DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY
DEFENSE OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

In the matter of:	)	
	)	
	)	ISCR Case No. 25-00719
	)	
Applicant for Security Clearance	)	

Appearances

For Government: Nicole A. Smith, Esq., Department Counsel
For Applicant: *Pro se*

08/20/2026

Decision

DRISKILL, A. M., Administrative Judge:

Applicant did not mitigate the security concerns under Guideline F (Financial Considerations). Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

Statement of the Case

Applicant submitted a security clearance application (SCA) on February 6, 2024. On March 2, 2026, the Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency (DCSA) sent him a Statement of Reasons (SOR) alleging security concerns under Guideline F. Applicant answered the SOR on April 2, 2026, and requested a hearing before an administrative judge. Department Counsel was ready to proceed on June 9, 2026. The case was assigned to me on June 11, 2026.

On June 17, 2026, the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) notified Applicant that the hearing was scheduled to be conducted on July 27, 2026. I convened the hearing as scheduled. Government Exhibits (GE) 1 through 3 were admitted in evidence without objection. Applicant testified and presented the testimony of two witnesses. He submitted Applicant's Exhibits (AE) A, B, and C, which were admitted without objection. I kept the record open until August 10, 2026, to enable him to submit additional evidence. He timely submitted AE D through K, which were admitted in evidence without objection. The record closed on August 11, 2026. DOHA received the transcript on August 3, 2026.

Findings of Fact

The SOR alleges that Applicant failed to timely file Federal (SOR ¶ 1.a) and State A (SOR ¶ 1.b) income tax returns for tax years (TY) 2020 through 2024; that he is indebted to the Federal Government for each of those TYs, owing a total of $72,796 (SOR ¶¶ 1.c – 1.g); that he is indebted to State A for TY 2020 through 2023, owing a total of $6,262 (SOR ¶¶ 1.h – 1.k); and that he is indebted to a creditor for a lien entered against him in 2023 in the amount of $30,000 (SOR ¶ 1.l). He admitted all the allegations with explanations. His admissions are incorporated into the findings of fact. Additional findings follow.

Applicant is 49 years old. He graduated high school in 1997 and has some college education. He was married from 2001 to 2006 and has two adult children. Since January 2024, he has been self-employed as the owner at his current company and as a consultant for another company. He was previously self-employed at a company he owned with a business partner from April 2019 to January 2024. This is his first security clearance application. (GE 1, 3; Tr. 55-57)

On his February 2024 SCA, Applicant reported failing to file and pay Federal and State A income tax returns for TY 2022, failing to pay Federal and State A taxes for TY 2021 and 2020, and the lien. (GE 1)

Applicant had a background interview (SI) with a government investigator in April 2024. He had not yet filed his TY 2022 or 2023 returns at the time. He explained that he did not set enough money aside in 2020 because he underestimated his business earnings and had resolved to put more aside in 2021, but then a hurricane in 2021 caused severe damage to his home, $40,000 of which was not covered by insurance. That year, he also discovered that an employee had embezzled about $110,000 from his company. Because of these financial setbacks, he could not pay off his delinquent taxes. (GE 3)

Applicant told the investigator that in 2023, he discovered his accountant had not filed his TY 2022 tax returns. As of the date of the interview, he had recently hired a new accounting firm to assist him. He stated that he anticipated making more money with his new company, which would allow him to pay off his tax debt more quickly. He stated he was current on all taxes prior to 2020. (GE 3)

Regarding the lien, Applicant explained to the investigator that, after the hurricane damaged his roof, he hired a contractor to repair the roof and other damage. The contractor was paid from funds Applicant received from his insurance company. At some point, the contractor started coming to his home less frequently and the quality of its work was poor. Applicant told them he no longer needed their services, and they gave him a bill for $32,000 even though the fee they agreed upon was $16,915. Applicant had the funds from the insurance company to cover the agreed-upon fee, but the contractor would not accept it and placed a lien on his home in January 2023. He stated the contractor changed the amount owed to $23,000 and the matter was pending in civil court. (GE 3)

