

DATE: October 31, 2006

In re:)
)
)
 -----) ISCR Case No. 06-02059
 SSN: -----)
)
 Applicant for Security Clearance)
)
)

**DECISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE
ERIN C. HOGAN**

APPEARANCES

FOR GOVERNMENT

Michael Lyles, Esq., Department Counsel
James B. Norman, Esq., Deputy Chief Department Counsel

FOR APPLICANT

Alexander J. Brittin, Esq.

SYNOPSIS

Applicant's omission of use of hallucinogenic mushrooms on a 1999 security clearance application and a 1999 signed, sworn, statement raised questions about her judgment and credibility. Concerns have been mitigated based on her full voluntary disclosure of her drug use during her 2005 periodic reinvestigation. Applicant's recreational drug use in college and a one time marijuana use in October 2001 after being granted a security clearance are mitigated based on the passage of time and her expressed intentions not to use illegal drugs in the future. The Personal Conduct security concern is mitigated. Clearance is granted.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On April 13, 2006, the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) issued to Applicant a Statement of Reasons (SOR) stating they were unable to find that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue a security clearance.¹ The SOR, which is in essence the administrative complaint, alleged security concerns under Guideline E, Personal Conduct.

In a sworn statement signed May 16, 2006, Applicant responded to the SOR allegations and requested a hearing. The case was assigned to me on July 20, 2006. DOHA issued a notice of hearing on August 9, 2006, scheduling the hearing for September 11, 2006. The hearing was conducted as scheduled. The SOR was amended by changing Applicant's name to "*****" rather than "*****" The government submitted three exhibits that were marked as Government Exhibits (Gov Ex) 1-3. The exhibits were admitted into the record without objection. The government called one witness, a Special Investigator for the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). Applicant testified on her own behalf and submitted three exhibits which were marked as Applicant Exhibits (AE) A-C and admitted without objection. DOHA received the hearing transcript (Tr.) on September 18, 2006.

FINDINGS OF FACT

In her SOR response, Applicant denies all of the allegations in the SOR. After a thorough and careful review of the pleadings, exhibits, and testimony, I make the following findings of fact:

Applicant is a 29-year-old regional director for a defense contractor. On November 22, 2004, she submitted a security clearance application as part of a periodic reinvestigation.² She has a bachelor's degree in electrical and computer engineering and a master's degree in telecommunications management.³ She married in June 2004, and has no children.⁴

Applicant first tried marijuana a couple times while in high school. Her first use occurred in Fall 1994. She used marijuana approximately 17 times between Fall 1994 to March 1999.⁵ She used marijuana socially, usually while at parties with friends.⁶ She and her friends purchased marijuana a couple of times while in college for their own personal use.⁷

¹ This action was taken under Executive Order 10865, dated February 20, 1960, as amended, and DoD Directive 5220.6, dated January 2, 1992, as amended.

² Tr. at 66; Gov Ex 2.

³ Tr. at 68; Gov Ex 2, question 5.

⁴ Tr. at 66; Gov Ex 2, question 8.

⁵ Tr. at 59-61; AE A; Gov Ex 1, 2, 3.

⁶ Gov Ex 3 at 1-2.

⁷ Tr. at 59.

Between the summer of 1995 and Fall 1997, Applicant used hallucinogenic mushrooms on four occasions. Her first use occurred in summer 1995. She also used hallucinogenic mushrooms on July 4, 1996, at a Halloween party in 1996, and at a Halloween party in 1997.⁸

In the summer of 1997, Applicant had her wisdom teeth pulled. She was prescribed Hydrocodone, a pain medication.⁹ Sometime in the fall of 1997, her roommate acquired some Hydrocodone pills. Applicant and her roommate each took a Hydrocodone pill on two occasions. Applicant did not have a prescription for Hydrocodone when she took the drug on these occasions.¹⁰

In 1998, while on spring break, Applicant took a day trip to Mexico. She purchased a small amount of Hydrocodone tablets as a surprise for her roommate. You can purchase Hydrocodone without a prescription in Mexico. She never ingested any of the Hydrocodone tablets. Her roommate took one tablet. Applicant flushed the rest of the Hydrocodone tablets down the toilet.¹¹

