

***The original of this document contains information which is subject to withholding from disclosure under 5 U.S. C. § 552. Such material has been deleted from this copy and replaced with XXXXXX's.**

**United States Department of Energy
Office of Hearings and Appeals**

In the Matter of: Personnel Security Hearing)
)
Filing Date: March 18, 2026) Case No.: PSH-26-0073
)
)
_____)

Issued: May 12, 2026

Administrative Judge Decision

Phillip Harmonick, Administrative Judge:

This Decision concerns the eligibility of XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX (the Individual) to hold an access authorization under the United States Department of Energy’s (DOE) regulations, set forth at 10 C.F.R. Part 710, “Procedures for Determining Eligibility for Access to Classified Matter and Special Nuclear Material or Eligibility to Hold a Sensitive Position.”¹ As discussed below, after carefully considering the record before me in light of the relevant regulations and the *National Security Adjudicative Guidelines for Determining Eligibility for Access to Classified Information or Eligibility to Hold a Sensitive Position* (June 8, 2017) (Adjudicative Guidelines), I conclude that the Individual should not be granted access authorization.

I. BACKGROUND

On July 21, 2025, the Individual completed and signed a Questionnaire for National Security Positions (QNSP) in connection with seeking access authorization related to his employment by a DOE contractor. Exhibit (Ex.) 3 at 45. The Individual indicated on the QNSP that he had left a position with his employer (Prior Employer) prior to the DOE contractor due to “no room for advancement,” but also checked a box on the QNSP indicating that he had left the position involuntarily on unfavorable terms. *Id.* at 19. The Individual checked a box marked “No” in response to a question asking whether he had been “reprimanded, suspended, or disciplined for misconduct” in connection with this employment. *Id.* In the section of the QNSP devoted to his financial record, the Individual disclosed that he had not filed a Federal personal income tax return for the 2018 tax year and estimated that he owed \$40,000 in unpaid taxes for that tax year. *Id.* at 41. The Individual checked a box marked “No” in response to a question inquiring as to whether he had any other instances of failing to file tax returns or pay taxes as required, and also checked a box marked “No” in response to a question inquiring as to whether he had fallen into delinquency on any debts in the prior seven years. *Id.* at 42.

¹ The regulations define access authorization as “an administrative determination that an individual is eligible for access to classified matter or is eligible for access to, or control over, special nuclear material.” 10 C.F.R. § 710.5(a). This Decision will refer to such authorization as access authorization or security clearance.

As part of a background investigation of the Individual's eligibility for access authorization, an investigator contacted the Prior Employer which indicated that the Individual had been disciplined on multiple occasions and that his employment was terminated for "falsifying his time report." *Id.* at 60. The investigator also obtained a copy of the Individual's credit report (Credit Report) which showed that the Individual had five debts, on which he owed a cumulative \$42,663, referred to collections. *Id.* at 70–72.

The Individual was interviewed by an investigator on September 4, 2025, as part of the background investigation. *Id.* at 51. During the interview, the Individual confirmed the accuracy of the information he provided on the QNSP regarding his employment with the Prior Employer and lack of delinquent debts. *Id.* at 51–52, 55. The investigator then confronted the Individual with the information obtained during the background investigation and the Individual admitted that he had intentionally omitted the information from the QNSP. *Id.* at 53, 55. The Individual then volunteered that he failed to file personal income tax returns or pay income taxes as required for the 2023 and 2024 tax years. *Id.* at 56. In a December 10, 2025, response to a letter of interrogatory (LOI) issued to him by the local security office (LSO), the Individual confirmed that his omissions from the QNSP were intentional. Ex. 4 at 5.

The LSO issued the Individual a Notification Letter advising him that it possessed reliable information that created substantial doubt regarding his eligibility for access authorization. Ex. 1 at 1–3. In a Summary of Security Concerns (SSC) attached to the letter, the LSO explained that the derogatory information raised security concerns under Guidelines E and F of the Adjudicative Guidelines. *Id.* at 4–7.

