



**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
DEFENSE OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS**



In the matter of: )  
 )  
XXXXXXXXXXXX, XXXXX ) ISCR Case No. 14-01874  
 )  
Applicant for Security Clearance )

**Appearances**

For Government: Chris Morin, Esq., Department Counsel  
For Applicant: Ronald C. Sykstus, Esq.

09/30/2014

**Decision**

TUIDER, Robert J., Administrative Judge:

Applicant has mitigated security concerns pertaining to Guideline H (drug involvement). Clearance is granted.

**Statement of the Case**

On February 6, 2014, Applicant submitted an Electronic Questionnaire for Investigations Processing (e-QIP) or security clearance application (SF 86). On June 13, 2014, the Department of Defense (DOD) Consolidated Adjudications Facility (CAF) issued a Statement of Reasons (SOR) to Applicant, pursuant to Executive Order 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information Within Industry*, dated February 20, 1960, as amended; DOD Directive 5220.6, *Defense Industrial Personnel Security Clearance Review Program* (Directive), dated January 2, 1992, as amended; and the adjudicative guidelines (AG) promulgated by the President on December 29, 2005.

The SOR alleged security concerns under Guideline H (drug involvement). The SOR detailed reasons why the DOD CAF was unable to find that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to continue a security clearance for Applicant, and

it recommended that his case be submitted to an administrative judge for a determination whether his clearance should be continued or revoked.

On July 2, 2014, Applicant responded to the SOR. On July 30, 2014, Department Counsel was ready to proceed on Applicant's case. On July 30, 2014, DOHA assigned Applicant's case to me. On July 31, 2014, the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) issued a hearing notice, setting the hearing for August 27, 2014. Applicant's hearing was held as scheduled. At the hearing, Department Counsel offered Government Exhibits (GE) 1 and 2, and Hearing Exhibit (HE) I, which were received into evidence without objection. Applicant called four witnesses, testified, and offered Applicant Exhibits (AE) A and B, which were received into evidence without objection.

I held the record open until September 26, 2014 to afford Applicant the opportunity to submit additional documents. Applicant timely submitted AE D through E, which were received into evidence without objection. On September 5, 2014, DOHA received the hearing transcript (Tr.).

### **Findings of Fact**

In his SOR answer, Applicant admitted all of the allegations with explanations. Applicant's answers and explanations are incorporated as findings of fact. After a thorough review of the evidence, I make the following additional findings of fact.

### **Background Information**

Applicant is a 26-year-old network technician, who has been employed by a defense contractor since July 2013. He seeks a security clearance, which is a requirement of his continued employment. (GE 1, Tr. 19, 25-26, 53-56.)

Applicant graduated from high school in 2006. He attended college from August 2006 to May 2011, and is approximately "30 to 35 hours" short of completing his bachelor's degree. Applicant's goal is to complete his degree within two years. (GE 1, Tr. 55-56, 50-52.) He has never married and has no dependents. Applicant has not served in the U.S. armed forces. (GE 1, Tr. 20-25.)

### **Drug Involvement**

The underlying basis of Applicant's past drug involvement is derived from his self-disclosure and is not disputed. His past drug use consists of: (1) from November 2007 to June 2013, he used marijuana approximately twice a day; (2) from November 2007 to June 2013, he purchased marijuana once a month; (3) between November 2007 and November 2009, he used LSD and Mushrooms on two occasions. (SOR ¶¶ 1.a - 1.c) Applicant fully disclosed the surrounding circumstances of his past drug use. (Tr. 26-31, 39-40, 45-50.)

Applicant has never been arrested as a result of his past involvement with drugs. He was introduced to marijuana when he was at a friend's apartment in November 2007 while in college. Applicant experienced depression during and after college and self-medicated with marijuana. After leaving college, he held several unsatisfying restaurant-type jobs in his college town. Realizing that he was not where he wanted to be in life, he contacted his parents. After discussing his situation with them, he returned home in June 2013 and they assisted him in getting professional help. Applicant was diagnosed with dysthymic disorder, a specific type of depression and prescribed Wellbutrin. (Tr. 27-33, 45-49, AE A.)

Applicant stopped using marijuana in June 2013 and has not used it since then. He has disassociated with persons using marijuana and is immersed in his job and professional development. (Tr. 33-35.) As a condition to being hired, Applicant underwent a drug test in August 2013 and tested negative. He is willing to take additional random drug tests. (Tr. 36-44, 52.)

At his hearing, Applicant submitted a signed, sworn statement of intent, dated August 18, 2014, to continue abstaining from any drug abuse or other illegal use of drugs both presently and in the future, with the understanding that any drug violation will result in the automatic revocation of clearance. (AE B.) Post-hearing, Applicant submitted a drug and alcohol evaluation from a duly qualified licensed marriage and family therapist (LMFT) with significant experience in substance abuse issues. The LMFT stated "it is the clinical opinion of this writer that [Applicant] is very likely to continue in his current state of remission of cannabis dependence due to being treated by a medical professional for dysthymia and because he exhibits emotional resiliency and social support needed to maintain sobriety." (AE D – AE E.)

