolve his financial problems. The Board cannot consider this new evidence on appeal. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.29.

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. It does not review cases *de novo*. Applicant has not made an allegation of harmful error. Therefore, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is AFFIRMED.

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

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

Signed: James E. Moody
James E. Moody
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board