The Individual exercised his right to request an administrative review hearing pursuant to 10 C.F.R. Part 710. Ex. 2. The Director of the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) appointed me as the Administrative Judge in this matter, and I conducted an administrative hearing. The LSO submitted four exhibits (Ex. 1–4). The Individual submitted eleven exhibits (Ex. A–K). The Individual testified on his own behalf. Hearing Transcript, OHA Case No. PSH-26-0073 (Tr.) at 6. The LSO did not call any witnesses to testify.

II. THE NOTIFICATION LETTER AND THE ASSOCIATED SECURITY CONCERNS

The LSO cited Guideline E (Personal Conduct) of the Adjudicative Guidelines as the first basis for its substantial doubt regarding the Individual's eligibility for access authorization. Ex. 1 at 4–6. "Conduct involving questionable judgment, lack of candor, dishonesty, or unwillingness to comply with rules and regulations can raise questions about an individual's reliability, trustworthiness, and ability to protect classified or sensitive information. Of special interest is any failure to cooperate or provide truthful and candid answers during national security investigative or adjudicative processes." Adjudicative Guidelines at ¶ 15. The SSC cited the Individual having failed to disclose on the QNSP: (1) his termination and discipline by the Prior Employer; (2) his failure to file personal income tax returns or pay personal income taxes for tax years 2023 and 2024; and (3) numerous delinquent financial accounts which were referred to collections and/or

charged off by the Individual's creditors within the prior seven years.² Ex. 1 at 4–6. Additionally, the LSO alleged that the Individual falsely denied being disciplined or terminated by the Prior Employer or having fallen into delinquency on any debts in the prior seven years during the interview with the investigator. *Id.* at 5–6. The LSO's allegations that the Individual deliberately omitted, concealed, or falsified information on the QNSP and deliberately provided false or misleading information to an investigator justify its invocation of Guideline E. Adjudicative Guidelines at ¶ 16(a)–(b).

The LSO also cited Guideline F (Financial Considerations) of the Adjudicative Guidelines as another basis for its substantial doubt regarding the Individual's eligibility for access authorization. Ex. 1 at 6. "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." Adjudicative Guidelines at ¶ 18. The SSC cited the Individual's failure to file personal income tax returns or pay personal income taxes as required and the delinquent debts revealed during the background investigation on which the Individual owed a cumulative balance of over \$40,000. Ex. 1 at 6–7. The LSO's allegations that the Individual demonstrated an inability or unwillingness to satisfy debts, a history of not meeting financial obligations, and failed to file personal income tax returns or pay personal income taxes as required justify its invocation of Guideline F. Adjudicative Guidelines at ¶ 19(a)–(c), (f).

III. REGULATORY STANDARDS

A DOE administrative review proceeding under Part 710 requires me, as the Administrative Judge, to issue a Decision that reflects my comprehensive, common-sense judgment, made after consideration of all of the relevant evidence, favorable and unfavorable, as to whether the granting or continuation of a person's access authorization will not endanger the common defense and security and is clearly consistent with the national interest. 10 C.F.R. § 710.7(a). The regulatory standard implies that there is a presumption against granting or restoring a security clearance. *See Dep't of Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518, 531 (1988) ("clearly consistent with the national interest" standard for granting security clearances indicates "that security determinations should err, if they must, on the side of denials"); *Dorfmont v. Brown*, 913 F.2d 1399, 1403 (9th Cir. 1990) (strong presumption against the issuance of a security clearance).

An individual must come forward at the hearing with evidence to convince the DOE that granting or restoring access authorization "will not endanger the common defense and security and will be clearly consistent with the national interest." 10 C.F.R. § 710.27(d). An individual is afforded a full opportunity to present evidence supporting his or her eligibility for an access authorization. The Part 710 regulations are drafted so as to permit the introduction of a very broad range of

² The SSC alleges that the Individual failed to disclose eleven financial delinquencies on the QNSP. Ex. 1 at 6. This claim is inconsistent with the credit report obtained during the background investigation which shows only five such debts. Ex. 3 at 73–75. The credit report reflects several debts on which the Individual was thirty to sixty days late on payments; however, the Individual was not required to report these untimely payments on the QNSP. *Compare id.* at 75–77 (showing debts for which the Individual made late payments on the credit report) *with* Ex. 3 at 45–46 (indicating that the Individual was required to disclose debts for which he was over one hundred twenty days delinquent on the QNSP). This apparent overcounting of the Individual's delinquent debts, and thus his omissions on the QNSP, is of no significance to my decision.

evidence at personnel security hearings. Even appropriate hearsay evidence may be admitted. *Id.* § 710.26(h). Hence, an individual is afforded the utmost latitude in the presentation of evidence to mitigate the security concerns at issue.

