

The Department of Defense (DoD) declined to grant Applicant a security clearance. On February 2, 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 decision on the written record. On December 19, 2017, after considering the record, Administrative Judge Pamela C. Benson 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 new evidence in the form of a narrative statement about his current financial status and his efforts to resolve the alleged debts. It also contains documents not previously submitted to the Judge, including a statement from a credit counseling service that post-dates the Judge’s decision. The Board cannot consider Applicant’s new evidence on appeal. *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 such an allegation of 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: Charles C. Hale
Charles C. Hale
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

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