



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



In the matter of:

Applicant for Security Clearance

)
)
)
)
)

ISCR Case No. 25-01339

Appearances

For Government: Lauren A. Shure, Esq., Department Counsel

For Applicant: *Pro se*

06/29/2026

Decision

DRISKILL, A. M., Administrative Judge:

Applicant did not mitigate the security concerns under Guidelines G (Alcohol Consumption), E (Personal Conduct) and J (Criminal Conduct). Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

Statement of the Case

On December 11, 2025, the Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency (DCSA) issued a Statement of Reasons (SOR) to Applicant detailing security concerns under Guidelines G, E, and J. Applicant responded to the SOR on December 18, 2025 (Answer) and requested a decision on the written record in lieu of a hearing. The Government's written case was submitted on March 10, 2026. A complete copy of the file of relevant material (FORM) was provided to Applicant, who was afforded an opportunity to file objections and submit material to refute, extenuate, or mitigate the security concerns. Applicant received the FORM on March 19, 2026, and she did not respond. The case was assigned to me on June 2, 2026. The Government exhibits included in the FORM (Items 3-10) are admitted in evidence without objection.

Findings of Fact

Applicant is 44 years old. She married in 2003 and has two adult children and one minor child. She graduated high school in 2001, attended some college, and earned a medical assistant certificate in 2006 and a cosmetologist license in 2013. She has worked for a defense contractor since October 2021. This is her first security clearance application. (Items 2, 3)

The SOR alleges: Applicant underwent an evaluation in 2025 in which she was diagnosed with alcohol use disorder, severe with a poor prognosis, and the evaluator opined that her condition impacts her judgment, reliability, and trustworthiness (SOR ¶ 1.a); she continues to consume alcohol despite her diagnosis (SOR ¶ 1.b); she received alcohol detox treatment in the end of March 2020 to April 2020 (SOR ¶ 1.c), mid-March 2020 (SOR ¶ 1.d), February 2020 (SOR ¶ 1.e), and March 2019 (SOR ¶ 1.f); she received court-ordered alcohol counseling in June to September 2019 (SOR ¶ 1.g); she was arrested in 2018 on three felony counts of assault and battery with a deadly weapon for conduct involving alcohol (SOR ¶¶ 1.h, 3.a); she falsified material facts on her 2021 security clearance application (SCA) for failing to report she was fired from Company A (SOR ¶ 2.a) and Company B (SOR ¶ 2.b); she was fired from Company A in 2021 for misconduct (SOR ¶ 2.c); and she was fired from Company B in 2020 for workplace violence and misconduct (SOR ¶ 2.d).

Applicant completed an SCA in August 2021. Under Section 13A – Employment Activities, she listed a position with Company A, where she worked from March to April 2021, and a position with Company B, where she worked from June 2019 to April 2020. When asked why she left Company A, she wrote, “company no longer need [sic] my service.” When asked why she left Company B, she wrote, “laid off.” Each entry asked whether she had been fired, quit after being told she would be fired, or left by mutual agreement following charges or allegations of misconduct or notice of unsatisfactory performance, and she answered “No” for both positions. (Item 3)

Applicant had a background subject interview (SI) with a government investigator in October 2021. When asked why she left Company A, she stated that she voluntarily quit because she was exhausted working concurrently there and for another employer. She was asked to clarify the reason she left Company A. She explained that she called out sick three or four times before she left the company, but she was not in fact sick; she was just too tired to work. The company asked her to provide a doctor’s note, but she never did. She admitted that she deliberately lied to Company A about being sick and about intending to obtain a doctor’s note. Because she called out sick so frequently in a short period of time without providing a doctor’s note, she was informed that she was fired. When asked why she did not report this as a firing, she stated that she was intending on quitting, and it was her decision not to go to work. She also stated the wording from Company A was that they no longer required her service due to calling out sick. She agreed she should have reported this information as a firing. (Item 10)

Applicant explained that she was “discharged” from Company B after she made a social media post saying that she had COVID. She did not actually have COVID, but she thought it was funny to say that she did. One of her co-workers saw the post and informed her supervisor. The supervisor told Applicant that he was discharging her for violating a company policy for deliberately making employees uncomfortable or scared. She told the investigator that she did not know she was violating company policy when she made the post. She reported that she was “laid off” from this position because she thought that was the closest option to her being “discharged.” After some discussion on whether there is a difference between being “fired” and being “discharged,” she agreed that they are essentially the same and that she should have listed the reason for leaving as being fired. (Item 10)

