



**DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY  
DEFENSE OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS**



In the matter of: )  
)  
) ISCR Case No. 25-00211  
)  
Applicant for Security Clearance )

**Appearances**

For Government: Brittany C. M. White, Esq., Department Counsel  
For Applicant: *Pro se*

05/29/2026

---

**Decision**

---

Dorsey, Benjamin R., Administrative Judge:

Applicant did not mitigate the financial considerations or the personal conduct security concerns. Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

**Statement of the Case**

On July 30, 2025, the Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency (DCSA) issued a Statement of Reasons (SOR) to Applicant detailing security concerns under Guideline F (financial considerations) and Guideline E (personal conduct). Applicant responded to the SOR on September 12, 2025 (Answer), and requested a decision based on the written record.

The Government submitted its written file of relevant material (FORM) on December 30, 2025. A complete copy of the FORM was provided to Applicant, along with information advising him that he had 30 days from his date of receipt to make objections to evidence, and submit material to refute, extenuate, or mitigate the security concerns. Applicant received the FORM on March 20, 2026, and did not provide a response. The case was assigned to me on May 19, 2026. The Government exhibits included in the FORM, marked as Items 1 through 4, are admitted in evidence, without objection.

## Findings of Fact

Applicant is a 64-year-old employee of a government contractor for which he has been employed since about 2009. He earned an associate degree in 1994. He was married from 1990 until a divorce in 1994. He married again in 1995 but has been separated from his wife since 2010. He has three adult children and two adult stepchildren. (Items 3, 4)

Under Guideline F, the Government alleged Applicant owes delinquent federal taxes in the following amounts: \$10,265 for tax year (TY) 2016 (SOR ¶ 1.a); \$21,760 for TY 2022 (SOR ¶ 1.b); and \$90 for TY 2024 (SOR ¶ 1.c). The Government also alleged that he did not file his federal income tax (FIT) returns for TYs 2016, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023, as required (SOR ¶ 1.d). (Item 1)

Under Guideline E, the Government alleged that Applicant falsified material facts on a security clearance application he certified in October 2021 (SCA) by failing to disclose six foreign contacts (SOR ¶ 2.a) and by failing to disclose criminal charges for driving under the influence of alcohol (DUI) in 2011 and 2014 (SOR ¶ 2.b). The Government also alleged that Applicant falsified material facts to a DCSA investigator during a November 2021 security interview (SI), when he failed to reveal the 2011 DUI charge despite being asked twice if he had any DUI charges other than the 2014 charge. Finally, the Government alleged that he failed to complete the alcohol course or pay the fines that were imposed upon him as a result of the 2014 DUI, resulting in his being unable to drive in the jurisdiction in which he had been arrested until about 2022. (Item 1)

In the Answer, Applicant denied the SOR allegations with the exception of SOR ¶ 1.b, which he admitted while claiming that he would begin paying this federal tax debt (for TY 2022) once he completed paying his delinquent federal taxes for TY 2016. His admission is incorporated into my findings of fact. He claimed that he had been paying the delinquent federal tax debt in SOR ¶ 1.a and had reduced the balance to \$4,876. He also claimed that he paid the federal tax debt in SOR ¶ 1.c, but that this payment was not reflected in his Internal Revenue Service (IRS) documents because he made the payment shortly before obtaining those documents. His response to the allegation in SOR ¶ 1.d is difficult to interpret, but he seems to claim that he remedied any late FIT return filings in 2020 and 2024. He claimed that his failure to provide the information regarding his foreign contacts resulted from his being rushed to fill out the SCA, not understanding the scope of the question, and not having required information, such as addresses. With respect to his failure to divulge his two DUIs, he claimed that the cases were expunged, and he did not know how to answer the question. He also claimed that he eventually told the investigator about the DUIs after being “asked again even though I was unsure.” Finally, he claimed that he completed the driving course without providing a completion date and he claimed he paid the fines in 2014. He further claimed that his driver’s license was never revoked and that he has a valid driver’s license. He did not provide any documents concerning his compliance with the requirements of the 2014 DUI (or any other documents) with his Answer. (Item 2)

In the SCA, Applicant certified that he had no foreign contacts and that he had never been charged with an offense related to alcohol. He disclosed his failure to file FIT returns for TYs 2018, 2019, and 2020 because he was “deciding to file separate or jointly” with his estranged spouse. He estimated that he owed \$3,000 in delinquent taxes for each of the 2018 and 2019 TYs and \$4,000 for the 2020 TY. He claimed that he had increased his withholdings and was planning to pay all these delinquent taxes in four months. He claimed he had an agreement with the IRS with respect to his 2020 TY federal tax delinquency. (Item 3)

