

KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: Applicant’s brief makes no assertions of harmful error. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 14-06436.a1

DATE: 10/19/2016

DATE: October 19, 2016

)	
In Re:)	
-----)	
Applicant for Security Clearance)	ISCR Case No. 14-06436
)	
)	

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 January 26, 2015, DoD issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that decision—security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) and Guideline J (Criminal Conduct) of Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested a hearing. On July 12, 2016, after the hearing, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) Administrative Judge David M. White 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. It merely states that he is appealing the Judge’s decision and provides a telephone number for obtaining further information. 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. Because Applicant has not raised such an allegation, the decision of the Judge is AFFIRMED.

Signed: Michael Ra’anan
Michael Ra’anan
Administrative Judge
Chairperson, Appeal Board

Signed: James E. Moody
James E. Moody
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: James F. Duffy
James F. Duffy
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board