



**CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY**

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

---

---

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

*Work-Product*

**DOCKET NUMBER:** BC-2022-02265

**COUNSEL:** *Work-Product*

**HEARING REQUESTED:** YES

---

---

**APPLICANT'S REQUEST**

1. His general (under honorable conditions) discharge be upgraded to honorable.
2. His narrative reason for separation and corresponding separation code be changed from GKQ "Misconduct (Serious Offense)" to MND "Miscellaneous/General Reasons."
3. His reentry (RE) code be changed from not applicable to 1J (eligible to reenlist but elected to separate).
4. His promotion to the grade of major (O-4) be reinstated with Intermediate Development Education (IDE) school designation.
5. His nonjudicial punishment (NJP) be removed from his record.
6. His officer performance report (OPR) closing out May 2014 be removed from his record.
7. All separation and administrative documents related to his false allegations be removed from his record.
8. His Meritorious Service Medal (MSM) be reinstated.

**APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS**

Through counsel, the applicant contends: 1) He was a victim of false allegations of sexual assault brought on against him in part of an extortion plot by his accuser and his chain of command had acted improperly in the disposition of his case; 2) He did not unlawfully enter a residence and it was improper to charge him at court-martial and NJP and separate him on this basis; 3) He did not have Herpes Simplex Virus-2 (HSV-2) and was misdiagnosed by the military resulting in improper charge; 4) His removal of promotion to major was solely based on his HSV-2 diagnosis and was executed in an illegal manner. Injustices to his records were: 1) The political climate at the time resulted in a case disposition clearly disparate from the facts of the case; 2) He was never HSV-2 positive and the misdiagnosis impacted the entire trajectory of the case; 3) The Air Force's Office of Special Investigations (OSI) illegally searched his medical records; 4) Allegations against him were false and contrary to the evidence; 5) He warrants clemency. Additionally, during the investigation, court-martial, and separation process, he suffered from severe stress, anxiety, depression, and sleep difficulties. He received a rating from the Department of Veterans Affairs

**AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2022-02265  
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](mailto:SAF.MRBC.Workflow@us.af.mil)

**CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY**

(DVA) for anxiety and has been receiving treatment for anxiety related to the false accusations against him.

In support of his request for clemency, the applicant provided a personal statement, FBI letter, dated 20 Aug 18 reflecting no arrests since his discharge, photos, and character reference letters.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

**STATEMENT OF FACTS**

The applicant is a former Air Force captain (O-3).

On 13 Aug 07, the applicant tested positive for HSV-1 (oral) and HSV-2 (genital).

On 17 Aug 07, the applicant met with a health care provider because of his positive HSV diagnoses. The doctor directed the applicant to refrain from having unprotected sex and to notify potential partners.

According to DD Form 458, *Charge Sheet*, dated 16 Jul 13, the 14 AF/CC preferred three charges and specifications against the applicant after withholding authority to do so from his former immediate commander based on their special working relationship and recommended the charges be referred to a general court-martial. The charges and specification were as follows:

Charge I, on or about (o/a) 1 Mar 12, he engaged in sexual intercourse with lieutenant K who was substantially incapacitated, in violation of Article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ).

Charge II, o/a 1 Jan 12 and o/a 17 Mar 12, he had sexual intercourse with lieutenant K without warning her he had been diagnosed with HSV-2 and without wearing a condom, which conduct under the circumstances, was unbecoming of an officer and gentleman, in violation of Article 133.

Charge III, o/a 17 Mar 12, he unlawfully entered the dwelling house of lieutenant N, was to the prejudice of good order and discipline in the armed forces, in violation of Article 134.

On 25 Oct 13, the applicant was notified of initiation to remove his name from the promotion list to the grade of major (O-4). Specific reasons for the action were, between o/a 1 Jan 12 and o/a 17 Mar 12, he had sexual intercourse with lieutenant K without warning her he had been diagnosed with HSV-2 and without wearing a condom. His failure to disclose this information disregarded the clear instructions of his medical provider and prevented his sexual partner from giving informed consent before engaging in unprotected sex.

On 30 Oct 13, the Staff Judge Advocate (SJA) provided pretrial advice to the general court-martial convening authority (GCMCA) and recommended the applicant be offered NJP for conduct unbecoming an officer and unlawful entry (Articles 133 and 134). The SJA did not recommend moving forward on the charge of aggravated sexual assault (Article 120) due to significant issues remained for questions, 1) whether the lieutenant was substantially incapacitated and incapable of appraising the nature of the sexual act and 2) whether a reasonably careful, ordinary, prudent, sober adult would have interpreted the lieutenant's words or overt acts as consent.

