

KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: Applicant requests the Board give him more time to address his debts. The Board does not have that authority. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 10-07892.a1

DATE: 09/07/2011

DATE: September 7, 2011

---

In Re: )  
 )  
 )  
 ----- ) ISCR Case No. 10-07892  
 )  
 )  
 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 16, 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 June 20, 2011, after the hearing, Administrative Judge Robert E. Coacher 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 requests that the Board give him more time (until the end of the year) to pay off his remaining debts. Applicant is requesting relief that the Board has no authority to grant. *See* ISCR Case No. 10-00983 at 1-2 (App. Bd. May 17, 2011). In essence, Applicant is seeking a continuance to allow him to develop additional favorable evidence. An applicant is not entitled to a delayed or deferred adjudication of his or her security eligibility. *See* ISCR Case No. 09-02926 at 2 (App. Bd. May 11, 2010). In making his request, Applicant makes factual assertions about anticipated post-hearing developments which he states support the eventual granting of his security clearance. However, the Board may not consider 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. *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: Jeffrey D. Billett  
Jeffrey D. Billett  
Administrative Judge  
Member, Appeal Board

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