



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



In the matter of:

Applicant for Security Clearance

)  
)  
)  
)  
)

ISCR Case No. 15-07426

**Appearances**

For Government: Bryan Olmos, Esq., Department Counsel  
For Applicant: *Pro se*

10/20/2017

---

**Decision**

---

HARVEY, Mark, Administrative Judge:

Applicant provided insufficient evidence of resolution of his financial issues. Financial considerations security concerns are not mitigated. Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

**Statement of the Case**

On May 7, 2015, Applicant signed his Questionnaire for National Security Positions (SF 86) or security clearance application (SCA). Item 3. On June 15, 2016, the Department of Defense (DOD) Consolidated Adjudications Facility (CAF) issued a statement of reasons (SOR) to Applicant under Executive Order (Exec. Or.) 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information within Industry*, February 20, 1960; DOD Directive 5220.6, *Defense Industrial Personnel Security Clearance Review Program* (Directive), January 2, 1992; and the *Adjudicative Guidelines for Determining Eligibility for Access to Classified Information*, effective on September 1, 2006. The SOR set forth security concerns arising under the financial considerations guideline. Item 1.

On July 11, 2016, Applicant provided a response to the SOR, and he did not request a hearing. Item 2. On August 4, 2016, Department Counsel completed the File of Relevant Material (FORM). On August 17, 2016, Applicant received the FORM, and he did not respond to the FORM. On October 1, 2017, the case was assigned to me. The

case file consists of six exhibits. Items 1-6. Applicant did not object to any of the Government exhibits, and they were admitted into evidence.

The Director of National Intelligence (DNI) issued Security Executive Agent Directive 4, establishing in Appendix A the *National Security Adjudicative Guidelines for Determining Eligibility for Access to Classified Information or Eligibility to Hold a Sensitive Position* (AGs), which he made applicable to all covered individuals who require initial or continued eligibility for access to classified information or eligibility to hold a sensitive position on or after June 8, 2017. The new AGs supersede the previous AGs. Accordingly, I have evaluated Applicant's security clearance eligibility under the new AGs.<sup>1</sup>

### **Findings of Fact<sup>2</sup>**

In Applicant's SOR response, he admitted the SOR allegations in SOR ¶¶ 1.a through 1.h. Item 2. He also provided extenuating and mitigating information. Item 2.

Applicant is 44 years old, and he has been employed as a senior engineering logistics specialist since 2000.<sup>3</sup> In 1992, he graduated from high school, and from 1992 to 1995, he attended community college. Item 4. In 1998, he received a bachelor's degree in management information systems. Item 4. In 2003, he married, and his children were born in 2002 and 2007. There is no evidence of security violations, abuse of alcohol, or use of illegal drugs.

### **Financial Considerations**

Applicant's SOR alleges seven delinquent debts totaling \$101,703 and a bankruptcy: ¶¶ 1.a and 1.b are charged-off debts owed to the same credit union for \$24,853 and \$38,209; ¶¶ 1.c, 1.d, and 1.e are charged-off bank debts for \$5,124, \$4,153, and \$4,999; ¶ 1.f is a student loan debt for \$20,245 past due in the amount of \$1,236; ¶ 1.g is a bank debt for \$4,140 past due in the amount of \$773; and ¶ 1.h states his nonpriority unsecured debts were discharged in August 2003 under Chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code. Item 1.

Applicant owns a food truck, and he works on the food truck about 32 hours a week in addition to his full-time employment for a DOD contractor. Items 2, 4. During his June 16, 2015 Office of Personnel Management (OPM) personal subject interview (PSI), Applicant said he would sell the food-truck business by the end of 2015. Item 4.

---

<sup>1</sup> Application of the AGs that were in effect as of the issuance of the SOR would not change my decision in this case. The new AGs are available at [http://ogc.osd.mil/doha/SEAD4\\_20170608.pdf](http://ogc.osd.mil/doha/SEAD4_20170608.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Some details were excluded to protect Applicant's right to privacy. Specific information is available in the cited exhibits.

