



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



In the matter of:)
)
) ISCR Case No. 21-02540
)
Applicant for Security Clearance)

Appearances

For Government: John C. Lynch, Esq., Department Counsel
For Applicant: Annie Stellato, Personal Representative

06/20/2023

Decision

LOUGHRAN, Edward W., Administrative Judge:

Applicant mitigated the security concerns under Guideline I (psychological conditions), but he did not mitigate the security concerns under Guidelines E (personal conduct), G (alcohol consumption), and J (criminal conduct). Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

Statement of the Case

On April 18, 2022, the Department of Defense (DoD) issued a Statement of Reasons (SOR) to Applicant detailing security concerns under Guidelines G (alcohol consumption), I (psychological conditions), and J (criminal conduct). Applicant responded to the SOR on May 12, 2022, and requested a hearing before an administrative judge.

On July 11, 2022, Department Counsel amended the SOR by correcting the lettering in the Guideline J allegation, deleting one of the Guideline I allegations, and adding an allegation under Guideline E (personal conduct). Applicant responded to the amended SOR on August 1, 2022. The case was assigned to me on April 6, 2023.

Evidence

Government Exhibits (GE) 1 through 9 and 11 were admitted in evidence without objection. The objection to GE 10 was partially sustained and partially overruled. With the exception of some language identified in the transcript, I admitted pages 6 through 9 of GE 10 and sustained the objection to the remainder of the document. A section of page 6 of GE 2 is illegible. That part will not be considered. Applicant testified and submitted Applicant's Exhibits (AE) 1 through 11, which were admitted without objection.

Department Counsel requested that I take administrative notice of certain provisions of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5), and a state statute on public intoxication. Without objection, I have taken administrative notice of the requested DSM-5 provisions (Hearing Exhibit (HE) III) and the state statute (HE IV).

Findings of Fact

Applicant is a 34-year-old employee of a defense contractor. He has worked for his current employer since 2011. He seeks to retain a security clearance, which he has held since about 2011. He earned a bachelor's degree in 2017 and a master's degree in 2019. He married in 2022. He has no children. (Transcript (Tr.) at 36, 64-65; GE 1; AE 1, 9)

Applicant has a history of alcohol-related incidents and criminal conduct. He was arrested for driving while intoxicated (DWI) in December 2015 and June 2021. He was arrested or cited for public intoxication in July 2018, November 2018, and October 2019. He was hospitalized for alcohol intoxication and suicidal ideation in February 2019.

Applicant had about seven shots of alcohol at a bar in December 2015. He attempted to drive home, but was found by the police in a nearby parking lot asleep behind the driver's wheel. He had a blood alcohol test, but he testified that he did not remember what his blood alcohol concentration (BAC) was on the test. He was arrested and charged with DWI. He pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 80 hours of community service and probation for 12 months. He was required to take three alcohol education classes. (Tr. at 36-39; Applicant's response to SOR; GE 3, 4, 10)

Applicant then girlfriend (not his wife) broke up with him while they were at the wedding of the girlfriend's sister in July 2018. He drank at the reception and then at a restaurant. He then drove and parked by the side of a secluded road and drank in his truck. The police found him asleep in the back of his truck. He was arrested for public intoxication. He pleaded guilty and paid a fine. (Tr. at 39-44; Applicant's response to SOR; GE 3, 10)

Applicant was drinking at a bar in November 2018. His ex-girlfriend contacted him about getting back together. He drank too much (about seven shots) and became anxious and emotional, and he started crying. The police took him to the hospital

because they had concerns that he was having an anxiety or a panic attack. The hospital did not admit him, and he was arrested for public intoxication. He pleaded guilty and received a deferred adjudication. (Tr. at 44-46; Applicant's response to SOR; GE 10)

Applicant was drinking wine by himself in his apartment in February 2019. He drank at least one bottle of wine. He cut his finger on a broken wine bottle, and he accidentally caused a crease in an extension faucet. The water leaked from the faucet, with the overflow going into the apartment below him. His neighbor called maintenance about the leak. When maintenance arrived at his apartment, they noticed the blood and the water, and they contacted the police. The police also received calls, apparently from his friend, indicating that Applicant had threatened to end his own life, had suicidal thoughts (ideation), and had threatened to kill his friend. When police arrived, they found multiple empty wine bottles, and Applicant was described as belligerent and intoxicated. (Tr. at 20, 46-50; Applicant's response to SOR; GE 2, 10)

