



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



In the matter of:)	
)	
-----)	ISCR Case No. 14-05041
)	
Applicant for Security Clearance)	

Appearances

For Government: Gina L. Marine, Esquire, Department Counsel
For Applicant: *Pro se*

January 28, 2016

DECISION

ROSS, Wilford H., Administrative Judge:

Applicant submitted his Electronic Questionnaire for Investigations Processing (e-QIP), on February 12, 2014. (Item 3.) On October 31, 2014, the Department of Defense issued a Statement of Reasons (SOR) detailing the security concerns under Guideline F (Financial Considerations) concerning Applicant. The action was taken under Executive Order 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information Within Industry* (February 20, 1960), as amended; Department of Defense Directive 5220.6, *Defense Industrial Personnel Security Clearance Review Program* (January 2, 1992), as amended (Directive); and the adjudicative guidelines (AG) effective within the Department of Defense on September 1, 2006.

Applicant answered the SOR in writing on January 22, and March 3, 2015, and requested a decision by an administrative judge without a hearing. (Item 2.) Department Counsel submitted the Government’s written case (FORM) to Applicant on July 15, 2015.¹ Applicant acknowledged receipt of the FORM August 7, 2015. He was given 30

¹Department Counsel submitted six items in the FORM. Item 4 is inadmissible and will not be considered or cited as evidence in this case. It is the summary of an unsworn interview of Applicant conducted by an interviewer from the Office of Personnel Management on March 20, 2014. It was never adopted by Applicant

days from receipt of the FORM to submit any additional documentation. Applicant submitted additional information in the form of an undated statement and attachments. This statement is admitted into evidence without objection as Applicant Exhibit A. The case was assigned to me on September 1, 2015. Applicant submitted additional information on September 16, and 21, 2015. Department Counsel had no objection to my considering these additional documents, and they are admitted into evidence as Applicant Exhibit B. Based upon a review of the pleadings and exhibits, eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

Findings of Fact

Applicant is 32 and single. He is employed by a defense contractor and seeks to obtain a security clearance in connection with his employment.

Paragraph 1 (Guideline F, Financial Considerations)

The Government alleges in this paragraph that Applicant is ineligible for clearance because he is financially overextended and therefore potentially unreliable, untrustworthy, or at risk of having to engage in illegal acts to generate funds. Applicant admitted all the allegations in the SOR under this paragraph. Those admissions are findings of fact. He also submitted additional evidence to support his eligibility to hold a security clearance.

The SOR lists four delinquent debts. The total indebtedness is approximately \$15,049. (Subparagraphs 1.a through 1.d.) The existence and amount of all the debts is supported by credit reports dated February 28, 2014; and June 16, 2015. (Items 5 and 6.) The current status of the debts is as follows:

1.a. Applicant admitted owing this judgment in connection with a bank credit card in the amount of \$4,410. He maintains that this debt is also part of the amount stated in subparagraph 1.b, below. As of September 21, 2015, Applicant had not made any arrangements with this creditor stating, "I plan to seek legal help with this matter." (Applicant Exhibit B.) No further information was provided. This debt is not resolved.

1.b. Applicant admitted owing this judgment in connection with a bank credit card in the amount of \$8,513. He maintains that this debt also includes the amount stated in subparagraph 1.a, above.² As of September 21, 2015, Applicant had not made any arrangements with this creditor stating, "I plan to seek legal help with this matter." (Applicant Exhibit B.) No further information was provided. This debt is not resolved.

as his own statement, or otherwise certified by him to be accurate. Under Directive ¶ E3.1.20, this Report of Investigation summary is inadmissible in the absence of an authenticating witness. Given Applicant's admissions, it is also cumulative.

²The credit report at Item 5 indicates that these judgments were rendered in different courts, for different plaintiffs, in different amounts. It is Applicant's burden to support his contention that they are the same debt. He has not done so.

1.c. Applicant admitted owing a past-due debt to a mobile-phone company in the amount of \$2,061. He paid this debt for a reduced amount in September 2015. (Applicant Exhibit B.) This debt is resolved.

1.d. Applicant admitted owing a past-due medical debt in the amount of \$65. He paid this debt in full in September 2015. (Applicant Exhibit B.) This debt is resolved.

The credit report in Item 6 showed an additional debt for cable television service in the amount of \$678, which is not alleged in the SOR. Applicant paid this debt in full in September 2015. (Applicant Exhibit B.)

Applicant has been gainfully employed by his current employer since February 2014. (Item 3, Section 13A.) Applicant submitted no evidence that he has received any financial counseling. He did not submit a budget, or any other information concerning his income and expenses.