<sup>3</sup> Unless stated otherwise, the source of the information in this paragraph is Applicant's May 7, 2015 Questionnaire for National Security Positions (SF 86) or security clearance application (SCA). Item 3.

On July 11, 2016, Applicant said for the debts in SOR ¶¶ 1.a through 1.e, he was “trying to get additional funding via the food truck.”<sup>4</sup> If that does not work, he plans to sell the food truck to pay his debts. He contacted some of his SOR creditors; he tried to make payment arrangements; and the creditors suggested payment arrangements that were not affordable.

Applicant said his student loan in SOR ¶ 1.f was current and in forbearance. He did not provide documentation showing the status of his student loan. He said his bank debt in SOR ¶ 1.g is in an established payment plan. He did not provide a copy of the payment plan or proof of any payments. He filed for bankruptcy, and the bankruptcy court discharged his debts in August 2003 because he did not believe he had any other options. Applicant does not believe he is a risk to national security.

In the FORM, Department Counsel noted the absence of corroborating or supporting documentation of resolution of the SOR debts. FORM at 2-3. Aside from Applicant’s uncorroborated statements, there is no documentary evidence that Applicant paid, arranged to pay, settled, compromised, or otherwise resolved any of the SOR debts. The record lacks corroborating or substantiating documentation and detailed explanations of the causes for his financial problems and other mitigating information. The FORM informed Applicant that he had 30 days from the receipt of the FORM “in which to submit a documentary response setting forth objections, rebuttal, extenuation, mitigation, or explanation, as appropriate. If you do not file any objections or submit any additional information . . . your case will be assigned to an Administrative Judge for a determination based solely” on the evidence set forth in this FORM. FORM at 4. He did not respond to the FORM.

## **Policies**

The U.S. Supreme Court has recognized the substantial discretion of the Executive Branch in regulating access to information pertaining to national security emphasizing, “no one has a ‘right’ to a security clearance.” *Department of the Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518, 528 (1988). As Commander in Chief, the President has the authority to control access to information bearing on national security and to determine whether an individual is sufficiently trustworthy to have access to such information.” *Id.* at 527. The President has authorized the Secretary of Defense or his designee to grant applicant’s eligibility for access to classified information “only upon a finding that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to do so.” Exec. Or. 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information within Industry* § 2 (Feb. 20, 1960), as amended.

Eligibility for a security clearance is predicated upon the applicant meeting the criteria contained in the adjudicative guidelines. These guidelines are not inflexible rules of law. Instead, recognizing the complexities of human behavior, these guidelines are applied in conjunction with an evaluation of the whole person. An administrative judge’s overarching adjudicative goal is a fair, impartial, and commonsense decision. An

---

<sup>4</sup> Unless stated otherwise, the source of the information in this paragraph and the next paragraph is Applicant’s July 11, 2016 SOR response. Item 2.

administrative judge must consider all available, reliable information about the person, past and present, favorable and unfavorable.

The Government reposes a high degree of trust and confidence in persons with access to classified information. This relationship transcends normal duty hours and endures throughout off-duty hours. Decisions include, by necessity, consideration of the possible risk the applicant may deliberately or inadvertently fail to safeguard classified information. Such decisions entail a certain degree of legally permissible extrapolation about potential, rather than actual, risk of compromise of classified information. Clearance decisions must be “in terms of the national interest and shall in no sense be a determination as to the loyalty of the applicant concerned.” See Exec. Or. 10865 § 7. Thus, nothing in this decision should be construed to suggest that it is based, in whole or in part, on any express or implied determination about applicant’s allegiance, loyalty, or patriotism. It is merely an indication the applicant has not met the strict guidelines the President, Secretary of Defense, and DNI have established for issuing a clearance.

