



Work-Product

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2018-03016

Work-Product

COUNSEL: NONE

HEARING REQUESTED: NO

APPLICANT'S REQUEST

1. His bad conduct discharge (BCD) for the period of service from 15 Jan 90 through 5 Aug 93 be upgraded to general (under honorable conditions).
2. He be granted a 100 percent service-connected disability.

APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS

At the time of his behavior which led to the BCD, he was suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), paranoid schizophrenia and major depression as the result of his service in *Work-Product* during the Gulf War in 1990-1991 to which he attested to in his court-martial trial. His mental illness preceded his medical injuries and mental health problems and he has been on medication for these problems since 2002. A serious error was made in his case when he was misdiagnosed for his illness which resulted in the loss of his spouse. The subsequent actions on 23 Feb 93, the shooting death of his spouse, was a result of not having the mental capacity to understand or reason with the situation which led to her death. He is remorseful for his actions which led to his discharge. He wishes to qualify for Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) benefits.

In support of his request for clemency, the applicant provides a personal statement and copies of military kudos, a character reference letter, and numerous post-service certificates of achievement and training certifications.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The applicant is a former Air Force airman basic (E-1) who entered the Air Force on 15 May 86.

Dated 20 Aug 93, AF Form 2096, *Duty Status Change*, indicates the applicant was confined due to court-martial sentencing changing his status from pre-trial confinement to military confinement.

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2018-03016

Work-Product

Work-Product

On 30 Nov 93, according to documentation provided by the applicant, the convening authority published General Court-Martial Order (GCMO) Number [redacted]. The Order stated the applicant pled not guilty but was found guilty of one charge and one specification of premeditated murder of his spouse in violation of Article 118 and pled not guilty and was found not guilty of one charge and one specification of assault in violation of Article 128. The applicant was sentenced to confinement for 40 years, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, reduction to the grade of airman basic, and a BCD.

On 12 May 97, according to documentation provided by the applicant, the convening authority published GCMO Number [redacted]. The Order stated the sentence promulgated in GCMO Number [redacted] was affirmed.

On 27 Jun 97, DD Form 214, *Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*, reflects the applicant was discharged with a BCD in the grade of airman basic (E-1) after serving 10 years, 8 months, and 3 days of active duty. He was discharged, with a narrative reason for separation of "Court-Martial (Other)." It is noted in Block 18, *Remarks*, he had continuous honorable active military service from 15 May 86 through 15 Jan 90.

For more information, see the excerpt of the applicant's record at Exhibit B and the advisories at Exhibits C, D, and G.

POST-SERVICE INFORMATION

On 27 Jun 23, the Board sent the applicant a request for post-service information and advised the applicant he was required to provide a Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Identity History Summary Check, which would indicate whether or not he had an arrest record. In the alternative, the applicant could provide proof of employment in which background checks are part of the hiring process (Exhibit J). The applicant replied on 25 Jul 23 and provided an FBI report. According to the report, the applicant has had no arrests since discharge. He was released on parole 5 Feb 17, which has an expiration date listed as 4 Aug 35. The applicant also provided a personal statement, numerous character statements, training certificates, and additional medical records. In his personal statement, the applicant states he is remorseful for his actions and his mental illness was the cause of the incident. He shot his wife feeling he was protecting his children from demons. He is now serving his community as a minister of his church, works for Archway Marketing Services, and is a mentor and speaker for the Real Talk Youth Impact Program.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit K.

APPLICABLE AUTHORITY/GUIDANCE

This Board is without authority to reverse, set aside, or otherwise expunge a court-martial conviction. Rather, in accordance with Title 10, U.S.C., Section 1552(f), actions by this Board regarding courts-martial are limited to two types: 1) corrections reflecting actions taken by the reviewing officials pursuant to the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) (for example, if a convening authority or appellate court took action but that action was not reflected in an Air Force

record); and 2) action on only the sentence of the court-martial and solely for the purpose of clemency.

On 3 Sep 14, the Secretary of Defense issued a memorandum providing guidance to the Military Department Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records as they carefully consider each petition regarding discharge upgrade requests by veterans claiming PTSD. In addition, time limits to reconsider decisions will be liberally waived for applications covered by this guidance.