During the August 2021 SI, when asked whether she was arrested in the past seven years, Applicant volunteered that she was arrested in February 2018 for assault. She and her husband were fighting, and she had consumed alcohol prior to the argument, which she admitted helped increase the degree of her anger. Her husband called the children in to witness the fight, but she did not want the children there. They would not leave, so Applicant grabbed a broom and tried to chase them away. Her husband kept pleading with the children to stay, and “without thinking about the consequences,” Applicant grabbed a butcher’s knife and held it toward her husband. She did not attempt to stab or slice him. The police arrived and Applicant was arrested for assault and a child-welfare charge. (Items 4, 10)

At her court hearing, the judge informed Applicant that, although her husband and children did not want to press charges, the State was required to pursue charges since it involved the possible assault or threatening of children with a dangerous weapon. Applicant was required to attend a motherhood class, an alcohol screening, and an alcohol counseling program. She was late to two sessions of the motherhood program, which required her to re-enroll and was considered a violation of her probation. She said she completed the program in the summer of 2019. (Item 10)

As part of the counseling and probation, Applicant was not permitted to consume alcohol. Her probation officer would administer random urinalyses for alcohol. After four months of sobriety, she decided to start drinking again despite knowing it was a probation violation. She told the investigator that she was tempted to drink when she attended social functions with her friends. She ended up failing a urinalysis and was ordered to carry a mobile breathalyzer with her at all times. She did not consume alcohol again while on probation, she successfully completed the three-month treatment program, and eventually all charges against her were dismissed. She thought she listed the arrest on the SCA since she listed the associated counseling (see below). (Items 4, 10)

Applicant told the investigator that she began drinking alcohol at age 22, consuming four to five alcoholic drinks once or twice per week. After the birth of her first child in 2004, she increased her alcohol intake to six to seven shots of “dark liquor” once or twice times per week. After the birth of her second child in 2006, she increased her

alcohol consumption to between a half and a full 750 milliliter bottle in each sitting, three times per week. She consumed this amount of alcohol until her arrest in February 2018. She abstained from alcohol for six months after she completed probation, but she could not remain sober due to being tempted to drink at social events. (Items 3, 10)

As of the date of the SI, Applicant was consuming three shots of vodka once or twice per month. She told the investigator that she would like to quit drinking alcohol, but she felt that she could not stop. During her 2018 court-ordered alcohol evaluation, she was informed that she had liver disease and liver damage due to her alcohol consumption. This results in her feeling sick to her stomach and becoming weak when she drinks. Even though she has these symptoms, “she continues to drink because she can’t stop.” She told the investigator that she planned on consuming alcohol in the future at her present rate. She stated that her professional life was never impacted by her alcohol use. (Item 10)

Applicant was admitted for detox treatment for seven days in March 2019, where she was diagnosed with alcohol use disorder, moderate/severe. The medical records indicate she had consumed a pint of hard liquor daily for the prior eight months, with her last use being the day before admission. Her medical history included cirrhosis and a history of withdrawal symptoms. She reported that when she comes off alcohol, she will have “really bad” seizures and not remember having the seizure. She was put on an Ativan protocol. In her biopsychosocial assessment, she reported that “she really needs help and is concerned about her family.” She successfully completed treatment. (Item 8)

Under Section 24 – Use of Alcohol in the SCA, Applicant reported court-ordered counseling or treatment as a result of her use of alcohol. This is the counseling associated with her February 2018 arrest. She listed treatment from June to September 2019 and affirmed that she successfully completed the treatment. Her medical records from the provider indicate a profile was created for her in April 2018 and the last service date was December 2019. This counseling consisted of weekly outpatient one-on-one counseling sessions. She was diagnosed with alcohol use disorder, moderate and generalized anxiety disorder. She successfully completed this program. (Items 3, 5, 10)

Applicant was admitted for detox treatment for three days in February 2020, where she was diagnosed with alcohol use disorder, moderate/severe. Her blood alcohol content (BAC) upon admission was measured at 0.209. She was marked as having a high overdose risk. The medical records indicate she was drinking ten “nips” daily for three months, with her last use on the date of admission. She reported a history of withdrawal seizures. She was put on an Ativan protocol. She is noted as having “poor compliance with and progress in treatment” and dropped out of treatment against medical advice. (Item 9)

