

KEYWORD: Guideline F; Guideline E

DIGEST: The Board does not review a case de novo. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 08-00346.a1

DATE: 04/13/2009

DATE: April 13, 2009

In Re:	)	
	)	
---	)	ISCR Case No. 08-00346
	)	
Applicant for Security Clearance	)	

**APPEAL BOARD SUMMARY DISPOSITION**

**APPEARANCES**

**FOR GOVERNMENT**

James B. Norman, Esq., Chief Department Counsel

**FOR APPLICANT**

*Pro Se*

The Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) declined to grant Applicant a security clearance. On May 13, 2008, DOHA issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that decision—security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) and Guideline E (Personal Conduct) of Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as

amended) (Directive). Applicant requested that the case be decided on the written record. On January 8, 2009, after considering the record, Administrative Judge Elizabeth M. Matchinski denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. 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. 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. It does not review cases *de novo*. Applicant has not made an allegation of harmful error. Therefore, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is AFFIRMED.

Signed: Michael D. Hipple  
Michael D. Hipple  
Administrative Judge  
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: Jean E. Smallin  
Jean E. Smallin  
Administrative Judge  
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: William S. Fields  
William S. Fields  
Administrative Judge  
Member, Appeal Board