### **Character Evidence**

Four character witnesses testified on Applicant's behalf – his father and three company executives. His father, a West Point graduate and career Army officer, discussed in detail his son's situation and family involvement in helping him. It is clear that Applicant comes from a good family and is fortunate to have a concerned and supportive family. (Tr. 56-81.) The remaining three witnesses are senior company executives with security clearances who know or supervise Applicant. The collective sense of their testimony is that Applicant made mistakes by using drugs as a young man, that he has put his drug use behind him, and that he is a productive and valuable employee. It was also clear from their testimony that their company has a zero tolerance for drug use and that Applicant would be terminated if he engaged in any further drug activity. (Tr. 82-110.)

### **Policies**

The U.S. Supreme Court has recognized the substantial discretion of the Executive Branch in regulating access to information pertaining to national security emphasizing, "no 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 Applicant’s 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, *Safeguarding Classified Information within Industry* § 2 (Feb. 20, 1960), as amended and modified.

Eligibility for a security clearance is predicated upon the applicant meeting the criteria contained in the adjudicative guidelines (AG). These guidelines are not inflexible rules of law. Instead, recognizing the complexities of human behavior, these guidelines are applied in conjunction with an evaluation of the whole person. An administrative judge’s over-arching adjudicative goal is a fair, impartial and common sense decision. An administrative judge must consider all available, 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 the applicant may deliberately or inadvertently fail to protect or safeguard classified information. Such decisions entail a certain degree of legally permissible extrapolation as to potential, rather than actual, risk of compromise of classified information. Clearance decisions must be “in terms of the national interest and shall in no sense be a determination as to the loyalty of the [A]pplicant concerned.” See Exec. Or. 10865 § 7. See *also* Executive Order 12968 (Aug. 2, 1995), Section 3. Thus, nothing in this Decision should be construed to suggest that I have based this decision, in whole or in part, on any express or implied determination as to Applicant’s allegiance, loyalty, or patriotism. It 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 (4<sup>th</sup> 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. 95-0611 at 2 (App. Bd. May 2, 1996).

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 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). The burden of disproving a mitigating condition never shifts to the Government. See ISCR Case No. 02-31154 at 5 (App. Bd. Sep. 22, 2005). “[S]ecurity clearance determinations should err, if they must, on the side of denials.” *Egan*, 484 U.S. at 531; see AG ¶ 2(b).

## Analysis

### Drug Involvement

AG ¶ 24 articulates the security concern concerning drug involvement:

Use of an illegal drug or misuse of a prescription drug can raise questions about an individual’s reliability and trustworthiness, both because it may impair judgment and because it raises questions about a person’s ability or willingness to comply with laws, rules, and regulations.

The Government established its case under Guideline H through Applicant’s admissions and the evidence presented. He fully disclosed his drug abuse in his SOR response and at his hearing.

A review of the evidence supports application of two drug involvement disqualifying conditions. AG ¶ 25(a): “any drug abuse (see above definition);”<sup>1</sup> and AG ¶ 25(c) “illegal drug possession, including cultivation, processing, manufacture, purchase, sale, or distribution, or possession of drug paraphernalia.”

Considering the totality of the circumstances in this case, I find application of drug involvement mitigating conditions AG ¶ 26(a) “the behavior happened so long ago, was so infrequent, or happened under such circumstances that it is unlikely to recur or does not cast doubt on the individual’s current reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment;” and AG ¶ 26(b): “a demonstrated intent not to abuse any drugs in the future, such as: (1) disassociation from drug-using associates and contacts; (2) changing or avoiding the environment where drugs were used; (3) an appropriate period of abstinence; (4) a signed statement of intent with automatic revocation of clearance for any violation.”

Concerning AG ¶ 26(a), there are no “bright line” rules for determining when conduct is “recent.” The determination must be based “on a careful evaluation of the totality of the record within the parameters set by the Directive.” ISCR Case No. 02-24452 at 6 (App. Bd. Aug. 4, 2004). For example, the Appeal Board determined in ISCR Case No. 98-0608 (App. Bd. Aug. 28, 1997), that an applicant’s last use of marijuana occurring approximately 17 months before the hearing was not recent. If the evidence shows “a significant period of time has passed without any evidence of misconduct,” then an administrative judge must determine whether that period of time

---

<sup>1</sup> AG ¶ 24(b) defines drug abuse as the illegal use of a drug or use of a legal drug in a manner that deviates from approved medication direction.

demonstrates “changed circumstances or conduct sufficient to warrant a finding of reform or rehabilitation.”<sup>2</sup>

