



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



In the matter of:)
)
) ISCR Case No. 24-01085
)
Applicant for Security Clearance)

Appearances

For Government: Cynthia Ruckno, Esq., Department Counsel
For Applicant: Brittany Forrester, Esq.

03/30/2026

Decision

HYAMS, Ross D., Administrative Judge:

Applicant mitigated the criminal conduct, personal conduct, and drug involvement and substance misuse security concerns. Eligibility for access to classified information is granted.

Statement of the Case

On November 5, 2024, the Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency (DCSA) issued a Statement of Reasons (SOR) to Applicant detailing security concerns under Guidelines J (criminal conduct), E (personal conduct), and H (drug involvement and substance misuse). Applicant answered the SOR on December 18, 2024, and requested a hearing before an administrative judge. The case was assigned to me on August 26, 2025. The scheduling of the hearing in this case 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.

The hearing convened on January 8, 2026. Department Counsel submitted Government Exhibits (GE) 1-6, which were admitted in evidence without objection.

Applicant submitted Applicant's Exhibit (AE) A-H, which were attached to Applicant's SOR Answer and were already part of the record in this case.

Amendment to the Statement of Reasons

At the start of the hearing, Department Counsel moved to withdraw SOR ¶ 2.c. The motion was granted without objection.

Findings of Fact

Applicant, with explanation, admitted SOR ¶¶ 1.a-1.i, 1.k, 2.a-2.b; admitted in part SOR ¶¶ 1.j, 2.e, and 3.a; and denied SOR ¶ 2.d. This information is incorporated into the findings of fact. Based on my review of the pleadings, evidence submitted, and testimony, I make the following findings of fact.

Applicant is 49 years old. He has worked in quality engineering for a defense contractor since 2011. His work ethic and skill earned him a promotion, and he now serves as a quality assurance program manager. He has been married since 2011. He was previously married from 2002-2010. He has four biological children, two who are minors, and two stepchildren. He graduated high school in 1994 and has attended some college. He served in the Navy on active duty from 1994-1998 as an aviation machinist, and received an honorable discharge. (Tr. 16-19; GE 1; AE E)

Under Guideline J, the allegations are as follows:

SOR ¶ 1.a alleges in 1995 Applicant was arrested for DUI and reckless driving. He pled no contest to reckless driving. He was 18 years old at the time. He testified that while in the Navy, a friend had purchased a new sports car he wanted to drive. One evening his friend was intoxicated, so he let Applicant drive home. Applicant drove beyond the speed limit and was stopped by police. When given a breathalyzer he blew under the legal limit but was arrested for reckless driving. He pled "no contest" to reckless driving. He received a non-adjudication of guilt, paid the required fine, and the case was dismissed. (Tr. 19-67; Answer; GE 2-5)

SOR ¶ 1.b alleges in 1997 Applicant was charged with unlawful use of an identification card (ID) and pled guilty. He was 20 years old at the time. He was in Key West, FL with Navy friends, who were all over 21. One friend gave him a fake ID so he could go to the bars with them. At one bar, local deputies were monitoring the door, and the fake ID was discovered and confiscated. He was given a summons to appear in court. He did not recall the case being adjudicated by a civilian court. He recalled being punished with base restriction for 45 days and forfeiture of half of his Navy pay per month for two months. (Tr. 19-67; Answer; GE 2-5)

SOR ¶ 1.c alleges in 1997 Applicant was arrested and charged with reckless driving for speeding at approximately 160 mph. He pled no contest and was assessed

finances and fees, which were allegedly unpaid. He was 20 years old at the time. He reported that he and his roommate both owned motorcycles. They had traded motorcycles for the evening. He was going over a 3.5-mile bridge late at night with no cars on it and drove fast to see what the motorcycle could do. He was stopped by police and arrested for reckless driving. He recalled spending the weekend in jail. He pled guilty to reckless driving. He had to make a presentation to his unit on motorcycle safety after being released. After recently discovering there were unpaid fines from this incident, he resolved the outstanding fine and provided a receipt. (Tr. 19-94; Answer; GE 2-5; AE D)