On 25 Aug 17, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD P&R) issued clarifying guidance to Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records considering requests by veterans for modification of their discharges due in whole or in part to mental health conditions [PTSD, Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), sexual assault, or sexual harassment]. Liberal consideration will be given to veterans petitioning for discharge relief when the application for relief is based in whole or in part on the aforementioned conditions.

Under Consideration of Mitigating Factors, it is noted that PTSD is not a likely cause of premeditated misconduct. Correction Boards will exercise caution in weighing evidence of mitigation in all cases of misconduct by carefully considering the likely causal relationship of symptoms to the misconduct. Liberal consideration does not mandate an upgrade. Relief may be appropriate, however, for minor misconduct commonly associated with the aforementioned mental health conditions and some significant misconduct sufficiently justified or outweighed by the facts and circumstances.

Boards are directed to consider the following main questions when assessing requests due to mental health conditions including PTSD, TBI, sexual assault, or sexual harassment:

- a. Did the veteran have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge?
- b. Did that condition exist/experience occur during military service?
- c. Does that condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge?
- d. Does that condition or experience outweigh the discharge?

On 25 Jul 18, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD P&R) issued supplemental guidance to military corrections boards in determining whether relief is warranted based on equity, injustice, or clemency. These standards authorize the board to grant relief in order to ensure fundamental fairness. Clemency refers to relief specifically granted from a criminal sentence and is a part of the broad authority Boards have to ensure fundamental fairness. This guidance applies to more than clemency from sentencing in a court-martial; it also applies to any other corrections, including changes in a discharge, which may be warranted on equity or relief from injustice grounds. This guidance does not mandate relief, but rather provides standards and principles to guide Boards in application of their equitable relief authority. Each case will be assessed on its own merits. The relative weight of each principle and whether the principle supports relief in a particular case, are within the sound discretion of each Board. In determining whether to grant relief on the basis of equity, an injustice, or clemency grounds, the Board should refer to paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Wilkie memorandum.

On 27 Jun 23, the Board staff provided the applicant a copy of the liberal consideration guidance (Exhibit J).

Department of the Air Force Instruction (DAFI) 36-3211, *Military Separations*, describes the authorized service characterizations.

Honorable. The quality of the airman's service generally has met Department of the Air Force standards of acceptable conduct and performance of duty or when a member's service is otherwise so meritorious that any other characterization would be inappropriate.

General (Under Honorable Conditions). If an airman's service has been honest and faithful, this characterization is warranted when significant negative aspects of the airman's conduct or performance of duty outweigh positive aspects of the member's military record.

Under Other than Honorable Conditions. This characterization is used when basing the reason for separation on a pattern of behavior or one or more acts or omissions that constitute a significant departure from the conduct expected of members. The member must have an opportunity for a hearing by an administrative discharge board or request discharge in lieu of trial by court-martial. Examples of such behavior, acts, or omissions include but are not limited to:

- The use of force or violence to produce serious bodily injury or death.
- Abuse of a special position of trust.
- Disregard by a superior of customary superior - subordinate relationships.
- Acts or omissions that endanger the security of the United States.
- Acts or omissions that endanger the health and welfare of other members of the DAF.
- Deliberate acts or omissions that seriously endanger the health and safety of other persons.
- Rape, sexual assault, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, rape of a child, sexual abuse of a child, sexual harassment, and attempts to commit these offenses.

AIR FORCE EVALUATIONS

The AFBCMR Psychiatric Advisor recommends denying the application finding insufficient evidence to warrant the desired change of the record. In 1992, prior to mental health treatment, the applicant was in a car accident, then started having audio/visual hallucinations, then was sent to a Medical Board where he was considered "unfit for active duty," then shot and killed his wife.

The Psychiatric Consultant has no access to the applicant's service medical records and therefore cannot comment on his state of mind at the time of the crime. The only evidence of the applicant's psychological disturbance in the early 1990s is his own disclosure to the DVA providers. Clemency and Parole Board documents reveal a history of Schizophrenia dating back to 1996, while he was already incarcerated. The case file also supports the applicant's positive response to an antipsychotic Risperdal. Since the initiation of Risperdal, he has not exhibited any violent or aggressive behaviors and for the past 18 years has demonstrated exemplary behavior.

