



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



In the matter of:

Applicant for Security Clearance

)
)
)
)
)

ISCR Case No. 18-00233

Appearances

For Government: Aubrey M. De Angelis, Esq., Department Counsel
For Applicant: *Pro se*

11/14/2018

Decision

HEINTZELMAN, Caroline E., Administrative Judge:

Applicant failed to mitigate security concerns raised by his Bipolar Disorder and Delusional Disorder. Based upon a review of the record as a whole, national security eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

History of the Case

Applicant submitted a security clearance application (SCA) on February 23, 2015. On February 1, 2018, the Department of Defense Consolidated Adjudication Facility (DOD CAF) sent him a Statement of Reasons (SOR) alleging security concerns under Guideline I: Psychological Conditions. Applicant answered the SOR on February 24, 2018, and requested a decision on the record without a hearing. On March 28, 2018, the Government elected to convert the case to a hearing before an administrative judge.

I was assigned to the case on May 3, 2018. On May 14, 2018, the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) notified Applicant that the hearing was scheduled for June 11, 2018. The hearing was held as scheduled. Government's Exhibits (GE) 1 through 9 and Applicant's Exhibits (AE) A through O were admitted without objection, and Applicant testified. I received the transcript (Tr.) on June 19, 2018, and the record closed.

Findings of Fact

Applicant is 47 years old, unmarried, and has no children. He received a bachelor's degree in 1992, and masters' degrees in 2008 and 2013. While he was an undergraduate student at U1, Applicant was in the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC), and he held a secret clearance from 1990 to 1992. Upon graduation from college, he was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Air Force, but due to a manic episode he never served on active duty. Applicant has worked for defense contractors off and on since approximately 1997, and has periodically held a security clearance. At the time of the hearing, Applicant had been unemployed since April 2018, but he still has an active sponsor for his clearance application.¹

Applicant attributes his mental health issues to the death of his mother when he was five years old. She drowned in Applicant's presence during a July 4th picnic. His father sent him to live with family members in India for approximately 18 months. Applicant's father remarried, and Applicant witnessed his father's physical abuse of his stepmother for a number of years. His family issues greatly impacted his religious beliefs. Throughout his life he has explored various religions and philosophies, to help him understand global political conflicts and to find purpose in life.²

In 1991, at the end of his junior year of college, Applicant experienced his first significant episode of hypomania. He became increasingly manic during his senior year, he was focused on his involvement with the ROTC program; a woman in the ROTC program;³ another university's basketball program; and various magazine articles and books, including the Bible, which resonated with him.⁴

Applicant graduated from U1 in May 1992 with an engineering degree and a minor in political science. The Air Force gave him a Judge Advocate education delay to attend law school, and in August 1992 Applicant matriculated at LS. Within a month, he was arrested for failing to pay for ice at a convenience store during a manic episode. The charges were ultimately dropped due to his medical condition. However, he was taken by the Dean of Students to a hospital; admitted for two weeks; and diagnosed with Bipolar Disorder. He was treated with Lithium, Haldol, and Cogentin, which are antipsychotic medications. Applicant testified that during this period, his first manic episode, he believed

¹ Tr. at 9-18, 34-35, 107-110, 112-117; GE 3 at 1; AE J.

² Tr. at 39-40, 51; GE 1 at 7; GE 2; GE 3 at 9-10; GE 5 at 1-2; GE 6 at 2; GE 7 at 2; AE A at 1; AE D at 3.

³ Applicant believed he was in love with a fellow ROTC cadet, and she reciprocated his feelings. He believed this based upon 'signs' he saw in her behavior and in signs he saw in the greater world. Due to strong feelings for her, Applicant sent threatening notes to another cadet who he viewed as her adversary. GE 3 at 19; GE 5 at 4-12; GE 6 at 2-3; GE 7 at 3; AE A at 1-2.

