



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



In the matter of: )  
)  
) ISCR Case No. 21-00054  
)  
)  
Applicant for Security Clearance )

**Appearances**

For Government: Aubrey De Angelis, Esq., Department Counsel  
For Applicant: *Pro se*

January 20, 2022

**Decision**

CEFOLA, Richard A., Administrative Judge:

**Statement of the Case**

On February 15, 2021, in accordance with DoD Directive 5220.6, as amended (Directive), the Department of Defense issued Applicant a Statement of Reasons (SOR) alleging facts that raise security concerns under Guidelines F and E (at the hearing, the Government withdrew the allegation under Guideline E). The SOR further informed Applicant that, based on information available to the government, DoD adjudicators could not make the preliminary affirmative finding it is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue Applicant’s security clearance.

Applicant answered the SOR soon thereafter, and requested a hearing before an administrative judge. (Answer.) The case was assigned to me on August 23, 2021. The Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) issued a notice of hearing on September 13, 2021, scheduling the hearing for October 19, 2021. The hearing was convened as scheduled. The Government offered Exhibits (GXs) 1 through 6, which were admitted into evidence, without objection. Applicant testified on his own behalf. The record was left open until January 6, 2022, for receipt of additional documentation.

Applicant offered six documents, which I marked Applicant's Exhibits (AppXs) A through F, which were admitted into evidence, without objection. DOHA received the transcript of the hearing (TR) on October 28, 2021.

### **Findings of Fact**

Applicant admitted to the allegations in SOR ¶¶ 1.a, 1.d~1g, 1.i, and 1.k~1.x. He denied SOR allegations ¶¶ 1.b, 1.c, 1.h, and 1.j. After a thorough and careful review of the pleadings, exhibits, and testimony, I make the following findings of fact.

Applicant is a 47-year-old employee of a defense contractor. He has been employed with the defense contractor since April of 2020. He is divorced, and has custody of his three children. (TR at page 11 line 23 to page 13 line 18, and GX 1 at page 7.)

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

1.d. Applicant filed for the protection of a Chapter 7 bankruptcy in November of 2013 and his debts were discharged in February of 2014. This filing was a result of Applicant being "laid off" from his employment. (TR at page 13 line 24 to page 15 line 6.)

1.a.~1.c. Applicant has submitted documentation showing he has paid his delinquent taxes for tax year 2015, and is current with his Federal and state income tax filings. (TR at page 15 line 12 to page 20 line 5, Answer at page 6, and AppX A.) These allegations are found for Applicant.

1.e. Applicant admits that he has a past-due debt, as the result of a jewelry purchase, to Creditor E in the amount of about \$1,801. (TR at page 20 line 8 to page 21 line 6, and at page 22 line 13 to page 23 line 8.) As this debt also appears as past-due on the Government's most recent, August 2021, credit report (GX 6 at page 2), this allegation is found against Applicant.

1.f. Applicant has submitted documentation showing he settled and paid the alleged \$799 past-due debt to Creditor F. (TR at page 21 line 7 to page 22 line 12.) This allegation is found for Applicant.

1.g. Applicant admits a \$2,788, past-due, motor vehicle debt, the result of a repossession. (TR at page 23 line 9 to page 24 line 14.) The debt appears on the Government's most recent, August 2021, credit report. (GX 6 at page 4.) This allegation is found against Applicant.

1.h. Applicant in his Answer denied; but at his hearing he now admits, a \$6,404 past-due debt to Creditor H. (TR at page 24 line 15 to page 26 line 1.) Despite having nearly three months to do so, Applicant has submitted nothing in this regard. This allegation is found against Applicant.

1.i. Applicant has submitted documentation showing he settled and paid the alleged \$4,483 past-due debt to Creditor I. (TR at page 26 line 2 to page 27 line 9.) This allegation is found for Applicant.

1.j. Applicant denies and formally disputed an alleged \$2,232 past-due debt to Creditor J. (TR at page 27 line 10 to page 28 line 23.) As this alleged debt does not appear on the Government's most recent, August 2021, credit report, this allegation is found for Applicant.