SOR ¶ 1.d alleges in 1999 Applicant was arrested for carrying a concealed weapon and discharging a firearm within city limits, and he pled guilty. He was 22 years old at the time. He reported that he left a nightclub with an African American friend. As they were walking to their car in the parking lot, four men followed them and made racial slurs. They proceeded to come up to the car on both sides, and Applicant fired a shot out of the sunroof of the vehicle to disperse them. He pled guilty to the charges. His gun was ordered to be destroyed, and he received a non-adjudication of guilt. The charges were dismissed after his successful completion of a year of probation. (Tr. 19-94; Answer; GE 2-5)

SOR ¶ 1.e alleges in 2001 Applicant was arrested for felony larceny, forged credit card, and identity fraud. He pled guilty and was on probation until 2003. It also alleged he violated his probation. He was 24 years old at the time. He was a skilled mechanic. An acquaintance asked him for help fixing his car. He did not have cash, so he gave Applicant his credit card to purchase the needed car parts. The credit card belonged to the father of the acquaintance, who had the same name, and when Applicant picked up the car parts he was arrested. Applicant testified he did not have money to hire an attorney for trial to fight the charges. He pled guilty to a felony, per the advice of the public defender, but did not understand the seriousness of the charges. He was trying to be helpful, but the acquaintance did not take responsibility for stealing his father's credit card. He was given probation as a sentence. The probation violation alleged is the arrest alleged in SOR ¶ 1.g. (Tr. 19-67; Answer; GE 2-5)

SOR ¶ 1.f alleges in 2001 Applicant was arrested for criminal speeding and possession of a Schedule W drug. This allegation was cross-alleged under Guideline H. He was 24 years old at the time. He was on a road trip with a friend. He was stopped for speeding. Police requested to search the vehicle, which belonged to his friend. He stated he borrowed his sister's backpack, which unknown to him had one Xanax pill in it. His sister had a prescription for the medication, but the pill was loose in the backpack. He was arrested, but the charges were dropped the next day. (Tr. 19-94; Answer; GE 2-5)

SOR ¶ 1.g alleges in March 2002 Applicant was arrested in City A of State A for felony cocaine distribution, and he pled guilty and was placed on probation for two years. It also alleged he was charged with a probation violation. This allegation was cross-alleged under Guideline H. This allegation is linked to the allegation in ¶ 1.h below. He was 24 years old at the time. He worked as a bouncer in a night club. An attractive woman

flirted with him at the night club, and that evening asked if he knew anyone from whom she could purchase cocaine. He directed her to someone in the nightclub whom he thought sold cocaine. A few days later, she called him and asked him to help her purchase some more cocaine. He picked up the cocaine on her behalf and brought it to her. He was under the impression she liked him and was going to have romantic relations with him, but she was an undercover police officer. This allegation concerns charges for facilitating the sale in the nightclub. He was given two years' probation. (Tr. 19-67; Answer; GE 2-5)

SOR ¶ 1.h alleges in March 2002 Applicant was arrested in City B of State A for felony distribution of cocaine, and pled guilty and was placed on probation for two years. This allegation was cross alleged under Guideline H. The circumstances regarding this allegation are discussed under SOR ¶ 1.g above and this allegation concerns Applicant picking up cocaine and delivering it to the undercover police officer's house. (Tr. 19-67; Answer; GE 2-5)

SOR ¶ 1.i alleges in June 2003 Applicant was indicted in State B with conspiracy to distribute Methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDMA). He pled guilty and was sentenced to 108 months in prison with 36 months of supervised release. In 2008, his sentence was reduced to 70 months. This allegation was cross alleged under Guideline H. He was 25 years old at the time. He moved from State A to State B in about 2003. After his move, he encountered an old friend who asked if he knew anyone in State A who sold MDMA. He was offered a substantial amount of money for the connection. He connected with someone he knew sold MDMA from working in the nightclub, and helped facilitate a few sales. The drug buyer was an informant for the DEA. Applicant was arrested and served as a government witness. His sentence was reduced for assisting in the apprehension and conviction of two drug dealers from State A. He served 63 months in prison and successfully completed a three-year probation in 2012. (Tr. 19-67; Answer; GE 2-5)