⁴ GE 3 at 5-6, 26, 40-41, 50-51; GE 5 at 4-7; GE 6 at 2; GE 7 at 3; AE A at 1-2; AE K.

he was Jesus Christ. This belief lasted throughout the episode, until his condition was brought under control with medications. He has not held this belief since then.⁵

After Applicant was released from the hospital in September 1992, he returned to his family's home. In March 1993, due to his hospitalization and mental health condition, the Air Force released him from service with an honorable discharge. Applicant returned to LS in August 1993 and completed one year of law school. He had a second manic episode at the end of the year, in part because he discontinued taking bipolar medications. As a result, he was hospitalized for two weeks. He chose not to return to LS, because he had not done well academically. Applicant admitted during his November 2006 personal subject interview (PSI) that he went off of his bipolar medications while in law school because he believed he was cured.⁶

After Applicant left LS in the spring of 1994, he moved across the country and took a job as a technical writer at a software company. On October 31, 1994, he experienced his third manic episode. His coworkers took him to an emergency room because they noticed his bizarre behavior; however, he did not tell them of his mental health diagnosis, and he left the hospital without treatment. A short time later, his parents took him to a hospital, and he was admitted for two weeks.⁷

In the fall of 1995, Applicant started a graduate program in engineering at another university (U2). He was hospitalized in January 1996 after "he made a written declaration that [he] would become President and use NATO to turn Germany into a Jewish state 'in retaliation' for the Holocaust."⁸

Applicant experienced a fourth manic episode in July 1996, and he was hospitalized. He remained at U2 until November 1996, when he dropped out of school and returned to his family's home. "After [his] two manic episodes [at U2], [he] was overly medicated and unable to concentrate or keep up in class. Another problem [he] had at [U2] was that [he] was spending too much time writing email and not enough time studying."⁹ Throughout this time, Applicant was sending emails to various political and religious leaders, including the Cardinal of Boston.¹⁰

⁵ Tr. at 12, 14, 45, 52, 112-113; GE 2 at 3; GE 3 at 5, 19; GE 4; GE 5 at 5-8; GE 6 at 3; GE 7 at 2-3; AE A at 1-2; AE K.

⁶ Tr. at 9-10, 14-15, 30-31, 45-49, 52; GE 2; GE 3 at 8-9, 15, 19-20; GE 4; GE 5 at 8-9; GE 6 at 2-3; GE 7 at 2; AE A at 2-3) (Tr. 48; GE 3 at 17; GE 6 at 4.

⁷ Tr. at 53, 113; GE 3 at 16; GE 5 at 9-10; GE 6 at 4-5; AE A at 3-4; AE E.

⁸ Tr. at 53-54; GE 3 at 7; GE 5 at 9-10.

⁹ GE 5 at 11.

¹⁰ Tr. at 54; GE 3 at 7; GE 5 at 11.

Applicant testified that the four hospitalizations between 1992 and 1996 were voluntary, but he was manic and to the point of “almost being psychotic, if not . . . psychotic. I lost all touch with reality.”¹¹ Applicant claims his only manic periods were between 1991 and 1996, and all of subsequent episodes have been hypomanic. The last hypomanic episode he has admitted to experiencing was in March 2016. This episode was triggered by the primary elections. Applicant claims he is able to recognize when a hypomanic episode is starting because he starts connecting dots where it makes no sense to connect dots unless somebody is spying on him or somebody is shadowing him.¹²

In July 2000, Applicant sent a letter and documents to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), detailing his personal and mental health history. The stated purpose of the letter was to request that the FBI provide him a copy of all of the potential communications he wrote and transmitted between 1992 and 2000, and which may exist in the FBI central records system. With the letter, Applicant included a detailed personal history, which he had started writing in 1994. Applicant testified he wrote to the FBI to create meaning in his life, and because he felt stable for the first time since being diagnosed with Bipolar Disorder.¹³ He also stated:

I just wanted to cover my bases. ‘Hello, FBI, I might be doing some strange things in the following years. If you ever have any questions’, as you can read from the letter to the FBI, ‘I have no objection if you monitor my emails, track me down, ask me questions. You have permission to spy on me’.¹⁴

This letter was the first step he made in a self-described “crusade.”¹⁵ Applicant went off his medication in December 2000, when he forgot to refill his prescriptions.¹⁶

In 2005, Applicant contacted the Cleveland FBI office to report a suspicious profile that appeared on social media. In 2007, to cheer up his father, he filed paperwork to register for the Republican nomination for President of the United States for the 2008 election. He also initiated a presidential campaign because he believed President Bush was responding to his writings. “President Bush averts the possibility of the curiosity of a

¹¹ Tr. at 52.

