KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: Applicant's appeal brief raises no allegation of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Rather, it contains a narrative statement about her efforts and plans to resolve her alleged debts. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 17-02365.a1

DATE: 06/14/2018

DATE: June 14, 2018

In Re:

Applicant for Security Clearance

## APPEAL BOARD DECISION

ISCR Case No.17-02365

## **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 August 24, 2017, 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 March 23, 2018, after considering the record, Administrative Judge Arthur E. Marshall, 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 a narrative statement about her efforts and plans to resolve her alleged debts. 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

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  Much of Applicant's narrative is new evidence that the Appeal Board cannot consider. *See*, Directive  $\P$  E3.1.29.