



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



In the matter of:

Applicant for Security Clearance

)
)
)
)
)

ISCR Case No. 18-00613

Appearances

For Government: Brittany Muetzel, Esquire, Department Counsel

For Applicant: *Pro se*

10/16/2018

Decision

GALES, Robert Robinson, Administrative Judge:

Applicant failed to mitigate the security concerns regarding financial considerations. Eligibility for a security clearance is denied.

Statement of the Case

On March 3, 2016, Applicant applied for a security clearance and submitted an Electronic Questionnaire for Investigations Processing (e-QIP) version of a Security Clearance Application. On December 19, 2017, the Department of Defense (DOD) Consolidated Adjudications Facility (CAF) issued a set of interrogatories to him. He responded to those interrogatories on February 2, 2018. On March 16, 2018, the DOD CAF issued a Statement of Reasons (SOR) to him, under Executive Order (Exec. Or.) 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information within Industry* (February 20, 1960), as amended and modified; DOD Directive 5220.6, *Defense Industrial Personnel Security Clearance Review Program* (January 2, 1992), as amended and modified (Directive); and Directive 4 of the Security Executive Agent (SEAD 4), (December 10, 2016), *National Security Adjudicative Guidelines* (AG) for all covered individuals who require initial or continued eligibility for access to classified information or eligibility to hold a sensitive position, effective June 8, 2017.

The SOR alleged security concerns under Guideline F (Financial Considerations), and detailed reasons why the DOD adjudicators were unable to find that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue a security clearance for Applicant. The SOR recommended referral to an administrative judge to determine whether a clearance should be granted, continued, denied, or revoked.

It is unclear as to when Applicant received the SOR as there is no receipt in the case file. In a sworn statement, dated May 8, 2018, Applicant responded to the SOR and elected to have his case decided on the written record in lieu of a hearing. A complete copy of the Government's file of relevant material (FORM) was mailed to Applicant by the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) on May 13, 2018, and he was afforded an opportunity, within a period of 30 days after receipt of the FORM, to file objections and submit material in refutation, extenuation, or mitigation. In addition to the FORM, Applicant was furnished a copy of the Directive as well as the Adjudicative Guidelines applicable to his case. Applicant received the FORM on June 18, 2018. Applicant's response was due on August 2, 2018. Applicant timely submitted one document in response to the FORM, and it was admitted as an Applicant exhibit without objection. The case was assigned to me on October 11, 2018.

Findings of Fact

In his Answer to the SOR, Applicant admitted nearly all of the factual allegations in the SOR (SOR ¶¶ 1.e., 1.g., 1.i. through 1.o., 1.q., and 1.r.). He denied the remaining allegations. Applicant's admissions are incorporated herein as findings of fact. After a complete and thorough review of the evidence in the record, and upon due consideration of same, I make the following additional findings of fact:

Applicant is a 33-year-old employee of a defense contractor. He has been serving as a project manager with his current employer since January 2016. A June 2003 high school graduate, Applicant earned some college credits, but no degree. He enlisted in the U.S. Army in April 2010, and served on active duty until he was administratively separated in May 2011 under the provisions of Ch. 5-17, Army Reg. 635-200, *Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations* (June 6, 2005). He reported that he had received an honorable discharge. He has never held a security clearance. Applicant was married in January 2009, separated in October 2014, and divorced in December 2016. He has two children, born in February 2008 and June 2013.

Financial Considerations¹

When Applicant completed his e-QIP in March 2016, he reported one issue regarding his finances: unspecified accounts involving an estimated \$10,000 that were placed for collection starting in May 2014 because of his separation from his wife. When he was interviewed by an investigator from the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) in June 2017, he acknowledged having a number of delinquent debts, including child support arrearage, student loans, and various commercial accounts. He claimed that he had a repayment plan regarding one student loan, and indicated that his wages were garnished in late 2016 to resolve the child support issues. Applicant failed to submit any documents to support his claims regarding the repayment plan, payments made under it, or garnishment. As for the other discussed delinquent accounts, Applicant stated that he could not afford to pay any of the other bills because he had no money left after paying his living expenses.²

On August 2, 2017, during his second OPM interview, Applicant discussed in detail many of his delinquent accounts, and he acknowledged that while he may have received notices of past-due accounts, those debts “got lost in a bunch of other debts” because of the separation from his ex-wife. He specifically acknowledged making no payments on those debts because of insufficient funds to do so.³ On August 10, 2017, during his third OPM interview, Applicant again discussed several of his delinquent accounts. He acknowledged certain debts and said he would contact his creditors in an effort to set up repayment plans to pay off the debts within the next six months (February 2018).⁴