¹² Tr. at 47-48, 66, 73-74; GE 5 at 8; GE 7.

¹³ Tr. at 21, 43-44; GE 4; GE 5; AE D at 5.

¹⁴ Tr. at 44.

¹⁵ Tr. at 44. Throughout the hearing, Applicant referred to his political and religious activities as a “crusade.” He recognized that this behavior contributed to employers and medical providers identifying him as delusional. Tr. at 67, 89, 112.

¹⁶ Tr. at 48-49; GE 3 at 17; GE 6 at 4; GE 8.

local politician story in Cleveland of a local political candidate claiming to be Jesus and claiming to atone for the Holocaust from becoming a national story.”¹⁷

Applicant was evaluated by a DOD psychologist, at the request of the DOD, after his 2006 personal subject interview (PSI) raised red flags as to his suitability to hold a clearance. Applicant’s security clearance was ultimately granted.¹⁸

In 2009, Applicant wrote “A PsychoTheoPolitical Theory for Peace in the Middle East.” He proposed that a Jewish State in Germany should be created in retaliation for the Holocaust, in order to resolve the conflict between Israel and Palestine. He sent this document to the Foundation of the American Jewish Committee and the Indian Ambassador to the United States. He also provided a copy of this document to the government investigator at his 2009 PSI. At the hearing, Applicant recognized that he “risked [his] security clearance to make a statement about my political beliefs, my ‘crusade’. And as a result, I was labeled delusional.”¹⁹

In 2011, Applicant paid \$2,000 to place an advertisement with a large newspaper. The ad’s title was “A Jewish State.” He did this, in part, because he was unsatisfied with the direction of the United Nations. Applicant “wanted to get [his] opinion out in the media to trigger a public reaction and perhaps start a public debate.”²⁰ Additionally, he claimed he had recently been selected to be in Who’s Who in America, and he believed that someone had noticed his various political activities. After the newspaper agreed to run the advertisement, he alerted his manager and gave him a copy of the ad and two other related documents. His manager elevated the issue within the company to senior management and security personnel.²¹

In November 2011, Applicant’s employer entered an incident history in Joint Personnel Adjudication System (JPAS) related to Applicant’s behavior. The JPAS entry indicated Applicant gave his employer three documents “espousing his beliefs and theories which were indicative of mental illness. His writings exhibit delusions of grandeur . . . paranoia . . . and other delusions. . . . This behavior came on suddenly but his writings indicate that he has had a history of previous mental disorders.” Applicant testified that he did not believe he was mentally unstable when he placed the advertisement.²²

In January or February 2013, for the second time, the DOD requested that Applicant see a DOD psychologist. This psychologist diagnosed Applicant with Bipolar

¹⁷ Tr. at 115-117; GE 6 at 1, 3; GE 8 at 3; AE A at 5.

¹⁸ Tr. at 10, 93-94; GE 2 at 5; GE 8; AE A; AE D at 6; AE N.

¹⁹ Tr. at 21-23, 67, 100-101; GE 2 at 5-6; GE 6; GE 8; AE A at 6-7; AE D at 7; AE K.

²⁰ Tr. at 84.

²¹ Tr. at 36-37, 70-71, 82-85; GE 9; AE A at 9; AE L.

²² Tr. at 36-37, 70-71, 82-85; GE 8; GE 9; AE A at 9; AE L.

