



request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to the 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 a narrative statement in which Applicant seeks "to clarify [his] moral and legal obligations." Appeal Brief at 1. He asks that the Board "accept not [his] financial faults, but [his] moral obligation to protect and safeguard classified information and reconsider reinstating [his] security clearance." *Id.* at 2.

The Board cannot receive or consider any new evidence on appeal. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.29. Additionally, the Board does not review a case *de novo*. The Board's authority to review a case is limited to cases in which the appealing party has alleged the Judge committed harmful error. Applicant has not made an allegation of harmful error on the part of the Judge. 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: William S. Fields  
William S. Fields  
Administrative Judge  
Member, Appeal Board