In his October 2024 response to interrogatories, Applicant reported that he had not paid the lien nor his TY 2019-2023 State A and Federal taxes. He stated he was getting his finances resolved by paying off credit cards, reducing his mortgage payment, and paying off a vehicle. He submitted a budget showing both a gross and net salary of $67,619 and monthly expenses, including debts, of about $4,500. He also included a letter from an accountant confirming that they would prepare his TY 2022 Federal and State A income tax returns and another letter from the accountant stating that his Federal and State A income tax returns were filed, presumably for TY 2022, that the Federal TY 2022 amount due was $17,681, and that they had filed his request for an installment agreement. It also provided a schedule of payments to State A for TY 2023 and instructions for submitting a request for an installment agreement with the state. An electronic funds withdrawal form shows a $434 payment made to State A for TY 2022 on June 6, 2024. (GE 2)

Included in the October 2024 interrogatory response was Internal Revenue Service (IRS) tax account transcripts. TY 2022 reflects a received date of June 5, 2024, and a total account balance of about $17,219. TY 2021 reflects a received date of May 4, 2023, and a total account balance of about $5,643. A letter from an accountant dated May 2023 indicates Federal and State A returns were filed but does not specify the year, although it is likely TY 2021. It states $5,288 is owed to the IRS and $767 to State A. (GE 2)

In his August 2025 response to interrogatories, Applicant adopted the summary of his SI and stated that his salesperson was fired in September 2022 for stealing over $100,000, which was another reason he was behind on his taxes and the debt is so large. He stated that he fired his tax preparer for not giving him his personal deductions and making an error with his social security number, but that he had hired a new firm, which was amending his TY 2022 and 2023 returns and completing his TY 2024 returns. He stated that once the amendments and TY 2024 return were filed, he intended to get a home loan to pay off his tax debt. (GE 3)

In his August 2025 interrogatory response (GE 3), Applicant reported that all returns had been filed except for TY 2024, which his new accountant was working on. He stated that his TY 2022 and 2023 tax debt should be lowered by about $8,000 once the amendments are filed. He submitted a budget showing a negative net monthly remainder of $1,152. Tax account transcripts included in the response reflect the following:

- TY 2020: Received December 26, 2024, with account balance of $9,631.
- TY 2021: Received May 4, 2023, with account balance of $6,001.
- TY 2023: Received September 13, 2024, with account balance of $22,390.
- TY 2024: Received October 27, 2025, with account balance of $29,133.

An IRS website screenshot (GE 3) reflects that as of December 1, 2025, the amounts due were:

- TY 2020: $9,573 (SOR ¶ 1.c)
- TY 2021: $6,139 (SOR ¶ 1.d)
- TY 2022: $11,437 (SOR ¶ 1.e)
- TY 2023: $16,593 (SOR ¶ 1.f)
- TY 2024: $29,054 (SOR ¶ 1.g)

State A tax returns reflect $1,097 owed for TY 2020 (SOR ¶ 1.h); $767 for TY 2021 (SOR ¶ 1.i); $2,168 for TY 2022 (SOR ¶ 1.j); and $2,230 for TY 2023 (SOR ¶ 1.k). (GE 3)

In his Answer, Applicant explained that when he started his business in 2019, he trusted his accountant to take care of him. In late 2024, Applicant realized his accountant had not done his taxes correctly, likely costing him significant amounts of money. He hired a new accountant in 2024 and amended the TY 2022 and 2023 returns, saving him $15,000. The TY 2024 return was filed late due to when he hired the new accountant. He stated he set up a payment plan with the IRS in November 2025 and was making monthly payments. He had not yet set up a payment plan with State A but planned on doing so in May 2026. (Answer)

Applicant explained in his Answer that he hired a salesperson in 2022, who also did his books and payroll. Even though the business was making money, they were always in debt. At the end of August 2022, he realized his salesperson was stealing from the company and had incurred company debt. She was fired and he estimates she stole about $200,000. With payroll and other expenses, he had no money to pay his tax debt. He closed his business and, by the end of 2023, had paid off all the company debt except for $51,000, which his business partner paid. After paying off the company debts, he still had no money to pay his tax debts. He believed that the work he was recently awarded would allow him to get completely out of debt. He also stated that he had a pending court date for the lien from his former contractor. (Tr. 57-61; Answer)