A detention warrant was issued, and Applicant was taken to the hospital in the evening of February 15, 2019. His lacerated finger was treated, and his blood was collected at 11:30 p.m. His BAC was .376%. He received a psychological screening the next morning. A differential diagnosis considered was suicidal ideation (SI), homicidal ideation (HI), co-ingestion, and acute alcohol intoxication. The provisional diagnosis was alcohol abuse. He was assessed with alcohol-induced mood disorder and alcohol use disorder, mild, abuse. An alcohol use disorder diagnosis requires the presence of at least 2 of the 11 criteria listed in the DSM-5. Applicant was deemed to be positive for 3 of the criteria. The DSM-5 indicates that if 2 to 3 of the criteria are met, the disorder is specified as mild. (Tr. at 67-68; GE 2; HE III)

The doctor discussed alcohol use disorder with Applicant. She encouraged him to track his alcohol use and to seek counseling or outpatient support for alcohol use cessation. Referrals for treatment and counseling were provided to him. He did not meet the criteria for inpatient hospitalization, and he was discharged to his home at about 11:09 a.m. on February 16, 2019. (Tr. at 67-68; GE 2)

Applicant was drinking at a bar in October 2019. The police arrested him for public intoxication. He pleaded guilty and paid a fine. He does not remember exactly what happened. (Tr. at 52-54; Applicant's response to SOR; GE 10)

Applicant was arrested and charged with DWI, second offense, in June 2021. He was at a baby shower with his girlfriend (now wife) that lasted for about eight to nine hours. He drank, but he did not believe he was intoxicated. He stated that he was driving with his girlfriend, and they had an argument. He was using his cell phone for navigation, when it fell. He swerved and hit the curb. They parked in a parking lot, got out of the truck, and continued to argue. The police arrived and arrested him. A blood test measured .18% and .14% BAC. Applicant believes the tests were inaccurate. The case is still pending trial. (Tr. at 20-21, 54-57, 65-67, Applicant's response to SOR; GE 5, 11)

The DoD Consolidated Adjudications Facility (CAF) requested that Applicant undergo a psychological evaluation in March 2021. The evaluation was voluntary, but the request had the following option:

I will not participate in an independent psychological evaluation with a provider retained by the DoD CAF. By initialing here, I understand that my refusal to participate in an independent psychological evaluation will result in the denial of my security clearance application due to my failure to cooperate. (GE 7)

Applicant agreed to undergo the evaluation. He reported to the evaluation in August 2021, but he refused to talk about the June 2021 DWI. He stated, "I want to postpone any discussion about that charge on the advice of my attorney." He elaborated, "I don't understand what happened. I was not in a vehicle and I didn't overconsume. I will discuss it at some point in the future after my attorney and I figure out exactly what happened." The psychologist was unable to render a diagnosis or an opinion. (Tr. at 21, 57-58, 70; GE 7, 8)

Applicant wrote in his response to the SOR that he realized that refusing to discuss the DWI with the psychologist was not in his best interest. He wrote:

I realize now that my attorney is not well versed in handling cases that involve clients with security clearance requirements. If I had that opportunity again, I would handle the situation differently. I would be more than happy to go through another evaluation. If there are questions asked of me during this process or during my hearing, I will absolutely provide full and detailed answers.

Applicant relied on the generic advice of his attorney to not discuss the case. He did not request specific advice from his attorney about the evaluation. He realizes now that it was a mistake to not fully participate in the psychological evaluation. He remains willing to undergo another evaluation. (Tr. at 70-72; Applicant's response to SOR)

Applicant admitted that 2018 to 2021 was "a dark time in [his] life," which resulted from a tumultuous relationship (previous girlfriend, not wife). He denied ever having plans to commit suicide. He had been sober for 718 days as of the date of the hearing. He has attended Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) meetings two to three times a week for the last year. He also saw his company's counselor several times. His marriage is happy, and his wife does not drink. He is more health conscious, with a better diet and daily exercise. He does not believe that he is an alcoholic; but he is convinced that his life is better without alcohol. (Tr. at 19, 23, 59-64, 68-70; Applicant's response to SOR)

Applicant had a psychological evaluation by a clinical psychologist in May 2023. She diagnosed Applicant with alcohol use disorder, mild, in sustained remission. The prognosis for continued sobriety was good. (AE 1)

Applicant submitted documents and letters attesting to his excellent job performance and strong moral character. He has received regular promotions and awards. He is praised for his trustworthiness, mentorship, work ethic, responsibility, empathy, loyalty, compassion, honesty, dependability, judgment, dedication, and integrity. (Attachments to Applicant's response to SOR; AE 2-10)

Policies

This case is adjudicated 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 the adjudicative guidelines (AG), which became effective on June 8, 2017.

