



**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
DEFENSE OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS**



In the matter of: )  
)  
) ISCR Case: 19-00658  
)  
Applicant for Security Clearance )

**Appearances**

For Government: Adrienne M. Driskill, Esquire, Department Counsel  
For Applicant: *Pro se*

October 10, 2019

---

**Decision**

---

CEFOLA, Richard A., Administrative Judge:

**Statement of Case**

On March 1, 2018, Applicant submitted a security clearance application (SF-86). On April 10, 2019, the Department of Defense Consolidated Adjudications Facility (DoD CAF) issued Applicant a Statement of Reasons (SOR), detailing security concerns under Guideline F, Financial Considerations. (Item 1.) The action was taken under Executive Order (EO) 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information within Industry* (February 20, 1960), as amended; DoD Directive 5220.6, *Defense Industrial Personnel Security Clearance Review Program* (January 2, 1992), as amended (Directive); and *National Security Adjudicative Guidelines for Determining Eligibility for Access to Classified Information or Eligibility to Hold a Sensitive Position* (AG), effective June 8, 2017.

Applicant answered the SOR on May 7, 2019. (Answer.) He admitted all of the SOR allegations concerning his delinquent debts, and requested that his case be decided by an administrative judge on the written record without a hearing. (Item 1.) On June 7, 2019, Department Counsel submitted the Government's written case. A

complete copy of the File of Relevant Material (FORM), containing seven Items, was received by Applicant on June 13, 2019. The FORM notified Applicant that he had an opportunity to file objections and submit material in refutation, extenuation, or mitigation within 30 days of his receipt of the FORM.

Applicant did not respond to the FORM. DOHA assigned the case to me on August 12, 2019. Items 1 through 7 are admitted into evidence.

## **Findings of Fact**

### **Guideline F – Financial Considerations**

Applicant is 29 years old. He is divorced and has no children. (Item 2 at pages 7 and 30~31.) In answer to the SOR, Applicant admitted all the alleged past-due debts, and attributes them to a failed marriage and periods of unemployment.

1.a.~1.d., and 1.f.~1.h. Applicant admits that he has past-due student loans totaling about \$27,431. In his Answer, Applicant avers, “I have entered an agreement with Pioneer Debt Solutions, I pay (5) dollars a month and will continue until July 2019. After I have successfully paid the (9) [\$45] required payments my loan will be brought out of default.” (Answer at page 1.) As these debts appear on Applicant’s February 2019 credit report (Item 5 at pages 1~2); and as he has submitted nothing in support of his averment, these allegations are found against Applicant.

1.e. Applicant admits that he has a past-due debt to Creditor E in the amount of about \$560. In his Answer, Applicant avers, “I have entered an agreement with them to make (12) monthly payments of thirty-five (35) dollars.” (Answer at page 1.) As this debt appears on Applicant’s February 2019 credit report (Item 5 at page 1); and as he has submitted nothing in support of his averment, this allegation is found against Applicant.

## **Policies**

When evaluating an applicant’s suitability for national security eligibility, the administrative judge must consider the adjudicative guidelines. In addition to brief introductory explanations for each guideline, the adjudicative guidelines (AG) list potentially disqualifying conditions and mitigating conditions, which are to be used in evaluating an applicant’s national security eligibility.

These guidelines are not inflexible rules of law. Instead, recognizing the complexities of human behavior, these guidelines are applied in conjunction with the factors listed in AG ¶ 2 describing the adjudicative process. The administrative judge’s overarching adjudicative goal is a fair, impartial, and commonsense decision. The entire process is a conscientious scrutiny of applicable guidelines in the context of a number of variables known as the whole-person concept. The administrative judge must

consider all available, reliable information about the person, past and present, favorable and unfavorable, in making a decision.

The protection of the national security is the paramount consideration. AG ¶ 2(b) requires that “[a]ny doubt concerning personnel being considered for national security eligibility will be resolved in favor of the national security.” In reaching this decision, I have drawn only those conclusions that are reasonable, logical, and based on the evidence contained in the record. I have not drawn inferences based on mere speculation or conjecture.

Directive ¶ E3.1.14, requires the Government to present evidence to establish controverted facts alleged in the SOR. Under Directive ¶ E3.1.15, an “applicant is responsible for presenting witnesses and other evidence to rebut, explain, extenuate, or mitigate facts admitted by the applicant or proven by Department Counsel, and has the ultimate burden of persuasion as to obtaining a favorable clearance decision.”