The company Applicant currently works for is a family-owned business. Her father is the President and CEO of the company. In 1999, on the advice of their accountant, Applicant's parents starting gifting interests in the company to their two children for estate tax purposes. Applicant had to apply for a security clearance as part owner of the company.¹² She submitted a security clearance application on January 21, 1999.¹³ Question 27 on the application reads:

Your Use of Illegal Drugs and Drug Activity - Illegal Use of Drugs. Since the age of 16 or in the last 7 years, whichever is shorter, have you illegally used any controlled substance, for example, marijuana, cocaine, crack cocaine, hashish, narcotics (opium, morphine, codeine, heroin, etc.), amphetamines, depressants (barbituates, methaqualone, tranquilizers, etc.), hallucinogenics (LSD, PCP, etc.), or prescription drugs?

Applicant listed using marijuana between November 1994 and November 1997 on at least six occasions. She did not list her use of hallucinogenic mushrooms or Hydrocodone. She testified at hearing that she did not list her hallucinogenic mushroom use because she forgot about it. It did not even occur to her to list the Hydrocodone use. She did not think that she had to list it.¹⁴

On April 8, 1999, Applicant was interviewed by a Special Agent of the Defense Security Service in conjunction with her security clearance background investigation. On that same date, she provided a signed, sworn statement. In the statement she stated that she used marijuana on at least

⁸ AE A; AE C.

⁹ Tr. at 75,80, 90-91.

¹⁰ Tr. at 97-98; AE C at 2.

¹¹ Tr. at 80-82, 90-91, 97-98; AE C at 2.

¹² Tr. at 105.

¹³ Gov Ex 1.

¹⁴ Tr. at 46-47, 58, 74-75, 84; AE C.

16 occasions between February 1994 to March 1999.¹⁵ She also stated: " I have never used any other illegal drugs or abused legal substances."¹⁶

In 1999, Applicant was granted a security clearance at the SECRET level. In May 1999, she graduated from college. In June 1999, she accepted a job as a systems engineer with another defense contractor. She was part of an engineering leadership development program. She worked there until August 2004. In August 2004, she assumed her current position.¹⁷

In October 2001, Applicant attended a dinner party hosted by a college friend. After dinner, a marijuana joint was passed around. When the marijuana joint was passed to her, she took one hit. Realizing that it was not the right thing to do, she stopped using marijuana and has not used marijuana since that occasion.¹⁸ She takes the responsibility of holding a security clearance seriously. She and her husband no longer socialize with people who use marijuana. She does not intend to use marijuana in the future.¹⁹

On November 22, 2004, Applicant submitted a security clearance application in conjunction with a periodic reinvestigation.²⁰ Question 27 on the application reads:

Your Use of Illegal Drugs and Drug Activity - Illegal Use of Drugs. Since the age of 16 or in the last 7 years, whichever is shorter, have you illegally used any controlled substance, for example, marijuana, cocaine, crack cocaine, hashish, narcotics (opium, morphine, codeine, heroin, etc.), amphetamines, depressants (barbituates, methaqualone, tranquilizers, etc.), hallucinogenics (LSD, PCP, etc.), or prescription drugs?

Applicant answered, "Yes" to question 27 and listed marijuana use on nine occasions between April 1997 and October 2001.²¹ She did not list hallucinogenic mushroom use because her use of hallucinogenic mushrooms was over seven years old. Illegal drug use which occurred more than seven years prior to the date of completing the security clearance application is beyond the scope of question 27. She did not list her Hydrocodone use because she did not think she needed to list it.²² It appears that her illegal use of Hydrocodone occurred more than seven years prior to Applicant's November 2004 security clearance application.

¹⁵ Gov Ex 3.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 2.

¹⁷ Tr. at 68; Gov Ex 2, question 6; AE B.

¹⁸ Tr. at 96-97; Gov Ex 2, question 43.

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ Gov Ex 2.

²¹ Gov Ex 2, question 27.

²² Tr. at 46-47, 58-59, 74-75, 77.

