

Judge Richard A. Cefola 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, it contains a narrative statement in which Applicant challenges the circumstances of her termination of employment after the Judge's adverse decision. Any recourse she might have for this complaint would be addressed properly in another forum. She also asserts that she does not need a security clearance for her work. The Board is no position to assess the validity of such an assertion. *See, e.g.*, ISCR Case No. 07-05632 at 2 (App. Bd. May 13, 2008).

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 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