

KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: Applicant’s appeal brief raises no allegation of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Rather, it contains information that she did not previously present to the Judge. The Appeal Board can neither receive nor consider this new evidence. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 12-10211.a1

DATE: 05/01/2017

DATE: May 1, 2017

)	
In Re:)	
)	
-----)	ISCR Case No.12-10211
)	
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 11, 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 a hearing. On March 22, 2017, after the hearing, Administrative Judge John Grattan Metz, Jr., 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 she 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: James E. Moody

James E. Moody
Administrative Judge
Member, 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