KEYWORD: Guideline G; Guideline E

DIGEST: An applicant's disagreement with the Judge's weighing of the evidence is not sufficient to demonstrate that the Judge weighed the evidence in a manner that is arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 06-19225.a1		
DATE: 01/29/2009		
	DATE: January 29, 200)9
In Re:)))	
) ISCR Case No. 06-192	25
Applicant for Security Clearance))	

APPEAL BOARD DECISION

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 January 30, 2008, DOHA issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that decision—security concerns raised under Guideline G (Alcohol Consumption) and Guideline E (Personal Conduct) of Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested that the case be decided on the written record. On

November 28, 2008, after considering the record, Administrative Judge Paul J. Mason denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. Applicant timely 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 the Judge did not give sufficient weight to Applicant's mitigating evidence. Applicant has not demonstrated 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). An applicant'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 this case, the Judge weighed the mitigating evidence offered by Applicant against the seriousness of the disqualifying conduct and considered the possible application of relevant conditions and factors. He reasonably explained why the mitigating evidence was insufficient to overcome the government's security concerns.¹ The Board does not review a case *de novo*. The favorable evidence cited by Applicant is not sufficient to demonstrate the Judge's decision is arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law. *See, e.g.,* ISCR Case No. 06-11172 at 3 (App. Bd. Sep. 4, 2007). 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 ultimate unfavorable security clearance decision under Guidelines G and E is sustainable.

¹In particular, the Judge noted that Applicant had been denied a clearance by a DOHA Judge in 2004 for alcohol-related conduct, and had continued to consume alcohol rather than discontinue drinking and/or seek treatment. He also noted that Applicant had "presented no independent evidence which shows rehabilitation or behavioral changes from his 22-year history of alcohol abuse or dependence." Decision at 8.

Order

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

Signed: Michael Y. Ra'anan Michael Y. Ra'anan Administrative Judge Chairman, 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