

KEYWORD: Guideline F; Guideline E

DIGEST: Applicant’s appeal brief contains no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Rather, his submission contains a narrative statement discussing the evidence presented below and improvements in his financial situation that have occurred subsequent to the hearings. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 15-03052.a1

DATE: 06/16/2017

DATE: June 16, 2017

In Re:  -----  Applicant for Security Clearance	) ) ) ) ) ) )	ISCR Case No. 15-03052
-------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------

**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 November 13, 2015, DoD issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that decision—security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) and Guideline E (Personal Conduct) of Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested a hearing. On March 27, 2017, after the hearing, Defense Office

of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) Administrative Judge John Grattan Metz, Jr., denied Applicant's 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, his submission contains a narrative statement discussing the evidence presented below and improvements in his financial situation that have occurred subsequent to the hearing. As part of his submission, he expresses a willingness to provide "a budget, character references and any pertinent information that is required."

The Board cannot consider any 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: Michael Ra'anan  
Michael 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