Applicant was admitted for detox treatment for seven days in mid-March 2020, where she was diagnosed with alcohol use disorder, moderate/severe. Her BAC upon admission was measured at 0.137, with benzodiazepine “in system from ER visit.” A later

note states she went to the emergency room looking for a detox bed. The medical records indicate she was drinking five to ten “nips” of hard alcohol daily for a week, with her last use on the date of admission. She reported a history of withdrawal seizures and that her last detox was the week prior. She told the staff that she wanted to complete detox, receive a completion letter in order to not lose her job (at Company B), and then return home. She was put on an Ativan protocol. She successfully completed treatment. (Item 8)

Applicant was admitted for detox treatment from the end of March 2020 to April 2020, less than two weeks after her prior detox. She was diagnosed with alcohol use disorder, moderate/severe. Her BAC upon admission was measured at 0.207. The medical records indicate she was drinking 12 “nips” of hard liquor daily for the past two weeks, with her last use on the date of admission. She reported a history of withdrawal seizures, with the last in October 2019. When asked why she chose detox at that time, she stated, “HR suggested it.” She was still working for Company B at that time. She was encouraged to go to aftercare, and the clinician completing the biopsychosocial assessment attempted to give her a list of Alcoholics Anonymous meetings in her area, but Applicant refused. She was put on an Ativan protocol. She successfully completed treatment. (Item 8)

Applicant responded to Government interrogatories in March 2023. She reported that she did not currently drink alcohol and last consumed it in August 2022, when she was drinking one to two bottles of beer a week, three to four cups of mixed drinks a week, and four to five shots of vodka a week. She stopped due to a medical condition and for her health. She reported that she did not intend to consume alcohol in the future. She reported that it takes more than eight shots for her to become intoxicated, her date of last intoxication was August 2022, and the date of her last blackout was April 2019. She denied that alcohol impacted her employment. She also included medical records from her court-ordered treatment. (Item 5)

Applicant responded to Government interrogatories in January 2025. She included a completed “Authorization for Release of Medical Information Pursuant to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act” form signed by a provider in January 2025, who answered “No” to the question, “Does the person under investigation have a condition that could impair his or her judgment, reliability, or trustworthiness?” The provider did not provide the diagnosis, prognosis, or dates of treatment, nor did the provider indicate which treatment facility they were from. (Item 6)

Applicant underwent a psychological evaluation in May 2025. The evaluator reported that Applicant remained sober for almost a year after her last detox treatment but had started drinking again to intoxication. When asked whether she had stopped drinking before, she told the evaluator, “I stopped four times and I know I can stop again if I want to I just don’t want to.” At the time of the evaluation, Applicant was consuming alcohol three to four times per week, five to six drinks on each occasion, and had more than six drinks three times per month. When the evaluator asked whether she is intoxicated after six drinks, she stated, “I don’t think so, it takes a little more to get me

drunk.” She was diagnosed with alcohol use disorder, severe and persistent depressive disorder, mild. Her prognosis was poor and noted she was not engaged or motivated to be in treatment. The evaluator recommended Applicant return to treatment and follow treatment recommendations. He concluded that Applicant’s psychiatric condition negatively impacted her judgment, reliability, and trustworthiness in safeguarding classified information or working in a cleared setting. (Item 7)

Applicant responded to Government interrogatories in December 2025. She confirmed that she has not received any alcohol treatment after her last detox treatment in April 2020 and that she does not currently go to any counseling. She stated that she still drinks alcohol occasionally at special events, during which she will consume three or four shots or a cup of a mixed drink. (Item 10)

In her Answer to the SOR, Applicant denied the conclusions of the May 2025 evaluation and admitted the rest of the allegations. She stated that she takes full responsibility for her past alcohol consumption and her actions. She acknowledged that she lost jobs due to alcohol and that she has not always been fully honest. She stated she has participated in counseling, multiple rehabilitation attempts, and in a support program, though she did not specify when or where. She stated she has reduced her alcohol intake, strengthened her honesty, and improved her financial responsibility. She included a December 2019 certificate of completion for the motherhood program she was court-ordered to attend and her Order of Probation Conditions paperwork, although the handwriting on those documents is illegible. She also included some financial documentation showing resolution of outstanding debts not alleged in the SOR. (Item 2)

Applicant also resubmitted her court-ordered counseling records and the January 2025 form signed by her provider opining that she did not have a condition that could impair her judgment, reliability, or trustworthiness. There is an additional record included in the Answer from February 2019, described as a “MCI/ESP Discharge Plan,” presumably referring to a mobile crisis intervention/emergency services program. The plan states that “given the current concerns,” Applicant was presented with the option to get a referral for detox and she declined. She reported to them that she was already in outpatient counseling and planned to continue weekly outpatient sessions. She was “encouraged to be honest” with her counseling program “about today’s incident,” but they do not state what the incident was. (Item 2)

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) implemented by the DOD on June 8, 2017.