When Applicant responded to the interrogatories in February 2018, he stated that he had set up payment plans with some creditors, and that he was either working with a debt consolidation company to pay certain debts or he was trying to find a debt consolidation company for other debts. It was his hope to consolidate all of his debts in order to make only one payment per month. Of the 19 delinquent accounts he was questioned about, he contended he had made payment arrangements with 7 creditors, and that he was making payments under those arrangements to those 7 creditors.⁵ To support his contentions, Applicant submitted three pages containing what he referred to as “snips from [his] online bank account showing payments in the last packet,” but those items do not identify the source of the purported payments. They are no different from

¹ General source information pertaining to the financial accounts discussed below can be found in the following exhibits: Item 3 (Response to Interrogatories, dated February 2, 2018); Item 4 (e-QIP, dated March 3, 2016); Item 7 (Combined Experian, TransUnion, and Equifax Credit Report, dated April 1, 2016); Item 6 (Equifax Credit Report, dated October 4, 2017); Item 5 (Equifax Credit Report, dated May 31, 2018); Item 8 (Personal Subject Interview, dated June 12, 2017); Item 8 (Personal Subject Interview, dated August 2, 2017); Item 8 (Personal Subject Interview, dated August 10, 2017); Applicant’s Response to the FORM, undated.

² Item 8 (June Personal Subject Interview), *supra* note 1, at 7-8.

³ Item 8 (August 2nd Personal Subject Interview), *supra* note 1, at 10-12.

⁴ Item 8 (August 10th Personal Subject Interview), *supra* note 1, at 12-14.

⁵ Item 3, *supra* note 1, at 3-5.

unverified handwritten notes. Applicant simply claims they are payments of \$75 to a creditor whose identity is unclear without an account number (December 4); \$25 to a particular debt purchaser without an account number (January 2); \$40 to a particular debt purchaser without an account number (January 2); and \$5 to merely “student loan” (January 19).⁶ In his Response to the FORM, Applicant contended that he was paying over \$150 per month on unspecified delinquent accounts, and that his wages are garnished at a rate of \$170 bi-monthly.⁷ Applicant failed to submit any documents to support his contentions that any repayment plans had been established; that his wages are being garnished; that payments are being made; and that he has engaged the services of a debt consolidation company. Other than the three sheets of paper with notations purported to be payments, there are no indications of payments made or payments received.

The SOR identified 18 purportedly delinquent accounts that had been placed for collection, charged off, or filed as judgments, as generally reflected by Applicant’s 2016, 2017, or 2018 credit reports. It appears that several of the alleged debts are actually duplicates of other alleged debts, simply by comparing account numbers. Applicant contended that his “identified” payments were made to creditors whose names appear in his credit reports under separate accounts, but he failed to identify to which accounts his payments were directed. Despite the SOR duplications, each with different balances, the SOR debts, totaling approximately \$31,892, are described below:

There are three student loan accounts, two with the U.S. Department of Education with unpaid and past-due balances of \$8,048 (SOR ¶ 1.a.) and \$3,715 (SOR ¶ 1.c.);⁸ and an unpaid and past-due balance with a particular college of \$907 (SOR ¶ 1.f.).⁹ Applicant claimed he made the \$5 payment to “student loan,” not a particular creditor. There are three medical accounts with unpaid balances of \$128 (SOR ¶ 1.i.),¹⁰ \$256 (SOR ¶ 1.o.),¹¹ and \$300 (SOR ¶ 1.p.);¹² a credit card with an unpaid balance of \$7,205 (SOR ¶ 1.b.);¹³ a utility account with an unpaid balance of \$365 (SOR ¶ 1.i.);¹⁴ an Internet or cable television account with an unpaid balance of \$118 (SOR ¶ 1.m.);¹⁵ an apartment lease

⁶ Item 3, *supra* note 1, at 5-7.

⁷ Applicant’s Response to the FORM, *supra* note 1.

⁸ Item 6, *supra* note 1, at 1-2.

⁹ Item 7, *supra* note 1, at 9; Item 6, *supra* note 1, at 2; Item 5, *supra* note 1, at 2.

¹⁰ Item 6, *supra* note 1, at 2; Item 5, *supra* note 1, at 1.

¹¹ Item 7, *supra* note 1, at 6.