In May 2025, Applicant answered interrogatories from the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA). He authenticated summaries of his security interviews with a DCSA investigator between November 2021 and May 2022 (SI), except for certain modifications. These modifications consisted of the following: a clarification concerning his foreign passport from Country J that is unrelated to the SOR; an addition to his reason for not complying with his FIT return filing obligations that communications between him and his estranged spouse were “low;” a clarification regarding his employment that it has been continuous since 2009 despite changes in the name of the government contractor; and a clarification that his driver’s license in State G was not suspended as a result of his 2014 DUI conviction, so he thought “he was only affected when it came to driving in [District C].” (Item 4)

During the SI, Applicant discussed his FIT return filing deficiencies. He confirmed the information regarding his FIT returns that he included in the SCA. He stated that he had not paid his taxes in three years because of conflicts with his estranged spouse related to her recordkeeping. He claimed he hired an accountant to help him with his FIT returns for tax year 2021, so “this will not happen again.” He claimed that he told the IRS he would take out a loan for about \$25,000 to pay his delinquent taxes. He also claimed that he began a payment arrangement with the IRS in 2021. (Item 4)

The DCSA investigator asked Applicant multiple questions regarding his alcohol consumption and whether alcohol caused problems in his life that eventually prompted Applicant to disclose that he was arrested and charged with DUI in 2014 in District C. He acknowledged that he did not complete the required “courses” or pay the fines after he determined that his failure to do so would merely prevent him from driving in District C. He decided that instead of finishing the courses or paying the fines, he would not drive in District C. He told the investigator that when he tried to get a driver’s license in State F, he recently realized that he had to pay the fines and take the courses. He did not tell the investigator that he had completed these requirements during the SI. After the investigator asked him twice whether he had any other DUIs, to which he answered “no” on both occasions, the investigator confronted him with a 2011 arrest and DUI charges. Only after he was confronted, did he disclose that he had been arrested for DUI in 2011 in Commonwealth V. He claimed he completed the sentencing requirements resulting from this charge. He claimed that he did not list the two DUIs because he believed that he did not have to disclose them on the SCA if they occurred earlier than within the previous seven years. He believed both DUI charges had been expunged so that he did not need to disclose them. (Item 4)

In the SI, Applicant acknowledged that he had foreign contacts in Country U only after the investigator confronted him with inconsistent information relevant to foreign contacts that he provided in another section of the SCA. The investigator noted that he explicitly claimed he had no foreign contacts, yet elsewhere in the SCA, he provided information that he recently visited family and friends in Country U. When the investigator asked him why he did not disclose these foreign contacts in the SCA, he claimed that he was in a time crunch to complete his questionnaire and knew that he would have to provide them at some point. He claimed that he would be providing all of his foreign contacts at a later date “since there are so many.” Before the interview process was completed, he provided information regarding six foreign contacts of his who are citizens of Country U and Country J. (Item 4)

In the interrogatory responses, Applicant claimed that he had filed his FIT returns for tax years 2016 through 2025. He claimed that he filed his 2016 and 2017 FIT returns in 2018, his 2018 through 2021 FIT returns in 2022, and his 2022 through 2025 FIT returns in 2025. He claimed that he owed about \$10,246 in delinquent federal taxes for TY 2016 and \$21,581 for TY 2022. He wrote that he did not have a payment plan in place for either of those TYs, but he was “in the process of enrolling.” (Item 4)

Applicant provided IRS transcripts with his interrogatory responses that reflect the following: he filed his 2016 FIT return in February 2018 and owed \$10,265 in delinquent taxes; he filed his 2017 FIT return in May 2018; he filed his 2018 FIT return in April 2023; he filed his 2019 FIT return in August 2022; he filed his 2020 FIT return in August 2022; he filed his 2021 FIT return in August 2022; he filed his 2022 FIT return in December 2024 and owed \$21,760 in delinquent taxes; he filed his 2023 FIT return in December 2024; and he filed his 2024 FIT return in May 2025 and owed \$90 in delinquent taxes. Unless I have indicated otherwise, the IRS account transcripts do not reflect a balance owed. Since TY 2019, he has filed his FIT returns as married, filing separately. He did not claim that the IRS granted him extensions for any of these TYs, and he provided no documentation to this effect. (Item 4)

Applicant did not provide documentation showing: (1) proof of federal tax payments, such as checking account statements, photocopies of checks, or a letter from the IRS proving that he paid or made any payments on his tax delinquencies; (2) correspondence to the IRS of credible tax debt disputes indicating he did not believe he was responsible for the tax debts and why he held such a belief; or (3) evidence of attempts to negotiate payment plans, such as settlement offers or agreements to show that he was attempting to resolve his delinquent federal tax debts.

### **Policies**

This case is adjudicated under Executive Order (EO) 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information within Industry* (February 20, 1960), as amended; Department of Defense (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 within DOD 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 F, Financial Considerations**

The security concern 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.