SOR ¶ 1.j alleges in 2003 Applicant was charged with writing a worthless check and pled guilty. He has no recollection about this event. It occurred right after the indictment in ¶ 1.i. (Tr. 19-67; Answer; GE 2-5)

SOR ¶ 1.k alleges in 2013 Applicant was arrested and charged with felony child abuse - intentional infliction of physical or mental injury. At the time, his 10-year-old son was going through a defiant period. He reported that they tried a variety of punishments, but nothing seemed to work. After repeated frustration and conflict, he spanked his son with his belt. The next day at school his son showed a counselor a small bruise on his leg. Applicant was arrested and spent the night in jail. The judge dismissed all charges because the spanking was discipline based and not abuse. He denied ever abusing any of his children and today has a loving relationship with his son. (Tr. 19-67; Answer; GE 2-5)

Under Guideline E, the allegations are as follows:

SOR ¶ 2.a alleges in 2018 Applicant received a corrective-action memorandum from his employer, for working on an aircraft without fall protection. He reported that he was supposed to be wearing a harness when working on the plane. However, since the plane was running, he had to use a ladder that did not accommodate the harness. He reported receiving a verbal admonishment. This was a minor issue and was more of a technical question about the proper technique for working on a running airplane. His performance was well rated in his performance evaluation for that year. (Tr. 19-67; Answer; GE 6; AE G)

SOR ¶ 2.b alleges in 2019, Applicant received a verbal warning from his employer after being involved in work on an aircraft performed without a work authorization document. He reported this occurred in 2018 and not in 2019. A manager above Applicant was confused about who could authorize a fix for a preventative repair on an airplane. He reported that he worked with an engineer to determine the appropriate repair and the engineer certified it. As a quality assurance program manager this was in his area of responsibility. A more senior manager, who did not understand this process, gave him the warning, which Applicant claims was in error. His performance was well rated in his performance evaluation for that year. (Tr. 19-67; Answer; GE 6; AE G)

SOR ¶ 2.d alleges in 2024 Applicant falsified material facts on an interrogatory response by failing to disclose speeding tickets from 2017-2020. He testified that he misread the question and was confused about the terminology used in the question. He was not charged; he received tickets. He did not know these were the same things, and asserted it was not an intentional falsification. (Tr. 19-67; GE 1, 3, 4, 5; Answer)

SOR ¶ 2.e alleges between 1995-2020, Applicant has been charged with at least 36 traffic crimes or infractions, stemming from 28 encounters with law enforcement. In 28 of the cases, he was charged with speeding, reckless driving, or racing on the highway. It also alleged there were unpaid fines and fees that were over 25 years old. Applicant used to drive motorcycles and sports cars fast. As he aged, he drives more slowly and more responsibly. He now drives a pickup truck and has a large slower motorcycle built for older riders. He understands that it is important as a father and a leader to set a good example for his children and employees, in all areas of his life.

Since 2009, the record shows ten minor instances of speeding. In the last ten years, there have only been four instances of speeding, the last one being in 2020. He has paid all outstanding fines he was able to find and provided receipts. Of these unpaid fines, three were from 1996, one from 1997, and two from 2000. He asserted he did not know these unpaid fines existed. He stated his driver's license was not suspended, which he would have expected if there were outstanding fines. (Tr. 19-96; Answer; GE 2-5; AE D)

Applicant stated he does not use any illegal drugs and has had no involvement with drugs whatsoever since his arrest in 2003. During his incarceration, he attended several substance abuse prevention courses, including Alcoholics Anonymous and