Even if the Psychiatric Advisor is to accept the applicant's claim he suffered from a psychological disturbance at the time of the shooting, it does not automatically relieve him from the criminal responsibility. In forensic cases where the mental state of the accused is of concern, such that it is affecting either ability to proceed (competency to stand trial) or responsibility at the time of the alleged offense or both, the Sanity Board evaluation/706 evaluation is ordered. The inquiry can be initiated by various parties and the concerns to prompt the investigation have a relatively low bar. The conditions/symptoms triggering evaluations vary, for example: history of mental health treatment, amnesia, PTSD, suicidal behavior, head trauma, sleepwalking, etc. The evaluator is typically tasked with answering questions that inquire both about the mental state of the accused at the time of the alleged offense and the current capacity to participate in the legal process. Therefore, the evaluation must be performed at the time of the offense and cannot be completed retroactively.

The Psychiatric Advisor has found no evidence the applicant's mental capacity was in question during the criminal proceedings, even though, it is possible such records are not part of the case file. Nevertheless, working under the presumption of regularity, the Board can assume if the applicant's criminal responsibility was in question during the court-martial, a Sanity Board evaluation would have been requested.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit C.

AFPC/DP2STM recommends denying the application. The applicant was already given credit for honorable active service on his DD Form 214. Under Item 18, *Remarks*, the form states "Continuous Honorable Active Military Service from 15 May 86 through 15 Jan 90." This honorable active service covers the applicant's first enlistment period. It was during a subsequent enlistment period after reenlisting when the applicant was court-martialed and why that period of time could not be considered honorable service. The applicant needs to show his honorable service from his first enlistment period located in the remarks section of his DD Form 214 to any agency needing to verify honorable service. Based on review of the applicant's request and the master of personnel record, there is no error or injustice.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit D.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATIONS

The Board sent copies of the Air Force evaluations to the applicant on 14 May 19 for comment (Exhibit E), and the applicant replied on 30 May 19 requesting his case be closed.

On 15 Mar 20, the applicant requested his case be reopened and submitted additional evidence. On 26 Apr 21 and 20 Feb 23, the applicant submitted further evidence. In his response, the applicant contends he suffered from medical and mental health problems stemming from his service in the Gulf War while serving in [Work-Product] from 1990-1991. He had been diagnosed with Major Depression with Psychotic Features, Paranoid Schizophrenia, and PTSD to which he has been taking medication to help alleviate the symptoms. His medical and mental health problems are service-connected because he had been on medications since Feb 92 after a motor

vehicle accident where he sustained injuries to his head, neck, chest, and back. His mental illness preceded his medical injuries and problems because it occurred within 24 months after his service and return from combat duty/zone and theater operations from Operation DESERT SHIELD and DESERT STROM. During his second enlistment period, his mind and soul were still in [Work-Product] [Work-Product]. He feels remorseful and apologetic for his actions on 23 Feb 93. He has been involved in rehabilitative efforts and was granted clemency and his sentence was reduced to 39-years in confinement on 23 Jan 13. He had a serious misdiagnosed illness that resulted in the death of his wife. The shooting of his wife was the result of him not having the mental capacity to understand or to reason with the situation his wife was leaving their home on [Work-Product] to drive to her mother's home in [Work-Product] which was only 45 minutes away, with their three children. His medical and mental illness were the cause of his actions on 23 Feb 93 when in his mind he thought his wife and friend were demons. He returned from the Gulf War suffering from a mental illness and was not himself as witnessed and testified in his trial records and documented in his medical and mental health records. He would like his discharge upgraded so he can qualify for DVA benefits.

In support of his request for clemency, the applicant provides a personal statement, his resume, character reference letters, numerous post-service certificates of achievement and training certifications, and other documents related to his request for upgrade. He also includes medical documentation and articles related to his mental health conditions in support of his petition to the Board for liberal consideration.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit F.

ADDITIONAL AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The AFRBA Psychological Advisor completed a review the newly submitted evidence and finds insufficient evidence to support the applicant's request for the desired changes to his record. This advisory supplements the original mental health advisory dated 10 Jan 19 completed by the Psychiatric Advisor that was previously provided to the Board. This advisory is also only limited to his mental health condition. It is recommended the Board review this supplementary advisory in addition to the previous advisory for the applicant's mental health history as information provided in the previous advisory will not be fully reiterated in this advisory. This supplementary advisory will address his newly submitted evidence.

