



decision—trustworthiness concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) of Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested the case be decided on the written record. On April 17, 2007, after considering the record, Administrative Judge Elizabeth M. Matchinski denied Applicant’s request for a trustworthiness designation. Applicant timely appealed pursuant to the Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant’s appeal brief contains no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge.<sup>1</sup> Rather, it contains new evidence: (a) a statement from the Applicant explaining the circumstances relating to several of her outstanding debts, and her recent efforts to dispute or resolve them, and (b) a letter from Applicant’s former husband taking responsibility for their joint debts. The Board cannot consider this new evidence on appeal. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.29.

The Appeal Board’s authority to review a case is limited to cases in which the appealing party has alleged the Judge committed harmful error. It does not review cases *de novo*. Applicant has not made an allegation of harmful error. Therefore, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant a trustworthiness designation is AFFIRMED.

Signed: Michael Y. Ra’anan  
Michael Y. Ra’anan  
Administrative Judge  
Chairman, Appeal Board

Signed: Jean E. Smallin  
Jean E. Smallin  
Administrative Judge  
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: William S. Fields  
William S. Fields  
Administrative Judge  
Member, Appeal Board

---

<sup>1</sup>Applicant challenges a finding by the Judge which she perceives as saying she was dishonest. Guideline E (Personal Conduct) is not at issue in this case, and the finding is not discussed elsewhere in the Judge’s decision.