Initially, the Government must establish, by substantial evidence, conditions in the personal or professional history of the applicant that may disqualify the applicant from being eligible for access to classified information. The Government has the burden of establishing controverted facts alleged in the SOR. See *Egan*, 484 U.S. at 531. “Substantial evidence” is “more than a scintilla but less than a preponderance.” See *v. Washington Metro. Area Transit Auth.*, 36 F.3d 375, 380 (4th Cir. 1994). The guidelines presume a nexus or rational connection between proven conduct under any of the criteria listed therein and an applicant’s security suitability. See ISCR Case No. 95-0611 at 2 (App. Bd. May 2, 1996).

Once the Government establishes a disqualifying condition by substantial evidence, the burden shifts to the applicant to rebut, explain, extenuate, or mitigate the facts. Directive ¶ E3.1.15. An applicant “has the ultimate burden of demonstrating that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue his security clearance.” ISCR Case No. 01-20700 at 3 (App. Bd. Dec. 19, 2002). The burden of disproving a mitigating condition never shifts to the Government. See ISCR Case No. 02-31154 at 5 (App. Bd. Sep. 22, 2005). “[S]ecurity clearance determinations should err, if they must, on the side of denials.” *Egan*, 484 U.S. at 531; see AG ¶ 2(b).

## **Analysis**

### **Financial Considerations**

AG ¶ 18 articulates the security concern for financial problems:

Failure 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 or sensitive information. . . . An individual who is financially

overextended is at greater risk of having to engage in illegal or otherwise questionable acts to generate funds. . . .

The Appeal Board explained the scope and rationale for the financial considerations security concern in ISCR Case No. 11-05365 at 3 (App. Bd. May 1, 2012) (citation omitted) as follows:

This concern is broader than the possibility that an applicant might knowingly compromise classified information in order to raise money in satisfaction of his or her debts. Rather, it requires a Judge to examine the totality of an applicant's financial history and circumstances. The Judge must consider pertinent evidence regarding the applicant's self-control, judgment, and other qualities essential to protecting the national secrets as well as the vulnerabilities inherent in the circumstances. The Directive presumes a nexus between proven conduct under any of the Guidelines and an applicant's security eligibility.

AG ¶ 19 includes three disqualifying conditions that could raise a security concern and may be disqualifying in this case: "(a) inability to satisfy debts"; "(b) unwillingness to satisfy debts regardless of the ability to do so"; and "(c) a history of not meeting financial obligations." In ISCR Case No. 08-12184 at 7 (App. Bd. Jan. 7, 2010), the Appeal Board explained:

It is well-settled that adverse information from a credit report can normally meet the substantial evidence standard and the government's obligations under [Directive] ¶ E3.1.14 for pertinent allegations. At that point, the burden shifts to applicant to establish either that [he or] she is not responsible for the debt or that matters in mitigation apply.

(internal citation omitted). The record establishes the disqualifying conditions in AG ¶¶ 19(a), 19(b), and 19(c) requiring additional inquiry about the possible applicability of mitigating conditions.

Five financial considerations mitigating conditions under AG ¶ 20 are potentially applicable in this case:

(a) the behavior happened so long ago,<sup>5</sup> 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;

(b) 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, a death, divorce or separation, clear

---

<sup>5</sup> A debt that became delinquent several years ago is still considered recent because "an applicant's ongoing, unpaid debts evidence a continuing course of conduct and, therefore, can be viewed as recent for purposes of the Guideline F mitigating conditions." ISCR Case No. 15-06532 at 3 (App. Bd. February 16, 2017) (citing ISCR Case No. 15-01690 at 2 (App. Bd. Sep. 13, 2016)).

victimization by predatory lending practices, or identity theft), and the individual acted responsibly under the circumstances;

(c) the individual has received or is receiving financial counseling for the problem from a legitimate and credible source, such as a non-profit credit counseling service, and there are clear indications that the problem is being resolved or is under control;

(d) the individual initiated and is adhering to a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or otherwise resolve debts;<sup>6</sup> and

(e) the individual has a reasonable basis to dispute the legitimacy of the past-due debt which is the cause of the problem and provides documented proof to substantiate the basis of the dispute or provides evidence of actions to resolve the issue.

