



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



In the matter of:	)	
	)	
	)	ADP Case No. 14-06631
	)	
	)	
Applicant for Public Trust Position	)	

**Appearances**

For Government: Tovah Minster, Esq., Department Counsel  
For Applicant: *Pro se*

11/21/2015

**Decision**

COACHER, Robert E., Administrative Judge:

Applicant did not mitigate the financial considerations trustworthiness concerns. Eligibility for access to sensitive information is denied.

**Statement of the Case**

On January 20, 2015, the Department of Defense (DOD) issued Applicant a Statement of Reasons (SOR) detailing trustworthiness concerns under Guideline F, financial considerations. DOD acted under Department of Defense Directive 5220.6, *Defense Industrial Personnel Security Clearance Review Program* (January 2, 1992), as amended (Directive); DOD Regulation 5200.2-R, *Personnel Security Program*, dated January 1987, as amended (Regulation); and the adjudicative guidelines (AG) effective within the DOD on September 1, 2006.

Applicant answered (Answer) the SOR on February 28, 2015, and elected to have her case decided on the written record in lieu of a hearing. Department Counsel submitted the Government’s File of Relevant Material (FORM) on July 19, 2015. The FORM was mailed to Applicant and she received it on August 20, 2015. Applicant was

given an opportunity to file objections and submit material in refutation, extenuation, or mitigation. She declined to submit any additional information. The Government's evidence (Items 1-4) is admitted into the record. The case was assigned to me on November 2, 2015.

### **Findings of Fact**

In her Answer, Applicant admitted all SOR allegations, except for SOR ¶ 1.b, which she denied. Her admissions are incorporated as findings of fact. After a review of the pleadings and evidence, I make the following additional findings of fact.

Applicant is a 45-year-old employee of a government contractor. She works as a customer service representative and has held that position since May 2014. She is divorced and has three adult children. From August 2008 through October 2009, she was unemployed. She has a high school diploma. She has no military background.<sup>1</sup>

The SOR alleges 12 delinquent debts for a total of approximately \$15,151, and a Chapter 7 bankruptcy that was discharged in 2010. The debts were listed in a credit report from February 2014 and discussed in her personal subject interview conducted in July 2014. There is no evidence supporting payment towards any of the listed debts. The debts are unresolved.<sup>2</sup>

In her Answer and her personal subject interview, Applicant stated that her financial difficulties came about because of her unemployment from 2008 to 2009, her divorce, and numerous medical bills she accumulated during an illness when she was without medical insurance. Additionally, her three adult children still live at home. Her plan is to start paying the medical bills one by one. She offered no proof of any agreements with the creditors. Her current discretionary monthly income is approximately \$727 per month. She has not had any financial counseling.<sup>3</sup>

### **Policies**

Positions designated as ADP I and ADP II are classified as "sensitive positions." (See Regulation ¶¶ C3.1.2.1.1.7 and C3.1.2.1.2.3.) "The standard that must be met for . . . assignment to sensitive duties is that, based on all available information, the person's loyalty, reliability, and trustworthiness are such that . . . assigning the person to sensitive duties is clearly consistent with the interests of national security." (See Regulation ¶ C6.1.1.1.) The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Counterintelligence and Security) Memorandum, dated November 19, 2004, indicates trustworthiness adjudications will apply to cases forwarded to The Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) by the Defense Security Service and Office of Personnel

---

<sup>1</sup> Item 2.

<sup>2</sup> Items 1-4.

<sup>3</sup> Items 1, 3, 4.

Management. DOD contractor personnel are afforded the right to the procedures contained in the Directive before any final unfavorable access determination may be made. (See Regulation ¶ C8.2.1.)

When evaluating an applicant's suitability for a public trust position, the administrative judge must consider the disqualifying and mitigating conditions in the AG. 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 the adjudicative process. The administrative judge's overarching 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.

The protection of the national security is the paramount consideration. AG ¶ 2(b) requires that "[a]ny doubt concerning personnel being considered for access to [sensitive] information will be resolved in favor of 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 applicant or proven by Department Counsel." The applicant has the ultimate burden of persuasion as to obtaining a favorable trustworthiness decision.

A person who seeks access to sensitive 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 sensitive information. Decisions include, by necessity, consideration of the possible risk the applicant may deliberately or inadvertently fail to protect or safeguard sensitive information. Such decisions entail a certain degree of legally permissible extrapolation as to potential, rather than actual, risk of compromise of sensitive information.

## **Analysis**

### **Guideline F, Financial Considerations**

The trustworthiness concern for financial considerations is set out in AG ¶ 18 as follows:

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 sensitive 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 trustworthiness concerns under AG ¶ 19. Two are potentially applicable in this case:

- (a) inability or unwillingness to satisfy debts; and
- (c) a history of not meeting financial obligations.

All of Applicant's numerous delinquent debts remain unpaid. Previously, she had her debts discharged through a Chapter 7 bankruptcy in 2010. The evidence is sufficient to raise the above disqualifying conditions.

Several financial considerations mitigating conditions under AG ¶ 20 are potentially applicable:

- (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, or a death, divorce or separation), and the individual acted responsibly under the circumstances;
- (c) the person has received or is receiving counseling for the problem and/or there are clear indications that the problem is being resolved or is under control;
- (d) the individual initiated a good-faith effort to repay overdue creditors or otherwise resolve debts; and
- (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.

Applicant's debts are recent, multiple, and cast doubt on her reliability, trustworthiness, and good judgment. AG ¶ 20(a) is not applicable. Although some of the debts were incurred during her unemployment and because of her medical needs, which are conditions beyond her control, she failed to show responsible action on her part to deal with the past-due debts. AG ¶ 20(b) is partially applicable.

There is no evidence of financial counseling, and Applicant has not offered proof that she paid any of the debts or established payment plans for them. AG ¶¶ 20(c) and 20(d) do not apply.

Applicant failed to provide any documentation supporting dispute of SOR ¶ 1.b. AG ¶ 20(e) does not apply. Applicant's finances remain a security concern.

### **Whole-Person Concept**

Under the whole-person concept, the administrative judge must evaluate an applicant's eligibility for a position of public trust 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(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.

Under AG ¶ 2(c), the ultimate determination of whether to grant eligibility for a position of public trust 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 relevant facts and circumstances surrounding this case. I have incorporated my comments under Guideline F in my whole-person analysis. Some of the factors in AG ¶ 2(a) were addressed under that guideline, but some warrant additional comment.

All of Applicant's debts remain unresolved. Her troublesome financial history causes me to question her ability to resolve her debts.

Overall, the record evidence leaves me with questions and doubts about Applicant's eligibility and suitability for access to sensitive information. For all these reasons, I conclude Applicant has not mitigated the financial considerations trustworthiness concerns.

### **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 – 1.m:	Against Applicant

## **Conclusion**

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

---

Robert E. Coacher  
Administrative Judge