When evaluating an applicant's suitability for a security clearance, the administrative judge must consider the adjudicative guidelines. 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 the adjudicative process. The administrative judge's overarching adjudicative goal is a fair, impartial, and commonsense decision. According to AG ¶ 2(c), 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."

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 security 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 of 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 G, Alcohol Consumption

The security concern for alcohol consumption is set out in AG ¶ 21:

Excessive alcohol consumption often leads to the exercise of questionable judgment or the failure to control impulses, and can raise questions about an individual’s reliability and trustworthiness.

The guideline notes several conditions that could raise security concerns under AG ¶ 22. The following are potentially applicable in this case:

- (a) alcohol-related incidents away from work, such as driving while under the influence, fighting, child or spouse abuse, disturbing the peace, or other incidents of concern, regardless of the frequency of the individual’s alcohol use or whether the individual has been diagnosed with alcohol use disorder; and
- (c) habitual or binge consumption of alcohol to the point of impaired judgment, regardless of whether the individual is diagnosed with alcohol use disorder.

Applicant was arrested for DWI in December 2015 and June 2021. He was arrested or cited for public intoxication in July 2018, November 2018, and October 2019. He was hospitalized for alcohol intoxication and suicidal ideation in February 2019. AG ¶¶ 22(a) and 22(c) are applicable.

Conditions that could mitigate alcohol consumption security concerns are provided under AG ¶ 23. The following are potentially applicable:

- (a) so much time has passed, or the behavior was so infrequent, or it happened under such unusual circumstances that it is unlikely to recur or does not cast doubt on the individual’s current reliability, trustworthiness, or judgment;
- (b) the individual acknowledges his or her pattern of maladaptive alcohol use, provides evidence of actions taken to overcome this problem, and has demonstrated a clear and established pattern of modified

consumption or abstinence in accordance with treatment recommendations; and

(d) the individual has successfully completed a treatment program along with any required aftercare, and has demonstrated a clear and established pattern of modified consumption or abstinence in accordance with treatment recommendations.

Applicant had been sober for 718 days as of the date of the hearing. He saw his company's counselor several times. He has attended AA meetings two to three times a week for the last year. His marriage is happy, and his wife does not drink. He is more health conscious, with a better diet and daily exercise. He does not believe that he is an alcoholic; but he is convinced that his life is better without alcohol.

Applicant is commended for his efforts to remain sober. Nonetheless, I have lingering concerns about his drinking and the extremely poor judgment he exhibited while drinking. His most recent DWI is still pending trial. 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." None of the mitigating conditions are sufficiently applicable to overcome concerns about Applicant's alcohol use, reliability, trustworthiness, and judgment.

Guideline J, Criminal Conduct

The security concern for criminal conduct is set out in AG ¶ 30:

Criminal activity creates doubt about an Applicant's judgment, reliability, and trustworthiness. By its very nature, it calls into question a person's ability or willingness to comply with laws, rules and regulations.

AG ¶ 31 describes conditions that could raise a security concern and may be disqualifying. The following is potentially applicable:

(b) evidence (including, but not limited to, a credible allegation, an admission, and matters of official record) of criminal conduct, regardless of whether the individual was formally charged, prosecuted, or convicted.

The SOR cross-alleges Applicant's alcohol-related arrests under criminal conduct. AG ¶ 31(b) is applicable.

Conditions that could mitigate criminal conduct security concerns are provided under AG ¶ 32. The following are potentially applicable:

(a) so much time has elapsed since the criminal behavior happened, or it happened under such unusual circumstances, that it is unlikely to recur and does not cast doubt on the individual's reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment;

(c) no reliable evidence to support that the individual committed the offense; and

(d) there is evidence of successful rehabilitation; including, but not limited to, the passage of time without recurrence of criminal activity, restitution, compliance with the terms of parole or probation, job training or higher education, good employment record, or constructive community involvement.

Applicant is still pending trial for his most recent arrest. The analysis under alcohol consumption applies equally here. His criminal conduct continues to cast doubt on his current reliability, trustworthiness, good judgment, and willingness to comply with laws, rules, and regulations. The above mitigating conditions, individually or collectively, are insufficient to alleviate those concerns.

Guideline E, Personal Conduct

The security concern for personal conduct is set out in AG ¶ 15, as follows:

Conduct involving questionable judgment, lack of candor, dishonesty, or unwillingness to comply with rules and regulations can raise questions about an individual's reliability, trustworthiness and ability to protect classified or sensitive information. Of special interest is any failure to cooperate or provide truthful and candid answers during national security clearance investigative or adjudicative processes. The following will normally result in an unfavorable national security eligibility determination, security clearance action, or cancellation of further processing for national security eligibility:

(a) refusal, or failure without reasonable cause, to undergo or cooperate with security processing, including but not limited to meeting with a security investigator for subject interview, completing security forms or releases, cooperation with medical or psychological evaluation, or polygraph examination, if authorized and required; and

(b) refusal to provide full, frank, and truthful answers to lawful questions of investigators, security officials, or other official representatives in connection with a personnel security or trustworthiness determination.

AG ¶ 16 describes conditions that could raise a security concern and may be disqualifying. The following disqualifying condition is potentially applicable:

(b) deliberately providing false or misleading information; or concealing or omitting information, concerning relevant facts to an employer, investigator, security official, competent medical or mental health professional involved in making a recommendation relevant to a national

security eligibility determination, or other official government representative.

The CAF requested that Applicant undergo a psychological evaluation in March 2021. The evaluation was voluntary, but he was advised that “refusal to participate in an independent psychological evaluation will result in the denial of [his] security clearance application due to [his] failure to cooperate.” He reported to the evaluation in August 2021, but he refused to talk about the June 2021 DWI. AG ¶¶ 15(a) and 16(b) are established.

AG ¶ 17 provides conditions that could mitigate security concerns. The following are potentially applicable:

(b) the refusal or failure to cooperate, omission, or concealment was caused or significantly contributed to by advice of legal counsel or of a person with professional responsibilities for advising or instructing the individual specifically concerning security processes. Upon being made aware of the requirement to cooperate or provide the information, the individual cooperated fully and truthfully;

(c) the offense is so minor, or so much time has passed, or the behavior is so infrequent, or it happened under such unique circumstances that it is unlikely to recur and does not cast doubt on the individual’s reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment;

(d) the individual has acknowledged the behavior and obtained counseling to change the behavior or taken other positive steps to alleviate the stressors, circumstances, or factors that contributed to untrustworthy, unreliable, or other inappropriate behavior, and such behavior is unlikely to recur;

(e) the individual has taken positive steps to reduce or eliminate vulnerability to exploitation, manipulation, or duress; and

(f) the information was unsubstantiated or from a source of questionable reliability.

Applicant relied on the generic advice of his criminal defense attorney to not discuss the case. He did not request specific advice from his attorney about the evaluation. He realizes now that it was a mistake to not fully participate in the psychological evaluation. He remains willing to undergo another evaluation. He participated in a private psychological evaluation by a clinical psychologist in May 2023.

It is difficult to undo Applicant’s failure to participate in the CAF evaluation, because he left the CAF and me without vital information in the determination of his security worthiness. His conduct continues to cast doubt on his current reliability,

trustworthiness, and good judgment. Personal conduct security concerns are not mitigated.

Guideline I: Psychological Conditions

The security concern for psychological conditions is set out in AG ¶ 27:

Certain emotional, mental, and personality conditions can impair judgment, reliability, or trustworthiness. A formal diagnosis of a disorder is not required for there to be a concern under this guideline. A duly qualified mental health professional (e.g., clinical psychologist or psychiatrist) employed by, or acceptable to and approved by the U.S. Government, should be consulted when evaluating potentially disqualifying and mitigating information under this guideline and an opinion, including prognosis, should be sought. No negative inference concerning the standards in this guideline may be raised solely on the basis of mental health counseling.

AG ¶ 28 provides conditions that could raise psychological conditions security concerns. The following are potentially applicable:

- (a) behavior that casts doubt on an individual's judgment, stability, reliability, or trustworthiness, not covered under any other guideline and that may indicate an emotional, mental, or personality condition, including, but not limited to, irresponsible, violent, self-harm, suicidal, paranoid, manipulative, impulsive, chronic lying, deceitful, exploitative, or bizarre behaviors;
- (b) an opinion by a duly qualified mental health professional that the individual has a condition that may impair judgment, stability, reliability, or trustworthiness;
- (c) voluntary or involuntary inpatient hospitalization; and
- (d) failure to follow a prescribed treatment plan related to a diagnosed psychological/psychiatric condition that may impair judgment, stability, reliability, or trustworthiness, including, but not limited to, failure to take prescribed medication or failure to attend required counseling sessions.

SOR ¶ 3.a

SOR ¶ 3.a alleges that Applicant refused to discuss details of his June 2021 DWI during the DoD CAF psychological evaluation, which prevented the psychologist from rendering an opinion. As discussed above, that constitutes personal conduct, but it does not raise any psychological conditions disqualifying conditions. SOR ¶ 3.a is concluded for Applicant.