The DOHA Appeal Board concisely explained Applicant's responsibility for proving the applicability of mitigating conditions as follows:

Once a concern arises regarding an Applicant's security clearance eligibility, there is a strong presumption against the grant or maintenance of a security clearance. See *Dorfmont v. Brown*, 913 F. 2d 1399, 1401 (9th Cir. 1990), *cert. denied*, 499 U.S. 905 (1991). After the Government presents evidence raising security concerns, the burden shifts to the applicant to rebut or mitigate those concerns. See Directive ¶ E3.1.15. The standard applicable in security clearance decisions is that articulated in *Egan, supra*. "Any doubt concerning personnel being considered for access to classified information will be resolved in favor of the national security." Directive, Enclosure 2 ¶ 2(b).

ISCR Case No. 10-04641 at 4 (App. Bd. Sept. 24, 2013).

None of the mitigating conditions fully apply. Applicant's financial problems were not related to unemployment because he has been continuously employed for 16 years.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Appeal Board has previously explained what constitutes a "good faith" effort to repay overdue creditors or otherwise resolve debts:

In order to qualify for application of [the "good faith" mitigating condition], an applicant must present evidence showing either a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or some other good-faith action aimed at resolving the applicant's debts. The Directive does not define the term "good-faith." However, the Board has indicated that the concept of good-faith "requires a showing that a person acts in a way that shows reasonableness, prudence, honesty, and adherence to duty or obligation." Accordingly, an applicant must do more than merely show that he or she relied on a legally available option (such as bankruptcy) in order to claim the benefit of [the "good faith" mitigating condition].

(internal citation and footnote omitted) ISCR Case No. 02-30304 at 3 (App. Bd. Apr. 20, 2004) (quoting ISCR Case No. 99-9020 at 5-6 (App. Bd. June 4, 2001)).

His food-truck business is struggling or at least insufficiently profitable to enable him to pay his delinquent SOR debts; however, he did not provide sufficient details about the effect this business had on his finances. Without more information, he did not establish that he acted prudently, and how circumstances beyond his control adversely affected his finances. Applicant did not prove he acted responsibly under the circumstances because he did not show the changes in his income over the last five years, and he did not establish he was unable to make any payments to address any of the SOR debts.

Applicant's SOR alleges seven delinquent debts totaling \$101,703 and discharge of his unsecured nonpriority debts through bankruptcy in August 2003. I have credited him with mitigating SOR ¶ 1.h because his bankruptcy in August 2003 is not recent.

Applicant's credit reports indicate that several of his debts are in charged-off status. Eventually the charged-off debts will be dropped from his credit report. "[T]hat some debts have dropped off his credit report is not meaningful evidence of debt resolution." ISCR Case No. 14-05803 at 3 (App. Bd. July 7, 2016) (citing ISCR Case No. 14-03612 at 3 (App. Bd. Aug. 25, 2015)). The Fair Credit Reporting Act requires removal of most negative financial items from a credit report seven years from the first date of delinquency or the debt becoming collection barred because of a state statute of limitations, whichever is longer.<sup>7</sup> Debts may be dropped from a credit report upon dispute when creditors believe the debt is not going to be paid, a creditor fails to timely respond to a credit reporting company's request for information, or when the debt has been charged off. Applicant's failure to provide more evidence of debt resolution precludes mitigation of the charged-off debts on his credit report.

Applicant did not provide documentation relating to his SOR debts such as: (1) proof of payments, for example, checking account statements, photocopies of checks, or a letter from the creditor proving that he paid or made any payments to the creditor; (2) correspondence to or from the creditor to establish maintenance of contact;<sup>8</sup> (3) copies of credible debt disputes sent to the creditor and/or credit reporting companies indicating he did not believe he was responsible for the debt and why he held such a belief; (4) evidence of attempts to negotiate payment plans, for example, settlement offers or agreements to show that he was attempting to resolve this debt; or (5) other evidence of progress or resolution.