On 12 Nov 13, the applicant submitted a memorandum of agreement (MOA) and stated he had been advised and counseled by civilian and military attorneys and understood implications of the

**CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY**

action. He offered to accept NJP for the specifications of Charges II and III and waived any Board of Inquiry (BOI)/Show Cause Board conditioned upon a discharge characterization no less favorable than general (under honorable conditions).

On 25 Nov 13, the applicant was offered NJP action pursuant to Article 15, UCMJ, for having sexual intercourse with lieutenant K o/a 1 Jan 12 and o/a 17 Mar 12, without warning her he had been diagnosed with HSV-2 and without wearing a condom, which conduct under the circumstances, was unbecoming of an officer and gentleman (Article 133), and o/a 17 Mar 12, he unlawfully entered the dwelling house of lieutenant N, conduct prejudicial to good order and discipline in the armed forces (Article 134). The applicant's punishment included forfeiture of \$3,235.00 pay per month for 2 months and a reprimand.

On 4 Dec 13, the applicant accepted the NJP and pled not guilty to the charges. He maintained lieutenant K invited him to the residence on 16 Mar 12, she never contracted anything from him, and he requested leniency.

On 13 Jan 14, a Notification of Show Cause Action was initiated under AFI 36-3206, *Administrative Discharge Procedures for Commissioned Officers*, dated 9 Jun 04, paragraph 3.6.4, requiring the applicant to show cause for retention on active duty for violating Articles 133 and 134.

On 31 Jan 14, the applicant provided a response to the Show Cause Authority (SCA) and requested he be cleared of all wrongdoing, at the very least, his NJP be rescinded and given an honorable discharge based on new evidence to include "Enhanced Extortion Audio" and letters of support from two previous sexual partners.

On 7 Feb 14, the SJA found the applicant's response and additional submission did not support changing the previous recommendation and recommended the matter be forwarded to the Secretary of the Air Force (SECAF) for action.

On 10 Feb 14, the SCA recommended to the SECAF, the applicant be involuntarily separated and his discharge by characterized as general (under honorable conditions) and indicated not only was the characterization proper, but consistent with the applicant's agreement to waive his right to a BOI provided he receive no less than a general (under honorable conditions) service characterization.

On 14 Mar 14, SECAF approved the applicant's removal from the promotion list.

On 24 Apr 14, AF/JAA found the SCA's recommendation legally sufficient to accept the respondent's conditional waiver of his right to undergo further discharge proceedings pursuant to AFI 36-3206, *Administrative Discharge Procedures for Commissioned Officers* for serious or recurring misconduct punishable by military or civilian authorities, in exchange for the AFPSC/CC withdrawing any outstanding charges against him from a prior referred general court-martial and recommended discharge with a general (under honorable conditions) service characterization.

On 4 Sep 14, SECAF accepted the applicant's conditional board waiver and directed the applicant be discharged with a service characterization of general (under honorable conditions).

On 18 Sep 14, the applicant received a general (under honorable conditions) discharge with narrative reason for separation of "Misconduct (Serious Offense)." He was credited with 10 years, 7 months, and 7 days of active service this period.

**CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY**

On 21 Oct 21, the applicant submitted a request to the Air Force Discharge Review Board (AFDRB) for an upgrade to his discharge characterization and to change his narrative reason for separation and reentry (RE) code based on similar contentions made in this petition to the AFBCMR.

On 15 Feb 22, the applicant and his counsel testified before the AFDRB via video teleconference and the AFDRB concluded the applicant's discharge was proper and his contentions without merit. Specifically, the AFDRB found no evidence of undue command influence, abuse of authority, or improper evidence collection. The AFDRB noted the applicant persuaded the command to withdraw and dismiss the court-martial charges. In exchange for the dismissal of charges, the applicant waived his right to a BOI where the misconduct and evidence could have been explored, he could have presented his case, and addressed his evidentiary concerns. The AFDRB considered liberal consideration due to the applicant's contention of a mental health condition and found no evidence his condition caused, mitigated or excused his discharge. The AFDRB also considered the factors laid out in the attachment to the Under Secretary of Defense memorandum, Guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records regarding equity, injustice, or clemency determinations, dated 25 Jun 18, known as the "Wilkie Memo" and did not find any evidence of an error or impropriety.

