

KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: Applicant has not made a claim of harmful error. Adverse decision affirmed

CASENO: 08-10274.a1

DATE: 09/11/2009

DATE: September 11, 2009

In Re:)	
)	
----)	ISCR Case No. 08-10274
)	
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 February 9, 2009, DOHA issued a statement of reasons advising Applicant of the basis for that decision—security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) of

Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992), as amended (Directive). Applicant requested a hearing. On June 30, 2009, after the hearing, Administrative Judge John Grattan Metz, Jr. 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 error on the part of the Judge.¹ The Appeal Board's authority is limited to cases in which the appealing party has alleged that the Judge committed harmful error. *See* Directive ¶ E3.1.32. *See also* ISCR Case No. 08-08702 at 1-2 (App. Bd. Jun. 4, 2009). It does not review a case *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

¹Applicant states, "I do not think that the judge made any errors . . ." Applicant then lists reasons why she believes she should be granted a clearance, in effect asking the Board to consider her case *de novo*.