Applicant provided no evidence concerning the quality of his professional performance, the level of responsibility his duties entail, or his track record with respect to handling sensitive information and observation of security procedures. He submitted character references from a former employer and his pastor. (Applicant Exhibit A.) I was unable to evaluate his credibility, demeanor, or character in person since he elected to have his case decided without a hearing.

Policies

Security clearance decisions are not made in a vacuum. When evaluating an applicant's suitability for a security clearance, 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 as appropriate in evaluating an applicant's eligibility for access to classified information.

These guidelines are not inflexible rules of law. Instead, recognizing the complexities of human behavior, these guidelines are applied in conjunction with the factors listed in AG ¶ 2 describing the adjudicative process. The administrative judge's over-arching adjudicative goal is a fair, impartial and commonsense decision. According to AG ¶ 2(c), 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. In addition, the administrative judge may also rely on his or her own common sense, as well as knowledge of the law, human nature, and the ways of the world, in making a reasoned decision.

The protection of the national security is the paramount consideration. AG ¶ 2(b) requires that, "Any doubt concerning personnel being considered for access to classified information 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. Likewise, I have avoided drawing inferences grounded on mere speculation or conjecture.

Under Directive ¶ E3.1.14, the Government must present evidence to establish controverted facts alleged in the SOR. Under Directive ¶ E3.1.15, “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 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. The Government reposes a high degree of trust and confidence in individuals to whom it grants access to classified information. Security clearance decisions include, by necessity, consideration of the possible risk that 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.

Finally, as emphasized in Section 7 of Executive Order 10865, “Any determination under this order adverse to an applicant shall be a determination 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

Paragraph 1 (Guideline F, Financial Considerations)

The security concern relating to the guideline for Financial Considerations is set out in AG ¶ 18:

Failure or inability 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 information. An individual who is financially overextended is at risk of having to engage in illegal acts to generate funds.

The guideline notes several conditions that could raise security concerns. Under AG ¶ 19(a), an “inability or unwillingness to satisfy debts” is potentially disqualifying. Similarly under AG ¶ 19(c), “a history of not meeting financial obligations” may raise security concerns. Applicant had over \$15,000 in past-due debts, which have been due and owing for several years. The evidence is sufficient to raise these potentially disqualifying conditions.

The guideline also includes examples of conditions that could mitigate security concerns arising from financial difficulties. Under AG ¶ 20(a), the disqualifying conditions may be mitigated where “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.” This condition does not apply as Applicant’s financial difficulties have been in existence for several years.

AG ¶ 20(b) states that the disqualifying conditions may be mitigated where “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, or a death, divorce or separation), and the individual acted responsibly under the circumstances.” The record does not show any unusual circumstances that would support the application of this mitigating condition.

AG ¶ 20(d) states it can be mitigating where, “the individual has initiated a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or otherwise resolve debts.” Applicant has submitted evidence showing that he has successfully paid two of the creditors listed in the SOR (1.c and 1.d). This mitigating condition has application to those allegations, and they are found for Applicant.

With regard to subparagraphs 1.a and 1.b, the record is simply insufficient to show mitigation at this time. He still owes at least \$12,923 on these two judgment debts.

In conclusion, looking at Applicant’s entire financial situation at the present time, I cannot find that “there are clear indications that the problem is being resolved or is under control,” as is required by AG ¶ 20(c). Paragraph 1 is found against Applicant.

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 relevant circumstances. 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. The administrative judge must consider the nine adjudicative process factors listed at AG ¶ 2(a):

- (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 considered the potentially disqualifying and mitigating conditions in light of all the relevant facts and circumstances surrounding this case. The discussion under Guideline F, above, applies here as well. Applicant has had financial problems for several years, which he has not yet resolved. If he is able to successfully resolve his remaining debts, Applicant may be eligible for a security clearance in the future. However, at the present time, Applicant's conduct with regard to his finances was not mitigated.

Under AG ¶ 2(a)(3), his conduct is recent and continuing. I cannot find that there have been permanent behavioral changes under AG ¶ 2(a)(6). Accordingly, I also cannot find that there is little to no potential for pressure, coercion, exploitation, or duress (AG ¶ 2(a)(8)); or that there is no likelihood of continuation or recurrence (AG ¶ 2(a)(9)).

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 has not mitigated the security concerns arising from his financial situation. Accordingly, the evidence supports denying his request for a security clearance.

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 F:	AGAINST APPLICANT
Subparagraph 1.a:	Against Applicant
Subparagraph 1.b:	Against Applicant
Subparagraph 1.c:	For Applicant
Subparagraph 1.d:	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.

WILFORD H. ROSS
Administrative Judge