DIGEST: Applicant's appeal brief raises no allegate Adverse decision affirmed.	ion of harmful error on the part of the Judge.
CASENO: 17-00560.a1	
DATE: 05/23/2018	
	DATE: May 23, 2018
	_
In Re:))
) ISCR Case No.17-00560
)
Applicant for Security Clearance)

KEYWORD: Guideline E; Guideline F

APPEAL BOARD DECISION

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 May 11, 2017, DoD issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that decision—security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) and Guideline E (Personal Conduct) of Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested a hearing. On March 6, 2018, after the hearing, Administrative Judge Jennifer Goldstein 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 a narrative statement about the status of her debts and her efforts to resolve them. In the appeal brief, she also admitted that she falsified her security clearance application and stated that she was extremely remorseful for doing so and it will not happen again.

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