Disorder, Type I, most recent episode manic; and Delusional Disorder, grandiose type. He gave a guarded prognosis, noting that Applicant's conditions were episodic in nature and may impair his judgment, reliability or trustworthiness with regard to managing information of concern to national security.²³

In March 2013, the DOD CAF issued Applicant an SOR, which alleged concerns about his behavior under Guideline I, Psychological Conditions. He admitted to the four allegations, but resigned his position from his employer prior to a hearing; therefore, there was no final adjudication of these concerns or his clearance eligibility.²⁴

Applicant was voluntarily hospitalized in June 2013 for two weeks due to hypomania. His sister, who is a clinical psychologist, identified that he was experiencing a hypomanic episode based on text messages he was sending her. Applicant disclosed that this episode was the result of, "The stress of leaving [his employment], coupled with some unexpected weight gain resulted in insufficient levels of medication in [his] bloodstream. As [he] was feeling hypomanic [he] voluntarily entered in-patient treatment . . . while [his] medication levels were recalibrated."²⁵

From approximately 2012 until August 2016, Applicant received talk therapy treatment every two weeks from a psychologist, and he saw a psychiatrist to prescribe and monitor his antipsychotic medication.²⁶ In October 2016, he moved to a different state, and discontinued talk therapy treatment because he believed he had talked through his issues during treatment. Instead, he chose to have coffee with a church pastor when he was feeling 'stressed.' He reported seeing a psychiatrist quarterly for medication.²⁷

In December 2017, the DOD CAF referred Applicant to be evaluated by a licensed psychologist, who subsequently diagnosed him with Bipolar Disorder, Type I and Delusional Disorder, deferred. The psychologist believed he was in a hypomanic episode during the evaluation, and found that he was potentially unreliable and his judgment was limited. The psychologist's prognosis was guarded because his symptoms were not fully managed, despite his claims that he undergoes biannual medical examinations.²⁸

In April 2018, the licensed psychologist who treated Applicant from 2012 until 2016 submitted a letter in response to the December 2017 mental health evaluation and report. This former psychologist found that Applicant's presentation was generally consistent in

²³ Tr. at 10-11, 62-63, 93-96, 121-122; GE 8.

²⁴ The 2013 medical evaluation and report was not offered as evidence at the hearing. GE 8; AE A at 8; AE D at 3, 7.

²⁵ Tr. at 55, 62-63, 73; GE 1 at 45; GE 7 at 3.

²⁶ Tr. at 56-57; GE 1; GE 2; GE 3; GE 1 at 46.

²⁷ Tr. at 34, 56-57; 60-61; GE 7.

²⁸ Tr. at 78-79, 96; GE 7.

their sessions, and he found that Applicant's behavior was not inconsistent with a person with delusional disorder. He did not give a recommendation as to whether or not Applicant is able to hold a security clearance. Applicant testified that this provider told the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) that he was capable of holding a security clearance, but he did not provide substantiating documentation to support this claim. He has not seen this provider since approximately August 2016.²⁹

Applicant testified that he has never had a depressive episode; however, the documentary and testimonial evidence suggest that he has been suicidal in the past. Throughout the hearing, he referred to the summer of 2016 as a near death experience, or his brush with death. Applicant sent a letter to President Obama in June 2016, in which he provided solutions to the Israel/Palestine conflict. He also stated that he might be forced to commit suicide in 2016 or 2017 due to financial problems. The administration responded to him and then relayed its concern to the Office of Veterans' Affairs (VA). The VA's suicide line personnel contacted Applicant, and he told them that he was getting regular treatment through his psychologist. He also told them that his depression was not related to current political events but because he needed a job.³⁰

Since the early 1990s, Applicant has persistently believed that various magazine articles, books, and religious materials were speaking to him or giving him guidance. He believed that people were watching him and warning him through various world events, such as the first World Trade Center bombing and the explosion of TWA Flight 800. Additionally, he believed the FBI was trying to entrap him; NASA made staff changes, which he believed was actually the FBI trying to eliminate his employment; and the government maneuvered him into a job at a defense contractor in an attempt to stop him from making political statements. As a result of beliefs that he could influence world events through his ideas and theories, he sent letters to multiple public political and religious leaders. Applicant also believed that God was talking directly to him, and the various books of the Bible were written for him, including the book of Revelations.³¹

About six weeks before the security clearance hearing, Applicant saw a therapist twice in anticipation of the stress of the hearing. At the hearing, he was asked if he would have sought that therapy if the hearing had not been scheduled at Department Counsel's request. He responded, "I do not know, honestly. All I know is the reason I chose to see a therapist is because my hearing is coming up." The last time he saw a psychiatrist for medication management was in February 2018.³²

²⁹ Tr. at 16, 33, 78-80, 95-96; GE 7; AE I.