¹² Item 7, *supra* note 1, at 6.

¹³ Item 6, *supra* note 1, at 2; Item 5, *supra* note 1, at 2.

¹⁴ Item 6, *supra* note 1, at 2; Item 5, *supra* note 1, at 2.

¹⁵ Item 6, *supra* note 1, at 2; Item 5, *supra* note 1, at 1.

with an unpaid balance of \$1,655 (SOR ¶ 1.e.);¹⁶ an unspecified type of account with a bank with an unpaid and past-due balance of \$713 that was sold to a debt purchaser (SOR ¶ 1.g.);¹⁷ an unspecified type of account with a bank with an unpaid balance of \$235 that was sold to a debt purchaser (SOR ¶ 1.k.);¹⁸ a lease with an unpaid balance of \$1,082 that became a judgment in March 2015 (SOR ¶ 1.n.);¹⁹ and a department store charge account with an unpaid balance of \$288 that was charged off (SOR ¶ 1.j.).²⁰ Those accounts have not been resolved.

In addition, there are two separate listings of the same unspecified type of account (with identical account numbers) with two separate snapshots of the changing unpaid balances of \$2,475 listed with a debt purchaser (SOR ¶ 1.d.)²¹ and \$2,866 with the debt purchaser and the original creditor (SOR ¶ 1.q.);²² and another two separate listings of the same unspecified type of account (with identical account numbers) with two separate snapshots of the changing unpaid balances of \$608 listed with a debt purchaser (SOR ¶ 1.h.)²³ and \$928 with the debt purchaser and the original creditor (SOR ¶ 1.r.).²⁴ Those accounts have not been resolved.

Applicant contends that he lives alone on less than \$1,700 per month, but he failed to submit any documents to reflect his actual monthly net pay, monthly expenses, debt payments, or if he has any monthly remainder that might be available for discretionary spending or savings. There is no evidence of a budget. There is no evidence of financial counseling. Applicant offered no evidence to indicate that his financial situation is now under control, but to the contrary, he stated that if he can obtain a security clearance, his financial situation should improve.

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,

¹⁶ Item 6, *supra* note 1, at 2; Item 5, *supra* note 1, at 2.

¹⁷ Item 6, *supra* note 1, at 2; Item 5, *supra* note 1, at 2.

¹⁸ Item 7, *supra* note 1, at 11; Item 6, *supra* note 1, at 2; Item 5, *supra* note 1, at 2-3.

¹⁹ Item 7, *supra* note 1, at 4.

²⁰ Item 7, *supra* note 1, at 11; Item 6, *supra* note 1, at 2; Item 5, *supra* note 1, at 4.

²¹ Item 6, *supra* note 1, at 2.

²² Item 7, *supra* note 1, at 8; Item 5, *supra* note 1, at 3.

²³ Item 6, *supra* note 1, at 2.

²⁴ Item 7, *supra* note 1, at 8; Item 5, *supra* note 1, at 2.

“no one has a ‘right’ to a security clearance.”²⁵ 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. The President has authorized the Secretary of Defense or his designee to grant an applicant eligibility for access to classified information “only upon a finding that it is clearly consistent with the national interest to do so.”²⁶

When evaluating an applicant’s suitability for a security clearance, the administrative judge must consider the guidelines in SEAD 4. In addition to brief introductory explanations for each guideline, the guidelines list potentially disqualifying conditions and mitigating conditions, which are used in evaluating an applicant’s eligibility for access to classified information.

An administrative judge need not view the guidelines as inflexible, ironclad rules of law. Instead, acknowledging the complexities of human behavior, these guidelines are applied in conjunction with the factors listed in the adjudicative process. The administrative judge’s overarching adjudicative goal is a fair, impartial, and commonsense decision. The entire process is a conscientious scrutiny of a number of variables known as the “whole-person concept.” The administrative judge must consider all available, reliable information about the person, past and present, favorable and unfavorable, in making a meaningful decision.

In the decision-making process, facts must be established by “substantial evidence.”²⁷ The Government initially has the burden of producing evidence to establish a potentially disqualifying condition under the Directive, and has the burden of establishing controverted facts alleged in the SOR. Once the Government has produced substantial evidence of a disqualifying condition, under Directive ¶ E3.1.15, the applicant has the burden of persuasion to present evidence in refutation, explanation, extenuation or mitigation, sufficient to overcome the doubts raised by the Government’s case. The burden of disproving a mitigating condition never shifts to the Government.²⁸

A person who seeks access to classified information enters into a fiduciary relationship with the Government predicated upon trust and confidence. This relationship transcends normal duty hours and endures throughout off-duty hours as well. It is because of this special relationship that the Government must be able to repose a high degree of trust and confidence in those individuals to whom it grants access to classified

²⁵ *Department of the Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518, 528 (1988).

