

to the Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant requested that her case be decided on the written record and then did not respond to the government's File of Relevant Material (FORM). Her appeal brief contains no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Rather, it contains new evidence in the form of a detailed narrative statement explaining the SOR allegations, and attachments including character references and documents showing debt payment or resolution. Some of the documents post-date the Judge's decision. Applicant requests that the Board reverse the Judge's adverse decision based on the attachments enclosed with her brief.

The Board cannot consider new evidence on appeal. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.29. Additionally, the Board does not review a case *de novo*. 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. Applicant has not made an allegation of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Therefore, the decision of the Judge is AFFIRMED.

Signed: James E. Moody
James E. Moody
Administrative Judge
Member, 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