



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



In the matter of:)
)
) ISCR Case No. 17-00821
)
Applicant for Security Clearance)

Appearances

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

02/28/2018

Decision

CERVI, Gregg A., Administrative Judge

This case involves security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations). Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

Statement of the Case

Applicant submitted a security clearance application (SCA) on December 3, 2015. On April 11, 2017, the Department of Defense Consolidated Adjudications Facility (DOD CAF) sent him a Statement of Reasons (SOR) alleging security concerns under Guideline F.¹ Applicant answered the SOR and elected to have the case decided on the written record in lieu of a hearing. The Government's written brief with supporting documents, known as the File of Relevant Material (FORM), was submitted by Department Counsel on July 13, 2017.

¹ The DOD CAF acted under Executive Order (Exec. Or.) 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information within Industry* (February 20, 1960), as amended; DOD Directive 5220.6, *Defense Industrial Personnel Security Clearance Review Program* (January 2, 1992), as amended (Directive); and the adjudicative guidelines (AG) implemented by the DOD on September 1, 2006.

A complete copy of the FORM was provided to Applicant, who was afforded an opportunity to file objections and submit material to refute, extenuate, or mitigate the security concerns. Applicant received the FORM on July 24, 2017, but did not submit a response. The Government's exhibits included in the FORM (Items 1 to 5) and AE A are admitted into evidence. The case was assigned to me on November 29, 2017.

Findings of Fact

Applicant is a 32-year-old engineering technician employed by a defense contractor since 2006. He graduated from high school in 2004 and attended some college. He married in 2004 and divorced in 2012. He has previously held a DOD security clearance.

The SOR alleges Applicant failed to file federal and state income taxes for tax years 2010 to 2016. Additionally, it alleges he has two medical debts in collections. Applicant admitted he failed to file and pay his state and federal taxes for 2010 to 2014, but asserted that he has since filed his 2015 and 2016 tax returns. He also denied the two delinquent medical accounts, claiming they are paid.

Applicant explained in his answer to the SOR, that he did not file his tax returns because he separated from his spouse in 2010, and his subsequent divorce resulted in additional expenses for child support on only one income. He started to prepare his 2010 tax returns, but discovered that he would owe taxes. He "buried his head in the sand" and avoided filing tax returns until he filed his 2015 and 2016 returns. He admitted that his actions show a lack of judgment, and he takes responsibility for it. He did not submit evidence of his current tax filing status, payments of taxes and medical debts, or current financial status.

Law and Policies

The Director of National Intelligence (DNI) issued revised adjudicative guidelines (AG) in a Security Executive Agent Directive, effective on June 8, 2017. The revised AG apply to this case.

"[N]o 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 applicants 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 § 2.

National security eligibility 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, an administrative judge applies these guidelines in conjunction with an evaluation of the whole person. An administrative

judge's overarching adjudicative goal is a fair, impartial, and commonsense decision. An administrative judge must consider a person's stability, trustworthiness, reliability, discretion, character, honesty, and judgment. AG ¶ 1(b).

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 that 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 made "in terms of the national interest and shall in no sense be a determination as to the loyalty of the applicant concerned." Exec. Or. 10865 § 7. Thus, a decision to deny a security clearance is merely an indication the applicant has not met the strict guidelines the President and the Secretary of Defense 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. 92-1106 at 3, 1993 WL 545051 at *3 (App. Bd. Oct. 7, 1993).

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 burden of proving a mitigating condition, and the burden of disproving it never shifts to the Government. See ISCR Case No. 02-31154 at 5 (App. Bd. Sep. 22, 2005).

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). "[S]ecurity clearance determinations should err, if they must, on the side of denials." Egan, 484 U.S. at 531; see AG ¶ 1(d).

Analysis

Financial Considerations

The security concern under this guideline is set out in AG ¶ 18:

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. . . .

The relevant disqualifying conditions under AG ¶ 19 include:

- (a) inability to satisfy debts;
- (b) unwillingness to satisfy debts regardless of the ability to do so;
- (c) a history of not meeting financial obligations; and
- (f) failure to file or fraudulently filing annual federal, state, or local income tax returns or failure to pay annual federal, state, or local income tax as required.

Applicant's admissions and the documentary evidence supporting the SOR allegations are sufficient to establish the disqualifying conditions. I reviewed the mitigating conditions under AG ¶ 20. None apply to this case.

Although Applicant's inability to pay his federal and state income taxes may have resulted from increased financial obligations from his divorce, he has not justified failing to file tax returns when due, and he has not shown evidence of actions taken to resolve his tax issues. In addition, he failed to submit evidence of resolution of the medical delinquencies listed in the SOR. Applicant's knowing failure to file federal and state income tax returns when due, regardless of his ability to pay, raises serious questions about his judgment and willingness to comply with rules and regulations. He presented insufficient evidence showing efforts to file and pay overdue taxes or to resolve his medical delinquencies. No mitigating condition is fully applicable.

Whole-Person Concept

Under AG ¶¶ 2(a), 2(c), and 2(d), the ultimate determination of whether to grant national security eligibility must be an overall commonsense judgment based upon careful consideration of the guidelines and the 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 relevant circumstances. The administrative judge should consider the nine adjudicative process

factors listed at AG ¶ 2(d). Although adverse information concerning a single criterion may not be sufficient for an unfavorable eligibility determination, the individual may be found ineligible if available information reflects a recent or recurring pattern of questionable judgment, irresponsibility, or unstable behavior. AG ¶ 2(e).

I considered all of the potentially disqualifying and mitigating conditions in light of all the facts and circumstances surrounding this case. I have incorporated my findings of fact and comments under Guideline F in my whole-person analysis. Applicant's delinquent tax filings and unpaid medical debts remain an ongoing concern. He has not shown sufficient effort to resolve these issues. I have insufficient record evidence to evaluate the extent his divorce impacted his finances or ability to file tax returns, the current status of his tax filings, and whether his current financial situation is under control.

Accordingly, I conclude he has not carried his burden of showing that it is clearly consistent with the national security interests of the United States to grant him eligibility for access to classified information.

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–1.d:	Against Applicant

Conclusion

I conclude that it is not clearly consistent with the national security interests of the United States to grant Applicant eligibility for access to classified information. Clearance is denied.

Gregg A. Cervi
Administrative Judge