KEYWORD: Guideline F

## 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 December 7, 2015, DoD 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 October 6, 2016, after the hearing, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) Administrative Judge Arthur E. Marshall, Jr., denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant's appeal brief contains no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Rather, it contains Applicant's statements that: she takes the resolution of her debt, along with her employment and security clearance, seriously; she is living within her means and is in need of

financial guidance; she is willing to attend any suggested financial programs that would help reflect how seriously she is taking the resolution of her debts; and if her clearance is reinstated at her current salary she would be able to resolve her debts within five years without accruing any further debt. She also details the current status of each of her debts and her plans for satisfying them.

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 a case *de novo*. Therefore, the decision of the Judge is AFFIRMED.

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

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

Signed: Catherine M. Engstrom
Catherine M. Engstrom
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board