Applicant answered "yes" to question 28 on her November 22, 2004, security clearance application which reads:

Your Use of Illegal Drugs and Drug Activity - Use in Sensitive Positions. Have you EVER illegally used a controlled substance while employed as a law enforcement officer, prosecutor, or courtroom official; while possessing a security clearance; or while in a position directly and immediately affecting public safety?

She listed her October 2001 marijuana use in response to this question. She provided further details about her October 2001 marijuana use in the general remarks section known on the security clearance application as question 43. She stated, in part:

... I have no further intention of using marijuana. My last experience was over 3 years ago and it was while I had my security clearance. I take that clearance very seriously. During that event, I took only one hit and quit because I realized it was not the right thing to do. I have not smoked marijuana or been in any environment where anyone is smoking marijuana or utilizing any illegal substance since. I have no intention of engaging in activities I know could compromise my company, my family and my job as a contractor...²³

Applicant also answered "yes" to question 29 which reads:

Your Use of Illegal Drugs and Drug Activity - Drug Activity. In the last 7 years, have you been involved in the illegal purchase, manufacture, trafficking, production, transfer, shipping, receiving, or sale of any narcotic, depressant, stimulant, hallucinogen, or cannabis for your own intended profit or that of another?²⁴

She did not provide further details about the "yes" response on her security clearance application. At hearing, she explained that she answered "yes" pertaining to her purchase of marijuana for she and her friends' personal use while in college.²⁵ She did not make a profit off the marijuana purchase and was not required to answer "yes" in response to question 29 based on the plain language of the question.

On October 7, 2005, Applicant was interviewed by an investigator from the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) in conjunction with her second background investigation. The OPM investigator went through each question on Applicant's security clearance application. When they reached the questions pertaining to illegal drug use, Applicant presented a list of all of her illegal drug use. The list was prepared in advance and included her use of hallucinogenic mushrooms.²⁶ At some point during the interview, Applicant asked the OPM investigator whether she needed to

²³ Gov Ex 2, question 43.

²⁴ *Id* at question 29.

²⁵ Tr. at 59, 64.

²⁶ AE A; Tr. at 25, 33, 38, 62-63.

list her two time use of Hydrocodone without a prescription. She then discussed her Hydrocodone use.²⁷ The OPM investigator thought Applicant was very forthcoming during the interview.²⁸

Applicant's father testified on her behalf. As mentioned previously, he is also her boss. Applicant has been a regional manager for two years. He describes her job performance as exceptional. He is not aware of any security incidents involving his daughter. He has a good relationship with his daughter. He was disappointed when he learned of his daughter's drug use and believes it is inconsistent with her overall character. He describes her as being honest, trustworthy, and direct. He has no reservations about issuing her a security clearance.²⁹

In April 2006, Applicant successfully completed the Facility Security Officer (FSO) Program Management Course at the Defense Security Service Academy. She has also completed the Essentials of Industrial Security Management course and Protecting Secret and Confidential Documents course. She is certified as an FSO.³⁰ She is a member of the following organizations: Women in Defense; National Defense Industrial Association and the Air Force Communication Electronics Association.³¹ In her spare time, she coaches a girl's soccer team for the local Parks and Recreation department and attends church on a regular basis.³²

POLICIES

The President has “the authority to . . . control access to information bearing on national security and to determine whether an individual is sufficiently trustworthy to occupy a position . . . that will give that person access to such information.”³³ In Executive Order 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information Within Industry* (Feb. 20, 1960), the President set out guidelines and procedures for safeguarding classified information within the executive branch.

To be eligible for a security clearance, an applicant must meet the security guidelines contained in the Directive. Enclosure 2 of the Directive sets forth personnel security guidelines, as well as the disqualifying conditions and mitigating conditions under each guideline. The adjudicative guideline at issue in this case is:

²⁷ AE C; Tr. at 34, 46, 78.

²⁸ Tr. at 46.

²⁹ Tr. at 104-116.

³⁰ Tr. at 70; Answer to SOR.

³¹ Tr. at 71, AE B.

³² *Id.*

³³ *Department of the Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518, 527 (1988).

