

Appeals (DOHA) Administrative Judge Francisco Mendez denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to the Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant requested that his case be decided on the written record and then submitted only a one page letter in response to the government's File of Relevant Material (FORM). "He provided no documentary evidence to corroborate or substantiate his efforts to address the debts alleged in the SOR or basis to dispute their legitimacy. He also provided no documentary evidence regarding the current state of his finances or addressing the whole person factors in AG ¶ 2(a)." Decision at 2.

Applicant's appeal brief contains no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Rather, it contains a detailed narrative statement by the Applicant explaining that he is currently working with a debt consolidation agency and that once he gets a contract with that company he could possibly submit it to the Appeal Board as evidence.

The Appeal Board cannot receive and consider new evidence on appeal. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.29. It 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 E. Moody
James E. Moody
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: William S. Fields
William S. Fields
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board