³⁰ Tr. at 28-30, 47-48, 60-61, 66, 68, 73-77, 87, 89-92, 98-99; GE 5 at 8; GE 7; AE D.

³¹ Tr. at 16, 25-30, 32-33, 37-39, 42, 46-47, 49-51, 65-66, 68, 74-75, 86-89, 104-108, 111, 113-114, 131; GE 2 at 5-6; GE 3 at 10-11, 17-18; GE 4 at 6; GE 5; GE 6 at 3-6; GE 7; GE 8; AE A; AE B; AE C; AD D; AE F; AE G; AE H; AE M; AE N; AE O.

³² Tr. at 34, 61-62, 64, 69-70.

Applicant's current sponsor for his security clearance is not aware of the allegations in the SOR or his underlying mental health history.³³

Policies

"[N]o one has a 'right' to a security clearance."³⁴ 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."³⁵ 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."³⁶

Eligibility for a security clearance is predicated upon the applicant meeting the criteria contained in the AG. 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 all available and 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 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.

Adverse 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."³⁷ Thus, a decision to deny a security clearance is merely an indication the applicant has not met the strict guidelines the President and the Security Executive Agent have established for issuing national security eligibility.

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

³³ Tr. at 102-104.

³⁴ *Department of the Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518, 528 (1988).

³⁵ *Egan* at 527.

³⁶ EO 10865 § 2.

³⁷ EO 10865 § 7.

establishing controverted facts alleged in the SOR.³⁸ “Substantial evidence” is “more than a scintilla but less than a preponderance.”³⁹ The guidelines presume a nexus or rational connection between proven conduct under any of the criteria listed therein and an applicant’s security suitability.⁴⁰ Once the Government establishes a disqualifying condition, the burden shifts to the applicant to rebut, explain, extenuate, or mitigate the facts.⁴¹ An applicant has the burden of proving a potential mitigation, and the burden of disproving it never shifts to the Government.⁴²

An applicant “has the ultimate burden of demonstrating that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue his security clearance.”⁴³ “[S]ecurity clearance determinations should err, if they must, on the side of denials.”⁴⁴

Analysis

Guideline I: Psychological Conditions

The security concern relating to the guideline for psychological conditions is set out in AG ¶ 27:

Certain emotional, mental, and personality conditions can impair judgment, reliability, or trustworthiness. A formal diagnosis of a disorder is not required for there to be a concern under this guideline. A duly qualified mental health professional (e.g., clinical psychologist or psychiatrist) employed by, or acceptable to and approved by the U.S. Government, should be consulted when evaluating potentially disqualifying and mitigating information under this guideline and an opinion, including prognosis, should be sought. No negative inference concerning the standards in this guideline may be raised solely on the basis of mental health counseling.

The guideline includes several conditions that could raise security concerns under AG ¶ 28. The following are potentially applicable in this case:

(a) behavior that casts doubt on an individual’s judgment, stability, reliability, or trustworthiness, not covered under any other guideline and that may

³⁸ Directive ¶ E3.1.14.

³⁹ See *v. Washington Metro. Area Transit Auth.*, 36 F.3d 375, 380 (4th Cir. 1994).

⁴⁰ ISCR Case No. 92-1106 at 3, 1993 WL 545051 at *3 (App. Bd. Oct. 7, 1993).

⁴¹ Directive ¶ E3.1.15.

⁴² ISCR Case No. 02-31154 at 5 (App. Bd. Sep. 22, 2005).

⁴³ ISCR Case No. 01-20700 at 3 (App. Bd. Dec. 19, 2002); Directive ¶ E3.1.15.

