



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



In the matter of:

Applicant for Security Clearance

)
)
)
)
)

ISCR Case No. 17-02096

Appearances

For Government: Carroll J. Connelley, Esq., Department Counsel
For Applicant: *Pro se*

01/24/2018

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 February 9, 2016, Applicant signed his Questionnaire for National Security Positions (SF 86) or security clearance application (SCA). Item 2. On June 29, 2017, 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 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). The SOR set forth security concerns arising under the financial considerations guideline. Item 1.

On July 17, 2017, Applicant provided a response to the SOR, and he did not request a hearing. Item 2. On August 17, 2017, Department Counsel completed the File of Relevant Material (FORM). On August 22, 2017, Applicant received the FORM, and he did not respond to the FORM. On December 18, 2017, the case was assigned to me.

The case file consists of five exhibits. Items 1-5. Applicant did not object to any of the Government exhibits, and they are admitted into evidence.

Findings of Fact¹

In Applicant's SOR response, he admitted the SOR allegations in SOR ¶¶ 1.a through 1.z. Item 1. His SOR response did not provide extenuating and mitigating information.

Applicant is a 62-year-old senior engineer, and the same employer has employed him since 1980.² In 1977, he received a bachelor's degree, and in 1980, he received a master's degree. He has not served in the U.S. armed forces. He has never married and has no children. There is no evidence of security violations, abuse of alcohol, or use of illegal drugs.

Financial Considerations

Applicant's SOR alleges 23 delinquent debts totaling \$ 537,477 as follows: ¶¶ 1.a, 1.b, and 1.t are accounts relating to a mortgage in foreclosure for \$185,772, a home-equity line of credit for \$24,999, and a home-equity line of credit for \$119,653; ¶¶ 1.c through 1.k are nine charged-off debts owed to banks for \$23,149, \$22,747, \$21,478, \$18,578, \$11,131, \$10,563, \$8,956, \$5,509, and \$2,570; ¶¶ 1.l, 1.m, 1.n, 1.o, 1.u, and 1.w are six charged-off debts or debts placed for collection for \$495, \$240, \$116, \$70, \$146, and \$1,061; and ¶¶ 1.p, 1.q, and 1.r are three judgments for \$1,282, \$5,864, and \$6,280. SOR ¶ 1.s alleges that in July 2016, Applicant filed for bankruptcy under Chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Code, and in August 2016, the bankruptcy was dismissed. SOR ¶ 1.v alleges a credit card account is 90 days past due in the amount of \$833 with a balance of \$10,818. SOR ¶¶ 1.x and 1.y allege he failed to file as required his federal and state income tax returns for tax years 2008 through 2015. SOR ¶ 1.z alleges a delinquent federal income tax debt for \$56,000 for tax year 2008.

Applicant was generous with family and friends.³ He provided financial assistance to his disabled sister, to his mother before she passed away, and to a friend. He provides the friend \$1,000 per month. Applicant stopped paying his mortgage in 2011, and his home was in foreclosure. He has not paid the real estate taxes for at least one year on his residence because his residence is in foreclosure. Applicant filed for bankruptcy to stop the foreclosure, and then he decided to stop the bankruptcy because he believed he could pay his debts. In July 2016, he received financial counseling as part of the

¹ Some details were excluded to protect Applicant's right to privacy. Specific information is available in the cited exhibits.

² The source of the information in this paragraph is Applicant's February 9, 2016 Questionnaire for National Security Positions (SF 86) or security clearance application (SCA). Item 2.

³ The source of the information in this paragraph is his August 22, 2016 Office of Personnel Management (OPM) personal subject interview (PSI). Item 3.

bankruptcy process. His annual gross income is about \$145,000. As of August 22, 2016, Applicant had not filed his federal and state income tax returns for 2008 through 2015. His \$56,000 federal income tax debt for tax year 2008 resulted from an early withdrawal from his 401(k) account.

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 3. 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 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 Director of National Intelligence 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 four 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"; "(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." 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), 19(c), and 19(f) requiring additional inquiry about the possible applicability of mitigating conditions.

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

(a) the behavior happened so long ago,⁴ 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 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;

⁴ 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)).

(d) the individual initiated and is adhering to a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or otherwise resolve debts;⁵

(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;

(f) the affluence resulted from a legal source of income; and

(g) the individual has made arrangements with the appropriate tax authority to file or pay the amount owed and is in compliance with those arrangements.

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).

Applicant's financial support for family and friends were partially or fully outside his control and adversely affected his finances. He received financial counseling. However, without more specific information, he did not establish that he acted prudently, and how circumstances beyond his control adversely affected his finances. Applicant did not prove

⁵ 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)).

he acted responsibly under the circumstances because he did not show the changes in his income or the specific needs of family and friends 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 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;⁶ (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.