During his court-martial process in 1996 for seemingly a different set of charges than his previously convicted charges in 1993, his defense attorney requested he receive a Sanity Board evaluation due to his questionable mental state. A statement from a specialist (SPC) triggered the request which supposedly documented his recent troubles. His defense attorney also stated in the Sanity Board request, "Through conversations with his prior defense counsel it is the belief of this counsel the applicant has already been diagnosed with a severe mental disease or defect which arose from the offense for which he was previously convicted." Although the defense attorney stated he believed the applicant was diagnosed with a severe mental disease or defect, this statement was not definitive and was not corroborated by any medical records. There are no records confirming he completed a Sanity Board evaluation. Even if the applicant had received a

Sanity Board evaluation by request of his defense attorney, there was no apparent changes to his prior conviction or sentencing and no records he was declared unfit to stand trial by mental defect. The applicant contended he developed a mental health condition/severe mental illness from his service in the Gulf War Work-Product from 1990-1991 and claimed he was suffering from a mental illness at the time of his criminal misconduct on 23 Feb 93. There is no objective evidence to support this contention. The applicant's full service treatment records were not available or submitted for review, and there is no evidence he had a mental health condition around this time frame. He had submitted memorandums from his mental health providers while he was incarcerated in 1996, three years after his criminal misconduct/offense had occurred in 1993. These memorandums confirmed he was diagnosed with Schizophrenia, Paranoid Type, Episodic with Interepisode Residual Symptoms and Antisocial Personality Disorder coinciding with his time in service. The former condition was assessed to be so severe that his mental health providers and the commandant from the United States Disciplinary Barracks (USDB) requested he be transferred to an inpatient psychiatric treatment facility to prevent him from decompensating as he was a danger to himself and others. It is unknown if the transfer request was approved because no records existed around this time frame or around the time he was formally discharged from service on 27 Jun 97. It appeared he was eventually transferred to the Federal Bureau of Prisons in Work-Pro... Work-Product as evidenced by a psychology assessment report dated 9 Jul 99, about two years post-discharge. This psychology assessment report stated he had a history of Schizophrenia, presented with symptoms of PTSD, and participated in a residential treatment program for stress and anger management issues. Other submitted post-service mental health treatment records consistently documented his diagnosis and treatment for Schizophrenia after discharge. A DVA Decision Rating letter dated in Jun 19 denied his claims for service-connection for PTSD and Schizophrenia because of his BCD, but these letters did find positive findings the evidence showed a qualifying event, injury, or disease had its onset during his service as evident in his service treatment record dated 28 Mar 95, which reported major depression with psychotic features and psychotic episode treatment on 22 July 94. These records the DVA cited were not available for review. The records review performed by the DVA indicated he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in 1994 and 1995 respectively, but after he had committed his convicted misconduct/serious offense of murder and assault occurring in Feb 93. Again, there are no objective records to substantiate he had a mental health condition prior to his misconduct, at the time he committed his criminal misconduct, or his mental health condition caused his behaviors.

Despite no actual evidence the applicant had a mental health condition at the time of his misconduct, the Psychological Advisor finds it is plausible he had a mental health condition at that time. The first available record revealed he was diagnosed with Schizophrenia, a serious and severe mental illness, in 1996 by his mental health providers while he was incarcerated at USDB, and this diagnosis was consistently diagnosed by other providers over the years after his service. His behaviors and symptoms displayed while incarcerated were described as severe and it takes time to reach this level of severity. However, a stressful environment like confinement may accelerate the severity and progression of his condition. It appeared he was showing signs of Schizophrenia or psychosis prior to 1996 because the DVA's decision letter stated he had psychotic episode treatment on 22 Jul 94 and was given a diagnosis of Major Depression with Psychotic Features on 28 Mar 95. The applicant claimed his judgment was impaired, he was not understanding of the situation, and he believed his wife and friends were demons at the time of the

incident. These are possible signs of psychosis. It is also noteworthy he was diagnosed with Antisocial Personality Disorder while incarcerated at USDB. His personality disorder may also be the reason for his criminal misconduct as it was documented he had a callous disregard for the rights and feelings of others, was manipulative, and exhibited complete indifference to the behavioral limitations posed by law or other forms of social expectations. Again, there are no records to substantiate his mental health condition caused his behaviors. Nevertheless, the Psychological Advisor concurs with the psychiatric advisor's opinion that even if it was accepted he had a mental health condition, suffered from psychological disturbance, or was experiencing a psychotic episode at the time of the shooting or misconduct, his mental health condition does not automatically relieve him from criminal responsibility. The egregious nature of his behaviors and crimes committed of killing his wife and assaulting another individual with a loaded shotgun could not be disregarded, excused, or mitigated by his mental health condition. Therefore, there is no evidence of any error or injustice with his discharge and the newly submitted records are not compelling enough to support his request for an upgrade of his discharge to general or honorable from a mental health perspective.

