



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

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2023-00676

COUNSEL: ANDREW WOLFE

HEARING REQUESTED: NO

APPLICANT'S REQUEST

His DD Form 214, *Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*, be corrected to reflect the following:

1. His under other than honorable conditions discharge be upgraded to honorable.
2. His narrative reason changed to "Secretarial Authority" or "Miscellaneous/General Reasons."
3. His reentry (RE) code changed to allow reenlistment to serve in the military.
4. Award of the Southwest Asia Service Medal (SWASM). **(Administratively Corrected)**

APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS

He references the Wilkie Memo and even though his military record is not flawless, his service was otherwise spotless. His performance evaluations were consistently positive, recommending him for advancement and opining on his promising potential. He also received various awards and medals during his service, including the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, the Air Force Achievement Award for outstanding achievement and the Hughes Trophy for "Top Air Superiority." His work performance only began to deteriorate when he learned of his then-wife's extra-marital affairs.

He deployed multiple times, including once to [REDACTED] for interceptor squad support, and three times to [REDACTED] in connection with Operation Southern Watch. From 22 Apr 93, the [REDACTED] through 30 Jun 97, he received exceptional grades on his enlistment performance reports and was recommended for promotion on each report issued during such time period. He also earned a series of medals and awards for his performance. However, shortly after his second deployment to [REDACTED] in 96, his personal life began to deteriorate as his wife engaged in extra-marital affairs. The volatile relationship with his then-wife caused him a great amount of stress and led to a significant decline in work performance. His unit was scheduled to undergo a permanent change of station to [REDACTED] South Korea on 27 Aug 97, a move would have separated him from his then-wife for a year and left him unable to address the issues with his

marriage. As a result, he missed his port call to [REDACTED] to fly to [REDACTED] which consequently led to his trial and conviction by a special court-martial on 8 Oct 97.

Further, in early 98, he traveled to [REDACTED] Nevada to participate in the exercise "Red Flag," a two-week aerial combat training event. At the event, the Air Force announced its partnership with American Express and unveiled the Government Travel Card Program which would provide service members with credit cards paid for by the military. After returning home from the event, he received an American Express bill in the amount of \$1,999.00. Due to financial constraints, he did not have sufficient funds in his bank account to pay the balance. At the time the balance was due, he had not been reimbursed yet for his expenses by the military. In seeking a solution, he approached his supervisor, who advised him he would be reimbursed soon and there would be enough money in his account by the time American Express deducted funds from his bank account. However, the reimbursement never occurred, causing him to over-draft funds from his own bank account to pay the balance. Although the debt was paid in full, he received a non-judicial punishment (NJP) for non-payment on 1 Apr 98.

During confinement, he did not receive any visits from his command. None of his superiors supported him during this time and it creates questions as to whether he would have received the proper advice had he gone to them prior to missing his port call. He did, however, meet with an Area Defense Counsel on the matter, who advised him appealing his conviction was a "losing battle" and he should sign a waiver of appeal in order to increase his chances of returning to his unit. The lack of guidance, coupled with the advice of his counsel, caused him to feel like he was alienated and lacked support.

In the initial years following his discharge, he continued to face marital issues and struggled to transition to civilian life. He and his now ex-wife were frequently in court over child visitation issues. In addition, he worked several jobs, including a pizza delivery person, wireless technician, and hotel maintenance engineer, to support his family. Despite these challenges, he began to persevere and made significant strides in his personal and professional life. He remarried in 2007, has been a consummate father and husband, maintained gainful employment and conducts charitable work.

Since his discharge, the military has significantly altered its views concerning ongoing punishment and second chances. These changes, along with the mitigating circumstances surrounding his absenteeism, declined work performance, and his exemplary post-discharge conduct, warrant an upgrade in his discharge characterization, and narrative reason and authority for his separation. He has also been offered and has accepted employment as a police officer with the Defense Logistics Agency.

In support of his request for a discharge upgrade, the applicant provides a personal statement and copies of military kudos, character references, and other documents related to his request for upgrade.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The applicant is a former Air Force airman (E-2).

