KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: Applicant raises no allegation of harmful error. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 15-03495.a1

DATE: 04/07/2017

DATE: April 7, 2017

In Re:

ISCR Case No.15-03495

Applicant for Security Clearance

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 December 4, 2015, DoD issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that

decision—security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) of Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested that the case be decided on the written record. On February 10, 2017, after considering the record, Administrative Judge Shari Dam denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant's Appeal Brief raises no allegation of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Rather, it contains information that he did not previously present to the Judge. The Appeal Board can neither receive nor consider this new evidence. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.29.

The Board does not review cases *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. Because Applicant has not made an allegation of harmful error, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is **AFFIRMED**.

Signed: Michael Ra'anan Michael Ra'anan Administrative Judge Chairperson, Appeal Board

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

Signed: James F. Duffy James F. Duffy Administrative Judge Member, Appeal Board