

DATE: June 19, 2002

---

In Re:

-----

SSN: -----

Applicant for Security Clearance

---

ISCR Case No. 01-21739

## **DECISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE**

**RICHARD A. CEFOLA**

### **APPEARANCES**

#### **FOR GOVERNMENT**

Martin H. Mogul, Department Counsel

#### **FOR APPLICANT**

*Pro Se*

### **SYNOPSIS**

The Applicant is suffering from a Dissociative Disorder, and admits he could be susceptible to blackmail, coercion, pressure or duress. Clearance is denied.

### **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

On January 4, 2002, the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA), pursuant to Executive Order 10865 and Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Directive), dated January 2, 1992, issued a Statement of Reasons (SOR) to the Applicant, which detailed reasons why DOHA could not make the preliminary affirmative finding under the Directive that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue a security clearance for the Applicant and recommended referral to an Administrative Judge to determine whether a clearance should be denied or revoked.

Applicant filed an Answer to the SOR on February 5, 2002.

Applicant elected to have this case determined on a written record in lieu of a hearing. Department Counsel submitted the Government's File of Relevant Material (FORM) on April 2, 2002. Applicant was instructed to submit objections or information in rebuttal, extenuation or mitigation within 30 days of receipt of the FORM. Applicant received his copy on April 10, 2002, and submitted nothing in reply. The case was received by the undersigned for resolution on May 22, 2002. The issue raised here is whether the Applicant's admitted personal conduct militates against the granting of a security clearance.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

The following Findings of Fact are based on Applicant's Answer to the SOR, and the File of Relevant Material. The Applicant is 59 years of age, and is employed by a defense contractor who seeks a security clearance on behalf of the Applicant.

Personal Conduct

1.a. The Applicant is suffering from a Dissociative Disorder (Government Exhibits (GXs 5 and 6). "[H]is symptoms include fractured thinking, the inability to stay focused on certain things and the inability to pull all of the relevant details from his memories together when he wants to" (GX 5). He admits "that in job related situations there have been times that because of a low tolerance to stress . . . [his] judgment may have been questionable" (GX 3). He further "admitted that he might be susceptible [to blackmail, coercion, pressure or duress] if someone were to try to use his mental health history and treatment against him" (GX 5).

Mitigation

The Applicant avers that "in the confidentiality of . . . [his] interview [by the Defense Security Service he] demonstrated the good judgement, responsibility, candor and honesty needed . . ." (GX 3).

**POLICIES**

Enclosure 2 and Section E2.2. of the 1992 Directive set forth both policy factors and conditions that could raise or mitigate a security concern, and which must be given binding consideration in making security clearance determinations. The conditions should be followed in every case according to the pertinent criterion, however, the conditions are neither automatically determinative of the decision in any case, nor can they supersede the Administrative Judge's reliance on his own common sense. Because each security clearance case presents its own unique facts and circumstances, it should not be assumed that these conditions exhaust the realm of human experience, or apply equally in every case. Conditions most pertinent to evaluation of this case are:

Personal ConductCondition that could raise a security concern and may be disqualifying include:

4. Personal conduct or concealment of information that increases an individual's vulnerability to coercion, exploitation, or duress . . . ;

Conditions that could mitigate security concerns include:

none

As set forth in the Directive, each clearance decision must be a fair and impartial common sense determination based upon consideration of all the relevant and material information and the pertinent criteria and adjudication policy in enclosure 2, including as appropriate:

- a. Nature and seriousness of the conduct and surrounding circumstances.
- b. Frequency and recency of the conduct.
- c. Age of the applicant.
- d. Motivation of the applicant, and the extent to which the conduct was negligent, willful, voluntary, or undertaken with knowledge of the consequence involved.
- e. Absence or presence of rehabilitation.
- f. Probability that circumstances or conduct will continue or recur in the future.

The Administrative Judge, however, can only draw those inferences or conclusions that have a reasonable and logical basis in the evidence of record. The Judge cannot draw inferences or conclusions based on evidence which is speculative or conjectural in nature.

The Government must make out a case under Guideline E (Personal Conduct) which establishes doubt about a person's judgment, reliability and trustworthiness. While a rational connection, or nexus, must be shown between an applicant's adverse conduct and his ability to effectively safeguard classified information, with respect to sufficiency of proof of a rational connection, objective or direct evidence is not required.

Then, the Applicant must remove that doubt with substantial evidence in refutation, explanation, mitigation or extenuation, which demonstrates that the past adverse conduct is unlikely to be repeated, and that the Applicant presently qualifies for a security clearance.

An individual who is reticent to divulge the existence of his mental disorder is susceptible to blackmail. The Government must be able to place a high degree of confidence in a security clearance holder to abide by all security rules and regulations at all times and in all places.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

The Applicant by his own admission is suffering from a dissociative disorder. This disorder results in "fractured thinking" on the part of the Applicant. He further admits that he might be susceptible to blackmail, coercion, pressure or duress if someone were to try to use his mental health history and treatment against him. This admission is clearly of national security significance; and as such, Guideline E is found against the Applicant.

Considering all the evidence, the Applicant has not rebutted the Government's case regarding his admitted personal conduct. The Applicant has thus not met the mitigating conditions of Guideline E, and of Section E2.2. of the Directive. Accordingly, he has not met his ultimate burden of persuasion under Guideline E.

### **FORMAL FINDINGS**

Formal Findings required by paragraph 25 of Enclosure 3 of the Directive are:

Paragraph 1: AGAINST THE APPLICANT

a. Against the Applicant.

Factual support and reasons for the foregoing are set forth in **FINDINGS OF FACT** and **CONCLUSIONS**, supra.

### **DECISION**

In light of the circumstances presented by the record in this case, it is not clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue a security clearance for the Applicant.

Richard A. Cefola

Administrative Judge