The applicant also requested a medical discharge. This request could not be supported as well because there is no evidence he had any unfitting mental health conditions that would lead to early career termination. It is unclear when he developed Schizophrenia or Major Depression with Psychotic Features during service and no records he had PTSD during service. There are no records his mental health condition to include any of these conditions had impaired his ability to perform his military duties in accordance with his office, grade, rank, or rating, no records he was placed on a duty limiting condition profile, and no records he was deemed not worldwide qualified because of his mental health condition prior to his criminal misconduct and offenses. Hypothetically if he had an unfitting mental health condition, he would not have received a medical discharge because his serious offenses/criminal conduct resulting with his court-martial conviction would supersede his medical discharge.

Liberal consideration is applied to the applicant's request due to the contention of a mental health condition. The following are responses to the four questions in the policy based on the available records for review:

1. Did the veteran have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge?
The applicant contends he believed his medical and mental health illnesses were the cause of his actions (shooting his wife and assaulting a friend with loaded shotgun) on 23 Feb 93 when, in his mind, he thought his wife and friend were demons. He also stated he did not understand the situation and had impaired judgment at the time caused by his mental health condition. He claimed his medical and mental health problems began during his time in **Work-Product** Gulf War from 1990-1991 and he had been diagnosed with Major Depression with Psychotic Features, Paranoid Schizophrenia, and PTSD.

2. Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service?
There are no records his condition of PTSD had existed or occurred during his military service. There is evidence via a DVA decision rating letter dated on 20 Jun 19 he received psychotic episode treatment on 22 Jul 94 and service treatment records dated 28 Mar 95 reported he received

a diagnosis of Major Depression with Psychotic Features. Memorandums from two mental health providers and the commandant at USDB dated in Oct and Nov 96 while he was incarcerated during service reported he was diagnosed with Schizophrenia, Paranoid Type, Episodic with Interepisode Residual Symptoms and Antisocial Personality Disorder. There are no records he had a mental health condition at or near the time of his criminal misconduct/offenses.

3. Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge?

The applicant was convicted at general court-martial for murdering his wife and assaulting, by pointing a loaded shotgun, at another individual. His behaviors and criminal conduct are too egregious to be disregarded and his mental health condition, whether or not had existed or occurred at the time of these offenses, does not excuse or mitigate his discharge.

4. Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge?

Since the applicant's mental health condition does not excuse or mitigate his discharge, his condition also does not outweigh his discharge.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit G.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The Board sent a copy of the advisory opinion to the applicant on 1 Jun 23 for comment (Exhibit H), and the applicant replied on 8 Jun 23. In his response, the applicant contends the DVA has given him favorable findings regarding his claims for benefits; however, benefits are not payable because his discharge was by reason of a court-martial to which he received a BCD. He served honorably from 15 May 86 to 15 Jan 90 and received an honorable discharge for that period. He is a Gulf War combat Veteran who was decorated due to his actions during the war. He suffered from sleep deprivation, PTSD, Schizophrenia to which was testified to by military personnel. In 1992, he was in a motor vehicle accident and was on pain medication for severe pain which caused him to hear voices and have hallucinations. He was determined fit for duty and six months later, he shot his spouse and assaulted another person. He served 23 years in federal custody of a 40-year prison sentence and completed 6.5 years of a 15 year parole period. During this period, he was beaten and tortured by military officials. He is now a minister of his church.

On 10 May 24, the applicant submitted another response. In this response the applicant contends he just received access to his official records and asks the Board to reject the mental health advisory. He does not have a copy of his full military treatment file because military officials and agents came into his home and took and destroyed his records. The Air Force and DVA are supposed to help him obtain his records which clearly show he suffered from a service-connected mental illness, schizophrenia and PTSD, along with other medical illnesses due to the exposure of toxic elements, due to his tour of duty in the Persian Gulf. He completed 23 of the 40-year sentence for the death of his wife. As further evidence, he submitted a letter from his doctor documenting the medical conditions he is being treated for, a medical record from his abdominal pain, and his current DVA rating.

