KEYWORD: Guideline F		
DIGEST: Applicant has made no allegation of	harmful eı	ror. Adverse decision affirmed.
CASENO: 12-08831.a1		
DATE: 04/01/2016		
		DATE: April 1, 2016
In Re:)	
)	ISCR Case No. 12-08831
Applicant for Security Clearance)	
Applicant for security Clearance	,	

APPEAL BOARD SUMMARY DISPOSITION

APPEARANCES

FOR GOVERNMENT

James B. Norman, Esq., Chief Department Counsel

FOR APPLICANT
Pro se

The Department of Defense (DoD) declined to grant Applicant a security clearance. On

November 24, 2014, DoD 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 decision on the written record. On January 28, 2016, after considering the record, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) Administrative Judge John Grattan Metz, 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, his submission contains new evidence in the form of releases of tax liens that are dated subsequent to the close of the record in the case.¹

The Board cannot consider any new evidence on appeal. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.29. Additionally, the Board does not review a case *de novo*. 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. Applicant has not made an allegation of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Therefore, the decision of the Judge is AFFIRMED.

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

¹Applicant asks that we distinguish his documents by calling them "newly acquired" evidence. If the evidence was not before the Judge, it is new evidence.