Applicant failed to prove that he filed his federal and state income tax returns for tax years 2008 to 2015. A willful failure to timely make (means complete and file with the IRS) a federal income tax return is a misdemeanor-level federal criminal offense.⁷ For purposes of this decision, I am not weighing Applicant's failure to timely file his federal income tax returns against him as a federal crime. In regard to the failure to timely file federal and state income tax returns, the DOHA Appeal Board has commented:

Failure to file tax returns suggests that an applicant has a problem with complying with well-established governmental rules and systems. Voluntary compliance with such rules and systems is essential for protecting classified information. ISCR Case No. 01-05340 at 3 (App. Bd. Dec. 20, 2002). As we have noted in the past, a clearance adjudication is not directed at collecting debts. See, e.g., ISCR Case No. 07-08049 at 5 (App. Bd. Jul. 22, 2008). By the same token, neither is it directed toward *inducing an applicant to file tax returns. Rather, it is a proceeding aimed at evaluating an applicant's judgment and reliability. Id.* A person who fails repeatedly to fulfill his or her

⁶ "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.

⁷ Title 26 U.S.C. § 7203, willful failure to file return, supply information, or pay tax, reads:

Any person . . . required by this title or by regulations made under authority thereof to make a return, keep any records, or supply any information, who willfully fails to . . . make such return, keep such records, or supply such information, at the time or times required by law or regulations, shall, in addition to other penalties provided by law, be guilty of a misdemeanor

A willful failure to make return, keep records, or supply information when required, is a misdemeanor without regard to existence of any tax liability. *Spies v. United States*, 317 U.S. 492 (1943); *United States v. Walker*, 479 F.2d 407 (9th Cir. 1973); *United States v. McCabe*, 416 F.2d 957 (7th Cir. 1969); *O'Brien v. United States*, 51 F.2d 193 (7th Cir. 1931).

legal obligations does not demonstrate the high degree of good judgment and reliability required of those granted access to classified information. See, e.g., ISCR Case No. 14-01894 at 5 (App. Bd. Aug. 18, 2015). See *Cafeteria & Restaurant Workers Union Local 473 v. McElroy*, 284 F.2d 173, 183 (D.C. Cir. 1960), *aff'd*, 367 U.S. 886 (1961).

ISCR Case No. 14-04437 at 3 (App. Bd. Apr. 15, 2016) (emphasis in original). See ISCR Case No. 14-05476 at 5 (App. Bd. Mar. 25, 2016) (citing ISCR Case No. 01-05340 at 3 (App. Bd. Dec. 20, 2002)); ISCR Case No. 14-01894 at 4-5 (App. Bd. Aug. 18, 2015). The Appeal Board clarified that even in instances where an “[a]pplicant has purportedly corrected [his or her] federal tax problem, and the fact that [applicant] is now motivated to prevent such problems in the future, does not preclude careful consideration of [a]pplicant’s security worthiness in light of [his or her] longstanding prior behavior evidencing irresponsibility” including a failure to timely file federal income tax returns. See ISCR Case No. 15-01031 at 3 and note 3 (App. Bd. June 15, 2016) (characterizing “no harm, no foul” approach to an Applicant’s course of conduct and employing an “all’s well that ends well” analysis as inadequate to support approval of access to classified information with focus on timing of filing of tax returns after receipt of the SOR).

In ISCR Case No. 15-01031 at 2 (App. Bd. June 15, 2016), the Appeal Board reversed the grant of a security clearance, and noted the following primary relevant disqualifying facts:

Applicant filed his 2011 Federal income tax return in December 2013 and received a \$2,074 tax refund. He filed his 2012 Federal tax return in September 2014 and his 2013 Federal tax return in October 2015. He received Federal tax refunds of \$3,664 for 2012 and \$1,013 for 2013.

Notwithstanding the lack of any tax debt owed, the Appeal Board provided the following principal rationale for reversing the grant of a security clearance:

Failure to comply with Federal and/or state tax laws suggests that an applicant has a problem with abiding by well-established Government rules and regulations. Voluntary compliance with rules and regulations is essential for protecting classified information. . . . By failing to file his 2011, 2012, and 2013 Federal income tax returns in a timely manner, Applicant did not demonstrate the high degree of good judgment and reliability required of persons granted access to classified information.

ISCR Case No. 15-01031 at 4 (App. Bd. June 15, 2016) (citations omitted).

There is insufficient evidence about why Applicant was unable to make greater progress sooner resolving his tax issues and other delinquent debts. There is insufficient assurance his financial problems are resolved, under control, and will not recur in the future. Under all the 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 a 62-year-old senior engineer, and the same employer has employed him since 1980. In 1977, he received a bachelor's degree, and in 1980, he received a master's degree. There is no evidence of security violations, abuse of alcohol, or use of illegal drugs.

I have credited Applicant with mitigation of the allegation in SOR ¶ 1.s that he filed for bankruptcy under Chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Code, and the court dismissed his bankruptcy the next month. He decided that bankruptcy was not prudent because he had sufficient income to pay his debts. His bankruptcy filing and its dismissal do not necessarily show financial irresponsibility.

The evidence against grant of a security clearance is more substantial. Applicant's SOR alleges 23 delinquent debts totaling \$537,477. He failed to prove he filed his state and federal income tax returns for tax years 2008 through 2015. He did not provide sufficient evidence of changes in his financial circumstances 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. 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.r:	Against Applicant
Subparagraph 1.s:	For Applicant
Subparagraphs 1.t through 1.z:	Against 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