KEYWORD: Guideline F

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

CASENO: 08-02916.a1

DATE: 02/12/2009

DATE: February 12, 2009

In Re:		

Applicant for Security Clearance

ISCR Case No. 08-02916

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 May 12, 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 a hearing. On December 4, 2008, after the hearing, Administrative Judge Arthur E. Marshall, Jr. 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 in which Applicant asserts that he has now paid off three of his outstanding debts and is making arrangements to resolve the rest of them, by either paying them off or disputing them.

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