



**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
DEFENSE OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS**



In the matter of:)	
)	
-----)	ISCR Case No. 10-02571
)	
Applicant for Security Clearance)	

Appearances

For Government: Paul M. DeLaney, Esquire, Department Counsel

For Applicant: *Pro se*

June 17, 2011

DECISION

ROSS, Wilford H., Administrative Judge:

Applicant submitted his Electronic Questionnaire for Investigations Processing (e-QIP) on November 24, 2009. (Item 5.) On October 29, 2010, the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) issued a Statement of Reasons (SOR) to Applicant detailing the security concerns under Guideline F (Financial Considerations). The action was taken under Executive Order 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information within Industry* (February 20, 1960), as amended; Department of Defense Directive 5220.6, *Defense Industrial Personnel Security Clearance Review Program* (January 2, 1992), as amended (Directive); and the adjudicative guidelines (AG) effective within the Department of Defense on September 1, 2006.

Applicant submitted an Answer to the SOR on November 29, 2010, and requested a decision without a hearing. Department Counsel submitted a File or Relevant Material (FORM) to Applicant on December 21, 2010. Applicant received the FORM on January 4, 2011, and was given 30 days to submit any additional information. Applicant did not submit any additional information. The case was assigned to me on March 3, 2011. Based upon a review of the pleadings and exhibits, eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

Findings of Fact

Applicant is 54 and married to his second wife. He is employed by a defense contractor and seeks to obtain a security clearance in connection with his employment.

Guideline F, Financial Considerations

The Government alleges that Applicant is ineligible for clearance because he is financially overextended and therefore at risk of having to engage in illegal acts to generate funds. Applicant admits all of the allegations in the SOR. Those admissions are deemed findings of fact.

The SOR alleges, Applicant admits, and Government exhibits substantiate nine delinquent debts totaling approximately \$168,000. The evidence shows that these debts began accumulating in 2006. (Items 5, 6, 7 and 8.)

1.a. Applicant admits declaring bankruptcy under Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code in 2001. (Item 9.)

1.b. Applicant admits owing this medical debt in the amount of \$98. He stated in his Answer to the SOR that this debt "will be paid in full mid month 12/2010." (Item 4 at 1.) Applicant had previously stated in response to Department of Defense interrogatories on September 24, 2010, "I am going to pay this off with my next pay check on 9/17/2010." (Item 6 at 9.) No evidence was submitted by Applicant to show that this debt had been paid. It is unresolved.

1.c. Applicant admits owing this past due debt in the amount of \$608. No evidence was submitted by Applicant to show that this debt has been paid. It remains unresolved.

1.d. Applicant admits owing this past due debt for a student loan in the amount of \$3,301. No evidence was submitted by Applicant to show that this debt has been paid. It is unresolved.

1.e. Applicant admits owing a mortgage company \$32,822 for a past due second mortgage on his primary residence. The house was foreclosed on in 2007. According to Applicant, the foreclosure was due to his being laid off from work. (Item 6 at 4.) Applicant stated in his Answer that he has never been contacted by the mortgage company regarding any deficiency. In addition, a November 5, 2010 credit report (Applicant Exhibit A) submitted by the Applicant with his Answer shows this particular mortgage debt to be charged off.

1.f. Applicant admits owing this past due debt for a student loan in the amount of \$3,157. The available evidence concerning this particular debt is confusing. A December 2009 credit report shows this debt as being in collection. It also states, "Claim filed with government." (Item 8 at 3.) The same information is found in an August

2010 credit report. (Item 7 at 3.) Applicant Exhibit A also shows the same information at pages 6-7. The current status of this debt is unknown.

1.g. Applicant admits owing a mortgage company \$128,000 for a first mortgage on his house. The records show this house was foreclosed in 2007. Applicant states that he has never been contacted by the mortgage company for any payment after the foreclosure. (Item 6 at 11.) The current status of this debt is unknown.

