



CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

**UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS**

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2022-00941

Work-Product

COUNSEL: *Work-Product*

HEARING REQUESTED: YES

APPLICANT'S REQUEST

1. His under other than honorable conditions (UOTHC) discharge be upgraded to a least general (under honorable conditions).
2. His narrative reason for separation and corresponding separation code (SPD) be upgraded to Secretarial Authority, JFF.
3. He be medically retired with at least a 30 percent disability with all back pay and benefits afforded to him.

APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS

He was referred to a Medical Evaluation Board (MEB) which referred him to the Physical Evaluation Board (PEB) based on his medical diagnosis of chronic pain syndrome – lower back. The service knew he had medical issues that may have been found unfit for continued service. He should have been entered into the Disability Evaluation System (DES) and considered under dual processing with a subsequent approval for a medical retirement. His medical records indicate the medication he was taking for his lower back pain and his ongoing medical issues impacted his mood. This same evidence indicates he had problems functioning at work and at home. Under the Veterans Affairs Schedule for Rating Disabilities (VASRD), he would qualify for a least a 30 percent disability rating due to his limited range of motion. Again, even though he requested a discharge in lieu of court-martial, he should have been processed under the dual processing procedures due to his serious medical conditions which contributed to his misconduct.

In support of his request, the applicant provides a personal statement, copies of military records the support his arguments, and his medical records.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The applicant is a former Air Force staff sergeant (E-5).

**AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2022-00941
CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY**

Controlled by: SAF/MRB
CUI Categories: SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY
Limited Dissemination Control: N/A
POC: SAF.MRBC.Workflow@us.af.mil

CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

On 18 Nov 96, AF Form 3070, *Record of Nonjudicial Punishment Proceedings*, indicates the applicant received nonjudicial punishment (NJP), Article 15 for operating a passenger vehicle while intoxicated. He received a reduction in grade to airman first class (E-2), suspended until 17 May 97, forfeiture of \$200.00 of pay for two months, and 30 days of extra duty.

On 2 Sep 04, AF IMT 910, *Enlisted Performance Report (AB thru TSgt)*, indicates the applicant received a referral enlisted performance report (EPR) for poor performance and conduct, both on and off duty. It is noted the applicant was injured in an off-duty alcohol related incident and was unable to perform his primary duties for over 130 days due to medical restrictions.

On 15 Sep 04, the applicant submitted a rebuttal to the referral EPR stating he was able to complete every task he was assigned even though he was unable to perform his duties as an air traffic controller due to medical issues. He acknowledges he faltered from a couple of military customs and courtesies, as well as respect for authority but exemplified the standard of dress and appearance, weight, financial responsibility, support for organizational activities, and maintenance of government facilities. Furthermore, he goes on to explain his disciplinary problems and the reasons for the lapse in judgement.

On or about 21 May 05, the applicant submitted a request to be discharged in lieu of a trial by court-martial acknowledging he may be discharged UOTHC. His defense counsel asked that he be discharged with a general service characterization due to his client's significant health issues and goes on to explain his health issues and the impact they had on his behavior.

On 31 May 05, the applicant's commander recommended the applicant be discharged from the Air Force in lieu of a trial by court-martial with an UOTHC discharge. The commander acknowledged the applicant had not had any significant disciplinary problems until he was charged with two violations of Article 128, assault, and one violation of Article 134, willful discharge of a firearm. Furthermore, the commander makes mention of the applicant's medical issues which he opined may lead to the applicant not receiving a punitive discharge in a court-martial but instead, he may be retained stating this would be detrimental to good order and discipline within the squadron.

On 3 Jun 05, the Acting Staff Judge Advocate found the discharge action legally sufficient.

On 13 Jun 05, the discharge authority directed the applicant be discharged in lieu of a trial by court-martial, with an UOTHC service characterization.

On 19 Jul 05, the applicant received an UOTHC discharge. His narrative reason for separation is "Triable by Court-Martial" and he was credited with 10 years, 9 months, and 21 days of total active service.

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

POST-SERVICE INFORMATION

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2022-00941

CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

On 3 Nov 22, 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 E). The applicant replied on 9 Nov 22 and provided an FBI report. According to the report, the applicant has had no arrests since discharge.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit F.

APPLICABLE AUTHORITY/GUIDANCE

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 3 Nov 22, the Board staff provided the applicant a copy of the guidance (Exhibit E).