At the hearing, Applicant submitted an undated payment of $283.27 to State A's department of revenue (AE A). He also submitted an IRS payment history showing five $100 payments made toward TY 2020 from January to June 2026 (with no April payment) and two payments, $178 in November 2025 and $100 in June 2026, made toward TY 2025 (AE B). Finally, he submitted a notice of judgment dated May 14, 2026, ordering Applicant to pay $16,915.20 with interest, attorneys fees, and costs, to the contractor who repaired his roof (AE C).

At the hearing, Applicant provided further background about his financial issues. He explained that he started his business in 2019 and was making enough to cover his paycheck by 2020. It was his first time owning a business and he was "terrible at admin." (Tr. at 58) He blamed himself for not paying taxes in 2020: "I just didn't know any better, was learning my way around and kind of screwed off and didn't pay my taxes in 2020."

(Tr. at 58) He stated, "as a business owner, I accept responsibility for everything." (Tr. at 59) He blamed himself for using an incompetent accountant, the unpaid taxes, and the salesperson being able to steal from him. He pressed charges against the salesperson, and she was arrested in December 2022. She was later tried and found not guilty. He does not have the money to sue her in civil court. (Tr. 57-59, 68, 83-86)

Applicant testified that when he started the business in 2019, he had to switch accountants because his prior accountant could not handle his business returns. He hired a new accountant for TY 2020, and that accountant would wait to file until the due date or even after the due date every year. He started a new business in 2024 but was struggling and still not paying his taxes. He then met Ms. R, his current bookkeeper and accountant, and she was able to amend two tax years' worth of returns and show him "a pathway to get out of debt." (Tr. 59-62)

Applicant did not remember any discussion or paperwork regarding the installment agreement that was requested by a prior accountant for TY 2022 in GE 2. He started making $100 monthly payments to the IRS in November 2025, and by March 2026, work had picked up and he was able to catch up on his other bills. Once those were caught up, he reached out to State A and set up a payment plan for his state taxes. July 2026 was his first payment (AE A), and the agreement is that payments of $283.27 will be auto-drafted out of his account monthly for 60 months. Once he pays off his state debt or when his income increases, he intends to increase his IRS payments. He anticipates being able to pay all of his 2026 taxes on time. He stated he was going to make his next IRS installment payment on the day of the hearing, and the next State A payment would be August 1. (Tr. 59-62, 70-72, 82-83)

At the hearing, Applicant testified that his current monthly salary is about $6,000 and he has about $1,500 net monthly remainder. All of his bills are current. He has filed his TY 2025 tax returns and owes $6,000 to the IRS and $822 to State A. He plans on paying the $822 outright within the next two weeks. He is putting money aside to pay for his 2026 taxes and currently has about $5,000 saved. He did not know why December and April payments are missing from his IRS payment history in AE B, but he believed he paid each month. He also did not know why some payments were applied to TY 2020 and others were applied to TY 2025. (Tr. 73-83)

Ms. R testified. She explained that she met Applicant at a business networking meeting in the summer of 2025. About a month later, she reviewed one of his personal tax returns and found a number of areas that could be improved. She also reviewed his books, and they needed a lot of help. They started working on the books together so that they could correctly file his returns. She stated that they work on his books on a monthly basis so that they are "nice and clean." (Tr. 31-34)

Ms. R stated that she and her partner specifically looked at Applicant's TY 2022 and 2023 personal returns, where they found several areas where Applicant could have taken deductions but did not. They redid the returns and refiled them. They could only do

TY 2022 and 2023 because you only have three years to amend. Ms. R stated that they also did the TY 2024 business and personal tax returns and that there was an extension past the normal due date due to a natural disaster in their area, which is why it appears to have been filed late on the transcript, but it was technically not late. She set up Applicant with a payment plan with the IRS when they filed his TY 2025 return in May 2026. (Tr. 34-51)

