

KEYWORD: Guideline F

DIGEST: Applicant's appeal brief raises no allegation of harmful error on the part of the Judge, but it does contain a number of documents and assertions that are not in the record. The Appeal Board is prohibited from considering new evidence. Directive ¶ E3.1.29. Adverse decision affirmed.

CASENO: 18-00249.a1

DATE: 04/02/2019

DATE: April 2, 2019

In Re: _____)
-----)
-----) ISCR Case No. 18-00249
-----)
Applicant for Security Clearance)
_____)

APPEAL BOARD DECISION

APPEARANCES

FOR GOVERNMENT

James B. Norman, Esq., Chief Department Counsel

FOR APPLICANT

Pro se

The Department of Defense (DoD) declined to grant Applicant a security clearance. On February 2, 2018, DoD issued a statement of reasons (SOR) advising Applicant of the basis for that decision—security concerns raised under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) of Department of Defense Directive 5220.6 (Jan. 2, 1992, as amended) (Directive). Applicant requested a hearing. On January 16, 2019, after the hearing, Administrative Judge Paul J. Mason denied Applicant's request for a security clearance. Applicant appealed pursuant to Directive ¶¶ E3.1.28 and E3.1.30.

Applicant's appeal brief raises no allegation of harmful error on the part of the Judge, but it does contain a number of documents and assertions that are not in the record. The Appeal Board is prohibited from considering new evidence. Directive ¶ E3.1.29.

The Board does not review cases *de novo*. The Appeal Board's authority to review a case is limited to cases in which the appealing party has alleged the Judge committed harmful error. Because Applicant has not made such an allegation of error, the decision of the Judge denying Applicant a security clearance is **AFFIRMED**.

Signed: Michael Ra'anan

Michael Ra'anan
Administrative Judge
Chairperson, Appeal Board

Signed: James F. Duffy

James F. Duffy
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board

Signed: Charles C. Hale

Charles C. Hale
Administrative Judge
Member, Appeal Board