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:

CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

- 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 EVALUATION

AFPC/DP2SSR recommends denying the application finding no error or injustice with the discharge process. Review of the master personnel record shows the applicant requested discharge in lieu of court-martial action. The commander provided ample justification to the Base Discharge Authority (BDA) to support the applicant's request for discharge and the character of service. The BDA determined the significant negative aspects of the applicant's behavior outweighed any positive aspects of the applicant's military career. The discharge was consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the discharge instruction and was at the discretion of the discharge authority.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit C.

The AFBCMR Medical Advisor recommends a medically plausible conclusion as to partially grant the applicant's requests. Although the Medical Advisor does not agree with the applicant's provider who stated, "any kind of mood behavioral issues at this point in time are definitely related to his hyperthyroid" the Medical Advisor does recognize the possible relatedness to his thyroid health condition and therefore, as a matter of fairness and justice a recommendation for an administration separation with a discharge upgrade to reflect general (under honorable conditions) be granted. Additionally, the Medical Advisor recommends along with the discharge upgrade, the narrative reasoning be changed from "Triable by Court-Martial" to "Minor Disciplinary Infractions-Health-Related" and the separation code be changed to "FND" which denotes miscellaneous/general reasons. In summary, the Medical Advisor offers the Board either the choice of separation with severance pay via the DES with a 20 percent permanent impairment rating or remain administratively separated, but change his current record to reflect a general discharge and a change to his narrative reason for separation and corresponding separation code as indicated above.

This case is intermingled with a variety of facts and possible inconsistencies with the caveats of subjectivity versus objectivity of evidence. Additionally, his medical diagnoses and possible (not proven) further side effects of both medications and known disease processes complicate the building of a nexus to the applicant's stated desires. Strictly from the health/medical side, we are dealing with the diagnoses of chronic lower back pain (LBP), hyperactive thyroid and occupational problems as listed by Life Skills. Regarding the applicant's back pain condition, in his own words such pain originated in 1996 as stated; back pain has been present for eight years on a 2004 clinic encounter. Despite being in two motor vehicle accidents (MVA) in 1999 (no mention of spine

injury), the initial spine magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) done eight years later was essentially normal (revealing disc dryness about L5-S1). Despite a non-traumatic history, non-correlating radiographic imaging (minimal findings inconsistent with reported pain levels), a failure of physical therapy (PT) modalities and local injections, the subjectivity complaint of LBP continued which eventually led to being dependent on narcotic medication for pain control as followed by pain management (PM) and additionally, was the focus of his MEB diagnosis. AFPC's decision to return the MEB without further action was due to their request for a line of duty (LOD) determination regarding the applicant's MVA's. AFPC's request occurred on the same day he made a request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court martial. Hence, the process of the MEB within the DES ceased and went no further. According to the USAF Medical Standards Directory, chronic back pain, regardless of cause, which requires ongoing duty or deployment restrictions for over a year, or ongoing specialist follow-up more than annually, or frequent duty absences, or chronic/recurrent use of controlled medication is disqualifying for service retention. The DES uses the VASRD for rating impairments. In this case the applicant contends he should have received (if the DES process went on to completion) at least a 30 percent disability rating for limited range of motion (ROM) of his spine using the measurements he stated were performed in Apr 05 by PT weeks after his Feb 05 MVA versus the set of back ROM as taken by the physician at the narrative summary (NARSUM) just before the Feb MVA. As previously listed, the emergency room (ER) examination was completely normal revealing no objective evidence of pain or tenderness, normal joint ROM and normal reading of x-rays. Therefore, in the absence of the PT evaluation, having physician measurements and no interim cause for a 70 percent decrease in lumbar flexion (50 to 15 degrees), the Medical Advisor places near complete probative value on the NARSUM ROM measurements of flexion of the lower spine at 50 degrees and more likely than not, the applicant would have been found unfit for further military service and discharged with severance pay. Under the guidance of the VASRD, the applicant's decrease in spinal flexion to 50 degrees would rate no greater than a 20 percent impairment rating under the analogous code of 5299-5237. The VASRD dictates forward flexion of the thoracolumbar spine greater than 30 degrees but not greater than 60 degrees rates at a 20 percent disability. This approach to an impairment rating is greater than what the applicant's neurologist put forth in Jan 05 when he stated "...at this part of the MEB process, from the standpoint of the spine, he can be rated for pain." The VASRD rating for pain alone would equate to only 10 percent.