On 9 Nov 98, the applicant's commander recommended the applicant be discharged from the Air Force, under the provisions of AFI 36-3208, *Administrative Separation of Airmen*, Chapter 5, Section H, paragraph 5.50.1, for pattern of misconduct. The specific reasons for the action were:

- a. On or about 27 Aug 97, he missed the movement of Air Mobility Command Charter Flight ^{Var.} [redacted] departing from [redacted] Washington, to [redacted] Republic of Korea, which he was required to do in the course of duty to move.
- b. On or about 31 Aug 97 until on or about 9 Sep 97, without authority, he was absent from his unit at which he was required to be. As a result, he received a Special Court-Martial Order (SCMO) Number ^{Wc.} [redacted] dated 5 Nov 97, and was sentenced to 30 days of confinement, forfeiture of \$100.00 of pay per month for three months, reduction to the grade of airman first class, and a reprimand.
- c. On or about 29 Jul and on or about 19 Mar 98, he failed to obey Government Travel Charge Card Program regulations and did not pay his balance.
- d. On or about 15 Jan 98, he wrote an insufficient check in the amount of \$1,999.00 to American Express. As a result, he received NJP, dated 30 Sep 98, which consisted of a suspended reduction to the grade of airman, five days of extra duty, and a reprimand.
- e. On or about 6 Jul 98 and on or about 7 Jul 98, he was derelict in the performance of his duties and failed to wear safety goggles while working. As a result, he received a letter of counseling (LOC), dated 8 Jul 98.
- f. On or about 25 Aug 98, he failed to go at the time prescribed to his appointed place of duty. As a result, he received a LOC, dated 25 Aug 98.
- g. On or about 25 Aug 98 and on or about 16 Sep 98, he failed to go at the time prescribed to his appointed place of duty. As a result, he received a LOR, dated 16 Sep 98.
- h. On or about 17 Sep 98, he was derelict in the performance of his duties and failed to secure the support section. As a result, he received a Vacation Action reducing his grade to airman, dated 30 Sep 98.

On 21 Dec 98, the Acting Staff Judge Advocate found the discharge action legally sufficient.

On 29 Dec 98, the discharge authority directed the applicant be discharged for misconduct, with a under other than honorable conditions service characterization. Probation and rehabilitation were considered, but not offered.

[REDACTED]

On 9 Jan 99, the applicant received a under other than honorable conditions discharge. His narrative reason for separation is "Misconduct" and he was credited with 5 years, 8 months, and 17 days of total active service.

For more information, see the excerpt of the applicant's record at Exhibit B and the advisory at Exhibit E.

POST-SERVICE INFORMATION

On 12 Jul 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 C). The applicant replied on 2 Aug 23 and provided an FBI report. According to the report, the applicant has had no arrests since discharge. The applicant also provided a personal statement, character statements, certificates, commendations, and letters from his employers, and evidence of community service.

On 5 Jan 24, the applicant provided an email confirmation of his selection as a Police Officer with the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), DLA Installation Support, [REDACTED]

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibits A and D.

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 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 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 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.

[REDACTED]

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 issued supplemental guidance, known as the Wilkie Memo, 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 Memo.

On 12 Jul 23, the Board staff provided the applicant a copy of the liberal consideration guidance (Exhibit C).

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 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 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 EVALUATION

AF/JAJI finds no evidence of injustice based on the totality of circumstance and recommends denying the application. The applicant does not allege error or injustice in the LOCs, LOR, NJP, NJP Vacation Action, or SCMO. Nor does he allege error in the administrative separation. Rather, he only alleges injustice in the administrative separation, and contends his discharge and re-enlistment code should be upgraded pursuant to the Wilkie Memorandum. As evidence of extenuation and mitigation, the applicant contends his “work performance began to deteriorate in 97 when he learned of his then-wife’s extra-marital affairs,” and he missed his unit’s movement to [REDACTED] on 27 Aug 97 (Misconduct 1) as a result of marital issues. The applicant also contends his worthless check (Misconduct 4) was the result of “misguidance from his superior,” who allegedly incorrectly assured him the Air Force would reimburse him before American Express deposited the check for \$1,999.00. Finally, the applicant contends the continued deterioration of his marriage led to his failure to wear safety goggles 6 Jul 98 through 7 Jul 98 (Misconduct 5), his being late to duty on 16 Sep 98 (Misconduct 7), and his failure to secure the support section on 17 Sep 98 (Misconduct 8).

