DIGEST: Applicant's appeal brief contains no assertion of harmful error on the part of the

KEYWORD: Guideline F

## 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 February 8, 2016, 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 a decision on the written record. On July 13, 2017, after considering the record, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) Administrative Judge Matthew E. Malone denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to 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, it contains a narrative statement explaining why his debts became delinquent, describing his efforts to resolve them, and indicating the debts are no longer legally collectable under the state's statute of limitations. In his appeal brief, he also provided a letter of reference. The Appeal Board is prohibited from considering new evidence on appeal. Directive ¶ E3.1.29.

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. Because Applicant has not made an allegation of harmful error on the part of the Judge, the decision of the Judge is AFFIRMED.

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

Signed: Catherine M. Engstrom
Catherine M. Engstrom
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

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