In the applicant's written response to the referred enlisted performance report (EPR), he stated, "...complicated health issues that I have been battling for more than half of this reporting period." By that calculation, such complicated issues would have been present or ongoing since Mar 04; which indeed corresponds to the time of intense and complicated treatment of his LBP. However, it was not until three and four months later (mid-June and July) when he first sought treatment for symptoms that have been present since Feb 04 (four months into the EPR reporting period) and likely could have been consistent with hyperthyroidism.

Secondary to a variety of symptom manifestations, a general medical work-up discovered the applicant had increased levels of thyroid hormone in his blood and thus was officially diagnosed as being hyperthyroid in early Aug 04 (one month prior to the closeout of his referral EPR). His treatment was to essentially destroy the thyroids' ability to manufacture any more thyroid hormone. This was done by the applicant taking oral medication and oral radioactive iodine.

Eventually, the treatment goal was met, and he was placed on lifelong supplement of thyroid replacement hormone; something that is easily taken on a daily basis with no known adverse side effects if taken in the correct dosage.

Current medical literature denotes a plethora of information regarding the various pathological states of the thyroid gland and its non-hormone producing diseased processes. The thyroid is a gland located in the neck which produces hormones that regulates the body's use of energy. In other words, if there is a high level of thyroid hormone in our system, many of the body's processes speed up. Some examples are metabolism, breathing, heart rate, nervous system, body temperature, and weight. Specifically, in speeding up the nervous system, one can become anxious, irritable, nervous, and can lead to frequent mood changes. All of these symptoms are possibilities to experience in a state of hyperthyroidism...they are not guaranteed symptoms. Each presenting pathological symptom and each individual are different. Given the parameters surrounding this case, in particular to the referral EPR and claiming a nexus to the Letter of Admonishment (LOA) and the Letter of Reprimand (LOR), the Medical Advisor opines on the medical plausibility between the known medical evidence and the actions put forth in receiving either the LOA and/or the LOR. The possibility does exist an accelerated nervous system could have contributed to such adverse behavior. Given that opinion, it is also the Medical Advisor's opinion a hyper-metabolic state was not the cause for the applicant's civilian alleged crimes which occurred just after the closeout of his referral EPR. From reviewing the witness statements as well as the police report, all appears to have had a basis of protecting the applicant's wife from being harmed by another man...a naked man at that. The Medical Advisor opines, the applicant's actions were formed with initial calmness, thought-out reasoning, and only turned to the way it did after being unsuccessful in achieving assurance for his wife's safety.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit D.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The Board sent a copy of the advisory opinion to the applicant on 9 Dec 22 for comment (Exhibit G), and the applicant replied on the same date. In his response, the applicant's counsel contends the advisory opined by AFPC/DP2SSR recommending denial of the applicant's request without any discussion or analysis of the facts, evidence, or argument contained within the original filing and fails to address any of the substantive facts or legal issues raised in this case and is entirely useless to this Board and should therefore be disregarded. Additionally, the advisory opined by the Medical Advisor recommending a partial grant is supported and agreed upon by counsel but again, encourages the Board to fully grant the applicant's petition.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit H.

ADDITIONAL AIR FORCE EVALUATION

AF/JAJI recommends denying the application finding no evidence of legal error or injustice that would undermine the applicant's UOTHC characterization of service. After consulting with his defense counsel and with full knowledge that a UOTHC was a possible outcome, he voluntarily

CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

requested to be administratively separated in lieu of trial, specifically acknowledging the UOTHC. There is no evidence the commander's acceptance of his request or the discharge characterization was erroneous or unjust.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit I.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The Board sent a copy of the advisory opinion to the applicant on 29 Jun 23 for comment (Exhibit J), and the applicant replied on the same day. In his response, the applicant's counsel contends the advisory opinion by AF/JAJI recommending a denial of the applicant's request without any discussion or analysis of the facts, evidence, or arguments contained within the original filing is entirely useless to the Board and should be disregarded.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit K.

