



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



In the matter of:	)	
	)	
XXXXXXXXXXXX, XXXXX	)	ISCR Case No. 14-03424
	)	
Applicant for Security Clearance	)	

Appearances

For Government: Robert J. Kilmartin, Esq., Department Counsel
For Applicant: *Pro se*

09/30/2015

Decision

TUIDER, Robert J., Administrative Judge:

Applicant failed to mitigate security concerns regarding Guideline F (financial considerations). Clearance is denied.

Statement of the Case

On January 20, 2014, Applicant submitted a Questionnaire for National Security Positions (SF 86). On October 23, 2014, the Department of Defense Consolidated Adjudications Facility (DOD 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), which became effective on September 1, 2006.

The SOR alleged security concerns under Guideline F. The SOR detailed reasons why DOD was unable to find that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to continue a security clearance for Applicant, and referred her case to an administrative judge for a determination whether her clearance should be granted or denied.

Applicant answered the SOR on November 7, 2014, and elected to have her case decided on the written record in lieu of a hearing. A complete copy of the file of relevant material (FORM), dated April 7, 2015, was provided to her by letter dated April 20, 2015. Applicant received the FORM on May 1, 2015. She was afforded a period of 30 days to file objections and submit material in refutation, extenuation, or mitigation. Applicant did not provide additional information within the allotted 30-day period after receipt of the FORM. On August 12, 2015, DOHA assigned the case to me.

Findings of Fact

In her answer to the SOR, Applicant admitted all of the allegations. Her admissions are incorporated in my findings of fact.

Background Information

Applicant is a 27-year-old aircraft mechanic employed by a defense contractor since November 2013, and is a first-time applicant for a security clearance. (Item 2)

Applicant was awarded a GED in December 2007. (Item 2, Item 3) Applicant was awarded a medical insurance billing and coding diploma in January 2010. (Item 2, Item 3) She was awarded associate of applied science degrees in airframe and powerplant in June 2012 and July 2012, respectively. (Item 2, Item 3) Applicant married in October 2010, and has a minor daughter from a previous relationship. (Item 2, Item 3) She did not serve in the armed forces. (Item 2)

Financial Considerations

Applicant's SOR contains 22 separate debt allegations totaling \$24,940. These debts are from a variety of creditors and range from a \$137 collection account to a \$7,242 charged-off repossession account. (SOR ¶¶ 1.a -1.n)

There is substantial evidence to support the SOR allegations through Applicant's admissions and her credit report dated January 14, 2014. (Item 2, Item 3, Item 4) Her record of indebtedness began in 2007 and has been ongoing. (Item 3, Item 4) Applicant claims that she recently sought financial advice through a website service and began using "suggestions" to resolve her credit problems. (Item 3) Applicant stated during her February 17, 2014 Office of Personnel Management Personal Subject Interview (OPM PSI) that she has been struggling financially ever since she became pregnant out of wedlock toward the end of 2007. (Item 3) She indicated during her February 2014 OPM PSI that she would be contacting various creditors and making payment arrangements. (Item 3) There is no evidence that Applicant followed through and arranged payment plans with her creditors or otherwise resolved her debts.

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.

Eligibility for a security clearance is predicated upon the applicant meeting the criteria contained in the adjudicative guidelines. 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 overarching adjudicative goal is a fair, impartial, and commonsense 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 safeguard classified information. Such decisions entail a certain degree of legally permissible extrapolation about 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 applicant concerned.” See Exec. Or. 10865 § 7. See also Executive Order 12968 (Aug. 2, 1995), § 3.1. 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 about 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 (4th 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 her 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

Financial Considerations

AG ¶ 18 articulates the security concern relating to financial problems:

Failure or inability to live within one’s means, satisfy debts, and meet financial obligations may indicate poor self-control, lack of judgment, or unwillingness to abide by rules and regulations, all of which can raise questions about an individual’s reliability, trustworthiness and ability to protect classified information. An individual who is financially overextended is at risk of having to engage in illegal acts to generate funds.

AG ¶ 19 provides two disqualifying conditions that could raise a security concern and may be disqualifying in this case: “(a) inability or unwillingness to satisfy debts;” and “(c) a history of not meeting financial obligations.”