²⁶ Exec. Or. 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information within Industry* § 2 (Feb. 20, 1960), as amended and modified.

²⁷ “Substantial evidence [is] such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion in light of all contrary evidence in the record.” ISCR Case No. 04-11463 at 2 (App. Bd. Aug. 4, 2006) (citing Directive ¶ E3.1.32.1). “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).

²⁸ See ISCR Case No. 02-31154 at 5 (App. Bd. Sep. 22, 2005).

information. 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 as to potential, rather than actual, risk of compromise of classified information. Furthermore, “security clearance determinations should err, if they must, on the side of denials.”²⁹

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.”³⁰ Thus, nothing in this decision should be construed to suggest that I have based this decision, in whole or in part, on any express or implied determination as to Applicant’s allegiance, loyalty, or patriotism. It is merely an indication the Applicant has or has not met the strict guidelines the President and the Secretary of Defense have established for issuing a clearance. In reaching this decision, I have drawn only those conclusions that are reasonable, logical, and based on the evidence contained in the record. Likewise, I have avoided drawing inferences grounded on mere speculation or conjecture.

Analysis

Guideline F, Financial Considerations

The security concern relating to the guideline for Financial Considerations 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. Financial distress can also be caused or exacerbated by, and thus can be a possible indicator of, other issues of personnel security concern such as excessive gambling, mental health conditions, substance misuse, or alcohol abuse or dependence. An individual who is financially overextended is at greater risk of having to engage in illegal or otherwise questionable acts to generate funds. Affluence that cannot be explained by known sources of income is also a security concern insofar as it may result from criminal activity, including espionage.

The guideline notes several conditions that could raise security concerns under AG 19:

(a) inability to satisfy debts;

(b) unwillingness to satisfy debts regardless of the ability to do so; and

²⁹ *Egan*, 484 U.S. at 531.

³⁰ See Exec. Or. 10865 § 7.

(c) a history of not meeting financial obligations.

Applicant had 16 (when discarding the duplicate listings)³¹ delinquent accounts that had been placed for collection, charged off, or filed as judgments, totaling somewhat less than approximately \$31,892. He has never expressed an unwillingness to satisfy his debts, but instead claimed that he had insufficient funds to do so. AG ¶¶ 19(a) and 19(c) have been established. AG ¶ 19(b) has not been established.

The guideline also includes examples of conditions that could mitigate security concerns arising from financial difficulties under AG ¶ 20:

(a) the behavior happened so long ago, was so infrequent, or occurred under such circumstances that it is unlikely to recur and does not cast doubt on the individual's current reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment;³²

(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;

(d) the individual initiated and is adhering to a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or otherwise resolve debts;³³ and

³¹ As noted above, SOR ¶¶ 1.d. and 1.q. refer to one account, and SOR ¶¶ 1.h. and 1.r. refer to one account.

³² 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. Feb. 16, 2017) (citing ISCR Case No. 15-01690 at 2 (App. Bd. Sep. 13, 2016)).

³³ 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 [or statute of limitations]) 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)).

(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.

AG ¶ 20(b) minimally applies, but none of the remaining mitigating conditions apply. The nature, frequency, and recency of Applicant's continuing financial difficulties make it difficult to conclude that it occurred "so long ago" or "was so infrequent," or that it is "unlikely to recur." Applicant attributed his financial difficulties, in part, to his 2014 separation and subsequent divorce from his ex-wife, and the fact that his debts "got lost in a bunch of other debts," because of those marital issues. On the one hand, Applicant claimed, without documentary support, that his wages were being garnished and that that he was making some payments under repayment plans, and on the other hand, he claimed to have insufficient funds to maintain his financial responsibilities. As noted above, there is no documented proof that Applicant has actually contacted his creditors or collection agents to pay or settle any of his delinquent debts.