The Wilkie Memorandum directs the Board to consider whether “it is consistent with military custom and practice to honor sacrifices and achievements, to punish only to the extent necessary, to rehabilitate to the greatest extent possible, and to favor second chances in situations in which individuals have paid for their misdeeds.” It further states, “An honorable discharge characterization does not require flawless military service. Many veterans are separated with an honorable characterization despite some relatively minor or infrequent misconduct.”

A careful examination of the applicant’s military record reveals material omissions in his application which show his misconduct was more than “relatively minor or infrequent.” Multiple times in the application, the applicant cited his wife’s infidelity as the reason for his missing movement to [REDACTED] on 27 Aug 97. He also stated he “promptly turned himself into authorities.” However, he omitted he was also absent for 10 days from 31 Aug 97 to 9 Sep 97, and the lengthy period of unauthorized absence also cuts against his contention he promptly turned himself in. Additionally, the applicant alleged his leadership was to blame for his worthless check violation on 15 Jan 98, but omitted he failed to pay the debt on his Government Travel Card for nine months between 29 Jul 97 and 19 Mar 98. Finally, the applicant alleged his continued marital issues were responsible for being late to work on 16 Sep 98, however he omitted he failed to be at his appointed place of duty on three different occasions between 25 Aug 98 and 16 Sep 98. These omissions show in total the applicant had eight documented instances of misconduct between Aug 97 and Sep 98. These contradict his assertion he had an “otherwise unblemished service record.” Furthermore, the applicant called into question one factor for consideration from the Wilkie Memorandum, which is “an applicant’s candor.”

The Wilkie Memorandum also states the Board should consider “evidence of rehabilitation.” Consistent with the Memorandum’s guidance to “punish only to the extent necessary, to rehabilitate to the greatest extent possible, and to favor second chances,” from Nov 97 to Sept 98, the Air Force repeatedly took rehabilitative measures – including a trial by special court-martial (without a punitive discharge), an NJP (with a suspended reduction), an LOR, two LOCs, and verbal counseling – but he rejected every attempt.

Finally, the applicant unconditionally waived his right to an administrative separation hearing, and acknowledged he could be separated with a under other than honorable conditions service characterization.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit E.

APPLICANT’S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The Board sent a copy of the advisory opinion to the applicant on 3 Oct 23 for comment (Exhibit F), and the applicant replied on 26 Oct 23. In his response, the applicant disagrees with the advisory and reiterates the arguments made in the application. Specifically, the advisory opinion does not accurately describe the factual evidence and fails to cite relevant sections of the Wilkie Memo; it fails to give weight to evidence and runs contrary to the Wilkie Memo.

The timeline of events prior to, during, and after his service, was provided in supporting documents to the Board. However, the advisory opinion sets forth a timeline of events which occurred at the end of his military career and after he learned of his wife’s extra marital affairs in 97. The advisory fails to include descriptions of the mitigating circumstances surrounding his offenses and his exemplary post-service conduct. By doing so, the advisory opinion is able to make an unreasonable assertion he did not have an “otherwise unblemished service record.” This assertion is contradicted by the supporting documentation provided. Prior to learning of his wife’s extra marital affairs in 97, he had zero instances of misconduct and had an outstanding record, evidenced by top-tier performance ratings, awards and accolades. After he learned of his wife’s extra marital affairs, his work performance deteriorated. During which, he testifies he was “overwhelmed with anxiety” and his attempt to cope with his marital issues “adversely affected” his work performance. Character references corroborate the decline in his spirit and focus after learning of his wife’s extra-marital affairs. His unblemished record from Apr 93 to Aug 97 further evidences his marital issues are the main cause of his misconduct during his last twelve months of service.