The applicant's complete responses are at Exhibit I and L.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

1. The application was timely filed. Given the requirement for passage of time, all clemency and discharge upgrade requests are technically untimely. However, it would be illogical to deny such application as untimely, since the Board typically looks for over 15 years of good conduct post-service. Therefore, the Board declines to assert the three-year limitation period established by 10 U.S.C. § 1552(b).

2. The applicant exhausted all available non-judicial relief before applying to the Board.

3. After reviewing all Exhibits, the Board concludes the applicant is not the victim of an error or injustice. It appears the discharge was consistent with the substantive requirements of the discharge regulation and was within the commander's discretion. Nor was the discharge unduly harsh or disproportionate to the offenses committed. Additionally, the Board concurs with the rationale of the AFBCMR Psychiatric Advisor and the AFRBA Psychological Advisor and finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the applicant's contentions. Specifically, the Board finds no evidence his mental health conditions, to include Schizophrenia, Major Depression with Psychotic Features, or PTSD impaired his ability to perform his military duties in accordance with his office, grade, rank, or rating. There were no records he was placed on a duty limiting condition profile and no records he was deemed not worldwide qualified because of his mental health condition prior to his criminal misconduct and offenses. The mere existence of a medical diagnosis does not automatically determine unfitness and eligibility for a medical separation or retirement. Even if he had an unfitting mental health condition, due to the seriousness of his crimes, he would not have received a medical separation. Furthermore, the Board finds no objective records to substantiate he had a mental health condition prior to or at the time of his criminal misconduct which caused his behaviors. Even if it is accepted he had a mental illness at the time of the shooting, this does not automatically relieve him from criminal responsibility. The Board applied liberal consideration to the evidence submitted by the applicant; however, newly submitted records are not compelling enough to support his request for an upgrade of his discharge to general or honorable. The egregious nature of his behavior and crimes committed of killing his wife and assaulting another individual with a loaded shotgun could not be disregarded, excused, or mitigated by his mental health condition. In the interest of justice, the Board considered upgrading the discharge based on clemency; however, given the evidence presented, and the egregious nature of his crimes, the Board finds no basis to do so. Therefore, the Board recommends against correcting the applicant's records.

RECOMMENDATION

The Board recommends informing the applicant the evidence did not demonstrate material error or injustice, and the Board will reconsider the application only upon receipt of relevant evidence not already presented.

CERTIFICATION

The following quorum of the Board, as defined in DAFI 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)*, paragraph 2.1, considered Docket Number BC-2018-03016 in Executive Session on 25 Aug 23 and 29 Jul 24:

Work-Product	Panel Chair
Work-Product	, Panel Member
Work-Product	Panel Member
Work-Product	Panel Member

All members voted against correcting the record. The panel considered the following:

- Exhibit A: Application, DD Form 149, w/atchs, dated 23 Jul 18.
- Exhibit B: Documentary Evidence, including relevant excerpts from official records.
- Exhibit C: Advisory Opinion, AFBCMR Psychiatric Advisor, dated 10 Jan 19.
- Exhibit D: Advisory Opinion, AFPC/DP2STM, dated 21 Feb 19.
- Exhibit E: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 14 May 19.
- Exhibit F: Applicant’s Response, w/atchs, dated 15 Mar 20, 26 Apr 21, and 20 Feb 23.
- Exhibit G: Advisory Opinion, AFRBA Psychological Advisor, dated 31 May 23.
- Exhibit H: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 1 Jun 23.
- Exhibit I: Applicant’s Response, w/atchs, dated 8 Jun 23.
- Exhibit J: Letter, SAF/MRBC, w/atchs (Post-Service Request and Liberal Consideration Guidance), dated 27 Jun 23.
- Exhibit K: Applicant’s Response, w/atchs, dated 25 Jul 23.
- Exhibit L: Applicant’s Response, w/atchs, dated 10 May 24.

Taken together with all Exhibits, this document constitutes the true and complete Record of Proceedings, as required by DAFI 36-2603, paragraph 4.12.9.

7/29/2024

Work-Product

Board Operations Manager, AFBCMR
Signed by: Work-Product