Applicant's declared future intentions to pay his debts when he obtains a security clearance is simply a hope for financial improvement, not an established strategy for a financial plan. There is no documentation to reflect that Applicant made any efforts, before or after he was interviewed by OPM on three occasions in 2017, or before or after the SOR was issued in March 2018, to: obtain financial counseling from a legitimate and credible source, such as a non-profit credit counseling service; dispute his delinquent accounts with the credit reporting agencies or the creditors themselves; contact his creditors to set up repayment plans; or indicate that payments had been made to his creditors.³⁴ An applicant who begins to resolve his financial problems only after being placed on notice that his or her security clearance is in jeopardy may be lacking in the judgment and self-discipline to follow rules and regulations over time or when there is no immediate threat to his or her own interests.³⁵ In this instance, to date, there is no meaningful evidence that any corrective actions have been taken by Applicant. There is little evidence to conclude that Applicant's finances are under control.

Clearance decisions are aimed at evaluating an applicant's judgment, reliability, and trustworthiness. They are not a debt-collection procedure. The guidelines do not require an applicant to establish resolution of every debt or issue alleged in the SOR. An applicant needs only to establish a plan to resolve financial problems and take significant actions to implement the plan. There is no requirement that an applicant immediately resolve issues or make payments on all delinquent debts simultaneously, nor is there a requirement that the debts or issues alleged in an SOR be resolved first. Rather, a reasonable plan and concomitant conduct may provide for the payment of such debts, or resolution of such issues, one at a time. Mere promises to pay debts in the future, without further confirmed action, are insufficient.

³⁴ See ISCR Case No. 12-01335 at 5 (App. Bd. Dec. 29, 2017).

³⁵ See, e.g., ISCR Case No. 17-01213 at 5 (App. Bd. Jun. 29, 2018); ISCR Case No. 17-00569 at 3-4 (App. Bd. Sept. 18, 2018).

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 SEAD 4, App. A, ¶ 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 SEAD 4, App. A, ¶ 2(c), the 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. Moreover, I have evaluated the various aspects of this case in light of the totality of the record evidence and have not merely performed a piecemeal analysis.³⁶

There is some evidence mitigating Applicant's conduct. Applicant is a 33-year-old employee of a defense contractor serving as a project manager with his current employer since January 2016. A 2003 high school graduate, Applicant earned some college credits. He served briefly on active duty with the U.S. Army.

The disqualifying evidence under the whole-person concept is more substantial. Applicant has 16 delinquent accounts that had been placed for collection, charged off, or filed as judgments. Among those debts are three student loan accounts; one judgment; and a variety of delinquent credit cards, charge accounts, telephone accounts, medical accounts, and Internet accounts, none of which have been addressed by Applicant over a lengthy period.

The Appeal Board has addressed a key element in the whole-person analysis in financial cases stating:³⁷

In evaluating Guideline F cases, the Board has previously noted that the concept of "meaningful track record" necessarily includes evidence of actual debt reduction through payment of debts. However, an applicant is not required, as a matter of law, to establish that he [or she] has paid off each and every debt listed in the SOR. All that is required is that an applicant

³⁶ See *U.S. v. Bottone*, 365 F.2d 389, 392 (2d Cir. 1966); See also ISCR Case No. 03-22861 at 2-3 (App. Bd. Jun. 2, 2006).

³⁷ ISCR Case No. 07-06482 at 2-3 (App. Bd. May 21, 2008) (internal citations omitted).

demonstrate that he [or she] has “. . . established a plan to resolve his [or her] financial problems and taken significant actions to implement that plan.” The Judge can reasonably consider the entirety of an applicant’s financial situation and his [or her] actions in evaluating the extent to which that applicant’s plan for the reduction of his outstanding indebtedness is credible and realistic. See Directive ¶ E2.2(a) (“Available, reliable information about the person, past and present, favorable and unfavorable, should be considered in reaching a determination.”) There is no requirement that a plan provide for payments on all outstanding debts simultaneously. Rather, a reasonable plan (and concomitant conduct) may provide for the payment of such debts one at a time. Likewise, there is no requirement that the first debts actually paid in furtherance of a reasonable debt plan be the ones listed in the SOR.

Applicant has demonstrated an extremely poor track record of debt reduction and elimination efforts, seemingly avoiding the debts in his name. Overall, the evidence leaves me with substantial questions and doubts as to Applicant’s eligibility and suitability for a security clearance. For all of these reasons, I conclude Applicant has failed to mitigate the security concerns arising from his financial considerations. See SEAD 4, App. A, ¶¶ 2(d)(1) through AG 2(d)(9).

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.p.:	Against Applicant
Subparagraphs 1.q. and 1.r.:	For Applicant

Conclusion

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

ROBERT ROBINSON GALES
Administrative Judge