During an interview with an investigator for the Office of Personnel Management in December 2009, Applicant stated that his financial problems were brought about, at least in part, by a period of unemployment and under employment in the 2006 time frame. In addition, his wife had to have surgery in 2009, costing over \$3,000. Applicant was still making payments on that debt as of the date of the interview.

A personal financial statement was not included in Item 6. However, Applicant states in the interrogatories that he has a monthly remainder of approximately \$900. (Item 6 at 14.)

Applicant provided no evidence concerning the quality of his professional performance, the level of responsibility his duties entail, or his track record with respect to handling sensitive information and observation of security procedures. He submitted no character references or other evidence tending to establish good judgment, trustworthiness, or reliability. I was unable to evaluate his credibility, demeanor, or character in person since he elected to have his case decided without a hearing.

Policies

Security clearance decisions are not made in a vacuum. When evaluating an applicant's suitability for a security clearance, the administrative judge must consider the revised adjudicative guidelines (AG). In addition to brief introductory explanations for each guideline, the adjudicative guidelines list potentially disqualifying conditions and mitigating conditions, which are to be used as appropriate in evaluating an applicant's eligibility for access to classified information.

These guidelines are not inflexible rules of law. Instead, recognizing the complexities of human behavior, these guidelines are applied in conjunction with the factors listed in the adjudicative process. The administrative judge's overarching adjudicative goal is a fair, impartial and commonsense decision. According to AG ¶ 2(c), the entire process is a conscientious scrutiny of a number of variables known as the "whole-person concept." The administrative judge must consider all available, reliable information about the person, past and present, favorable and unfavorable, in making a decision. In addition, the administrative judge may also rely on his or her own common sense, as well as knowledge of the law, human nature, and the ways of the world, in making a reasoned decision.

The protection of the national security is the paramount consideration. AG ¶ 2(b) requires that “[a]ny doubt concerning personnel being considered for access to classified information will be resolved in favor of national security.” In reaching this decision, I have drawn only those conclusions that are reasonable, logical and based on the evidence contained in the record. Likewise, I have avoided drawing inferences grounded on mere speculation or conjecture.

Under Directive ¶ E3.1.14, the Government must present evidence to establish controverted facts alleged in the SOR. Under Directive ¶ E3.1.15, the applicant is responsible for presenting “witnesses and other evidence to rebut, explain, extenuate, or mitigate facts admitted by applicant or proven by Department Counsel. . . .” The applicant has the ultimate burden of persuasion as to obtaining a favorable security decision.

A person who seeks access to classified information enters into a fiduciary relationship with the Government predicated upon trust and confidence. This relationship transcends normal duty hours and endures throughout off-duty hours. The Government reposes a high degree of trust and confidence in individuals to whom it grants access to classified information. Security clearance decisions include, by necessity, consideration of the possible risk that the 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.

Finally, as emphasized in Section 7 of Executive Order 10865, “Any determination under this order . . . shall be a determination in terms of the national interest and shall in no sense be a determination as to the loyalty of the applicant concerned.” See *also* EO 12968, Section 3.1(b) (listing multiple prerequisites for access to classified or sensitive information).

Analysis

Guideline F, Financial Considerations

The security concern relating to the guideline for Financial Considerations is set out in AG ¶ 18:

Failure or inability to live within one’s means, satisfy debts, and meet financial obligations may indicate poor self-control, lack of judgment, or unwillingness to abide by rules and regulations, all of which can raise questions about an individual’s reliability, trustworthiness and ability to protect classified information. An individual who is financially overextended is at risk of having to engage in illegal acts to generate funds.

The guideline notes several conditions that could raise security concerns. Under AG ¶ 19(a), an “inability or unwillingness to satisfy debts” is potentially disqualifying.