AG ¶ 26(a) applies. Applicant’s last drug use was June 2013, about 14 months before his hearing. His illegal drug use occurred primarily in his early years and ended when he realized that he needed to turn his life around and ceased altogether in November 2013. The absence of evidence of more recent or extensive drug use, and his promise not to use illegal drugs in the future as well as his recent favorable drug and alcohol assessment eliminates doubts about his current reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment with respect to abstaining from illegal drug use.<sup>3</sup>

AG ¶ 26(b) lists four ways Applicant can demonstrate his intent not to abuse illegal drugs in the future. With maturity, and having sought professional help, he has broken or reduced the prevalence of his patterns of drug abuse, and he has changed his own life with respect to illegal drug use. He has abstained from drug abuse for about 14 months and has no problem in doing so. AG ¶ 26(b) partially applies.

The testimony from senior company representatives and his father show Applicant’s work behavior has not been indicative of his having a drug problem. He is viewed as a valuable employee, who is reliable, dependable, and professional. His

---

<sup>2</sup> ISCR Case No. 02-24452 at 6 (App. Bd. Aug. 4, 2004). In ISCR Case No. 04-09239 at 5 (App. Bd. Dec. 20, 2006), the Appeal Board reversed the judge’s decision denying a clearance, focusing on the absence of drug use for five years prior to the hearing. The Appeal Board determined that the judge excessively emphasized the drug use while holding a security clearance, and the 20 plus years of drug use, and gave too little weight to lifestyle change and therapy. For the recency analysis the Appeal Board stated:

*Compare* ISCR Case No. 98-0394 at 4 (App. Bd. June 10, 1999) (although the passage of three years since the applicant’s last act of misconduct did not, standing alone, compel the administrative judge to apply Criminal Conduct Mitigating Condition 1 as a matter of law, the Judge erred by failing to give an explanation why the Judge decided not to apply that mitigating condition in light of the particular record evidence in the case) with ISCR Case No. 01-02860 at 3 (App. Bd. May 7, 2002) (“The administrative judge articulated a rational basis for why she had doubts about the sufficiency of Applicant’s efforts at alcohol rehabilitation.”) (citation format corrections added).

In ISCR Case No. 05-11392 at 1-3 (App. Bd. Dec. 11, 2006) the Appeal Board, considered the recency analysis of an administrative judge stating:

The administrative judge made sustainable findings as to a lengthy and serious history of improper or illegal drug use by a 57-year-old Applicant who was familiar with the security clearance process. That history included illegal marijuana use two to three times a year from 1974 to 2002 [drug use ended four years before hearing]. It also included the illegal purchase of marijuana and the use of marijuana while holding a security clearance.

<sup>3</sup>In ISCR Case No. 02-08032 at 8 (App. Bd. May 14, 2004), the Appeal Board reversed an unfavorable security clearance decision because the administrative judge failed to explain why drug use was not mitigated after the passage of more than six years from the previous drug abuse.

value to the defense industry is supported by senior company officials, who know him personally and professionally, and by his own credible testimony and evidence presented. At his hearing, Applicant acknowledged that drug abuse is incompatible with his future career and family plans. He expressed a steadfast commitment to continue lifestyle changes consistent with total abstinence of marijuana or any other drugs.

### **Whole-Person Concept**

Under the whole-person concept, the administrative judge must evaluate an applicant's eligibility for a security clearance by considering the totality of the applicant's conduct and all the circumstances. The administrative judge should consider the nine adjudicative process factors listed at AG ¶ 2(a):

(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.

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. AG ¶ 2(c). The discussion in the Analysis section under Guideline H is incorporated in this whole-person section. However, additional comments are warranted.

Applicant has been and is willing to maintain conduct expected of one entrusted with a security clearance. His employer and family support him. His employment history to date is indicative of stability and a strong work ethic. This support and self-introspection should ensure his continued success. Applicant demonstrated the correct attitude and commitment to remaining drug free. Considering his demeanor and testimony, I believe Applicant has learned from his mistakes, and his questionable behavior is unlikely to recur. I find Applicant has presented sufficient evidence of rehabilitation.

To conclude, Applicant presented sufficient evidence to explain, extenuate, or mitigate the security concerns raised. Applicant met his ultimate burden of persuasion to obtain a favorable clearance decision. I take this position based on the law, as set forth in *Department of Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518 (1988), my "careful consideration of the whole-person factors"<sup>4</sup> and supporting evidence, my application of the pertinent

---

<sup>4</sup>See ISCR Case No. 04-06242 at 2 (App. Bd. June 28, 2006).

factors under the Adjudicative Process, and my interpretation of my responsibilities under the Guidelines. For the reasons stated, I conclude he is eligible for access to classified information.

### **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 H:	FOR APPLICANT
---------------------------	---------------

Subparagraphs 1.a – 1.c:	For Applicant
--------------------------	---------------

### **Decision**

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

---

ROBERT J. TUIDER  
Administrative Judge