Guideline E - Personal Conduct: Conduct involving questionable judgment, untrustworthiness, unreliability, lack of candor, dishonesty, or unwillingness to comply with rules and regulations could indicate that the person may not properly safeguard classified information.³⁴

Conditions that could raise a security concern and may be disqualifying, as well as those which could mitigate security concerns pertaining to this adjudicative guideline, are set forth and discussed in the conclusions below.

“The adjudicative process is an examination of a sufficient period of a person’s life to make an affirmative determination that the person is eligible for a security clearance.”³⁵ An administrative judge must apply the “whole person concept,” and consider and carefully weigh the available, reliable information about the person.³⁶ An administrative judge should consider the following factors: (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 voluntariness of participation; (6) the presence or absence of rehabilitation and other pertinent 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.³⁷

Initially, the Government must present evidence to establish controverted facts in the SOR that disqualify or may disqualify the applicant from being eligible for access to classified information.³⁸ Thereafter, the applicant is responsible for presenting evidence to rebut, explain, extenuate, or mitigate the facts admitted by the applicant or proven by Department Counsel. The applicant has the ultimate burden of persuasion as to obtaining a favorable clearance decision.³⁹ Any doubt as to whether access to classified information is clearly consistent with national security will be resolved in favor of the national security.⁴⁰

A person granted access to classified information enters into a special relationship with the government. The government must be able to repose a high degree of trust and confidence in those individuals to whom it grants access to classified information. The decision to deny an individual a security clearance is not a determination as to the loyalty of the applicant. It is merely an indication that the applicant has not met the strict guidelines the President has established for issuing a clearance.

³⁴ Directive, ¶ E2.A5.1.1.

³⁵ Directive, ¶ E2.2.1.

³⁶ *Id.*

³⁷ *Id.*

³⁸ Directive, ¶ E3.1.14.

³⁹ Directive, ¶ E3.1.15.

⁴⁰ Directive, ¶ E.2.2.2.

CONCLUSIONS

I have carefully considered all the facts in evidence and the legal standards. I make the following conclusions.

Personal Conduct

With respect to SOR ¶ 1.a (1), I find Applicant deliberately falsified her response to question 27 on her January 21, 1999, security clearance application by deliberately omitting her use of hallucinogenic mushrooms. She admits to using hallucinogenic mushrooms in the summer 1995, the summer 1996, Halloween 1996, and Halloween 1997. Her use of hallucinogenic mushrooms occurred within the parameters of the question. Although, Applicant claims she forgot about her use of hallucinogenic mushrooms at the time she filled out her 1999 security clearance application, her last use occurred less than two years prior to submitting her security clearance application. Applicant is an intelligent and well educated individual. I find it implausible that she forgot her use of hallucinogenic mushrooms when she filled out her security clearance application in 1999.

I find for Applicant with respect to SOR ¶¶ 1.a(2) and 1.a(3). In response to question 27, Applicant listed that she used marijuana six times. It was not an accurate accounting of the total number of times she used marijuana. However, I find that her inaccurate accounting of her marijuana use was immaterial. She put the government on notice that she illegally used marijuana. When she was interviewed in April 8, 1999, she provided further information about the number of times that she used marijuana. It did not occur to Applicant that she needed to list the Hydrocodone use on her 1999 security clearance application. I find her explanation credible. Her confusion about whether to list her Hydrocodone use was corroborated by the OPM Investigator during the hearing. During her 2005 interview with the OPM investigator, the OPM investigator testified that Applicant asked her during the interview whether she needed to list her Hydrocodone use in response to question 27. I conclude she did not deliberately omit her Hydrocodone usage.