Similarly under AG ¶ 19(c), “a history of not meeting financial obligations” may raise security concerns. The Applicant, by his own admission, has over \$168,000 in past due debts, all of which have been due and owing for several years. The evidence is sufficient to raise these potentially disqualifying conditions.

The guideline also includes examples of conditions that could mitigate security concerns arising from financial difficulties. Under AG ¶ 20(a), the disqualifying condition may be mitigated where “the behavior happened so long ago, was so infrequent, or occurred under such circumstances that it is unlikely to recur and does not cast doubt on the individual’s current reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment.” The Applicant’s financial difficulties are of a longstanding nature. As stated above, he has not submitted any evidence showing he paid off any of his alleged past due debts. This includes a small debt of \$98, which Applicant stated several times he would pay. It is the Applicant’s burden to submit evidence showing that his financial situation has improved. He has not done so. This mitigating condition is not applicable.

AG ¶ 20(b) states that the disqualifying conditions may be mitigated where “the conditions that resulted in the financial problem were largely beyond the person’s control (e.g., loss of employment, a business downturn, unexpected medical emergency, or a death, divorce or separation), and the individual acted responsibly under the circumstances.” Applicant indicates that a period of unemployment and underemployment in 2006, along with his wife’s health problems in 2009, have caused his financial problems. However, there is scant evidence to show the impact of these acts, or to conclude that he has acted responsibly since then. This is especially so where the Applicant seems to indicate a net remainder every month of \$900.

The Applicant has not initiated a good-faith effort to pay off his creditors or otherwise resolve the debts. There is no track record of his making payments for any period of time. Accordingly, AG ¶ 20(d) is not applicable. Finally, given the fact that he is at least \$168,000 in debt (\$7,164 if the first and second mortgages are removed) with virtually no movement in payment for several years, I cannot find that “there are clear indications that the problem is being resolved or is under control,” as required by AG ¶ 20(c).

Whole-Person Concept

Under the whole-person concept, the administrative judge must evaluate an applicant’s eligibility for a security clearance by considering the totality of applicant’s conduct and all the circumstances. Under AG ¶ 2(c), the ultimate determination of whether to grant eligibility for a security clearance must be an overall commonsense judgment based upon careful consideration of the guidelines and the whole-person concept. The administrative judge should consider the nine adjudicative process factors listed at AG ¶ 2(a):

- (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 extent to which participation is voluntary; (6) the presence or absence of rehabilitation and other permanent 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.

I considered the potentially disqualifying and mitigating conditions in light of all the facts and circumstances surrounding this case. Applicant is under financial strain, and has been for several years. His debt situation is not yet under control. Under AG ¶ 2(a)(3), Applicant's conduct is recent. Based on the state of the record, particularly the lack of any recent payments, I cannot find that there have been permanent behavioral changes under AG ¶ 2(a)(6). Accordingly, at the present time, I find that there is the potential for pressure, coercion, exploitation, or duress (AG ¶ 2(a)(8)), and that there is a high likelihood of recurrence (AG ¶ 2(a)(9)).

Overall, the record evidence leaves me with questions or doubts as to Applicant's eligibility and suitability for a security clearance. For all these reasons, I conclude Applicant has not mitigated the security concerns arising from his financial situation.

On balance, it is concluded that Applicant has not successfully overcome the Government's case opposing his request for a DoD security clearance. Accordingly, the evidence supports a finding against Applicant as to the factual and conclusory allegations expressed in Paragraph 1 of the Government's Statement of Reasons.

Formal Findings

Formal findings for or against Applicant on the allegations set forth in the SOR, as required by section E3.1.25 of Enclosure 3 of the Directive, are:

Paragraph 1, Guideline F:	AGAINST THE APPLICANT
Subparagraphs 1.a. through 1.g.	Against the Applicant

Conclusion

In light of all of the circumstances presented by the record in this case, it is not clearly consistent with the national interest to grant Applicant eligibility for a security clearance. Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

WILFORD H. ROSS
Administrative Judge