

DATE: January 12, 2004

In Re:

SSN: -----

Applicant for Security Clearance

ISCR Case No. 01-25376

APPEAL BOARD DECISION

APPEARANCES

FOR GOVERNMENT

Peregrine D. Russell-Hunter, Esq., Chief Department Counsel

FOR APPLICANT

Pro Se

The Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) issued to Applicant a Statement of Reasons (SOR) dated January 13, 2003 which stated the reasons why DOHA proposed to deny or revoke access to classified information for Applicant. The SOR was based on Guideline F (Financial Considerations). Administrative Judge James A. Young issued an unfavorable security clearance decision dated September 15, 2003.

Applicant appealed the Administrative Judge's unfavorable decision. The Board has jurisdiction under Executive Order 10865 and Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Directive), dated January 2, 1992, as amended.

The following issue has been raised on appeal: whether the Administrative Judge's adverse conclusions under Guideline F are arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law. For the reasons that follow, the Board affirms the Administrative Judge's decision.

Scope of Review

On appeal, the Board does not review a case *de novo*. Rather, the Board addresses the material issues raised by the parties to determine whether there is factual or legal error. There is no presumption of error below, and the appealing party must raise claims of error with specificity and identify how the Administrative Judge committed factual or legal error. Directive, Additional Procedural Guidance, Item E3.1.32. *See also* ISCR Case No. 00-0050 (July 23, 2001) at pp. 2-3 (discussing reasons why party must raise claims of error with specificity).

When the rulings or conclusions of an Administrative Judge are challenged, the Board must consider whether they are: (1) arbitrary or capricious; or (2) contrary to law. Directive, Additional Procedural Guidance, Item E3.1.32.3. In deciding whether the Judge's rulings or conclusions are arbitrary or capricious, the Board will review the Judge's decision to determine whether: it does not examine relevant evidence; it fails to articulate a satisfactory explanation for its conclusions, including a rational connection between the facts found and the choice made; it does not consider relevant factors; it reflects a clear error of judgment; it fails to consider an important aspect of the case; it offers an explanation for the decision that runs contrary to the record evidence; or it is so implausible that it cannot be ascribed to a mere difference of opinion. *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 97-0435 (July 14, 1998) at p. 3 (citing Supreme Court decision). In deciding whether the Judge's rulings or conclusions are contrary to law, the Board will consider whether they are

contrary to provisions of Executive Order 10865, the Directive, or other applicable federal law. Compliance with state or local law is not required because security clearance adjudications are conducted by the Department of Defense pursuant to federal law. *See* U.S. Constitution, Article VI, clause 2 (Supremacy Clause). *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 00-0423 (June 8, 2001) at p. 3 (citing Supreme Court decisions).

When an Administrative Judge's factual findings are challenged, the Board must determine whether "[t]he Administrative Judge's findings of fact are supported by such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion in light of all the contrary evidence in the same record. In making this review, the Appeal Board shall give deference to the credibility determinations of the Administrative Judge." Directive, Additional Procedural Guidance, Item E3.1.32.1. The Board must consider not only whether there is record evidence supporting a Judge's findings, but also whether there is evidence that fairly detracts from the weight of the evidence supporting those findings, and whether the Judge's findings reflect a reasonable interpretation of the record evidence as a whole. Although a Judge's credibility determination is not immune from review, the party challenging a Judge's credibility determination has a heavy burden on appeal.

When an appeal issue raises a question of law, the Board's scope of review is plenary. *See* DISCR Case No. 87-2107 (September 29, 1992) at pp. 4-5 (citing federal cases).

If an appealing party demonstrates factual or legal error, then the Board must consider the following questions:

Is the error harmful or harmless? *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 00-0250 (July 11, 2001) at p. 6 (discussing harmless error doctrine);

Has the nonappealing party made a persuasive argument for how the Administrative Judge's decision can be affirmed on alternate grounds? *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 99-0454 (October 17, 2000) at p. 6 (citing federal cases); and

If the Administrative Judge's decision cannot be affirmed, should the case be reversed or remanded? (Directive, Additional Procedural Guidance, Items E3.1.33.2 and E3.1.33.3).

Appeal Issue⁽¹⁾

Applicant asks the Board to let him know if he can supply additional information to assist the Board in making its decision. The Board cannot consider new evidence on appeal. *See* Directive, Additional Procedural Guidance, Item E3.1.29. Accordingly, the Board cannot and will not act on Applicant's offer to supply additional information for consideration in his case. Applicant had ample opportunity during the proceedings below to present information for consideration by the Administrative Judge in his case.

Applicant does not challenge the Administrative Judge's findings of fact about his history of financial difficulties. Accordingly, the Board need not review those factual findings. However, Applicant contends that his financial situation has improved since the beginning of the investigation of his case, and that he is doing his best to clear up his financial problems. The Board construes those contentions as raising the issue of whether the Administrative Judge's adverse conclusions under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) are arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law.

Given the Administrative Judge's findings of fact about Applicant's history of financial difficulties, the Judge gave a reasonable explanation for why he concluded Applicant's history of financial difficulties was not extenuated or mitigated under Guideline F. A reading of the decision below persuades the Board that the Judge took into account the facts and circumstances surrounding Applicant's financial difficulties, Applicant's efforts to deal with his financial problems, the current status of Applicant's debt problems, and whether Applicant was likely to resolve his debts or otherwise get them under control in the near future. The Judge's decision reflects a reasonable analysis of the facts and circumstances of Applicant's case consistent with pertinent provisions of the Directive. Applicant's appeal arguments fail to demonstrate the Judge's adverse conclusions under Guideline F are arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law.

Conclusion

Applicant has failed to demonstrate error below. Therefore, the Board affirms the Administrative Judge's security

clearance decision.

Signed: Emilio Jaksetic

Emilio Jaksetic

Administrative Judge

Chairman, Appeal Board

Signed: Michael Y. Ra'anan

Michael Y. Ra'anan

Administrative Judge

Member, Appeal Board

Signed: Michael D. Hipple

Michael D. Hipple

Administrative Judge

Member, Appeal Board

1. The Administrative Judge entered formal findings in favor of Applicant with respect to SOR paragraphs 1.a and 1.d. Those favorable formal findings are not at issue on appeal.