“[N]o one has a ‘right’ to a security clearance.” *Department of the Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518, 528 (1988). As Commander in Chief, the President has the authority to “control access to information bearing on national security and to determine whether an individual is sufficiently trustworthy to have access to such information.” *Id.* at 527. The President has authorized the Secretary of Defense or his designee to grant applicants eligibility for access to classified information “only upon a finding that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to do so.” EO 10865 § 2.

Eligibility for a security clearance is predicated upon the applicant meeting the criteria contained in the adjudicative guidelines. These guidelines are not inflexible rules of law. Instead, recognizing the complexities of human behavior, an administrative judge applies these guidelines in conjunction with an evaluation of the whole person. An administrative judge’s overarching adjudicative goal is a fair, impartial, and commonsense decision. An administrative judge must consider all available and reliable information about the person, past and present, favorable and unfavorable.

The Government reposes a high degree of trust and confidence in persons with access to classified information. This relationship transcends normal duty hours and endures throughout off-duty hours. Decisions include, by necessity, consideration of the possible risk that the applicant may deliberately or inadvertently fail to safeguard classified information. Such decisions entail a certain degree of legally permissible extrapolation about potential, rather than actual, risk of compromise of classified information.

Clearance decisions must be made “in terms of the national interest and shall in no sense be a determination as to the loyalty of the applicant concerned.” EO 10865 § 7. Thus, a decision to deny a security clearance is merely an indication the applicant has not met the strict guidelines the President and the Secretary of Defense have established for issuing a clearance.

Initially, the Government must establish, by substantial evidence, conditions in the personal or professional history of the applicant that may disqualify the applicant from being eligible for access to classified information. The Government has the burden of establishing controverted facts alleged in the SOR. *See Egan* at 531. “Substantial evidence” is “more than a scintilla but less than a preponderance.” *See v. Washington Metro. Area Transit Auth.*, 36 F.3d 375, 380 (4th Cir. 1994). The guidelines presume a nexus or rational connection between proven conduct under any of the criteria listed therein and an applicant’s security suitability. *See* ISCR Case No. 15-01253 at 3 (App. Bd. Apr. 20, 2016).

Once the Government establishes a disqualifying condition by substantial evidence, the burden shifts to the applicant to rebut, explain, extenuate, or mitigate the facts. Directive ¶ E3.1.15. An applicant has the burden of proving a mitigating condition, and the burden of disproving it never shifts to the Government. *See* ISCR Case No. 02-31154 at 5 (App. Bd. Sep. 22, 2005).

An applicant “has the ultimate burden of demonstrating that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue his security clearance.” ISCR Case No. 01-20700 at 3 (App. Bd. Dec. 19, 2002). “[S]ecurity clearance determinations should err, if they must, on the side of denials.” *Egan* at 531.

Analysis

Guideline G, Alcohol Consumption

The concern under this guideline 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 following disqualifying conditions under this guideline are potentially applicable:

AG ¶ 22(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;

AG ¶ 22(c): habitual or binge consumption of alcohol to the point of impaired judgment, regardless of whether the individual is diagnosed with alcohol use disorder;

AG ¶ 22(d): diagnosis by a duly qualified medical or mental health professional (e.g., physician, clinical psychologist, psychiatrist, or licensed clinical social worker) of alcohol use disorder;

AG ¶ 22(e): the failure to follow treatment advice once diagnosed;

AG ¶ 22(f): alcohol consumption, which is not in accordance with treatment recommendations, after a diagnosis of alcohol use disorder; and

AG ¶ 22(g): failure to follow any court order regarding alcohol education, evaluation, treatment, or abstinence.

For years, Applicant has struggled with an alcohol use disorder so severe that she has experienced withdrawal seizures when she stops consuming alcohol. It contributed to her 2018 arrest and caused her to violate her probation when she could not maintain abstinence. She has been through detox programs repeatedly and been diagnosed with

liver disease, but she continues to consume alcohol. AG ¶¶ 22(a) and 22(c)-(f) are applicable.

The following mitigating conditions are potentially applicable:

AG ¶ 23(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; and

AG ¶ 23(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;

AG ¶ 23(c): the individual is participating in counseling or a treatment program, has no previous history of treatment and relapse, and is making satisfactory progress in a treatment program; and

AG ¶ 23(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.