Ms. R also testified to Applicant's character. She stated that although they have not known each other long, they have had countless meetings going over all of his documentation. She stated that he "100 percent wants to make sure that he's doing everything right." (Tr. at 49) She stated that he has done everything she has asked of him, provided all of the necessary documentation, and always been up-front with her. She described him as "a wonderful client." (Tr. at 49) (Tr. 48-49)

Applicant testified regarding the current status of the lien. He explained that, after the contractor obtained a lien against Applicant's home, Applicant consulted an attorney who told him not to act on the lien for a year and, if the contractor did not take action, Applicant could have the lien cancelled. The contractor acted on the lien two days before it could be cancelled. They went to court in April 2026, and the court awarded the contractor a judgment in the amount originally agreed upon, with Applicant to pay attorney fees, interest, and other costs. (AE C) All documentation has been sent to the mortgage company, who will release the funds to the contractor. After the insurance check is cashed, he believes he will owe about $8,000 in the additional costs adjudged. Applicant's home is still in disrepair. (Tr. 88-97)

Ms. M testified in support of Applicant. She has worked with him for eight to ten years and stated, "he's been so reliable that we could have considered him a single point of failure." (Tr. at 21) She stated he has always been trustworthy and has a great reputation. He has never had any problems while he has worked with her organization. She stated that, even though he is a subcontractor to her company, he is "literally like a part of our [company] family." (Tr. at 24) She stated that he holds certifications under her company, which she emphasized demonstrates that he is considered "incredibly trustworthy." (Tr. 20-30)

After the hearing, Applicant submitted several documents. His most recent IRS tax account transcripts, obtained on August 10, 2026, reflect the following:

- TY 2020: Balance of $9,509. "Installment agreement established" on October 31, 2025. In addition to the payments reflected on AE B, this document also shows a $22 payment in November 2025 and a $200 payment in December 2025. On July 13, 2026, the TY was "no longer in installment agreement status." (AE D)

- TY 2021: Balance of $6,445. It was enrolled in the installment agreement on October 31, 2025 and was no longer in an installment agreement status on July 13, 2026. (AE E)

- TY 2022: Balance of $12,069. The amended return was filed on August 20, 2025, and in October 2025 the balance of the prior tax assessed and the penalty for filing the tax return after the due date were both reduced. It was enrolled in the installment agreement on October 31, 2025 and was no longer in an installment agreement status on July 13, 2026. (AE F)

- TY 2023: Balance of $18,287. The amended return was filed on August 26, 2025, and in October 2025 the balance of the prior tax assessed and the penalty for filing the tax return after the due date were both reduced. It was enrolled in the installment agreement on October 31, 2025 and was no longer in an installment agreement status on July 13, 2026. (AE G)

- TY 2024: Balance of $31,640. It was enrolled in the installment agreement on December 13, 2025 and was no longer in an installment agreement status on July 13, 2026. (AE H)

- TY 2025: Balance of $6,332. An extension to file was granted and the return was received on May 5, 2026. One $100 payment was made on June 30, 2026. There is no mention of the installment agreement. A Civil Penalty account transcript reflects a $178 payment of fees and costs in November 2025 and a zero balance. (AE I, J)

Applicant also submitted a copy of the check sent to the contractor from his mortgage company. The check was signed on July 20, 2026, for the court-ordered amount. (AE K)

Policies

This case is adjudicated under Executive Order 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." Exec. Or. 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." Exec. Or. 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*, 484 U.S. 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*, 484 U.S. at 531.

Analysis

Guideline F, Financial Considerations

The concern under this guideline 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 evidence establishes the following disqualifying conditions under this guideline:

AG ¶ 19(a): inability to satisfy debts;

AG ¶ 19(c): a history of not meeting financial obligations; and

AG ¶ 19(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.

The following mitigating conditions are potentially applicable:

AG ¶ 20(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;

AG ¶ 20(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;

AG ¶ 20(d): the individual initiated and is adhering to a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or otherwise resolve debts;

AG ¶ 20(e): the individual has a reasonable basis to dispute the legitimacy of the past-due debt which is the cause of the problem and provides documented proof to substantiate the basis of the dispute or provides evidence of actions to resolve the issue; and

AG ¶ 20(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.