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

**POST-SERVICE INFORMATION**

On 18 May 23, the Board sent the applicant a request for any additional post-service information he may wish the Board to consider including a current 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 F). The applicant replied on 13 Jun 23 and provided an FBI report, dated 19 May 23 (Exhibit G). According to the report, the applicant has had no arrests since discharge. The applicant also provided additional evidence in support of his request to include a personal statement, character statements, and articles.

**APPLICABLE AUTHORITY/GUIDANCE**

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 post-traumatic stress disorder (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

**CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY**

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 18 May 23, the Board staff provided the applicant a copy of the clarifying guidance (Exhibit F).

Department of the Air Force (DAFI) 36-3211, *Military Separations*, describes the types of service characterization:

**Honorable.** The quality of the service member's service generally has met DAF 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 a member's service has been honest and faithful, this characterization is warranted when negative aspects of the member's conduct or performance of duty outweigh positive aspects of the member's military record.

**AIR FORCE EVALUATION**

AF/JA recommends denying the application. Given the one-sided nature of applications to the AFBCMR, the inability to conduct cross-examination, and the inability to conduct investigation, AF/JA reminds the Board they do not perform a de novo review of the facts. AF/JA does not address the applicant's evidentiary challenges point by point, although it is noted the arguments misrepresent the facts of the case. Instead, AF/JA relies on factual determinations made by commanders at the time of discharge and defer to their conclusion that the preponderance of the evidence was sufficient to prove the allegations against the applicant. Furthermore, even if there were evidentiary challenges, AF/JA focuses on the fact the applicant made the voluntary offer to separate with a general discharge. After a thorough review of the applicant's 895-page submission, it is concluded there is no evidence to suggest the government's acceptance of the applicant's

**CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY**

voluntary offer was erroneous or unjust, and no evidence to otherwise support the applicant's allegations of an error or injustice.

On 13 Jan 14, the applicant was ordered to "show cause" for retention in the Air Force based on allegations of misconduct during sexual relations with one lieutenant, and allegations of unlawfully entered the dwelling of a different lieutenant. In response, on 31 Jan 14, the applicant offered to waive his right to undergo further discharge proceedings; in exchange he requested the AFPSC/CC to separate him with a characterization of service no worse than a general discharge and to withdraw any outstanding charges against him. That offer was accepted. By voluntarily offering to separate with a general discharge, the applicant avoided potentially more negative consequences. In his submission to the SCA, he argued his innocence regarding the allegations of sexual misconduct against him. He repeats some of the same arguments in his application to the AFBMCR. Furthermore, the applicant had ample opportunity to challenge the government's case against him before a BOI and to show cause for retention in the Air Force, but he chose to voluntarily waive it in exchange for a general discharge.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit C.

**APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION**

The Board sent a copy of the advisory opinion to the applicant on 14 Mar 23 for comment (Exhibit D), and the applicant replied on 5 Apr 23. In his response and through counsel, the applicant contends he never requested separation. Rather, he requested his court-martial proceedings be ended and his case be decided by the AFSPC/CC. He retained the right to submit written matters requesting that the administrative separation be withdrawn and that he be retained in service. He waived his right to have his case heard by a BOI in exchange for no less than a general discharge characterization as long as AFPSC/CC was the decision-maker. The AF/JA advisory fails to address the newly discovered evidence showing the applicant was improperly diagnosed with a disease that formed the basis for one of the court-martial charges and was the main driving factor for why he entered into the alternate disposition agreement. Had he not been misdiagnosed, he would never have been facing that charge, and he would never have accepted an alternate disposition agreement. Further, he discovered the medical records from AFOSI were illegally obtained, which was unknown to him at the time. A thorough analysis shows the commanders did not make factually or legally supportable decisions at the time, and the applicant would not have been in the position he was in were it not for those injustices, including being misdiagnosed with a disease he never had.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit E.

