

requested a decision on the written record. On October 8, 2009, after considering the record, Administrative Judge Carol G. Ricciardello denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant raised the following issues on appeal: whether the Judge's application of the mitigating conditions was erroneous and whether the Judge's adverse security clearance decision is arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law. Finding no error, we affirm.

The Judge found that Applicant had approximately \$31,000 in delinquent debts, which were discharged in a Chapter 7 bankruptcy in mid-2009. The Judge acknowledged that the specific debts alleged in the SOR were no longer owed due to the bankruptcy. She also acknowledged that Applicant's financial condition was affected by a job loss and pregnancy. However, the Judge concluded that Applicant had failed to mitigate the security concerns in her case. Specifically, the Judge noted the paucity of record evidence explaining the reason for Applicant having amassed the debts in the first place.¹ She also concluded that Applicant had not established a track record of responsible financial conduct, given the relative recency of the bankruptcy at the close of the record.

After reviewing the record, the Board concludes that the Judge examined the relevant data and articulated a satisfactory explanation for the 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 Judge's decision that "it is not clearly consistent with national security to grant Applicant eligibility for a security clearance" is sustainable on this record. Decision at 7. "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).

Order

The Judge's adverse security clearance decision is AFFIRMED.

Signed: Michael Y. Ra'anan

Michael Y. Ra'anan
Administrative Judge
Chairperson, Appeal Board

Signed: William S. Fields

William S. Fields

¹Applicant asserts that the record evidence shows that her family's financial troubles were due to loss of employment. She had made such a statement in her security clearance application. However, the Judge correctly observed that the record evidence indicates that Applicant's financial problems preceded the cited loss of employment.

Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: James E. Moody

James E. Moody
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board