KEYWORD: Guideline F; Guideline E

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

CASENO: 09-07789.a1

DATE: 10/10/2012

DATE: October 10, 2012

In Re:

\_\_\_\_\_

Applicant for Security Clearance

ISCR Case No. 09-07789

## 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 June 10, 2011, 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 a hearing. On June 18, 2012, after the hearing, Administrative Judge Robert J. Tuider 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 makes no assertion of harmful error on the part of the Judge. He asserted that he is taking action to address his outstanding debts and he has engaged a financial assistance company to help him obtain good credit. Some of these representations are not contained in the record below.

The Board may not consider new evidence on appeal. See Directive  $\P$  E3.1.29. Additionally, 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. See Directive  $\P$  E3.1.32. The Board does not review cases *de novo*. Therefore, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is AFFIRMED.

Signed: Jeffrey D. Billett Jeffrey D. Billett Administrative Judge Member, Appeal Board

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

<u>Signed: William S. Fields</u> William S. Fields Administrative Judge Member, Appeal Board