

KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: The Appeal Board does not review a case *de novo*. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 14-02765.a1

DATE: 08/17/2015

DATE: August 17, 2015

In Re:)	
)	
-----)	ISCR Case No. 14-02765
)	
Applicant for Security Clearance)	
)	

APPEAL BOARD SUMMARY DISPOSITION

APPEARANCES

FOR GOVERNMENT

James B. Norman, Esq., Chief Department Counsel

FOR APPLICANT

Pro se

The Department of Defense (DoD) declined to grant Applicant a security clearance. On August 1, 2014, DoD issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that

decision—security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) of Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested a decision on the written record. On June 12, 2015, after considering the record, Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) Administrative Judge Shari Dam denied Applicant’s request for a security clearance. Applicant 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. Rather, it is a narrative statement that summarizes the evidence Applicant presented in response to the Department Counsel’s File of Relevant Material (FORM), and gives details about his continuing efforts to resolve his financial problems.

The Appeal Board does not review a case *de novo*, and it cannot consider new evidence on appeal. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.29. The Board’s authority to review a case is limited to cases in which the appealing party has alleged the Judge committed harmful error. Applicant has not made an allegation of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Therefore, the decision of the Judge is **AFFIRMED**.

Signed: Jeffrey D. Billett
Jeffrey D. Billett
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: James E. Moody
James E. Moody
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

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