



Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

\

In her brief, Applicant requests that the Judge’s final decision be “reconsidered” because the processing of her case took too long. She states that she was advised that a decision would be made by the Judge sooner than it actually was<sup>1</sup> and she feels that because of the delay, “[her] case and appearance at the hearing was . . . forgotten and not given a fair ruling.” Appeal Brief at 1. Other than the aforesaid assertion, Applicant does not point to any specific error in the Judge’s decision or the hearing process. Included with her brief is new evidence in the form of two character references which post-date the Judge’s decision.

The Board has no jurisdiction to rule on Applicant’s contention that the processing of her case took too long. *See* ISCR Case No.11-12730 at 2 (App. Bd. Sep. 4, 2013). Additionally, it cannot receive and consider any new evidence on appeal. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.29. 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 E. Moody  
James E. Moody  
Administrative Judge  
Member, Appeal Board

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

---

<sup>1</sup>It is unclear from the brief who advised Applicant as to when she could expect to receive a decision, and the copy of the Directive and pre-hearing guidance that was provided to the Applicant do not specify any time limits in that regard.