The evidence establishes the disqualifying conditions in AG ¶¶ 19(a) and 19(c), requiring additional inquiry about the possible applicability of mitigating conditions.

Five mitigating conditions under AG ¶ 20 are potentially applicable:

(a) the behavior happened so long ago, was so infrequent, or occurred under such circumstances that it is unlikely to recur and does not cast doubt on the individual’s current reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment;

(b) the conditions that resulted in the financial problem were largely beyond the person’s control (e.g., loss of employment, a business downturn, unexpected medical emergency, or a death, divorce or separation), and the individual acted responsibly under the circumstances;

(c) the person has received or is receiving counseling for the problem and/or there are clear indications that the problem is being resolved or is under control;

(d) the individual initiated a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or otherwise resolve debts; and

(e) the individual has a reasonable basis to dispute the legitimacy of the past-due debt which is the cause of the problem and provides documented proof to substantiate the basis of the dispute or provides evidence of actions to resolve the issue.

Considering the record evidence as a whole,¹ I conclude none of the five financial considerations mitigating conditions above are applicable or partially applicable to explain, extenuate, or mitigate the security concern. The available information shows that Applicant has taken little or no affirmative action to resolve her delinquent debts.

With that said, a security clearance case is not aimed at collecting debts.² Rather the purpose is to evaluate an applicant's judgment, reliability, and trustworthiness consistent with the security guidelines in the Directive. In evaluating Guideline F cases, the Appeal Board has established the following standard:

The Board has previously noted that the concept of a meaningful track record necessarily includes evidence of actual debt reduction through payment of debts. However, an applicant is not required, as a matter of law, to establish that [she] has paid off each and every debt listed in the SOR. All that is required is that an applicant demonstrate that [she] has established a plan to resolve [her] financial problems and taken significant actions to implement that plan. The Judge can reasonably consider the entirety of an applicant's financial situation and his actions in evaluating the extent to which that applicant's plan for the reduction of [her] outstanding indebtedness is credible and realistic. There is no requirement that a plan provide for payments on all outstanding debts simultaneously. Rather, a reasonable plan (and concomitant conduct) may provide for the payments of such debts one at a time. Likewise, there is no requirement that the first debts actually paid in furtherance of a reasonable debt plan be the ones listed in the SOR.³

In requesting an administrative determination, Applicant chose to rely on the written record. In so doing, however, she failed to submit sufficient evidence to supplement the record with relevant and material facts regarding her circumstances, articulate her position, and mitigate the financial security concerns. She failed to offer evidence of financial counseling or provide documentation regarding her past efforts to address her delinquent debt. By failing to provide such information, and in relying on a scant paragraph of explanation, financial considerations security concerns remain.

After weighing the relevant disqualifying and mitigating conditions and evaluating the evidence in light of the whole-person concept,⁴ I conclude Applicant did not present sufficient evidence to explain, extenuate, and mitigate the Guideline F security concern. Accordingly, Applicant has not met her ultimate burden of persuasion to show that it is

¹ See ISCR Case No. 03-02374 at 4 (App. Bd. Jan. 26, 2006) (citing ISCR Case No. 02-22173 at 4 (App. Bd. May 26, 2004)). When making a recency analysis for AG ¶ 20(a), all debts are considered as a whole.

² ISCR Case No. 09-02160 (App. Bd. Jun. 21, 2010).

³ ISCR Case No. 07-06482 at 3 (App. Bd. May 21, 2008) (citations and quotations omitted).

⁴ AG ¶ 2(a) (1)-(9).

clearly consistent with the national interest to grant her eligibility for access to classified information.

Formal Findings

The formal findings on the SOR are as follows:

Paragraph 1, Guideline F:	AGAINST APPLICANT
---------------------------	-------------------

Subparagraphs 1.a – 1.v:	Against Applicant
--------------------------	-------------------

Conclusion

In light of all of the record as a whole, it is not clearly consistent with the national interest to grant Applicant eligibility for a security clearance. Clearance is denied.

ROBERT J. TUIDER
Administrative Judge