Narcotics Anonymous. He submitted a clean drug test in the record. He also provided a statement of intent to not use or be involved with illegal drugs ever again. His employer has a no drug use policy, but he is subject to random testing by the FAA. (Tr. 19-94; Answer; AE C, H)

In prison, Applicant worked several jobs and received career training. During his three years of supervised probation, he had to submit weekly reports, financial reports, and was subject to random drug screening. His career training in prison allowed him to get employment right after his release. He has disclosed all of his history to his employers. (Tr. 19-94; Answer)

Applicant submitted eight character letters in the record which state he is reliable and trustworthy, and an excellent and skilled employee and leader. His performance evaluations also reflect these traits. He stated he is passionate about his work. He reported he recently received warnings about his choice of language with inept employees, who did not work for him. He understands that as a leader, his job is to maintain his patience, even in trying times, and set an example. (Tr. 19-96; AE F, G)

He is active in the community and serves as a football and soccer coach at his church. He stated that he is respected at his job as a quality assurance program manager. He strives to continue to advance in his career to be a senior manager. He understands that his life went the wrong way in his early 20's by being greedy, lacking direction, and associating with the wrong people. He now has direction, loves life, and has changed his ways. (Tr. 19-94; Answer)

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 J, Criminal Conduct

AG ¶ 30 expresses the security concern for criminal conduct:

Criminal activity creates doubt about a person'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.

I have considered the disqualifying conditions under AG ¶ 31 and the following are applicable in this case:

(a) a pattern of minor offenses, any one of which on its own would be unlikely to affect a national security eligibility decision, but which in combination cast doubt on the individual's judgment, reliability, or trustworthiness; and

(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.

I have considered the mitigating conditions 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; 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.

AG ¶¶ 32(a) and (d) apply. In his early 20's, Applicant was involved in irresponsible and questionable behavior, associated with problematic people involved in criminal behavior, and made poor choices including committing criminal conduct. In some cases, he was arrested, and the charges were dropped, or the adjudication of punishment was diverted. His sentence to 108 months in prison, including 36-month supervised release was reduced to 63 months, and he successfully completed probation after serving as a government witness. During his incarceration, he reformed himself and changed his life. Applicant's last criminal behavior was 23 years ago. He obtained gainful employment right after being released on probation, and has provided for his family since. He was a hardworking and skilled employee, in an area that ensures the safe flight and function of airplanes. His knowledge and skill got him promoted to a manager position, and he now mentors and supervises young employees.

Applicant learned his lessons the hard way, but changed the direction of his life. He provided sufficient evidence of rehabilitation and the passage of time without recurrence of criminal activity. He sufficiently complied with the terms of his three-year probation. He has an excellent employment record. He is a loving father and family man and is involved in the community. He provided sufficient evidence to find that enough time has passed, the behavior is unlikely to recur, and these incidents no longer cast doubt on his reliability, trustworthiness, and judgment. The criminal conduct security concerns are mitigated.

Guideline E, Personal Conduct

AG ¶ 15 details the personal conduct security concern:

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 investigative or adjudicative processes. . .

I have considered the disqualifying conditions under AG ¶ 16 and the following are potentially applicable:

(a) deliberate omission, concealment, or falsification of relevant facts from any personnel security questionnaire, personal history statement, or similar form used to conduct investigations, determine employment qualifications, award benefits or status, determine national security eligibility or trustworthiness, or award fiduciary responsibilities;

(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; and

(c) credible adverse information in several adjudicative issue areas that is not sufficient for an adverse determination under any other single guideline, but which, when considered as a whole, supports a whole-person assessment of questionable judgment, untrustworthiness, unreliability, lack of candor, unwillingness to comply with rules and regulations, or other characteristics indicating that the individual may not properly safeguard classified or sensitive information.

I have considered the mitigating conditions under AG ¶ 17. The following are potentially applicable:

(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; and

(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.