Additionally, he disagrees with the advisor’s opinion he “through design” missed his port call to [REDACTED] and did not promptly turn himself in. His absence was “not pre-planned nor pre-meditated.” He was attempting to cope with his wife’s infidelity, as well as trying to reconcile his marriage. He was not thinking clearly and made a rash decision in his youthful indiscretion. He promptly turned himself in after reflecting on the situation, rather than immediately after missing his port call. What is believed to be what a reasonable person in a similar circumstance would do, he took time to focus on his personal life, and the circumstance clouded his judgment. The applicant stated he was thinking long and hard about the impact the permanent change of station

would have on his family, especially after being a child of a broken home. The applicant further stated he now acknowledges he should have explored all possible avenues of support, but in his youthful indiscretion, he felt his options were limited, and he acted uncharacteristically. After taking time to face his marital issues and understand, he made a mistake, he did in fact promptly turn himself in to authorities.

Further, he believes the advisory ignores his testimony regarding the matter of the failed payment of debt on the Government Travel Card for nine months. The Wilkie Memo states a “veteran or Service member’s sworn testimony alone, oral or written, may establish the existence of a fact supportive of relief.” In the applicant’s statement, he states he sought the advice of his supervisor after he received a bill from American Express in the amount of \$1,999.00. His supervisor advised him to write a check to American Express for the balance and assured Finance would issue a reimbursement to his account before American Express cashed the check and deducted funds from his account. Additionally, he and his section commander made calls to American Express, who incorrectly confirmed the bill was paid in full. Therefore, the applicant was under the impression there were no issues with American Express and his debt was paid in full. He had no intent to defraud American Express. The applicant would like it noted he had no prior instances of delivering checks to creditors while having insufficient funds in his account.

He additionally states the advisory also incorrectly states the applicant omitted information about failing to be at the applicant’s appointed place of duty on three occasions between 25 Aug 98 and 16 Sep 98. The applicant’s statement identified and described the three events, as well as the other instances of misconduct described in the advisory. With respect to the mitigating facts related to the two instances in which he was late to work, the applicant stated the issues stemmed from working 13 to 16-hour days while still coping with his wife’s extra-marital affairs. Further, the applicant was never late for work prior to learning of his wife’s extra-marital affairs. Regarding the mitigating circumstances related to his failure to secure the support section, he states in his experience and to the best of knowledge, the entrance to the support section was never locked and was instead monitored 24-hours per day. Further, as a result of his missed port call, his duties were limited to those requiring oversight from his supervisors, and thus, was not permitted to be the first one in nor the last one out of the section and was never provided with keys to the entrance of the support section. In addition, the advisory states he failed to wear his safety goggles while working with a grinder and was disrespectful to a non-commissioned officer when verbally counseled, however does not account for his acknowledgement of counseling. In the acknowledgement of counseling, the applicant took responsibility for his actions, but felt he was receiving a disparate reprimand influenced by his reputation at the time. The applicant stated he felt he was doing the right thing when he requested the non-commissioned officer to take the conversation inside so they could discuss the situation without hostility, but instead he received harsh language and threats in return, which he felt were disproportionate to the offense. He also believed he was not being disrespectful when he asked for permission to speak up, which is supported by the record as the letter of counseling does not describe how he was disrespectful.

In addition, the advisory makes an assertion the applicant’s candor should be called into question. However, the applicant stated he was determined to earn back the trust of his peers by taking on special projects and increasing his work shifts. Further, prior to 97, he received the highest or

[REDACTED]

second highest rating on the performance evaluation criteria related to his verbal skills and respect for authority.

The applicant further believes the advisory fails to cite pertinent provisions of the Wilkie Memo; including the Board is instructed to consider the mitigating facts related to the record or punishment from which the veteran or Service member wants relief when determining whether to grant relief on the basis of an injustice. As stated by the applicant, the mitigating facts in the instant case are the following: the applicant's sole reason for absenting himself from his unit and missing his port call to [REDACTED] was he was attempting to reconcile his marriage after learning his wife was engaging in extra-marital affairs, his reason for paying the balance on his American Express Government Travel Card while having insufficient funds was because he was advised by his supervisor Finance would timely reimburse him so he could pay such balance, and his sole reason for a declined performance during the period from 1 Jul 97 to 30 Jun 98 was because he was still coping with his broken marriage caused by his then-wife's pattern of infidelity.