1.k. Applicant avers he paid an alleged \$1,437 past-due debt to Creditor K. (TR at page 28 line 24 to page 30 line 2.) As this alleged debt does not appear on the Government's most recent, August 2021, credit report, this allegation is found for Applicant.

1.l. Applicant has submitted documentation showing that his current balance due to Creditor L is "\$0.00." (TR at page 30 line 3 to page 31 line 6, AppX D.) This allegation is found for Applicant.

1.m. Applicant avers he has settled an admitted \$875 past-due debt to Creditor M. (TR at page 31 lines 7~21.) Despite having nearly three months to do so, he has submitted nothing in this regard. This allegation is found against Applicant.

1.n. Applicant has submitted documentation showing that his current balance due to Creditor N is "\$0.00." (TR at page 31 line 22 to page 32 line 14., and AppX E) This allegation is found for Applicant.

1.o.~1.x. Applicant has submitted documentation showing that he has "settled in full" his nine, past-due, medical debts. (TR at page 32 line 15 to page 34 line 13, and AppX F.) These allegations are found for Applicant.

## **Policies**

When evaluating an applicant's national security eligibility, the administrative judge must consider the adjudicative guidelines (AG). In addition to brief introductory explanations for each guideline, the adjudicative guidelines 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, administrative judges apply the guidelines 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. According to AG ¶ 2(a), the entire process is a conscientious scrutiny 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.

Under Directive ¶ E3.1.14, the Government must present evidence to establish controverted facts alleged in the SOR. Directive ¶ E3.1.15 states the “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 who applies for access to classified information 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 access to classified information. 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 information.

Section 7 of Executive Order (EO) 10865 provides that adverse decisions shall be “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 concern relating to the guideline for Financial Considerations is set out in AG ¶ 18:

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. Affluence that cannot be explained by known sources of income is also a security concern insofar as it may result from criminal activity, including espionage.

The guideline notes several conditions that could raise security concerns under AG ¶ 19. Four are potentially applicable 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;
- (f) failure to file or fraudulently filing annual Federal, state, or local income tax returns or failure to pay annual Federal, state, or local income tax as required.

Applicant had a plethora of past-due indebtedness. The evidence is sufficient to raise these disqualifying conditions.

AG ¶ 20 provides conditions that could mitigate security concerns. I considered all of the mitigating conditions under AG ¶ 20 including:

- (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;
- (d) the individual initiated and is adhering to a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or otherwise resolve debts;
- (e) the individual has a reasonable basis to dispute the legitimacy of the past-due debt which is the cause of the problem and provides documented proof to substantiate the basis of the dispute or provides evidence of actions to resolve the issue; and
- (g) the individual has made arrangements with the appropriate tax authority to file or pay the amount owed and is in compliance with those arrangements.

Although Applicant has addressed much of his past-due indebtedness, his financial problems are ongoing. Applicant still has nearly \$12,000 of past-due indebtedness. He has not demonstrated that future financial problems are unlikely. Mitigation under AG ¶ 20(a) has not been established. 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.

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

I considered the potentially disqualifying and mitigating conditions in light of all facts and circumstances surrounding this case. I have incorporated my comments under Guideline F in my whole-person analysis. Overall, the record evidence leaves me with questions and doubts as to Applicant's eligibility and suitability for a security clearance. For all these reasons, I conclude Applicant failed to mitigate the Financial Considerations security concerns.

## Formal Findings

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

Paragraph 1, Guideline F:	AGAINST APPLICANT
Subparagraphs 1.a~1.d:	For Applicant
Subparagraph 1.e:	Against Applicant
Subparagraph 1.f:	For Applicant
Subparagraphs 1.g and 1.h:	Against Applicant
Subparagraphs 1.i~1.l:	For Applicant
Subparagraph 1.m:	Against Applicant

Subparagraphs 1.n~1.x:

For 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 for a security clearance. Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

---

Richard A. Cefola  
Administrative Judge