**ADDITIONAL AIR FORCE EVALUATIONS**

The AFRBA Psychological Advisor completed a review of all available records and finds insufficient evidence to support the applicant's request for the desired changes to his record from a mental health perspective. A review of the available records finds the applicant's mental health condition had no direct impact or was a mitigating factor to his misconduct or discharge from service. It has been consistently documented and reported in his service treatment records, post service DVA records, letter from his former military provider, the applicant's personal statement to the DVA for increased rating, his statement for this petition, and from his legal counsel's briefs that he suffered from severe stress, anxiety, depression, and sleep difficulties in response or as a result of his legal and occupational problems initially deriving from being accused of sexual assault. He began to experience anxiety, depression, and sleep problems in May 12, about two months after his encounter with the lieutenant, according to his service treatment records.

**CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY**

There is no evidence he was in emotional distress or had any mental health concerns or defects that would impair his judgment at the time of any of his documented offenses. He did have a prior history of anxiety and depression in 2007 secondary to his situational stressor of his divorce, but these symptoms appeared to have resolved several years prior to his second iteration of mental health treatment stemming from his legal/occupational problems starting in 2012 (transferred care to a psychiatrist in 2013) with his primary care manager (PCM) during service. These two mental health treatment cycles for different causes of his anxiety and depression were mutually exclusive events.

Liberal consideration is applied to the applicant's request. The following are responses to the four questions from the Kurta memorandum, albeit different response style but consistent to the AFDRB's rationale, based on information presented in the records.

1. Did the veteran have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge? The applicant's legal counsel contends during the investigation, court-martial, and separation process, the applicant suffered from severe stress, anxiety, depression, and sleep difficulties, he received a rating from the DVA for anxiety and has been receiving treatment for anxiety related to the false accusations against him. The applicant was consistent with his reporting to his legal counsel and also reported he developed extreme stress and mental health anguish for being accused of a crime he did not commit and was medicated for anxiety and sleep deprivation while the investigation was ongoing during service. The applicant believed relief based on a mental health condition including PTSD and and/or a sexual assault experience should be considered for relief on equitable, injustice or clemency grounds whenever there is insufficient evidence to warrant relief for an error or impropriety and harsh collateral consequences (Wilkie memorandum). The applicant and his legal counsel did not contend his mental health condition caused, mitigated, or excused the applicant's misconduct causing his discharge. The applicant was discharged from service based on allegations of sexual misconduct with a lieutenant and unlawfully entering the residence of a different lieutenant.

2. Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? There is no evidence the applicant was diagnosed with or had PTSD during service. He did seek and received medication management services from his primary care manager (PCM) from May 12 to July 13 for anxiety, depression, and sleep problems caused by his work problems, after his misconduct/offenses occurred. He was given diagnoses of anxiety, depression, depression with anxiety, adjustment disorder with anxiety, and insomnia from his PCM. His care was transferred to a military psychiatrist starting in Aug 13 until his discharge from service for the same presenting problems. He was given diagnoses of anxiety disorder not otherwise specified (NOS), depression NOS, insomnia and occupational problem due to his occupational stress and legal problems from the psychiatrist. There is no evidence the applicant had a sexual assault experience such as he was sexually assaulted, but he was accused of sexual assault by a lieutenant during service.

3. Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? The applicant and his legal counsel denied the applicant engaged in any of the offenses that were documented as the basis of his discharge. There is no evidence his mental health condition or experience had caused his documented misconduct/offenses resulting with his discharge from service. He developed anxiety, depression, and sleep disturbances as a result of his legal and occupational problems stemming from his reported misconduct/offenses. His mental health condition or experience does not excuse or mitigate his discharge.

4. Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? Since his mental health condition or experience does not excuse or mitigate his discharge, his condition or experience also does not outweigh his original discharge.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit G.

The AFBCMR Medical Advisor completed a review of all available records and recommends consideration of removal of the 2007 positive HSV-2 results. Given that serologic screening for genital herpes is associated with a high rate of “false-positive” test results, and the applicant’s two subsequent negative HSV-2 test results received in 2021 from a reputable source, the medical advisor recommends consideration of removal of the 2007 positive HSV-2 results, as a possible contributory factor in the applicant’s discharge; contingent upon evidence he received a negative confirmatory test for HSV-2 test, such as the Western blot or PCR [polymerase chain reaction]. However, the medical advisor opines eliminating the positive HSV-2 test results of 2007 may not remove other possible legal bases (pl.) for discharge that are beyond the scope of the medical review.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit I.

