



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



In the matter of:	)	
-----	)	
	)	ISCR Case No. 10-06471
Applicant for Security Clearance	)	

**Appearances**

For Government: Gregg A. Cervi, Esquire, Department Counsel

For Applicant: *Pro se*

May 3, 2011

---

**DECISION**

---

ROSS, Wilford H., Administrative Judge:

Applicant submitted his Electronic Questionnaire for Investigations Processing (e-QIP) on March 2, 2010. (Item 5.) On December 14, 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 for SORs issued after September 1, 2006.

Applicant submitted an undated Answer to the SOR, and requested a decision be made without a hearing. Department Counsel submitted a File or Relevant Material (FORM) to Applicant on January 27, 2011. Applicant received the FORM on February 7, 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 24, 2011. Based upon a review of the pleadings and exhibits, eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

## Findings of Fact

Applicant is 43 and separated from his 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 \$24,861. The evidence shows that these debts began accumulating in 2006. (Items 7, 8 and 9.)

During an interview with an investigator for the Office of Personnel Management, Applicant indicated that he had begun working with a debt resolution company to pay his debts. In May 2010, Applicant stated that he was paying this company \$210 a month and was current on his account. (Item 7.) He also provided a letter from this organization, dated November 18, 2010, saying that he "enrolled into the debt settlement program in January, 2009." The letter goes on to state:

We are in the process of negotiating with your outstanding creditors that you enrolled in the program and reaching settlement offers on all these accounts. As you know the program is a 3 year repayment program and should be finished at that time, given all the guidelines be followed. (Item 6 at 8.)

The letter does not contain a statement as to what his monthly payment is, how much the Applicant has paid into the account, and if there have been any successful negotiations.

An analysis of the financial documents provided by Applicant shows approximately \$310 positive monthly cash flow. (Item 6 at 5, 7.) That does not include the \$210 monthly payment to the debt resolution company.

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 \$24,000 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 paid off none of his alleged past due debts. While there is some evidence that he has an arrangement with a debt resolution company, no information was provided that he is making regular payments, or that they have succeeded in any negotiations on the Applicant’s behalf. Even if he has made regular payments to this company, the amount is just over \$5,000. 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., . . . divorce or separation), and the individual acted responsibly under the circumstances.” The Applicant and wife were separated in 2007. He indicates that the separation may have exacerbated his financial situation. However, there is scant evidence to show the impact of the separation, or to conclude that he has acted responsibly since then.

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 \$24,000 in debt, 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, 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 at this time. If he is able to pay down his debts, or otherwise resolve them, he may be eligible for a clearance in the future. He is not eligible now.

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.e.	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