



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



Appearances

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

04/17/2025

Decision

CEFOLA, Richard A., Administrative Judge:

Statement of the Case

On October 24, 2024, in accordance with DoD Directive 5220.6, as amended (Directive), the Department of Defense issued Applicant a Statement of Reasons (SOR) alleging facts that raise security concerns under Guideline F (Financial Considerations). The SOR further informed Applicant that, based on information available to the government, DoD adjudicators could not make the preliminary affirmative finding it is clearly consistent with the national interest to grant or continue Applicant's security clearance.

Applicant answered the SOR soon thereafter, and requested a hearing before an administrative judge. (Answer.) The case was assigned to me on February 10, 2025. The Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) issued a notice of hearing on February 10, 2025, scheduling the hearing for March 4, 2025. The hearing was convened as scheduled. The Government offered Exhibits (GXs) 1 through 3, which were admitted into evidence. Applicant testified on his own behalf. The record was left open until April 4, 2025, for receipt of additional documentation. Applicant offered three documents, which I marked Applicant's Exhibits (AppXs) A through C, and admitted into evidence. DOHA received the transcript of the hearing (TR) on March 17, 2025.

At the hearing, the Government amended the SOR, in concert with Applicant's testimony: 1.c. "You are indebted to the Federal Government for delinquent taxes, in the approximate amount of \$4,300, for Tax Years 2021 through 2023." An allegation which Applicant admits.

Findings of Fact

Applicant admitted to the allegations in SOR ¶¶ 1.a, through 1.c. After a thorough and careful review of the pleadings, exhibits, and testimony, I make the following findings of fact.

Applicant is a 45-year-old employee of a defense contractor. He is married, and has no children. (TR at page 11 lines 21~23, and GX 1 at pages 5, 17 and 19.)

Guideline F - Financial Considerations

1.a. Applicant admits that he and his wife failed to file their Federal income tax returns in a timely manner for tax years 2021 and 2022. They experienced "several losses around that time - - deaths in April and May . . . sidetracked with family issues." He has now submitted post-hearing documentation showing those taxes have been filed. (TR at page 10 line 19 to page 11 line 5, at page 11 line 24 to page 14 line 20, and AppXs A and B.) This allegation is found for Applicant.

1.b, Applicant admits that he and his wife failed to file their State income tax returns in a timely manner for tax years 2021 and 2022. (TR at page 20 lines 1~17.) He has submitted nothing further regarding this allegation. (Based on the available record, it cannot be assumed Applicant filed his State income tax returns in conjunction with his Federal income tax returns.) This allegation is found against Applicant.

1.c. Applicant admits that he is indebted to the Federal Government for delinquent taxes, in the approximate amount of \$4,300, for Tax Years 2021 through 2023. He avers

that he is making monthly payments of \$200 towards this tax lien, but has submitted nothing further in this regard. (TR at page 14 line 21 to page 17 line 24.) This allegation is found against Applicant.

Policies

When evaluating an applicant's national security eligibility, the administrative judge must consider the adjudicative guidelines (AG). In addition to brief introductory explanations for each guideline, the adjudicative guidelines list potentially disqualifying conditions and mitigating conditions, which are to be used in evaluating an applicant's national security eligibility.

These guidelines are not inflexible rules of law. Instead, recognizing the complexities of human behavior, administrative judges apply the guidelines in conjunction with the factors listed in AG ¶ 2 describing the adjudicative process. The administrative judge's overarching adjudicative goal is a fair, impartial, and commonsense decision. According to AG ¶ 2(a), 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 decision.

The protection of the national security is the paramount consideration. AG ¶ 2(b) requires that “[a]ny doubt concerning personnel being considered for national security eligibility will be resolved in favor of the national security.” In reaching this decision, I have drawn only those conclusions that are reasonable, logical, and based on the evidence contained in the record.

Under Directive ¶ E3.1.14, the Government must present evidence to establish controverted facts alleged in the SOR. Directive ¶ E3.1.15 states the “applicant is responsible for presenting witnesses and other evidence to rebut, explain, extenuate, or mitigate facts admitted by the applicant or proven by Department Counsel, and has the ultimate burden of persuasion as to obtaining a favorable clearance decision.”

A person who applies for access to classified information seeks to enter into a fiduciary relationship with the Government predicated upon trust and confidence. This relationship transcends normal duty hours and endures throughout off-duty hours. The Government reposes a high degree of trust and confidence in individuals to whom it grants access to classified information. Decisions include, by necessity, consideration of the possible risk the applicant may deliberately or inadvertently fail to protect or 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.

Section 7 of Executive Order (EO) 10865 provides that adverse decisions shall be “in terms of the national interest and shall in no sense be a determination as to the loyalty of the applicant concerned.” See *also* EO 12968, Section 3.1(b) (listing multiple prerequisites for access to classified or sensitive information).

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. One is potentially applicable in this case:

(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 failed to file his Federal and State income tax returns for tax years 2021 and 2022 in a timely manner, and owes monies as a result of these untimely filings. The evidence is sufficient to raise these disqualifying conditions.

AG ¶ 20 provides conditions that could mitigate security concerns. I considered all of the mitigating conditions under AG ¶ 20 including:

- (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;
- (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; 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.

Applicant has not submitted documentation regarding his State income tax filings, nor evidence regarding his averred monthly payments to the IRS. He has not demonstrated that future financial problems are unlikely. Mitigation under AG ¶ 20 has not been established.

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):

- (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), the ultimate determination of whether to grant eligibility for a security clearance must be an overall commonsense judgment based upon careful consideration of the guidelines and the whole-person concept.

I considered the potentially disqualifying and mitigating conditions in light of all facts and circumstances surrounding this case. I have incorporated my comments under Guideline F in my whole-person analysis. Overall, the record evidence leaves me with questions and doubts as to Applicant's eligibility and suitability for a security clearance. For all these reasons, I conclude Applicant failed to mitigate the Financial Considerations security concerns.

Formal Findings

Formal findings for or against Applicant on the allegations set forth in the SOR, as required by ¶ E3.1.25 of the Directive, are:

Paragraph 1, Guideline F: **AGAINST APPLICANT**

Subparagraph 1.a:	For Applicant
Subparagraph 1.b:	Against Applicant
Subparagraph 1.c:	Against 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 national security eligibility for a security clearance. Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

Richard A. Cefola
Administrative Judge