There is insufficient evidence about why Applicant was unable to make greater documented progress resolving his SOR debts. There is insufficient assurance that his financial problem is being resolved and will not recur in the future. Under all the

---

<sup>7</sup>Title 15 U.S.C. § 1681c. See Federal Trade Commission website, Summary of Fair Credit Reporting Act Updates at Section 605, <https://www.consumer.ftc.gov/articles/pdf-0111-fair-credit-reporting-act.pdf>.

<sup>8</sup> "Even if Applicant's financial difficulties initially arose, in whole or in part, due to circumstances outside his [or her] control, the Judge could still consider whether Applicant has since acted in a reasonable manner when dealing with those financial difficulties." ISCR Case No. 05-11366 at 4 n.9 (App. Bd. Jan. 12, 2007) (citing ISCR Case No. 99-0462 at 4 (App. Bd. May 25, 2000); ISCR Case No. 99-0012 at 4 (App. Bd. Dec. 1, 1999); ISCR Case No. 03-13096 at 4 (App. Bd. Nov. 29, 2005)). A component is whether he or she maintained contact with creditors and attempted to negotiate partial payments to keep debts current.

circumstances, he failed to establish mitigation of financial considerations security concerns.

### **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 the Applicant's conduct and all the circumstances. The administrative judge should consider the nine adjudicative process factors listed at AG ¶ 2(d):

(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.

Under AG ¶ 2(c), "[t]he ultimate determination" of whether to grant a security clearance "must be an overall commonsense judgment based upon careful consideration of the guidelines" and the whole-person concept. My comments under Guideline F are incorporated in my whole-person analysis. Some of the factors in AG ¶ 2(d) were addressed under that guideline but some warrant additional comment.

Applicant is 44 years old, and he has been employed as a senior engineering logistics specialist since 2000. In 1998, he received a bachelor's degree in management information systems. In 2003, he married, and his children were born in 2002 and 2007. I have credited Applicant with mitigation of the discharge of his unsecured nonpriority debts through bankruptcy in August 2003 because his bankruptcy is not recent. There is no evidence of security violations, abuse of alcohol, or use of illegal drugs.

The evidence against grant of a security clearance is more substantial. Applicant's SOR alleges seven delinquent debts totaling \$101,703. He did not provide sufficient evidence of changes in his income to show he was unable to make any payments to any of his SOR creditors. He provided insufficient corroborating or substantiating documentary evidence of payments and an established payment plan or other mitigating information relating to his SOR debts. His actions show lack of financial responsibility and judgment and raise unmitigated questions about Applicant's reliability, trustworthiness, and ability to protect classified information. See AG ¶ 18. More documented information about inability to pay debts, financial history, or financial progress is necessary to mitigate security concerns.

It is well settled that once a concern arises regarding an applicant's security clearance eligibility, there is a strong presumption against the granting a security clearance. See *Dorfmont*, 913 F. 2d at 1401. Unmitigated financial considerations security concerns lead me to conclude that grant of a security clearance to Applicant is not



warranted at this time. This decision should not be construed as a determination that Applicant cannot or will not attain the state of reform necessary for award of a security clearance in the future. With more effort towards documented resolution of his past-due debts, and a track record of behavior consistent with his obligations, he may well be able to demonstrate persuasive evidence of his security clearance worthiness.

I have carefully applied the law, as set forth in *Egan*, Exec. Or. 10865, the Directive, and the AGs, to the facts and circumstances in the context of the whole person. Financial consideration security concerns are not mitigated. It is not clearly consistent with the interests of national security to grant Applicant security clearance eligibility at this time.

### **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 APPLICANT |
| Subparagraphs 1.a through 1.g: | Against Applicant |
| Subparagraph 1.h:              | For Applicant     |

### **Conclusion**

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

---

Mark Harvey  
Administrative Judge