ADDITIONAL AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The AFBCMR Medical Advisor provided a supplemental advisory to correct the recommendation from the previous advisory opinion dated 30 Oct 22. After a thorough re-review of the entire case file and pursuant to regulatory guidance, the Medical Advisor's recommendation has been changed to recommend denial of the applicant's request for a disability separation.

It is acknowledged up front, the previous Medical Advisor's recommendation of a partial grant detailing a DES adjudication and a discharge upgrade was in error and not consistent with applicable guidance in effect at the time of the applicant's separation. Counsel, in their justification and citing of regulatory guidance also made the same error in quoting instructional regulations that did not take effect until 15 Jul 19 (14 years after the applicant's discharge); specifically, counsel's citing of AFI 36-3212, *Physical Evaluation for Retention, Retirement, and Separation*, chapter 1.7 and its sub-paragraphs. The appropriate version of AFI 36-3212 that would have been in effect at the time of the applicant's discharge was effective as of 30 Sep 99 and remained in effect until its revision on 2 Feb 06; the applicant's separation occurred in Jul 05. That applicable version did not include the instructional verbiage as cited by counsel. Instead, the 30 Sep 99 version, paragraph 1.4.4. states, process as dual action disability cases on members with an unfit finding who are also pending administrative separation and or who apply for non-disability retirement or discharge in lieu of court-martial (CM) action according to AFI 36-3208, *Administrative Separation of Airmen*. The Secretary of the Air Force Personnel Counsel (SAFPC) makes the final disposition (however, often the General Court-Martial Convening Authority (GCMCA) becomes the approval authority in requests for discharge in lieu of CM). If SAFPC or the GCMCA does not accept the discharge in lieu of CM action, the CM will proceed. However, the excerpt described above is predicated on the Service member (SM) having an unfit finding. At the time the applicant was administratively discharged in lieu of trial by CM, he had not been deemed unfit for continued military service by a PEB. Indeed, the record reflects the case was referred to a MEB who had referred his case for DES processing; however, the case had been

returned due to questions related to whether the applicant's medical condition was incurred in the line of duty.

The record also reflects, before the case could be returned for processing, he was administratively discharged in accordance with his request and furnished a UOTHC characterization of service. This is important because the misconduct for which the member was pending discharge rendered him ineligible for referral into the DES. In this respect, it is noted per DoDI 1332.18, *Physical Evaluation System*, DES processing is prohibited for members pending discharge for misconduct that could garner a UOTHC discharge. See paragraph E3.P2.4 of the instruction dated 14 Nov 96, which was in effect during the events under review.

As the applicant was not eligible for DES processing at the time of his administrative discharge, he was certainly not eligible for dual action processing, which is predicated on an unfit finding. Even if the applicant were eligible for dual action processing, there is no evidence such processing would have resulted in the applicant's disability separation. In this respect, it is noted in the previous medical opinion which indicated the evidence was sufficient to conclude the applicant could have been found unfit and assigned a disability rating for his low back issues. However, had the applicant been found unfit for this condition and his case been referred to SAFPC for dual action processing, the evidence in this case is not sufficient to conclude SAFPC would have determined a disability discharge was in the best interest of the Air Force. In this respect, the misconduct for which the applicant was discharged was egregious and there was no nexus between this medical condition and that misconduct. Therefore, the evidence is not sufficient to conclude SAFPC would have directed the applicant's separation for physical disability, but instead would have directed the proposed administrative discharge. Again, the applicant was not eligible for dual action consideration in the first place and the evidence indicates the applicant's chain of command followed appropriate measures in the processing of an administrative separation in lieu of court-martial.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit L.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The Board sent a copy of the advisory opinion to the applicant on 18 Jan 24 for comment (Exhibit M), and the applicant replied on 21 Jan 24. In his response, the applicant contends, through counsel, he does not deny the verbiage in AFI 36-3212 changed between 30 Sep 99 and 15 Jul 19; however, he does not agree the intent regarding dual action processing changed. The fact he was not found unfit for duty at the time of his adverse separation and therefore is barred from dual action processing is non-sensical. His contention is the Air Force failed to process him through the DES for a medical retirement which violated their own instruction and is unfair and unjust. The fact that the Air Force revised their instruction to clarify both adverse separations and DES processing must proceed independently before final action can be taken, highlights the previous version of the AFI was both unclear and unfair.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit N.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