IV. FINDINGS OF FACT

A. Individual's Employment History

The Individual was employed by the Prior Employer from April 2021 to May 2025. Ex. 3 at 18. During this period, the Individual was issued a written warning for tardiness. *Id.* at 60. He was also suspended for two weeks for failing to maintain a driver's license which was required for his position.³ *Id.* At some point in 2025, the Prior Employer investigated the Individual for time theft. *Id.* at 62. Based on video footage reviewed during the investigation, the Prior Employer determined that the Individual had falsified his timecard, and on that basis it terminated his employment. *Id.* at 60, 62; *see also* Tr. at 19 (Individual testifying that he knowingly violated the Prior Employer's time and attendance policy). In June 2025, one month after his termination by the Prior Employer, the Individual obtained employment with the DOE contractor. Ex. 3 at 17.

B. Individual's Financial Difficulties

The Individual failed to timely file Federal or state personal income tax returns for tax years 2018, 2022, 2023, or 2024. *Id.* at 56; Tr. at 23, 25. The Individual failed to withhold sufficient taxes from his paychecks and chose not to file tax returns because he "always owed taxes" and "just [could not] afford to pay the money that [he] owe[d]" Tr. at 28; *see also* Ex. A at 4 (Federal tax return prepared by the Individual for 2022 showing that he owed \$4,784 in unpaid taxes); Ex. B at 4–5 (state tax return prepared by the Individual for 2022 showing that he owed \$227 in taxes); Ex. C at 3 (Federal tax return prepared by the Individual for 2023 showing that he owed \$3,539 in taxes); Ex. D at 4 (state tax return prepared by the Individual for 2023 showing that he owed \$269 in taxes).

In 2022 or 2023, the Individual purchased a timeshare at a vacation destination. Ex. 3 at 57. The Individual also took international vacations in 2019, 2022, and 2023. *Id.* at 54–55. From 2023 to 2024, the Individual opened at least four credit cards to pay household bills. *Id.* at 56–57. Over the ensuing months, the Individual fell behind on payments on each of the credit cards and eventually stopped making payments altogether. *Id.* The Individual's creditors then referred the delinquent debts to collections. *Id.* at 56–57, 70–71.

C. The QNSP and Background Investigation

On July 21, 2025, the Individual completed and signed the QNSP. *Id.* at 48. As part of doing so, the Individual certified that the answers he had provided therein were "true, complete, and correct to the best of [his] knowledge and belief and [were] made in good faith." *Id.*

³ The Individual held a commercial driver's license which lapsed, and he did not timely obtain a personal driver's license. Tr. at 14–17. As a result, he was not licensed to drive for a period of time and was disciplined by the Prior Employer. *Id.*; Ex. 3 at 60.

In the section of the QNSP related to his employment history, the Individual disclosed his employment with the Prior Employer. *Id.* at 18. The Individual checked a box marked “Yes” in answer to a question asking if he had been “Fired,” “Quit after being told you would be fired,” “Left by mutual agreement following charges or allegations of misconduct,” or “Left by mutual agreement following notice of unsatisfactory performance.” *Id.* at 19. Despite answering yes to the previous question, the Individual represented that he quit his position with the Prior Employer due to “no room for advancement.” *Id.* The Individual also checked a box marked “No” in response to a question asking whether he had “received a written warning, been officially reprimanded, suspended, or disciplined for misconduct in the workplace” in the prior seven years. *Id.*

In the section of the QNSP related to his financial record, the Individual disclosed that he had failed to file personal income tax returns or pay personal income taxes for the 2018 tax year. *Id.* at 41. The Individual estimated that he owed \$40,000 in unpaid income taxes for that year. *Id.*; *but see* Tr. at 28 (testifying at the hearing that \$40,000 was a “[c]razy number” that he came up with off of the “top of [his] head” when completing the QNSP and that he did not actually owe that much). However, he checked a box marked “No” in answer to a question asking whether he had failed to file any other tax returns or pay taxes as required in the prior seven years and did not disclose his failure to comply with his tax obligations for the 2022, 2023, and 2024 tax years. Ex. 3 at 42.

The Individual also failed to disclose his delinquent debts as required. In answer to a question asking whether he “had bills or debts turned over to a collection agency,” “had any account or credit card suspended, charged off, or cancelled for failing to pay as agreed,” or had “been over 120 days delinquent on any debt” in the prior seven years, the Individual checked a box marked “No.” *Id.* at 42–43.

As part of the background investigation into the Individual’s eligibility for access authorization, an investigator contacted representatives of the Prior Employer who revealed the Individual’s discipline and termination for falsification of his timecard. *Id.* at 60, 62. Additionally, the Credit Report showed that the timeshare debt and the four aforementioned credit card debts, on which the Individual owed a cumulative \$42,663, had all been charged off or referred to collections by the creditors. *Id.* at 70–72. The Credit Report additionally showed that the Individual had fallen at least thirty days behind on payments on seven other debts. *Id.* at 72–74.

On September 4, 2025, the Individual met with an investigator for an interview under oath. *Id.* at 51. When asked about his employment with the Prior Employer, the Individual claimed that he had “left the employment voluntarily,” “did not quit after being told [he] would be fired,” and “accidentally selected the incorrect reason for leaving the employment on the [QNSP].” *Id.* The investigator then asked the Individual to confirm that he had not been terminated from the employment, that he had not been disciplined, and that he had not “experienced any issues at all at the employment,” which the Individual claimed was correct. *Id.* at 52. The investigator gave the Individual a final opportunity to correct these claims and reminded him that he was under oath, to which the Individual denied that he had any reportable employment problems with the Prior Employer. *Id.* The investigator then began confronting the Individual with each piece of derogatory information obtained from the Prior Employer, one at a time, and provided the Individual an opportunity to volunteer additional derogatory information after each piece of information. *Id.* at

52–53. Each time, the Individual denied that he had any additional information to disclose, only to be confronted with another piece of derogatory information provided by the Prior Employer. *Id.* Ultimately, the Individual admitted to the accuracy of the information provided by the Prior Employer and that he had not disclosed his discipline and termination for falsifying his timecard due to shame. *Id.*; *see also* Tr. at 14 (testifying at the hearing that he intentionally provided false information to the investigator because he was embarrassed and did not want the circumstances of his termination by the Prior Employer to prevent him from obtaining the job with the DOE contractor).

The investigator subsequently asked the Individual to confirm the accuracy of the financial information that he disclosed on the QNSP. Ex. 3 at 55. The Individual denied that he had any delinquent debts within the prior seven years to report and was then confronted by the investigator with the delinquent debts reflected on the Credit Report. *Id.* at 55–57. After being confronted, the Individual admitted that he owed each of the debts and that they had fallen into delinquency. *Id.*

D. Individual’s Recent Efforts to Address His Financial Difficulties

On September 11, 2025, the Individual entered into an agreement with a debt consolidation company to assist him in resolving his delinquent debts. Ex. H at 8. Pursuant to the agreement, the Individual committed to make monthly \$172.82 payments for thirty-six months, subject to change based on the debts the Individual enrolled in the program with the debt consolidation company and the results of the debt consolidation company’s negotiations with the Individual’s creditors. *Id.* The agreement provided that the debt consolidation company would seek resolution of seven debts on which the Individual owed a cumulative \$14,284, including three of the credit card debts identified on the Credit Report that fell into delinquency around 2024 and four additional debts that subsequently fell into delinquency. *Compare id.* at 2 with Ex. 3 at 70–72. The timeshare debt reflected on the Credit Report was not included in the agreement with the debt consolidation company. *Compare* Ex. H at 2 with Ex. 3 at 70–72; Tr. at 31.

On December 10, 2025, the LSO issued the Individual the LOI. Ex. 4 at 1. In his response, the Individual indicated that he had retained the debt consolidation company but had not yet resolved any of the delinquent debts or filed any of his unfiled tax returns. *Id.* at 3–4.

At the hearing, the Individual testified that he had not obtained his 2018 W2 and had no recollection of having filed a personal income tax return for the 2018 tax year. *Id.* at 22–24. The Individual claimed that he had filed personal income tax returns for 2020 and 2021 but provided no evidence of having done so. *Id.* at 25. As of the hearing date, the Individual had not filed personal income tax returns for the 2022 or 2024 tax years. *Id.* at 25, 27; *see also id.* at 25 (testifying that he had prepared the 2022 tax returns but had not filed them because he could not do so electronically and they would “have to be mailed”). The Individual filed his personal income tax returns for 2023 and 2025. *Id.* at 26–27; Ex. K attachment (att.) 1 (showing that the IRS had received, but not yet processed, the Individual’s 2023 tax return); Ex. J att. 1–4 (showing that the Individual’s Federal and state personal income tax returns for the 2025 tax year had been received and processed, and that the Individual was entitled to refunds).

The Individual estimated that he owed approximately \$6,000 to \$8,000 in Federal taxes “so far” for the years he had filed. Tr. at 28. However, he admitted that he would not know how much he owed until he filed all of his unfiled Federal and state tax returns. *Id.* at 29. The Individual testified that he intended to set up payment plans after he determined his total tax liability. *Id.* at 8, 28–29.

As of the hearing date, the debt consolidation company had negotiated settlements with some of the Individual’s creditors and the Individual had made some payments towards satisfaction of debts. Ex. I. However, the debt consolidation company had not yet negotiated agreements with all of the creditors included in the agreement between the Individual and the debt consolidation company. Tr. at 34; Ex. I (showing that one debt was “In Negotiations” and that other debts were included in the agreement but not resolved). In addition, the Individual had not yet taken any action to address the timeshare debt that was not included in the agreement with the debt consolidation company. Tr. at 31.

V. ANALYSIS

A. Guideline E

Conditions that could mitigate security concerns under Guideline E include:

- (a) the individual made prompt, good-faith efforts to correct the omission, concealment, or falsification before being confronted with the facts;
- (b) the refusal or failure to cooperate, omission, or concealment was caused or significantly contributed to by advice of legal counsel or of a person with professional responsibilities for advising or instructing the individual specifically concerning security processes. Upon being made aware of the requirement to cooperate or provide the information, the individual cooperated fully and truthfully;
- (c) the offense is so minor, or so much time has passed, or the behavior is so infrequent, or it happened under such unique circumstances that it is unlikely to recur and does not cast doubt on the individual’s reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment;
- (d) the individual has acknowledged the behavior and obtained counseling to change the behavior or taken other positive steps to alleviate the stressors, circumstances, or factors that contributed to untrustworthy, unreliable, or other inappropriate behavior, and such behavior is unlikely to recur;
- (e) the individual has taken positive steps to reduce or eliminate vulnerability to exploitation, manipulation, or duress;
- (f) the information was unsubstantiated or from a source of questionable reliability; and
- (g) association with persons involved in criminal activities was unwitting, has ceased, or occurs under circumstances that do not cast doubt upon the individual’s reliability, trustworthiness, judgment, or willingness to comply with rules and regulations.

Adjudicative Guidelines at ¶ 17.

The investigator provided the Individual with numerous opportunities to reveal his omissions on the QNSP prior to confronting him with the information uncovered during the investigation. Despite this prompting from the investigator, the Individual continued to intentionally withhold information he knew he was required to disclose. The first mitigating condition is not applicable. *Id.* at ¶ 17(a).

The second mitigating condition is irrelevant because the Individual did not allege that he relied on the advice of counsel or another representative in completing the QNSP or responding to questions from the investigator. *Id.* at ¶ 17(b).

The Individual's omissions on the QNSP and false statements to the investigator concerned prior employment misconduct and significant financial liabilities, which are of significant importance to the evaluation of the Individual's reliability, trustworthiness, judgment, and willingness to comply with rules and regulations. Considering the numerous opportunities the Individual was provided to be forthcoming, his misrepresentations to the investigator were particularly flagrant and indicative of a lack of trustworthiness. Thus, the conduct in question was not minor. The Individual's failure to truthfully disclose derogatory information occurred multiple times in the past year and did not occur under any unusual circumstances. Accordingly, the third mitigating condition is inapplicable. *Id.* at ¶ 17(c).

The Individual has admitted to his untruthfulness. However, he has not alleged that his behavior is attributable to a cause that can be addressed through counseling and has not received any counseling related to the untruthfulness. Therefore, the fourth mitigating condition is inapplicable. *Id.* at ¶ 17(d).

The remaining mitigating conditions are not relevant to this case because the LSO did not allege that the Individual engaged in activity that placed him at special risk of exploitation, manipulation, or duress, did not rely on sources of questionable reliability, and did not allege that the Individual associated with persons involved in criminal activities. *Id.* at ¶ 17(e)-(g).

For the aforementioned reasons, none of the mitigating conditions are applicable to the facts of this case. Accordingly, the Individual has not resolved the security concerns asserted by the LSO under Guideline E.

B. Guideline F

Conditions that could mitigate security concerns under Guideline F include:

- (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;
- (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;
- (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;
- (f) the affluence resulted from a legal source of income; 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.

Id. at ¶ 20.

The Individual has not yet filed all of his outstanding tax returns, owes an unknown amount of unpaid taxes, and has not taken any steps to resolve the delinquent timeshare debt. Since the Individual's failure to meet his financial obligations is ongoing, I cannot conclude that it is unlikely to recur. Thus, the first mitigating condition is inapplicable. *Id.* at ¶ 20(a).

The Individual has not identified any event beyond his control that led to his financial delinquencies; rather, it appears that the Individual lived beyond his means by taking on expenses such as the timeshare debt. Even if the Individual had identified an extrinsic cause of his financial difficulties that was outside of his control, the fact that the Individual has not yet taken any steps to negotiate payment plans for his delinquent tax debt and the timeshare debt shows that he has not acted responsibly under the circumstances. The second mitigating condition is inapplicable. *Id.* at ¶ 20(b).

The third mitigating condition is inapplicable because the Individual does not claim to have received financial counseling. He does not claim to have received financial counseling from the debt consolidation company and even if he had I would conclude that this for-profit enterprise hired by the Individual to negotiate debts on his behalf was not a credible source of financial education. Furthermore, as described above, the Individual has not taken steps to resolve his most significant financial delinquencies, and I cannot conclude that the problem is under control. *Id.* at ¶ 20(c).

While the Individual entered into payment arrangements with some of his creditors and has provided evidence of adhering to those arrangements, I cannot conclude that the fourth mitigating condition is applicable because the Individual has yet to take any action to resolve his largest outstanding delinquent debt. As the timeshare debt, which is greater than the value of all of the debts entered into the agreement with the debt consolidation company, is not being addressed, the fourth mitigating condition is inapplicable. *Id.* at ¶ 20(d).

The fifth and sixth mitigating conditions are irrelevant because the Individual has not disputed the delinquent debts cited by the LSO and the LSO did not allege that he displayed unexplained affluence. *Id.* at ¶ 20(e)–(f).

Finally, the seventh mitigating condition is not applicable because the Individual has not filed all of his outstanding tax returns, does not know how much he owes in unpaid taxes, and has not taken any actions to make arrangements to pay his unpaid taxes. *Id.* at ¶ 20(g).

For the aforementioned reasons, none of the mitigating conditions are applicable. Thus, the Individual has not resolved the security concerns asserted by the LSO under Guideline F.

VI. CONCLUSION

In the above analysis, I found that there was sufficient derogatory information in the possession of DOE to raise security concerns under Guidelines E and F of the Adjudicative Guidelines. After considering all the relevant information, favorable and unfavorable, in a comprehensive, common-sense manner, including weighing all the testimony and other evidence presented at the hearing, I find that the Individual has not brought forth sufficient evidence to fully resolve the security concerns asserted by the LSO. Accordingly, I have determined that the Individual should not be granted access authorization. This Decision may be appealed in accordance with the procedures set forth at 10 C.F.R. § 710.28.

Phillip Harmonick
Administrative Judge
Office of Hearings and Appeals