The guideline notes several conditions that could raise security concerns under AG ¶ 19. The following are potentially applicable in this case:

- (a) inability to satisfy debts;
- (c) a history of not meeting financial obligations; and
- (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 owes delinquent federal taxes for TYs 2016, 2022, and 2024 in the approximate amount of \$32,000. He did not meet his FIT return filing requirements for several tax years. The above disqualifying conditions are established.

Conditions that could mitigate the financial considerations security concerns are provided under AG ¶ 20. The following are potentially applicable:

- (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; 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.

I note that the Appeal Board has held that failure to comply with tax laws suggests that an applicant has a problem with abiding by well-established government rules and systems. Voluntary compliance with rules and systems is essential for protecting classified information. See, e.g., ISCR Case No. 16-01726 at 5 (App. Bd. Feb. 28, 2018). A person who fails repeatedly to fulfill his or her legal obligations, such as filing tax returns and paying taxes when due, does not demonstrate the high degree of good judgment and reliability required of those granted access to classified information. See, e.g., ISCR Case No. 17-01382 at 4 (App. Bd. May 16, 2018).

Against that backdrop, I will first analyze the mitigating factors potential applicability to Applicant's delinquent federal taxes (SOR ¶¶ 1.a, 1.b, and 1.c) and then analyze mitigation concerning his failure to file his FIT returns, as required (SOR ¶ 1.d). It is reasonable to expect Applicant to present documentation about the resolution of specific debts. See, e.g., ISCR Case No. 15-03363 at 2 (App. Bd. Oct. 16, 2016). While Applicant claimed that he reduced his federal tax delinquency for TY 2016 and claimed that he paid the tax delinquency for TY 2024, he provided no documents to corroborate those assertions. He did not claim to have made a payment arrangement or made payments on his delinquent taxes for TY 2022. Applicant's federal tax delinquencies are recent and ongoing. Therefore, I do not find they are unlikely to recur. Given the insufficiency of his corroborating evidence, he failed to establish that he acted responsibly under the circumstances, failed to establish that he made good-faith efforts to repay or otherwise resolve his federal tax debts, and failed to establish that he has made arrangements with the IRS to pay the amount owed. AG ¶¶ 20(a), 20(b), 20(d), and 20(g) do not apply to the delinquent federal taxes alleged in SOR ¶¶ 1.a, 1.b, and 1.c.

While Applicant has remedied his FIT return filing requirements and timely filed his TY 2024 FIT return, he has an extended history of failing to comply with those filing requirements. He has timely filed his FIT return only twice since 2016. He claimed he hired an accountant in 2021 to assist him with his FIT return filings; however, he continued to file his FIT return late for TYs 2021, 2022, and 2023. Given these circumstances, I do not find that his delinquent FIT return filings are unlikely to recur. AG ¶ 20(a) does not apply to SOR ¶ 1.d.

Applicant provided evidence to prove that his untimely FIT return filings arose from conditions largely beyond his control. He claimed that his estrangement from his spouse contributed to his issues with meeting his FIT return filing requirements. However, he must also show that he acted responsibly under the circumstances. He has not done so. While he subsequently filed all of the FIT returns referenced in the SOR and for TY 2024, it took him years to do so, and even when he did file some of his late FIT returns, he then failed to timely file them in subsequent years. For example, after catching up on his FIT return filings from 2018 through 2021 in 2022, he then did not timely file his FIT returns for TYs 2022 and 2023. AG ¶ 20(b) does not apply to SOR ¶ 1.d.

AG ¶ 20(d) references good-faith efforts to repay or otherwise resolve debts, so it is inapplicable to FIT return filings. AG ¶ 20(g) has some applicability to SOR ¶ 1.d because Applicant provided sufficient evidence through documents to show that he has

now filed his FIT returns with the IRS. However, the applicability of this mitigating factor is insufficient to overcome the inapplicability of the other mitigating factors, and the overriding reliability concerns appurtenant to his prolonged and consistent failure to meet FIT return filing requirements.

### **Guideline E, Personal Conduct**

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

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.

The guideline notes several conditions that could raise security concerns under AG ¶ 16. The following are potentially applicable in this case:

(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 security clearance 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 government official; and

(d) credible adverse information that is not explicitly covered under any other guideline and may not be sufficient by itself for an adverse determination, but which, when combined with all available information, 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. This includes, but is not limited to, consideration of:

(1) untrustworthy or unreliable behavior to include breach of client confidentiality, release of proprietary information, unauthorized release of sensitive corporate or government protected information;

(2) any disruptive, violent, or other inappropriate behavior;

(3) a pattern of dishonesty or rule violations; and

(4) evidence of significant misuse of Government or other employer's time or resources.

