

DATE: April 6, 1998

In Re:

SSN: -----

Applicant for Security Clearance

ISCR Case No. 98-0087

DECISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

ROBERT R. GALES

APPEARANCES

FOR GOVERNMENT

Pamela C. Benson, Esquire, Department Counsel

FOR APPLICANT

Pro Se

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On January 27, 1998, the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA), pursuant to Executive Order 10865, "Safeguarding Classified Information Within Industry," dated February 20, 1960, as amended and modified, and Department of Defense Directive 5220.6, "Defense Industrial Personnel Security Clearance Review Program" (Directive), dated January 2, 1992, as amended and modified, issued a Statement of Reasons (SOR) to 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 Applicant, and recommended referral to an Administrative Judge to determine whether a clearance should be granted, continued, denied, or revoked.

In a sworn written statement, dated February 6, 1998, Applicant responded to the allegations set forth in the SOR, and elected to have her case decided on a written record, in lieu of a hearing. Department Counsel submitted the Government's written case on February 24, 1998. A complete copy of the file of relevant material (FORM)(1) was provided to Applicant, and she was afforded an opportunity to file objections and submit material in refutation, extenuation, or mitigation. She submitted a response, dated February 26, 1998. The case was initially assigned to Administrative Judge Roger C. Wesley on March 27, 1998, but due to caseload considerations, was subsequently reassigned to, and received by, this Administrative Judge on April 2, 1998.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Applicant has admitted all of the factual allegations pertaining to drug involvement under Criterion H. Those admissions are incorporated herein as findings of fact.

After a complete and thorough review of the evidence in the record, and upon due consideration of same, I make the following additional findings of fact:

Applicant is a twenty-two year old female employed by a defense contractor, and she is seeking to obtain a TOP

SECRET security clearance.

Applicant was an illegal poly-substance abuser. She commenced using marijuana in about December 1993,⁽²⁾ when she was 18 years of age, while in college, initially out of "youthful curiosity" and due to peer pressure,⁽³⁾ and continued doing so, on a regular basis, until at least November 1996. During the period 1993-95, she abused marijuana up to two times per week; and in 1996, the frequency increased to daily abuse.⁽⁴⁾ She smoked it primarily in social situations, and estimated that she had used marijuana on about 100-150 occasions.⁽⁵⁾

Applicant ceased using marijuana when she decided she didn't like it any more.⁽⁶⁾ Her cessation of marijuana abuse had nothing to do with abstinence, because she had found a substitute illegal substance, and had already commenced abusing cocaine. There is, however, nothing in the record to rebut Applicant's contention that she has abstained from marijuana abuse since November 1996.

Applicant commenced using cocaine in approximately May 1996, initially after being introduced to it by her boss, and continued doing so, on a regular basis, until at least January 1997.⁽⁷⁾ Initially, she abused cocaine only a few times per month, but by November 1996, the frequency had increased to regular daily abuse.⁽⁸⁾ She abused cocaine primarily by herself, and estimated that she had done so on about 15-20 occasions.⁽⁹⁾ Applicant eventually realized that she had a cocaine "problem," and terminated her employment and ceased abusing cocaine. There is nothing in the record to rebut Applicant's contention that she has abstained from cocaine abuse since January 1997.

During the period of her greatest cocaine abuse, on one occasion, when encouraged to do so by her boss, Applicant purchased an unspecified quantity of cocaine.⁽¹⁰⁾ There is nothing in the record to rebut Applicant's contention that she had made only one such purchase.

February 1994 was a time for experimentation by Applicant. On one occasion, with a friend in a college dormitory room, out of curiosity, Applicant experimented with an amphetamine, referred to as a "white cross."⁽¹¹⁾ That same month, on two separate occasions, also in a college dormitory room, out of curiosity and due to peer pressure, Applicant experimented with Lysergic Acid Diethylamide (LSD), referred to as "acid."⁽¹²⁾ There is nothing in the record to rebut Applicant's contentions that she has abstained from both amphetamine and LSD abuse since February 1994.

Applicant has vowed to never use illegal substances in the future,⁽¹³⁾ and contends that she has turned her life around and become more active in positive endeavors. She attributes her poly-substance abuse to the "mistakes of an insecure, misguided girl with little or no long-range goals for her life."⁽¹⁴⁾

Applicant has never undergone any drug treatment or rehabilitation.⁽¹⁵⁾

Applicant has been employed by her current employer since April 1997. Corporate officers and co-workers from her employer have characterized her performance and attitude in positive terms, and they, along with friends, support her application.