#### **APPLICANT’S REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL AIR FORCE EVALUATIONS**

The Board sent copies of the advisory opinions to the applicant on 30 Jun 23 for comment (Exhibit J), and the applicant replied on 25 Jul 23 and 14 Aug 23. In his response and through counsel, the applicant again contends he has never had genital sores develop and never has taken the prescribed Valtrex to prevent genital sores, except as preventative to protect his unborn daughter because of the positive HSV-2 test in 2007. He took the Valtrex to prevent and treat cold sores.

The Western blot test is performed only by the University of Washington and in the research and article (referenced by the medical advisor), there is nothing that states confirmatory negative testing should be done at any point. The applicant underwent type-specific HSV testing on 18 Jul 23 in accordance with the medical advisor’s opinion and the results are negative for HSV-2. He has now had three consecutive serologic tests performed, all of which show he does not, and never has had HSV-2. Initially the applicant contended he was physically unable to request PCR testing through any lab or provider. However, in his 14 Aug 23 supplement response, the applicant provided a copy of PCR results, dated 11 Aug 23 reflecting negative results.

The conduct unbecoming charge was the only basis used to redline his promotion to major. On these facts alone, his record should be corrected to reflect a promotion to major at his projected pin-on date. However, in combination with the rest of the evidence in this case – the lack of probable cause, the violation of his HIPAA rights, and the lies of his accuser – the misdiagnosis in 2007 is particularly egregious. The misdiagnosis precipitated the charging decision by the Government and the applicant’s subsequent desire to avoid conviction on the conduct unbecoming specification through a contested administrative separation process instead. The outcome of his case was unjust. In support of his request, the applicant provided additional evidence in the form copies of a negative PCR HSV-2 DNA result, collected on 9 Aug 23, a negative HSV-2 Ab IgG test result, collected on 18 Jul 23, an article titled, *Herpes Simplex Virus – HSV*, and print out from the STD Center titled, *Important details for different types of herpes tests*.

The applicant’s complete responses are at Exhibit K.

#### **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION**

**CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY**

1. The application was timely filed.
2. The applicant exhausted all available non-judicial relief before applying to the Board.
3. After reviewing all Exhibits, to include the applicant's responses to the advisory opinions, the Board concludes the applicant is not the victim of an error or injustice. The Board concurs with the rationale of the AFRBA Psychological Advisor, to include the rationale and recommendation of AF/JA and finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the applicant's contentions. While the Board notes the AFBMCR Medical Advisor's consideration of removal of the 2007 positive HSV-2 results, the Board opines the positive results are irrelevant to the applicant's misconduct, subsequent administrative actions, and his discharge characterization. The issue of whether the applicant had HSV-2 in 2007, or not, does not affect the orders given in 2007 to not have unprotected sex. Consequently, the applicant's 2021 negative test results do not warrant the applicant's requested corrections. Furthermore, the applicant voluntarily offered to separate with a general (under honorable conditions) discharge rather than face a BOI. Liberal consideration was applied to the applicant's case due to a mental health condition; however, the Board does not find his condition mitigated or excused his misconduct or his discharge. Therefore, the Board recommends against correcting the applicant's records.
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-2022-02265 in Executive Session on 21 Jun 23 and 27 Sep 23:

Mr. Work-Product Panel Chair  
Dr. Work-Product Panel Member  
Ms. 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 19 Jul 22.
- Exhibit B: Documentary Evidence, including relevant excerpts from official records.
- Exhibit C: Advisory Opinion, AF/JA, dated 2 Mar 23.
- Exhibit D: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 14 Mar 23.
- Exhibit E: Applicant's Response, w/atchs, dated 5 Apr 23.
- Exhibit F: Letter, SAF/MRBC, w/atchs (Post-Service Request and Liberal Consideration Guidance), dated 18 May 23.
- Exhibit G: Advisory Opinion, AFRBA Psychological Advisor, dated 23 May 23.
- Exhibit H: Applicant's Response to Clemency Bulletin w/atchs, dated 5 Apr 23.
- Exhibit H: FBI Report, dated 19 May 23
- Exhibit I: Advisory Opinion, BCMR Medical Advisor, dated 27 Jun 23.
- Exhibit J: Notification of Advisories, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 30 Jun 23.

**CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY**

Exhibit K: Applicant's Response, 2/atches, dated, 25 Jul 23 and 14 Aug 23.

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.

1/29/2024

X **Work-Prod...**

---

**Work-Product**  
Board Operations Manager, AFBCMR  
Signed by: **Work-Product**