Further, the applicant believes the advisory fails to address his evidence of rehabilitation. The advisory ignores the applicant's exceptional post-discharge conduct, including his meritorious service in other endeavors, when discussing rehabilitation measures, which is contrary to the Wilkie Memo. The advisory instead cites disciplinary actions, including a trial by special court-martial, a nonjudicial punishment, a letter of reprimand, two letters of counseling, and verbal counseling, to describe his rehabilitation efforts. Disciplinary actions, such as a trial by a special court-martial or a non-judicial punishment, should not be viewed as rehabilitative measures due to their punitive nature. The punitive nature of these measures is evidenced by the applicant's comments made on 25 Jul 98 where he described these disciplinary actions as "punishments," "costly" and "demoralizing", and requested inquiries from supervisors as to his character, which he never received. Further, the advisory inaccurately claims he "rejected every attempt" to rehabilitate himself while he was a servicemember. The applicant stated in 98 he took multiple measures to rectify his reputation and good standing, such as working 13 to 16-hour shifts and volunteering for special projects in addition to his normal duties. While he does accept responsibility for his actions which led to these disciplinary actions and acknowledges he should have exhausted all resources available to him, he feels his options were limited.

Since his discharge, he has had an opportunity to reflect on mishaps and has been determined to rectify his life. The applicant has become an incredible husband and father, teaching his children the values of charity, generosity and hard-work. In addition, he volunteered at a number of charitable organizations, including Sleep Heavenly Peace, a foundation focused on building and supplying beds to families in need. [REDACTED] *Work-Product*, the Chapter Co-President of Sleep Heavenly Peace, has described the applicant as someone who has unmatched reliability, treats others with compassion and professionalism, and maintains self-control in the most stressful situations. He has also become a great employee, regardless of the occupation, and an individual his fellow community members respect and admire.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit G.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

1. The application was timely filed. Given the requirement for passage of time, all discharge upgrade requests 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 the victim of an injustice. While the Board agrees with the AF/JAJI advisory opinion finding no error in the original discharge process, the Board disagrees with the recommendation and recommends relief based on fundamental fairness. The Board contemplated the many principles included in the Wilkie Memo to determine whether to grant relief based on an injustice or fundamental fairness. Furthermore, the Board considered the applicant's post-service conduct and achievements, length of time since the misconduct, his character and reputation, service to the community, job history and degree of contrition. The Board notes the applicant has made a successful post-service transition; his submitted evidence includes numerous character references showing his impact in his community to include his volunteer time with Sleep Heavenly Peace. He is also gainfully employed, has not had any history of criminal activity since his discharge, and shows remorse for his actions that led to his discharge. Furthermore, the Board notes his desire to continue to serve as a Guard or Reserve member and notes his four years of good service with less than a year of multiple disciplinary issues, some due to extenuating circumstances. Given the evidence presented, the Board finds the applicant's post-service accomplishments sufficient enough to warrant a discharge upgrade. Therefore, the Board recommends the applicant's records be corrected as indicated below.

RECOMMENDATION

The pertinent military records of the Department of the Air Force relating to APPLICANT be corrected to show on 9 January 1999, he was discharged with service characterized as honorable, a separation code and corresponding narrative reason for separation of JFF (Secretarial Authority), and a reentry code of 1J.

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-2023-00676 in Executive Session on 23 May 24:

██████████ Panel Chair

██████████ Panel Member

██████████ Panel Member

All members voted to correct the record. The panel considered the following:

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2023-00676

[REDACTED]

Exhibit A: Application, DD Form 149, w/atchs, dated 23 Feb 23, 3 Aug 23, and 5 Jan 24.
Exhibit B: Documentary Evidence, including relevant excerpts from official records.
Exhibit C: Letter, SAF/MRBC, w/atchs (Post-Service Request and Liberal Consideration Guidance), dated 12 Jul 23.
Exhibit D: FBI Report, dated, 2 Aug 23.
Exhibit E: Advisory Opinion, AF/JAJI, dated 22 Aug 23.
Exhibit F: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 3 Oct 23.
Exhibit G: Applicant's Response, w/atchs, dated 26 Oct 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.

7/14/2025

[REDACTED]

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2023-00676

[REDACTED]