

KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: The Judge concluded that Applicant failed to mitigate security concerns arising from significant delinquent debt. Applicant’s disagreement with the Judge’s weighing of the evidence did not demonstrate that the Judge weighed the evidence in an erroneous manner. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 08-00344.a1

DATE: 03/09/2009

DATE: March 9, 2009

In Re: ----- Applicant for Security Clearance)))))))	ISCR Case No. 08-00344
---	---------------------------------	------------------------

APPEAL BOARD DECISION

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 July 25, 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 30, 2008, after the hearing, Administrative Judge Paul J. Mason

denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. Applicant timely appealed pursuant to the Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant raised the following issue on appeal: whether the Judge's adverse clearance decision is arbitrary, capricious or contrary to law.

Applicant contends that the Judge's adverse decision should be reversed because the Judge did not correctly weigh Applicant's mitigating evidence. Applicant argues that this evidence was sufficient to warrant favorable application of the mitigating conditions and whole person factors. In support of his argument, Applicant submits new evidence in the form of documentary exhibits which the Board cannot consider on appeal. *See* Directive E3.1.29. Applicant has not demonstrated that the Judge's decision is arbitrary, capricious or contrary to law.

The presence of some mitigating evidence does not alone compel the Judge to make a favorable security clearance decision. As the trier of fact, the Judge has to weigh the evidence as a whole and decide whether the favorable evidence outweighs the unfavorable evidence, or *vice versa*. *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 06-10320 at 2 (App. Bd. Nov. 7, 2007). A party's disagreement with the Judge's weighing of the evidence, or an ability to argue for a different interpretation of the evidence, is not sufficient to demonstrate the Judge weighed the evidence or reached conclusions in a manner that is arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law. *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 06-17409 at 3 (App. Bd. Oct. 12, 2007).

In this case, the Judge found that Applicant had a lengthy history of not meeting financial obligations. At the time the case was submitted for decision, Applicant still had significant outstanding debts, and was still trying to resolve his financial problems. In light of the foregoing, the Judge could reasonably conclude that those problems were still ongoing. *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 05-07747 at 2 (App. Bd. Jul. 3, 2007). The Judge weighed the mitigating evidence offered by Applicant against the length and seriousness of the disqualifying conduct and considered the possible application of relevant conditions and factors. He found in favor of Applicant as to four of the SOR factual allegations. However, he reasonably explained why the mitigating evidence was insufficient to overcome the government's security concerns. The Board does not review a case *de novo*. After reviewing the record, the Board concludes that the Judge examined the relevant data and articulated a satisfactory explanation for his decision, "including a 'rational connection between the facts found and the choice made.'" *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of the United States v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983) (quoting *Burlington Truck Lines, Inc. v. United States*, 371 U.S. 156, 168 (1962)). "The general standard is that a clearance may be granted only when 'clearly consistent with the interests of the national security.'" *Department of the Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518, 528 (1988). Therefore, the Judge's unfavorable security clearance decision under Guideline F is sustainable.

Order

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: Jeffrey D. Billett

Jeffrey D. Billett
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: William S. Fields

William S. Fields
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board