DIGEST: The Appeal Board's authority is limi Adverse decision affirmed	ted to cases	s with an allegation of harmful error.
CASENO: 14-02592.a1		
DATE: 07/24/2015		
		DATE: July 24, 2015
In Re:)))	
))	ADP Case No. 14-02592
Applicant for Public Trust Position)	

KEYWORD: Guideline F

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 eligibility for a public trust position. On August 11, 2014, DoD issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that decision—trustworthiness 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 May 29, 2015, after considering the record, Administrative Judge Wilford H. Ross denied Applicant eligibility for a public trust position. 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, her submission is a narrative statement that she is continuing to work hard to pay off her debts. The Board cannot consider any new evidence on appeal. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.29.

The Board does not review a case *de novo*. 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. Applicant has not made an allegation of harmful error on the part of the Judge. Therefore, the decision of the Judge is AFFIRMED.

Signed: Michael Ra'anan
Michael Ra'anan
Administrative Judge
Chairperson, 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