⁴⁴ *Egan*, 484 U.S. at 531; See also AG ¶ 2(b).

indicate an emotional, mental, or personality condition, including, but not limited to, irresponsible, violent, self-harm, suicidal, paranoid, manipulative, impulsive, chronic lying, deceitful, exploitative, or bizarre behaviors;

(b) an opinion by a duly qualified mental health professional that the individual has a condition that may impair judgment, stability, reliability, or trustworthiness;

(c) voluntary or involuntary inpatient hospitalization; and

(d) failure to follow a prescribed treatment plan related to a diagnosed psychological/psychiatric condition that may impair judgment, stability, reliability, or trustworthiness, including, but not limited to, failure to take prescribed medication or failure to attend required counseling sessions.

The record evidence established the above disqualifying conditions. Since approximately 1991, Applicant has exhibited delusional and manic behavior. He has been hospitalized at least five times as a result of manic episodes, many of which followed his failure to take medications that were prescribed to treat his psychological conditions.

Appellant has been diagnosed by a duly qualified mental health professional with a condition that impairs his judgment, reliability, and trustworthiness. At the hearing, he asserted that he is receiving treatment; however, he failed to provide documentary evidence to corroborate this claim. Rather, the evidence demonstrates that he has known for a significant period that he has a serious mental health condition, and for the past two years he failed to seek consistent treatment regimen.

AG ¶ 29 provides the following conditions that could mitigate security concerns in this case:

(a) the identified condition is readily controllable with treatment, and the individual has demonstrated ongoing and consistent compliance with the treatment plan;

(b) the individual has voluntarily entered a counseling or treatment program for a condition that is amenable to treatment, and the individual is currently receiving counseling or treatment with a favorable prognosis by a duly qualified mental health professional;

(c) recent opinion by a duly qualified mental health professional employed by, or acceptable to and approved by, the U.S. Government that an individual's previous condition is under control or in remission, and has a low probability of recurrence or exacerbation;

(d) the past psychological/psychiatric condition was temporary, the situation has been resolved, and the individual no longer shows indications of emotional instability; and

(e) there is no indication of a current problem.

Applicant has suffered with Bipolar Disorder and Delusional Disorder since approximately 1992. These are life-long conditions that are treated with pharmacological and talk therapy intervention. Since August 2016, he has not regularly received therapy. During the June 2018 hearing, Applicant asserted that he recently saw a mental health professional several times, and he argued that his most recent psychologist, who has not treated him since 2016, believes he is capable of holding a clearance. However, he provided no substantiating evidence to corroborate his claims, nor did he demonstrate that he is receiving ongoing and consistent treatment. He did not provide documentation from medical providers who have treated him recently that his medical conditions do not pose a threat to his reliability and judgment. There is no evidence that his ongoing medical disorders are being properly treated, or that they are under control.

Applicant failed to provide evidence of consistent and ongoing treatment, and did not establish that he is no longer suffering from the underlying conditions. Mitigation under AG ¶¶ 29(a), 29(b), 29(c), 29(d), and 29(e) was not established.

Whole-Person Concept

Under AG ¶ 2(c), the ultimate determination of whether the granting or continuing of national security eligibility is clearly consistent with the interests of national security must be an overall common sense judgment based upon careful consideration of the applicable guidelines, each of which is to be evaluated in the context of the whole person. An 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.

I have incorporated my comments under the guideline at issue in my whole-person analysis, and I have considered the factors in AG ¶ 2(d). After weighing the disqualifying and mitigating conditions under this guideline, and evaluating all the evidence in the context of the whole person, I conclude that Applicant has not mitigated psychological conditions security concerns at issue. Accordingly, Applicant has not carried his burden

to show that it is clearly consistent with the interests of national security 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 ¶ E3.1.25 of Enclosure 3 of the Directive, are:

Paragraph 1, Guideline I: AGAINST APPLICANT

Subparagraphs 1.a. – 1.b.: Against Applicant

Conclusion

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

CAROLINE E. HEINTZELMAN
Administrative Judge