Applicant deliberately falsified material facts in her April 8, 1999, signed, sworn statement, by omitting her use of hallucinogenic mushrooms. In her signed, sworn, statement, she states, "I have never used any other illegal drugs or abused legal substances."⁴¹ This statement is not true because she had experimented with hallucinogenic mushrooms and Hydrocodone. Applicant's omission of her Hydrocodone use was not intentional based on her confusion over whether to list the drug. However, she had a duty to disclose her use of hallucinogenic mushrooms. Applicant maintains the sole focus of the interview was on her marijuana use. However, her affirmative statement that she used no other illegal drugs other than marijuana contradicts this assertion. She also testified that the Special Agent told her what to put in her signed, sworn statement. Applicant was a college student majoring in engineering at the time she filled out the security clearance application. She was able to understand the content of her signed, sworn statement. She had the opportunity to correct her statement. In fact, several items are crossed out with Applicant's initials written next to the edits. When she signed the document, she acknowledged that she read the entire statement, that she initialed all pages and corrections, and that it is correct and true as written. I

⁴¹ Gov Ex 3 at 2.

conclude that she was not truthful in her April 8, 1999, signed, sworn statement by deliberately failing to list her use of hallucinogenic mushrooms.

The government did not meet its burden of proof with respect to SOR ¶¶ 1.c and 1.e. SOR ¶ 1.c alleged Applicant deliberately falsified her November 22, 2004, security clearance application by failing to list her use of hallucinogenic mushrooms and Hydrocone in response to question 27. I find the Applicant did not need to list the past uses since both occurred more than seven years prior to completing the application. Her last use of hallucinogenic mushrooms occurred during Halloween 1997. Her use of Hydrocodone without a prescription occurred in the fall 1997. Although the OPM Investigator's investigative summary lists the Hydrocodone use occurred in the Fall 1998.⁴² Applicant testified it occurred in the Fall 1997. I find Applicant's testimony more reliable. The Special Agent's investigative summary is a summary of her notes of the interview. The record is not clear when these notes were prepared. As such, I do not find the summary to be as reliable as a signed, sworn, statement taken at the time of the interview would have been. I conclude both uses occurred more than seven years prior to Applicant filling out her November 22, 2004, security clearance application.

SOR ¶ 1.e alleges that Applicant had purchased Hydrocodone in Mexico and transported it illegally over the border into the United States after she filled out her January 21, 1999, security clearance application. Applicant acknowledges that she purchased Hydrocodone for her roommate while in Mexico. She states that it was during Spring Break 1998 rather than Spring Break 1999. I find the conduct occurred in the Spring 1998 rather than 1999. The conduct occurred prior to Applicant completing her security clearance application. Although the OPM Investigator's notes indicate the trip occurred during Spring Break 1999, I do not find the notes to be reliable for the reasons discussed in the previous paragraph.

SOR ¶ 1.d is the same allegation as SOR ¶ 1.e, without the allegation that Applicant committed the act after she submitted a security clearance application in 1999. Although Applicant admits to purchasing Hydrocodone in Mexico and bringing it back into the United States, there is nothing in the record evidence that indicates her conduct was illegal. Her conduct raises questions about her judgment but the Government submitted no information to support that her conduct was illegal as alleged in SOR. Applicant's admission of marijuana use on one occasion in October 2001, after being granted a security clearance raises a an additional concern about her judgment.

Under Personal Conduct the following disqualifying conditions apply in Applicant's case. Personal Conduct Disqualifying Condition (PC DC) E2.A5.1.2.2: (*The deliberate omission, concealment, or falsification of relevant and material 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*) applies with respect to Applicant's deliberate omission of her hallucinogenic mushroom use in response to question 27 on her January 21, 1999, security clearance application.

PC DC E2.A5.1.2.3: (*Deliberately providing false or misleading information, concerning relevant and material matters to an investigator, security official, competent medical authority, or*

⁴²AE C.

other official representative in connection with a personnel security or trustworthiness determination) applies with respect to Applicant's April 8, 1999, signed, sworn statement. The statement was provided to a Special Agent of the Defense Security Service in conjunction with a security clearance background investigation. Applicant stated that she had not used illegal drugs other than marijuana in this signed, sworn statement. The statement was not true in that she used hallucinogenic mushrooms.

The overall concern under Personal Conduct is also relevant to Applicant's case. Conduct involving questionable judgment, untrustworthiness, lack of candor, dishonesty, or unwillingness to comply with rules and regulations could indicate that a person may not properly safeguard classified information. Applicant's past drug involvement raises concerns about her judgment and reliability. Of particular concern is her decision to use marijuana after being granted a security clearance in October 2001.