Applicant omitted material information from the SCA when he failed to list his foreign contacts. Regardless of his motivation, he acknowledged that he deliberately omitted this information because he was in a rush to complete the SCA and because he believed he would provide the information later. In other words, he knew he was required to provide the information, but he deliberately made the decision not to. He omitted material information when he failed to list his 2011 and 2014 DUIs on the SCA. Given his willingness to deliberately omit other information from his SCA, and the motivation he had to exclude derogatory information, I find that this omission was deliberate as well. AG ¶ 16(a) is established with respect to SOR ¶¶ 2.a and 2.b.

During the SI, a DCSA investigator asked Applicant twice if he had any other DUIs (in addition to the 2014 DUI). He denied having any other DUIs twice before the investigator confronted him with his 2011 DUI. He then went into some detail about this DUI and the resultant punishment, so he had not forgotten about it. Given the circumstances, including other evidence of his deliberate omissions during the clearance process, I find that he was deliberately untruthful with the DCSA investigator during the SI when he failed to divulge his 2011 DUI. AG ¶ 16(b) is established with respect to SOR ¶ 2.c.

Applicant did not pay fines or complete a course that was required of him as a result of his 2014 DUI. He consciously made this decision after weighing whether complying or not driving in District C was more convenient for him. He has not provided documentation corroborating that he has paid the fines or completed the course. While this failure to comply with the punishment from a DUI charge is arguably criminal in nature and is explicitly covered by Guideline J, it may not be sufficient for an adverse determination under that Guideline. Moreover, his conscious decision to avoid compliance for the sake of convenience that may still be continuing constitutes a pattern of dishonesty or rule violations. AG ¶ 16(d) is established with respect to SOR ¶ 2.d.

AG ¶ 17 provides conditions that could mitigate personal conduct security concerns. The following mitigating conditions potentially apply in Applicant's case:

(a) the individual made prompt, good-faith efforts to correct the omission, concealment, or falsification before being confronted with the facts;

(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; and

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

First, I will address potential mitigation of Applicant's deliberate falsifications on the SCA and to the DCSA investigator during the SI. There is affirmative evidence that he did not divulge his foreign contacts or the 2011 DUI until he was confronted, and there is insufficient evidence that he volunteered the 2014 DUI. Regarding the 2014 DUI, in 2021, the investigator asked him several leading questions regarding his alcohol consumption before he divulged the 2014 DUI. This effort was not prompt as it occurred about seven years after the underlying events. It also falls short of meeting the good-faith requirement because of the leading nature in which the investigator elicited the information. AG ¶ 17(a) does not apply to Applicant's deliberate falsifications.

An applicant's deliberate falsification of information provided in the SCA and during the SI is not minor, as deliberately omitting or falsifying required information during the security clearance process strikes at the heart of the process, which relies on candid and honest reporting. AG ¶ 17(c) does not apply.

Applicant has not acknowledged his dishonest behavior. He continued to attempt to excuse his deliberate falsifications as innocent oversight or a misunderstanding of the questions presented in the SCA and during the SI. He did not provide evidence of counseling or other positive steps he took to alleviate the factors that contributed to his untrustworthy behavior. AG ¶ 17(d) does not apply.

Applicant divulged his foreign contacts sometime in 2021 or 2022, so AG ¶ 17(e) has some applicability as to the existence of his foreign contacts. However, that mitigating condition is not applicable to his underlying falsification concerning these contacts. Even if it were applicable, the application of this mitigating condition does not outweigh the significant security issues presented by his deliberate falsifications and the lack of applicability of the other mitigating conditions.

None of the mitigating conditions are applicable to Applicant's failure to pay fines and complete a course related to his 2014 DUI. His decision to forgo these requirements was intentional and calculated. He has not presented sufficient evidence to show that this behavior is unlikely to recur because he has not presented documents to corroborate that he has since paid these fines or taken the course. This failure to provide significant evidence that he has complied with these legal requirements also precludes him from proving that he has taken positive steps to reduce or eliminate vulnerability to exploitation, manipulation, or duress that he may be subjected to as a result of his failure to comply with these legal requirements.

## 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 have incorporated my comments under Guideline F and Guideline E in my whole-person analysis. Applicant has unmitigated federal income tax issues. He has consistently failed to be forthcoming during the security clearance process, and he has shown a prolonged and intentional willingness to avoid complying with legal requirements when it is inconvenient for him. I conclude Applicant did not mitigate the financial considerations or the personal conduct 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 F:	AGAINST APPLICANT
Subparagraphs 1.a-1.d:	Against Applicant
Paragraph 2, Guideline E:	AGAINST APPLICANT
Subparagraphs 2.a-2.d:	Against Applicant

## **Conclusion**

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

---

Benjamin R. Dorsey  
Administrative Judge