KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: The Board cannot consider new evidence on appeal. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 08-00486.a1

DATE: 01/27/2009

DATE: January 27, 2009

In Re:)
)
)
Applicant for Security Clearance)

ISCR Case No. 08-00486

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 April 30, 2008, 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 the case be decided on the written record. On November 20, 2008, after considering the record, Administrative Judge Joseph Testan 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 an explanatory statement and documentary exhibits, which updates Applicant's financial situation and indicates that she has paid off or is attempting to resolve her outstanding debts.

The Board cannot consider Applicant's new evidence on appeal. See Directive \P 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: Michael Y. Ra'anan Michael Y. Ra'anan Administrative Judge Chairman, 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