The Personal Conduct concern can be mitigated. I find Personal Conduct Mitigating Condition (PC MC) E2.A5.1.3.1 (*The information was unsubstantiated or not pertinent to a determination of judgment, trustworthiness, or reliability*) applies. Applicant's past conduct is no longer pertinent to determine her judgment, trustworthiness, or reliability. Most of Applicant's drug use occurred when she was still a college student. Since that time, she has matured and has accepted more responsibility, both personally and professionally. Although, she withheld information about her illegal use of hallucinogenic mushrooms during her previous security clearance investigation, she fully disclosed this information during her second background investigation. While she did not demonstrate the best judgment by taking a hit from a marijuana joint after being granted a security clearance, she immediately understood the error of her actions and stopped. She fully disclosed the incident on her 2004 security clearance application. She has not used illegal drugs since October 2001 and does not intend to use illegal drugs in the future.

PC MC E2.A5.1.3.2 (*The falsification was an isolated incident, was not recent, and the individual has subsequently provided correct information voluntarily*) is the only mitigating condition that has the potential to apply to Applicant's falsifications during her previous security clearance investigation. Although Applicant withheld information about her hallucinogenic mushroom use during her 1999 background investigation, she fully disclosed this use during her periodic reinvestigation. It has been more than six years since the falsifications occurred. As such the behavior is not recent. To her credit, Applicant provided the correct information voluntarily during her October 2005 interview with an OPM investigator. She prepared a list of the full extent of her drug use in advance of the interview. The OPM investigator testified that Applicant was very forthcoming during the interview. More problematic is the question as to whether Applicant's falsification was an isolated incident. I cannot conclude the falsification was an isolated incident because Applicant deliberately omitted her hallucinogenic mushroom use on two occasions -on her security clearance application in January 21, 1999, and in her April 8, 1999, signed sworn statement. For this reason, PC MC E2.A5.1.3.2 cannot be applied.

Although Applicant technically does not meet all three requirements of PC MC E2.A5.1.3.2, I conclude that her voluntary disclosure of her hallucinogenic mushroom use during her periodic reinvestigation negates the concern with respect to her prior falsifications.

Whole Person Factors

There are several whole person factors that apply in Applicant's favor. As to the nature, extent and seriousness of the conduct, Applicant's actions as a senior in college and young adult did not demonstrate the best judgment. However, most of the conduct occurred over seven years ago. The questionable conduct is not recent.⁴³ Applicant has since matured. She is now married and is advancing in her professional career. She is involved in her community as well as in several professional organizations.

Applicant's voluntary disclosure of her past illegal drug use during her current security clearance background investigation are the actions of a person who has grown to appreciate the security significance of providing full disclosure. As a result of her full disclosure, she is not vulnerable to coercion, exploitation or duress.⁴⁴ There is nothing in the record which would indicate that the Government had learned of her past drug use from third party sources. Applicant understands the responsibilities entrusted to her with regard to protecting classified information based on her training to become an FSO. Applicant's actions during her current security clearance investigation indicate that it is unlikely, she will repeat the behavior which raised the security concerns.⁴⁵ Based on these reasons, I conclude she has mitigated the concern under Personal Conduct.

I considered all the evidence provided and also considered the "whole person" concept in evaluating Applicant's risk and vulnerability in protecting our national interests. I find Applicant mitigated the security concerns raised by the personal conduct concern. Therefore, I am persuaded by the totality of the evidence in this case, that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant Applicant a security clearance.

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 E:	AGAINST APPLICANT
Subparagraph 1.a:	For Applicant
Subparagraph 1.b:	For Applicant
Subparagraph 1.c:	For Applicant
Subparagraph 1.d:	For Applicant
Subparagraph 1.e:	For Applicant
Subparagraph 1.f:	For Applicant

DECISION

⁴³ Directive, ¶¶ E2.2.1.3, E2.2.1.4

⁴⁴ Directive ¶ E2.2.1.8.

⁴⁵ Directive ¶¶ E2.2.1.6 and E2.2.1.9.

In light of all of the circumstances in this case, it is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue a security clearance for Applicant. Clearance is granted.

Erin C. Hogan
Administrative Judge