POLICIES

Enclosure 2 of the Directive sets forth adjudicative guidelines which must be considered in the evaluation of security suitability. In addition to brief introductory explanations for each guideline, the adjudicative guidelines are divided into those that may be considered in deciding whether to deny or revoke an individual's eligibility for access to classified information (Disqualifying Factors) and those that may be considered in deciding whether to grant an individual's eligibility for access to classified information (Mitigating Factors).

An Administrative Judge need not view the adjudicative guidelines as inflexible ironclad rules of law. Instead, acknowledging the complexities of human behavior, these guidelines, when applied in conjunction with the factors set forth in the Adjudicative Process provision--an expansion of the factors set forth in Section F.3. of the Directive, are intended to assist the Administrative Judge in reaching fair and impartial common sense decisions.

Because the entire process is a conscientious scrutiny of a number of variables known as the "whole person concept," all available, reliable information about the person, past and present, favorable and unfavorable, should be considered in making a meaningful decision. The Adjudicative Process factors which an Administrative Judge should consider are: (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 voluntariness of participation; (6) the presence or absence of rehabilitation and other pertinent 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.

Based upon a consideration of the evidence as a whole, I find the following adjudicative guidelines most pertinent to an evaluation of the facts of this case:

[Drug Involvement - Criterion H]: Improper or illegal involvement with drugs, raises questions regarding an individual's willingness or ability to protect classified information. Drug abuse or dependence may impair social or occupational functioning, increasing the risk of an unauthorized disclosure of classified information.

Drugs are defined as mood and behavior altering:

(a) drugs, materials, and other chemical compounds identified and listed in the Controlled Substances Act of 1970, as amended (e.g., marijuana or cannabis, depressants, narcotics, stimulants, and hallucinogens) and

(b) inhalants and other similar substances.

Drug abuse is the illegal use of a drug or use of a legal drug in a manner that deviates from approved medical direction.

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

(1) any drug abuse (see above definition);

(2) illegal drug possession, including cultivation, processing, manufacture, purchase, sale, or distribution;

Conditions that could mitigate security concerns include:

(3) a demonstrated intent not to abuse any drugs in the future.

Since the protection of the national security is the paramount determinant, the final decision in each case must be arrived at by applying the standard that the issuance of the clearance is "clearly consistent with the interests of national security,"⁽¹⁶⁾ or "clearly consistent with the national interest." For the purposes herein, despite the different language in each, I have concluded that both standards are one and the same. In reaching this Decision, I have endeavored to draw only those conclusions that are reasonable, logical and based on the evidence contained in the record. Likewise, I have attempted to avoid drawing inferences that are grounded on mere speculation or conjecture.

In the decision-making process, the burden of producing evidence initially falls on the Government to establish a case which demonstrates, in accordance with the Directive, that it is not clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue an applicant's access to classified information. If the Government meets its burden, the heavy burden of persuasion then falls upon the applicant to present evidence in refutation, explanation, extenuation or mitigation sufficient to overcome the doubts raised by the Government's case, and to ultimately demonstrate that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue the applicant's clearance.

A person who seeks access to classified information enters into a fiduciary relationship with the Government predicated upon trust and confidence. It is a relationship that transcends normal duty hours and endures throughout off-duty hours as well. It is because of this special relationship that the Government must be able to repose a high degree of trust and confidence in those individuals to whom it grants access to classified information. Decisions under this Directive include, by necessity, consideration of the possible risk that an 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.

One additional comment is worthy of note. Applicant's loyalty and patriotism are not at issue in these proceedings. Section 7 of Executive Order 10865 specifically provides that industrial security clearance decisions shall be "in terms of the national interest and shall in no sense be a determination as to the loyalty of the applicant concerned." Security clearance decisions cover many characteristics of an applicant other than loyalty and patriotism. 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 decision as to Applicant's loyalty or patriotism.

CONCLUSIONS

Upon consideration of all the facts in evidence, an assessment of the witness credibility, and after application of all appropriate legal precepts and factors, including those described briefly above, I conclude the following with respect to each allegation set forth in the SOR:

With respect to Criterion H, the Government has established its case. Applicant's improper and illegal drug abuse, including the possession and use of marijuana, cocaine, amphetamine, and LSD, and her one-time purchase of cocaine, is of concern, especially in light of her desire to have access to the nation's secrets. With regard to the marijuana and cocaine, Applicant did not simply experiment out of curiosity and stop. Instead, motivated by social pleasures, notwithstanding the legal status of her endeavor (it was illegal), she exhibited a pattern of questionable judgment, irresponsibility, and immature behavior, and continued her regular abuse of marijuana for nearly three years; and her regular abuse of cocaine for eight months. The marijuana abuse finally ceased about 16 months before the closing of the record; and the cocaine abuse ceased about 14 months before the closing of the record.