Applicant successfully refuted the falsification allegation in SOR ¶ 2.d. He showed candor in his participation in the SCA, the interview process, and in his

testimony at the hearing. He simply misunderstood and misinterpreted wording in a question of an interrogatory. He did not intentionally falsify his response.

AG ¶¶ 17(c) and 17(d) apply to SOR ¶¶ 2.a and 2.b. The incidents cited are minor issues. They involve technical and procedural matters involving work on airplanes, in situations where there are not always brightline answers. There was no danger to personnel or airplanes, and the incidents reflect the seriousness with which Applicant and his colleagues conduct themselves. These two incidents are mitigated and do not present security concerns.

AG ¶¶ 17(c) and 17(d) apply to SOR ¶ 2.e. When Applicant was younger, he drove sports cars and motorcycles and was involved in repeated instances of unreasonable speeding and reckless driving. This was an element of the misguided lifestyle he was living at the time. Since 2009, the record shows ten minor instances of speeding. In the last ten years, there have only been four instances of speeding, the last one being in 2020. He has paid all outstanding violations he was able to find and provided receipts. The recent offenses are minor, enough time has passed, the behavior is now infrequent and happened under circumstances unlikely to recur. This no longer casts doubt on his reliability, trustworthiness, and judgment. He has acknowledged the behavior and has taken appropriate steps to no longer be involved in reckless or unlawful driving. The personal conduct security concerns are mitigated.

Guideline H, Drug Involvement and Substance Misuse

AG ¶ 24 expresses the security concern regarding drug involvement:

The illegal use of controlled substances, to include the misuse of prescription drugs, and the use of other substances that can cause physical or mental impairment or are used in a manner inconsistent with their intended use 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.

I have considered the disqualifying conditions for drug involvement under AG ¶ 25 and the following are potentially applicable:

(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.

I have considered the mitigating conditions under AG ¶ 26. The following are potentially 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 is grounds for revocation of national security eligibility.

AG ¶¶ 26(a) and 26(b) apply. Applicant stated he does not use any illegal drugs and has had no involvement with drugs whatsoever since his arrest in 2003. During his incarceration, he attended several substance abuse prevention courses, including Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous. He submitted a clean drug test in the record. He also provided a statement of intent to not use or be involved with illegal drugs ever again. His employer has a no drug use policy, and he is subject to random testing by the FAA.

The Guideline J allegations cross alleged here involved drug possession and distribution, and not use of illegal drugs. There is no evidence in the record of use of illegal drugs or involvement with illegal drugs in the last 23 years. These incidents occurred long ago under circumstances unlikely to recur, and it do not cast doubt on his current reliability, trustworthiness, and judgment. There is sufficient evidence to find he took action to overcome the problem and establish a pattern of abstinence. He moved, no longer associates with drug using or distributing people, and lives a completely different lifestyle. He signed a statement of intent to abstain from all drug involvement. The drug involvement and substance misuse security concerns 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 considered the potentially disqualifying and mitigating conditions in light of all the facts and circumstances surrounding this case. I considered his military service, employment record, character letters, and service to the government working for a defense contractor. I have incorporated my comments under Guidelines J, E and H in my whole-person analysis.

At hearing, I had the chance to observe Applicant's demeanor and assess his credibility. I found his testimony and explanations to be credible and supported by the record as a whole. Overall, the record evidence leaves me without questions or doubts about Applicant's eligibility for a security clearance. I conclude that Applicant has mitigated the criminal conduct, personal conduct, and drug involvement and substance misuse security concerns

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 J:	FOR APPLICANT
Subparagraphs 1.a-1.k:	For Applicant
Paragraph 2, Guideline E:	FOR APPLICANT
Subparagraphs 2.a-2.e:	For Applicant
Paragraph 3, Guideline H:	FOR APPLICANT
Subparagraph 3.a:	For Applicant

Conclusion

It is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant Applicant a security clearance. Eligibility for access to classified information is granted.

Ross D. Hyams
Administrative Judge