



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



In the matter of:)	
)	
)	ISCR Case No. 22-00041
)	
)	
Applicant for Security Clearance)	

Appearances

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

November 22, 2022

Decision

Lokey Anderson, Darlene D., Administrative Judge:

On May 28, 2020, Applicant submitted a security clearance application (e-QIP). (Government Exhibit 4.) On April 15, 2022, the Department of Defense Consolidated Adjudications Facility (DoD CAF) issued Applicant a Statement of Reasons (SOR), detailing security concerns under Guideline H, Drug Involvement and Substance Misuse. The action was taken under Executive Order 10865 (EO), *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 the *National Security Adjudicative Guidelines for Determining Eligibility for Access to Classified Information or Eligibility to Hold a Sensitive Position* (AG), effective within the DoD after June 8, 2017.

Applicant answered the SOR on a date uncertain. He requested that his case be decided by an administrative judge on the written record without a hearing. (Item 1.) On June 22, 2022, Department Counsel submitted the Government’s written case. A complete copy of the File of Relevant Material (FORM), containing seven Items, was mailed to Applicant and received by him on July 18, 2022. 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 submitted no response to the FORM. Applicant did not object to Government Items 1 through 7, and they are admitted into evidence, referenced hereinafter as Government Exhibits 1 through 7.

Findings of Fact

Applicant is 37 years old. He has a high school diploma and some college courses. He currently holds the position of Systems Administrator. He is seeking to obtain a security clearance for a NATO Direct Hire position with the NCIA, in connection with his employment.

Guideline H - Drug Involvement and Substance Misuse

The Government alleges that the Applicant has used controlled substances that cause physical or mental impairment or are used in a manner inconsistent with their intended purpose; and that he has engaged in conduct involving questionable judgment, which can raise questions about an individual's reliability and trustworthiness.

The SOR alleged that Applicant has used and purchased marijuana with varying frequency from about July 2006 to at least February 2022; that he has been arrested in May 2018 for Possession of Marijuana, among other things; and that he intends to continue using marijuana in the future. Applicant admits each of the allegations with explanations. (Government Exhibit 3.)

Applicant explained that he has used marijuana over the years to treat symptoms of back pain and depression. This use has occurred on a weekly basis over the years. He also stated that he plans to continue using marijuana in the future. (Government Exhibit 6.) He stated that he would be willing to discontinue his marijuana use if that is a requirement of his security clearance process. He does not believe that his use of marijuana constitutes "drug abuse," and notes that marijuana is legal in the state where he resides. (Government Exhibit 3.)

In May 2018, Applicant was arrested and charged with Hashish-Possession (felony), Possession of Controlled Substance (felony), Marijuana Possession with Intent (felony), Marijuana Possession - More than 1 oz, less than 1 lb, Narcotic Equipment-Possession. Applicant admits the allegation. On this occasion, Applicant believes that the search of his vehicle was illegal under the 4th amendment. He contends that his purchase of the substance was legal, and his use of the substance was personal and medicinal. (Government Exhibit 7.)

Applicant further notes that his purchases of marijuana have all been legal. He stated that he has always paid taxes on the marijuana he purchased. He has never been involved in any criminal distribution networks. (Government Exhibit 3.)

Policies

When evaluating an applicant's suitability for a security clearance, 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 eligibility for access to classified information.

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. 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. Likewise, I have avoided drawing inferences grounded on mere speculation or conjecture.

Under Directive ¶ E3.1.14, the government must present evidence to establish controverted facts alleged in the SOR. Under Directive ¶ E3.1.15, 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." The applicant has the ultimate burden of persuasion to obtain a favorable clearance decision.

A person who seeks access to classified information enters 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 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 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 H - Drug Involvement and Substance Misuse

The security concern relating to the guideline for Drug Involvement and Substance Misuse is set forth at AG ¶ 24:

The illegal use of controlled substances, to include the misuse of prescription and non-prescription drugs, and the use of other substances that cause physical or mental impairment or are used in a manner inconsistent with their intended purpose can raise questions about an individual's reliability and trustworthiness, both because such behavior may lead to physical or psychological impairment and because it raises questions about a person's ability or willingness to comply with laws, rules, and regulations. *Controlled substance* means any "controlled substance" as defined in 21 U.S.C. 802. *Substance misuse* is the generic term adopted in this guideline to describe any of the behaviors listed above.

The guideline at AG ¶ 25 contains three conditions that could raise a security concern and may be disqualifying:

- (a) any substance misuse (see above definition);
- (c) illegal possession of a controlled substance, including cultivation, processing, manufacture, purchase, sale, or distribution; or possession of drug paraphernalia; and
- (g) expressed intent to continue drug involvement and substance misuse, or failure to clearly and convincingly commit to discontinue such misuse.

The guideline at AG ¶ 26 contains conditions that could mitigate security concerns:

- (a) the behavior happened so long ago, was so infrequent, or happened under such circumstances that it is unlikely to recur or does not cast doubt on the individual's current reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment; and
- (b) the individual acknowledges his or her drug involvement and substance misuse, provides evidence of actions taken to overcome this problem, and has established a pattern of abstinence, including, but not limited to:
 - (1) disassociation from drug-using associates and contacts;
 - (2) changing or avoiding the environment where drugs were used; and

(3) providing a signed statement of intent to abstain from all drug involvement and substance misuse, acknowledging that any future involvement or misuse is grounds for revocation of national security eligibility.

None of the mitigating factors are applicable. Applicant has deliberately used marijuana for the past seventeen years, from 2006 to at least 2022. In May 2020, in his eQIP, and again in February 2022, in responses to interrogatories, he stated his intention was to continue to use marijuana in the future. Marijuana is illegal under Federal law, and is clearly prohibited by the DoD under any circumstances. Applicant's actions are not mitigated.

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 H in my whole-person analysis. An individual who holds a security clearance is expected to comply with the law at all times. Applicant is a 37-year-old man. He has not demonstrated the level of maturity needed in order to access classified information. Applicant should know the requirements associated with holding a security clearance and should know that marijuana use is against Federal law and not tolerated. Under the circumstances, Applicant is not an individual in whom the Government can be confident to know that he will always follow rules and regulations and do the right thing, even when no one is looking. Applicant does not meet the qualifications for a security clearance.

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 Drug Involvement and Substance Misuse security concern.

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 H:	AGAINST APPLICANT
Subparagraphs 1.a., 1.b., and 1.c.	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 or continue Applicant's eligibility for a security clearance. Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

Darlene Lokey Anderson
Administrative Judge