

Applicant's appeal brief makes no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge.¹ Applicant does offer additional written materials which she asserts support a reversal of the Judge's adverse security clearance decision. However, the Board may not consider new evidence on appeal. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.29. 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. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.32. The Board does not review cases *de novo*. Therefore, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is AFFIRMED.

Signed: Jeffrey D. Billett

Jeffrey D. Billett
Administrative Judge
Member, 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

¹Without claiming that the Judge erred, Applicant makes a factual statement on appeal that she has never lost her home to foreclosure. A review of the Judge's decision reveals that the Judge made a finding of fact that Applicant lost her home to foreclosure. To the extent that Applicant's factual statement can be construed as a claim of error, it fails to establish error on the part of the Judge. Applicant submitted a document entitled "Forbearance Agreement/Stipulation" as part of her submission to the File of Relevant Material. The document purports to be an agreement between Applicant and her lender to cure her mortgage loan default and reinstate her mortgage to good standing. The Judge specifically mentioned the document in his decision and noted that it was an unexecuted document. The document contains Applicant's signature but not the signature of the mortgagee.