Applicant's tax returns were filed late primarily due to his accountant's failure to submit timely returns, a circumstance largely beyond his control. He acted responsibly by firing the derelict accountant, and he now has a competent accountant who has helped him amend prior returns and timely file the most recent year's return (TY 2025). All of Applicant's tax returns are currently filed. The failure to timely file returns occurred under circumstances that make the behavior unlikely to recur and does not cast doubt on his current reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment. AG ¶¶ 20(a), 20(b), and 20(g) apply to SOR ¶¶ 1.a and 1.b and those allegations are found for Applicant.

Applicant's tax debt arose primarily from not saving enough, having to use money toward hurricane repairs, having business money siphoned off by his former employee, and the costs of closing his business. Apart from failing to save enough, these are circumstances beyond his control. Applicant began trying to act responsibly toward the IRS debt in October 2025 when he set up an installment agreement with the IRS and made a payment the following month. Unfortunately, concerns remain.

Of greatest concern is the transcript information reflecting that the IRS debts are no longer in an installment agreement status, which occurred two weeks before the hearing. Applicant did not mention this in his testimony, and it is unclear if he was aware of the status change at the time of the hearing. He did not address it in his post-hearing submission. Nevertheless, in addition to not having made an April payment, there is no evidence Applicant made a July payment, which he said he was going to do on the day of the hearing. There is no evidence indicating whether the missing July payment was what caused the debts to be removed from the installment agreement status, nor of any remedial measures taken in response to the status change. Ultimately, the two missing payments (April and July) and the agreement status change are indicators that Applicant's plan is not realistic in the long term, especially considering: he is paying only $100 a month on a debt that right now stands at $84,282; he has roughly $8,000 in court-ordered fees to pay soon; he is indebted to State A for approximately $6,000 in delinquent taxes; and he is trying to set aside enough money to pay his TY 2026 taxes on time. None of the mitigating conditions sufficiently apply to SOR ¶¶ 1.c through 1.g.

Applicant began responsibly addressing his State A delinquent taxes in July 2026 when he made a payment as part of a payment agreement. He was supposed to make a second payment on that agreement on August 1, and he testified that he was going to pay the balance of the TY 2025 debt ($822, not alleged on the SOR) within two weeks of the hearing, but he did not provide evidence of those payments in his post-hearing submission. Whether he failed to make the payments or simply overlooked submitting proof, it is reasonable to expect an Applicant to present documentation corroborating actions taken to resolve debts. Without evidence of a second payment, I am unable to conclude whether Applicant has a history of timely payments toward his State A tax debts alleged on the SOR. Likewise, there is no evidence that he is resolving the most recent tax years' debt which, although that debt is not alleged, could have at least provided an additional piece of mitigation to indicate his state tax debt was being resolved. None of the mitigating conditions sufficiently apply to SOR ¶¶ 1.h through 1.k.

The lien entered against Applicant arose due to a dispute with a contractor. On the advice of counsel, he waited nearly a year to act on the lien and was eventually able to have his day in court, where the court adjudged the original amount that Applicant had agreed to rather than the $30,000 alleged on the SOR. Applicant now owes less than a third of the amount alleged on the SOR and, as of the hearing, it was not yet time for him to pay the adjudged fees. This debt arose under circumstances that are unlikely to recur and does not cast doubt on his current reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment. AG ¶¶ 20(a) and 20(e) apply and SOR ¶ 1.l is mitigated.

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 Guideline F in my whole-person analysis and considered the factors in AG ¶ 2(d). I also considered Appellant's favorable character evidence, particularly the testimony of his two witnesses, and his excellent work performance. However, 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." Appellant has not removed doubts that he may be unable to pay his tax debts in the future.

Overall, the record evidence leaves me with questions and doubts about Appellant's eligibility and suitability for a security clearance. I conclude Appellant has not mitigated the financial considerations 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.b:	For Applicant
Subparagraphs 1.c-1.k:	Against Applicant
Subparagraph 1.l:	For Applicant

Conclusion

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

____

A. M. Driskill
Administrative Judge