The presence or absence of rehabilitation and other pertinent behavioral changes are significant factors in the overall adjudicative process. Despite a period of marijuana and cocaine abuse, Applicant has not undergone any drug awareness, education, or treatment program, in order to achieve a better self-understanding of the behavioral and psychological effects of her actions and the motivation therefor. Likewise, simply superficially claiming that peer pressure, curiosity, immaturity, and continued social pleasures were motivators, does not demonstrate true insight into the actual motivation for following the course of conduct which she had chosen. Without the development of countermeasures to the resumption of substance abuse--relapse prevention, the likelihood of recurrence becomes greater.

Applicant's continuing abstinence is to be encouraged, but the current period of abstinence is still relatively brief, too brief, in light of her substance abuse history. In this instance, I believe that both the successful completion of a drug treatment and rehabilitation program, as well as a longer period of abstinence should be required to demonstrate the truly successful transformation from substance abuser to an abstinent, drug-free person, and to provide the basis for a conclusion that such conduct will not continue or recur in the future. Under the evidence presented, I am not confident that Applicant's substance abuse is a thing of the past, or that it will not recur.

I do not take this position lightly, but based on the law, as set forth in *Department of Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518 (1988), my evaluation of the evidence, and my application of the pertinent factors under the Adjudicative Process, I believe that Applicant has failed to mitigate or overcome the Government's case. The evidence leaves me with questions and doubts as to Applicant's continued security eligibility and suitability. Accordingly, allegations 1.a. through 1.c. of the SOR are concluded against Applicant.

Applicant's experimentation with amphetamine on one occasion in February 1994, and LSD on two occasions that same month, has not been repeated thereafter, and I consider such abuse to be stale, with little current security significance. Thus, I conclude that Applicant has, through evidence of extenuation and explanation, successfully mitigated and overcome the Government's case. Accordingly, allegations 1.d. and 1.e. of the SOR are concluded in favor of Applicant.

For the reasons stated, I conclude Applicant is not suitable for access to classified information.

FORMAL FINDINGS

Formal findings For or Against Applicant on the allegations set forth in the SOR, as required by Paragraph 25 of Enclosure 3 of the Directive, are:

Paragraph 1. Criterion H: AGAINST THE APPLICANT

Subparagraph 1.a.: Against the Applicant

Subparagraph 1.b.: Against the Applicant

Subparagraph 1.c.: Against the Applicant

Subparagraph 1.d.: For the Applicant

Subparagraph 1.e.: For the Applicant

DECISION

In light of all 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 Applicant.

Robert R. Gales

Chief Administrative Judge

1. The Government submitted five items in support of its contentions.
2. *See* Item 5 (Statement of Subject, dated December 15, 1997) at 1.
3. *See* Response to FORM at 1.
4. *See* Item 5, *supra* note 2 at 2.
5. *See* Item 4 (Security Clearance Application (SF 86), dated July 10, 1997) at 9. It should be noted that the SF 86 is unsigned. Nevertheless, Applicant has offered no objection to its admission into evidence.
6. *See* Item 5, *supra* note 2 at 2.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*
9. *See* Item 4, *supra* note 5, at 9.
10. *See* Response to FORM, *supra* note 3 at 2.
11. *See* Item 5, *supra* note 2 at 2.
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Id.* at 3.
14. *See* Response to FORM, *supra* note 3 at 2.
15. *See* Item 5, *supra* note 2 at 3.

16. *See*, Executive Order 12968, "*Access to Classified Information*;" as implemented by Department of Defense Regulation 5200.2-R, "*Personnel Security Program*," dated January 1987, as amended by Change 3, dated November 8, 1995. However, the Directive uses both "clearly consistent with the national interest" (*see*, Sec. B.3; Sec. C.2.; and Sec. D.2.; Enclosure 3, Sec. 1.; and Sec. 25), and "clearly consistent with the interests of national security" (*see*, Enclosure 2 (Change 3), Adjudicative Guidelines, at 2-2).