None of the mitigating conditions apply. Applicant has been to treatment multiple times but continues to consume alcohol. Although she mentioned in her Answer that she has engaged in a support program, there is no evidence she has participated in any aftercare alcohol counseling or treatment since 2020. In fact, she specifically stated in December 2025 that she had not received any alcohol treatment after April 2020. She further stated in her Answer that she has significantly reduced her alcohol use, but this is not in accordance with treatment recommendations and, given her grave and problematic history with alcohol, this is not sufficiently mitigating.

Guideline E, Personal Conduct

The concern under this guideline 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 following disqualifying conditions under this guideline are potentially applicable:

AG ¶ 16(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; and

AG ¶ 16(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; and
- (3) a pattern of dishonesty or rule violations.

Applicant deliberately mischaracterized the reasons for leaving Company A and Company B when reporting them on her SCA. By her account in her SI, she was fired from Company A due to attendance issues and from Company B due to a policy violation. AG ¶¶ 16(a) and 16(d) are established.

The following mitigating conditions are relevant:

AG ¶ 17(a): the individual made prompt, good-faith efforts to correct the omission, concealment, or falsification before being confronted with the facts;

AG ¶ 17(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

AG ¶ 17(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.

In her SCA, Applicant deliberately mischaracterized her reasons for leaving her employment at two different companies. She did not try to correct the concealment until the SI investigator asked her about it. Even then, I have serious concerns about Applicant's complete honesty both in the SI and currently. There are several references to her employment with Company B throughout her medical records, and, in her Answer under Guideline E, she vaguely acknowledges losing jobs due to alcohol. In the SI and in her 2023 interrogatory response, however, she denied alcohol affecting her professional life, and she did not mention it in her descriptions of what led to her being fired. I am unconvinced that she has been completely truthful about the impact her alcohol use has had on her employment. Although she has maintained her current employment for several years, the fact that she continues to consume alcohol, particularly in the absence of counseling, leaves me unable to conclude that her behavior is unlikely to recur. None of the mitigating conditions are established.

Guideline J, Criminal Conduct

The concern under this guideline is set out in AG ¶ 30: "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."

The following disqualifying conditions under this guideline are potentially applicable:

AG ¶ 31(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; and

AG ¶ 31(d): violation or revocation of parole or probation, or failure to complete a court-mandated rehabilitation program.

Applicant was arrested in 2018 on felony charges. She violated probation twice, the most significant violation for continuing to consume alcohol after being ordered to abstain. AG ¶¶ 31(b) and 31(d) are established.

The following mitigating conditions are potentially applicable:

AG ¶ 32(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

AG ¶ 32(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.

Neither of the mitigating conditions fully apply for the reasons stated in the alcohol consumption section, above.

Whole-Person Concept

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. In applying the whole-person concept, an 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. An 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.

I have incorporated my comments under Guidelines G, E, and J in my whole-person analysis and applied the adjudicative factors in AG ¶ 2(d). Because Applicant requested a determination on the record without a hearing, I had no opportunity to evaluate her credibility and sincerity based on demeanor. See ISCR Case No. 01-12350 at 3-4 (App. Bd. Jul. 23, 2003).

"Once a concern arises regarding an applicant's security clearance eligibility, there is a strong presumption against the grant or maintenance of a security clearance." ISCR Case No. 09-01652 at 3 (App. Bd. Aug. 8, 2011), *citing Dorfmont v. Brown*, 913 F.2d 1399, 1401 (9th Cir. 1990), *cert. denied*, 499 U.S. 905 (1991). Applicant has not overcome this presumption. After weighing the disqualifying and mitigating conditions under Guidelines G, E, and J and evaluating all the evidence in the context of the whole person, I conclude Applicant has not mitigated the security concerns raised by her alcohol consumption, personal conduct, and criminal conduct.

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 (Alcohol): AGAINST APPLICANT

 Subparagraphs 1.a-1.h: Against Applicant

Paragraph 2, Guideline E (Personal Conduct): AGAINST APPLICANT

 Subparagraphs 2.a-2.c: Against Applicant

 Subparagraph 2.d: Against Applicant

Paragraph 3, Guideline J (Criminal Conduct): AGAINST APPLICANT

 Subparagraph 3.a: Against Applicant

Conclusion

I conclude that it is not clearly consistent with the interests of national security to grant Applicant eligibility for access to classified information. Clearance is denied.

A. M. Driskill
Administrative Judge