1. The application was timely filed. Given the requirement for passage of time, all discharge upgrade requests under fundamental fairness are technically untimely. However, it would be illogical to deny a discharge upgrade 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. Based on the available evidence of record, it appears the discharge was consistent with the substantive requirements of the discharge regulation and was within the commander's discretion. The applicant has provided no evidence which would lead the Board to believe his service characterization was contrary to the provisions of the governing regulation, unduly harsh, or disproportionate to the offenses committed. Additionally, the Board concurs with the rationale and recommendations of AFPC/DP2SSR, the AFBCMR Medical Advisor, and AF/JAJI and finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the applicant's contentions. Specifically, the Board finds the applicant's petition for a medical retirement not warranted based on the evidence presented, finding his medical condition was not unfitting at or near the time of his discharge. The mere existence of a medical diagnosis does not automatically determine unfitness and eligibility for a medical separation or retirement. The applicant's military duties were not degraded due to his medical condition. A Service member shall be considered unfit when the evidence establishes that the member, due to physical disability, is unable to reasonably perform the duties of his or her office, grade, rank, or rating. Although his medical condition may have affected his behavior, due to the seriousness of his misconduct, it does not excuse, mitigate, or outweigh his discharge. Furthermore, per DoDI 1332.18, he was prohibited from DES processing due to his pending discharge for misconduct which garnered an UOTHC discharge to which the applicant acknowledged when he submitted his request in lieu of a trial by court-martial.

Lastly, in the interest of justice, the Board considered upgrading the applicant's discharge. In support of his request for an upgrade, the applicant has provided an FBI report with no record of any arrests post-discharge and a personal statement. In his personal statement, the applicant explains how his medical condition impacted his behavior; however, he does not express any remorse for his actions. The Board contemplated the many principles included in the Wilkie Memo to determine whether to grant relief based on an injustice or fundamental fairness. However, the Board does not find the evidence presented is sufficient to conclude the applicant's post-service activities overcame the misconduct for which he was discharged. This Board very carefully weighs requests to upgrade the character of a discharge and in doing so, considers whether the impact of an applicant's contributions to his or her community since leaving the service are substantial enough for the Board to conclude they overcame the misconduct that precipitated the discharge and whether an upgrade of the discharge would create a larger injustice to those who served honorably and earned the characterization of service the applicant seeks. The applicant has not presented any supporting evidence indicating he has made an impact in the community and if the impact is so admirable the Board could conclude an upgrade of his discharge would not

constitute an injustice to those who have earned this characterization of service. Therefore, the Board does not find the applicant's submission sufficient to grant the requested relief.

The applicant retains the right to request reconsideration of this decision, which could be in the form of a personal statement attesting to his wrongfulness of his actions, character statements, or testimonials from community leaders/members specifically describing how his efforts in the community have impacted others. Should the applicant provide documentation pertaining to his post-service accomplishments and activities, this Board would be willing to review the materials for possible reconsideration of his request based on fundamental fairness.

4. The applicant has not shown a personal appearance, with or without counsel, would materially add to the Board's understanding of the issues involved.

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-2022-00941 in Executive Session on 31 Aug 23 and 21 Feb 24:

Work-Product, Panel Chair
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 10 Mar 22.
- Exhibit B: Documentary Evidence, including relevant excerpts from official records.
- Exhibit C: Advisory Opinion, AFPC/DP2SSR, dated 18 Apr 22.
- Exhibit D: Advisory Opinion, AFBCMR Medical Advisor, dated 30 Oct 22.
- Exhibit E: Letter, SAF/MRBC, w/atchs (Post-Service Request and Clemency Guidance), dated 3 Nov 22.
- Exhibit F: FBI Report, dated 9 Nov 22.
- Exhibit G: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 9 Dec 22.
- Exhibit H: Applicant's Response, dated 9 Dec 22.
- Exhibit I: Advisory Opinion, AF/JAJI, dated 26 Jun 23.
- Exhibit J: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 29 Jun 23.
- Exhibit K: Applicant's Response, dated 29 Jun 23.
- Exhibit L: Advisory Opinion, AFBCMR Medical Advisor, dated 16 Jan 24.
- Exhibit M: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 18 Jan 24.

CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

Exhibit N: Applicant's Response, dated 21 Jan 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.

3/8/2024

Work-Product

Board Operations Manager, AFBCMR

Signed by: USAF

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2022-00941

CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY