



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



In the matter of:)
)
) ISCR Case No. 25-00548
)
Applicant for Security Clearance)

Appearances

For Government:
Tovah Minster, Esquire, Department Counsel

For Applicant:
Pro se

04/09/2026

Decision

CEFOLA, Richard A., Administrative Judge:

On January 13, 2025, Applicant submitted his Electronic Questionnaire for Investigations Processing (e-QIP). On July 17, 2025, the Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency Consolidated Adjudication Services (DCSA CAS) 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, *Safeguarding Classified Information within Industry* (February 20, 1960), as amended; Department of Defense Directive 5220.6, *Defense Industrial Personnel Security Clearance Review Program* (January 2, 1992), as amended (Directive); and the Adjudicative Guidelines effective June 8, 2017.

Applicant answered the SOR in writing on September 18, 2025, and requested a hearing before an administrative judge. The Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) received the request soon thereafter. This Decision was delayed when all Administrative Judges were furloughed from October 1 through November 12, 2025, during a Federal Government shutdown due to a lapse in Federal funding. I received the case assignment on November 13, 2025. DOHA issued a Notice of Hearing on January 27, 2026, and I convened the hearing as scheduled on February 24, 2026. The Government offered Exhibits (GXs) 1 and 2, which were received without objection. Applicant testified and called one witness to testify on his own behalf. He also asked that the record be kept open until March 24, 2026, for the receipt of additional documentation. Applicant offered Exhibits (AppXs) A and B, in a timely fashion, which were admitted without objection. DOHA received the transcript of the hearing (TR) on March 4, 2026. Based upon a review of the pleadings, exhibits, and testimony, eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

Findings of Fact

In his Answer to the SOR Applicant admitted the factual allegations in Paragraph 1 of the SOR, with explanations. He also provided additional information to support his request for eligibility for a security clearance.

Applicant is 29 years old, unmarried, and has no children. He has a bachelor's degree in finance. He has worked for a defense contractor since November of 2022. Applicant does not currently hold a security clearance. (TR at page 5 line 16 to page 6 line 11, and at page 16 line 6 to page 18 line 17.)

Guideline H – Drug Involvement and Substance Misuse

1.a. and 1.g. Applicant admits that he used marijuana “about once every two months” from about January of 2014 until about January of 2025, a period of about 11 years. Prior to moving to Colorado in September of 2022, where the use of marijuana is legal under state law, he knew its use was illegal under the various states’ laws where he resided. Applicant also knew his marijuana usage was illegal under federal law. He purchased marijuana “approximately five to ten times,” from about 2020 to 2022, prior to his move to Colorado. (TR at page 13 line 20 to page 15 line 16, and at page 19 line 21 to page 27 line 15.)

1.b. Applicant admits that he used “Psilocybin Hallucinogenic Mushrooms” (mushrooms) about four times from about August of 2019 until August of 2024, a period of about five years. Two of those four usages were while Applicant was employed by his current employer, a defense contractor. (TR at page 27 line 17 to page 30 line 21.)

1.c. and 1.h. Applicant admits that he used cocaine about “once every three months” from about May of 2019 until about January of 2021, a period of more than two and a half years. He purchased cocaine on two separate occasions. (TR at page 30 line 22 to page 32 line 25.)

1.d. Applicant admits that he used ketamine once in about October 2020. (TR at page 33 line 1 to page 34 line 16.)

1.e. and 1.i. Applicant admits that he used the prescription medication Adderall, that was not prescribed to him, about ten times from about January of 2014 to about March of 2022, a period of more than eight years. Applicant purchased Adderall, that was not prescribed to him, about five times. (TR at page 34 line 17 to page 37 line 18.)

1.f. Applicant admits that he used a pain killer medication, that was not prescribed to him, once in March of 2019. (TR at page 37 line 19 to page 39 line 7.)

At his hearing, Applicant was very forthcoming and contrite in his testimony. He stated an intent to abstain from all drug involvement and substance misuse. Applicant reiterated this intent in his written closing statement.

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 useful 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. 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. 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, 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 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 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 10865 provides that 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 seven conditions that could raise a security concern and may be disqualifying. Two conditions are established:

- (a) any substance misuse (see above definition); and

- (c) illegal possession of a controlled substance, including cultivation, processing, manufacture, purchase, sale, or distribution; or possession of drug paraphernalia.

Appellant used and purchased marijuana, cocaine, and unprescribed Adderall. He also used mushrooms, ketamine, and an unprescribed pain killer medication. Therefore, AG ¶ 25 (a) and (c) are established.

The guideline at AG ¶ 26 contains four conditions that could mitigate security concerns. Two conditions may be applicable:

(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.

Applicant's drug involvement and substance misuse occurred from about January of 2014 until his last usage, which was marijuana, in January of 2025, only about six months prior to the issuance of the SOR. Although he has submitted a signed statement of intent to abstain from all future drug involvement and substance misuse, it is too soon to say his past usage of multiple drugs is not of present security significance. Drug Involvement and Substance Misuse is found against Applicant. This should not dissuade Applicant from applying for a security clearance in the future after an additional year of abstinence.

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 an applicant's conduct and all the 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.

AG ¶ 2(b) requires each case must be judged on its own merits. 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. Applicant's "Boss and Supervisor" spoke most highly of Applicant. (TR at page 44 line 24 to page 51 line 14.) However, overall, the record evidence leaves me with questions and doubts as to Applicant's eligibility and suitability for a security clearance. For these reasons, I conclude Applicant has not mitigated the security concerns arising from his drug involvement and substance abuse.

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 H:	AGAINST APPLICANT
Subparagraphs 1.a~1.i:	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 for a security clearance. Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

Richard A. Cefola
Administrative Judge