SOR ¶ 3.b

SOR ¶ 3.b alleges that in February 2019, Applicant was hospitalized for acute alcohol intoxication and suicidal ideation. Upon his discharge, it was recommended that he seek substance abuse treatment and mental health counseling. However, as of the date of his 2021 psychological evaluation, he had not complied with those recommendations.

AG ¶ 28(a)

Applicant was extremely drunk before he was hospitalized in 2019. That behavior casts doubt on his judgment, reliability, and trustworthiness. However, that behavior is covered under the alcohol consumption guideline, and by definition cannot be “behavior that casts doubt on an individual’s judgment, stability, reliability, or trustworthiness, **not covered under any other guideline**” (emphasis added). As such, that conduct cannot be used to establish AG ¶ 28(a) as a disqualifying condition. Suicidal ideation is thoughts or “ideas” of suicide. Thoughts are not behavior. AG ¶ 28(a) is not applicable.

AG ¶ 28(b)

AG ¶ 28(b) requires 1) an opinion by a duly qualified mental health professional that the individual has a condition; and 2) that the condition may impair judgment, stability, reliability, or trustworthiness.

SOR ¶ 3.b alleges that Applicant was hospitalized for acute alcohol intoxication. Alcohol intoxication is a medical condition under the DSM-5. Without going too far into the medical terminology, in lay person’s terms, alcohol intoxication means that Applicant was drunk, and acute alcohol intoxication means that he was extremely drunk. It is a condition may impair judgment, stability, reliability, or trustworthiness. AG ¶ 28(b) is applicable.

AG ¶ 28(c)

AG ¶ 28(c) requires not just hospitalization, but inpatient hospitalization. Inpatient is not defined in the adjudicative guidelines, but Merriam-Webster defines it as “a hospital patient who receives lodging and food as well as treatment.” Applicant was in the hospital from the evening of February 15, 2018, until about 11:09 a.m. on February 16, 2019. The medical record indicates that he did not meet the criteria for inpatient hospitalization. I believe he was treated overnight and released the next morning, but he was never admitted as an inpatient. AG ¶ 28(c) is not applicable.

AG ¶ 28(d)

AG ¶ 28(d) requires a “prescribed treatment plan,” not just an encouragement for Applicant to track his alcohol use and to seek counseling or outpatient support. AG ¶ 28(d) is not applicable.

AG ¶ 29 provides conditions that could mitigate psychological conditions security concerns. The following are potentially applicable:

- (a) the identified condition is readily controllable with treatment, and the individual has demonstrated ongoing and consistent compliance with the treatment plan;
- (b) the individual has voluntarily entered a counseling or treatment program for a condition that is amenable to treatment, and the individual is currently receiving counseling or treatment with a favorable prognosis by a duly qualified mental health professional;
- (c) recent opinion by a duly qualified mental health professional employed by, or acceptable to and approved by, the U.S. Government that an individual's previous condition is under control or in remission, and has a low probability of recurrence or exacerbation;
- (d) the past psychological/psychiatric condition was temporary, the situation has been resolved, and the individual no longer shows indications of emotional instability; and
- (e) there is no indication of a current problem.

What we are left with under Guideline I is that in February 2019, Applicant was treated for acute alcohol intoxication, or in other words, he was extremely drunk. It does not require a psychologist to make that determination, and that conduct is appropriately addressed under the alcohol consumption guideline. Any psychological considerations security concerns generated by that conduct are 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 have incorporated my comments under Guidelines E, G, I, and J in my whole-person analysis. I also considered Applicant's favorable character evidence.

Overall, the record evidence leaves me with questions and doubts about Applicant's eligibility and suitability for a security clearance. I conclude Applicant mitigated the security concerns under Guideline I, but he did not mitigate the security concerns under Guidelines E, G, and J.

Formal Findings

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

Paragraph 1, Guideline G:	Against Applicant
Subparagraphs 1.a-1.g:	Against Applicant
Paragraph 2, Guideline J:	Against Applicant
Subparagraph 2.a:	Against Applicant
Paragraph 3, Guideline I:	For Applicant
Subparagraphs 3.a-3.b:	For Applicant
Paragraph 4, Guideline E:	Against Applicant
Subparagraph 4.a:	Against Applicant

Conclusion

It is not clearly consistent with the national interest to continue Applicant's eligibility for a security clearance. Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

Edward W. Loughran
Administrative Judge