A person applying for national security eligibility seeks to enter into a fiduciary relationship with the Government predicated upon trust and confidence. This relationship transcends normal duty hours and endures throughout off-duty hours. The Government reposes a high degree of trust and confidence in individuals to whom it grants national security eligibility. Decisions include, by necessity, consideration of the possible risk the applicant may deliberately or inadvertently fail to protect or safeguard classified information. Such decisions entail a certain degree of legally permissible extrapolation as to potential, rather than actual, risk of compromise of classified or sensitive information. Finally, as emphasized in Section 7 of EO 10865, “[a]ny determination under this order adverse to an applicant shall be a determination in terms of the national interest and shall in no sense be a determination as to the loyalty of the applicant concerned.” See *also* EO 12968, Section 3.1(b) (listing multiple prerequisites for access to classified or sensitive information.)

## **Analysis**

### **Guideline F - Financial Considerations**

The security concerns relating to the guideline for financial considerations are set out in AG ¶ 18, which reads in pertinent part:

Failure to live within one's means, satisfy debts, and meet financial obligations may indicate poor self-control, lack of judgment, or unwillingness to abide by rules and regulations, all of which can raise questions about an individual's reliability, trustworthiness, and ability to protect classified or sensitive information. Financial distress can also be caused or exacerbated by, and thus can be a possible indicator of, other issues of personnel security concern such as excessive gambling, mental health conditions, substance misuse, or

alcohol abuse or dependence. An individual who is financially overextended is at greater risk of having to engage in illegal or otherwise questionable acts to generate funds. . . .

AG ¶ 19 describes three conditions that could raise security concerns and may be disqualifying in this case:

- (a) inability to satisfy debts;
- (b) unwillingness to satisfy debts regardless of the ability to do so; and
- (c) a history of not meeting financial obligations.

Applicant has significant past-due student loans and another past-due debt.. These facts establish prima facie support for the foregoing disqualifying conditions, and shift the burden to Applicant to mitigate those concerns.

The guideline includes three conditions in AG ¶ 20 that could mitigate the security concerns arising from Applicant's alleged financial difficulties:

- (a) the behavior happened so long ago, was so infrequent, or occurred under such circumstances that it is unlikely to recur and does not cast doubt on the individual's current reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment;
- (b) the conditions that resulted in the financial problem were largely beyond the person's control (e.g., loss of employment, a business downturn, unexpected medical emergency, a death, divorce or separation, clear victimization by predatory lending practices, or identity theft), and the individual acted responsibly under the circumstances; and
- (d) the individual initiated and is adhering to a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or otherwise resolve debts.

None of these apply. Applicant has not acted responsibly under unforeseen difficult circumstances that were completely beyond his control, and there are no clear indications that his financial issues are under control. Financial considerations is found against Applicant.

### **Whole-Person Concept**

Under the whole-person concept, the administrative judge must evaluate an applicant's eligibility for a security clearance by considering the totality of the applicant's conduct and all relevant circumstances. The administrative judge should consider the nine adjudicative process factors listed at AG ¶ 2(d):

(1) the nature, extent, and seriousness of the conduct; (2) the circumstances surrounding the conduct, to include knowledgeable participation; (3) the frequency and recency of the conduct; (4) the individual's age and maturity at the time of the conduct; (5) the extent to which participation is voluntary; (6) the presence or absence of rehabilitation and other permanent behavioral changes; (7) the motivation for the conduct; (8) the potential for pressure, coercion, exploitation, or duress; and (9) the likelihood of continuation or recurrence.

According to AG ¶ 2(c), the ultimate determination of whether to grant national security eligibility must be an overall commonsense judgment based upon careful consideration of the applicable guidelines and the whole-person concept.

I considered the potentially disqualifying and mitigating conditions in light of all pertinent facts and circumstances surrounding this case. Overall, the record evidence leaves me with questions and doubts as to Applicant's judgment, eligibility, and suitability for a security clearance. He has not met his burden to mitigate the security concerns arising under the guideline for financial considerations.

### **Formal Findings**

Formal findings for or against Applicant on the allegations set forth in the SOR, as required by ¶ E3.1.25 of Enclosure 3 of the Directive, are:

Paragraph 1, Guideline F:	AGAINST APPLICANT
Subparagraphs 1.a through 1.h:	Against Applicant

### **Conclusion**

In light of all of the circumstances presented by the record in this case, it is not clearly consistent with the national interest to grant Applicant national security eligibility and a security clearance. National security eligibility is denied.

---

Richard A. Cefola  
Administrative Judge