

## **RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**DOCKET NUMBER:** BC-2023-01390

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

**COUNSEL:** XXXXXXXXXXXX

**HEARING REQUESTED:** YES

### **APPLICANT'S REQUEST**

Her general (under honorable conditions) discharge be upgraded to honorable, with Reentry Code 1 under Secretarial Authority.

### **APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS**

The applicant's supporting documentation provided with her application to the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR) was originally drafted to appeal an initial finding by the Air Force Discharge Review Board (AFDRB). In this appeal, counsel, on behalf of the applicant, contended she was unjustly and erroneously separated from the Air Force with an under honorable conditions (general) discharge. She became aware of the existence of the error upon consultation with an attorney in 2019, and then became apprised of the legal errors of her discharge. Her appeal was based on three errors: (1) the underlying basis of her separation was procedurally defective at the time of the discharge; (2) the adverse action, to include the administrative discharge, was unfair at the time; and (3) the under honorable conditions (general) discharge is inequitable now. In support of this request for correction, counsel detailed the legal standards for the AFBCMR and AFDRB, as well as the Secretary of Defense memorandum (Hagel Memo), dated 3 Sep 14, and Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness memorandum (Kurta Memo), dated 25 Aug 17, addressing liberal consideration.

The applicant entered the Air Force on 25 Sep 12 in security forces. After training, her first job was safeguarding and responding to nuclear alarm missiles. She then became an armory armorer with a lot of responsibility as an E-3 [airman first class]. Since she was a stellar airman, she was approved to enter the canine handler course and graduated in 2015. Upon return to her base, she started working as a narcotics detector dog handler with the only narcotics detector dog on base.

A couple of airmen in her flight decided to make bad decisions and started to smoke marijuana. She was regularly scheduled with these same airmen, so it was hard to get away from it. The applicant did not want to have anything to do with it, did not want to have knowledge of it, and that was her first mistake as she should have just reported it. However, the Air Force Office of Special Investigations (AFOSI) already found out the airmen were smoking weed [marijuana].

One night, when she was already relieved of duty and on her way to another base, she was called into the AFOSI station. She was told to pull her dog and meet the AFOSI there. When she arrived, she was told the AFOSI was going to set up a sting to bust all of these airmen (some of them her friends) that they knew were doing drugs. She was only 21 at the time and very nervous to be caught up in this situation. She knew it was not going to go well and texted the airmen that were at her house, telling them to get out of her house because the AFOSI was looking for them and she did not want to be part of it. When the AFOSI learned she had texted the airmen about the sting, she was charged with Article 31, Obstruction of Justice. None of the airmen that smoked weed [marijuana] and were doing narcotics got court-martialed, only the applicant received a court-martial.

She was served with a special court-martial with up to six months confinement, had her badge and beret taken away, was banned from the kennels, was given a non-contact order prohibiting her from coming in contact with any working dog and speaking to any on-duty canine handler, her secret security clearance was revoked, her orders to Italy rescinded, she was assigned different odd jobs around the base, and she became part of the AFOSI investigation. She felt singled out and that she was treated the hardest though she had not been involved with the drugs; however, she held her head high, tried to retain her dignity, and worked hard to maintain her professionalism throughout the process.

The applicant's court-martial was downgraded to a summary court-martial with 30 days confinement, reduction in rank from E-4 [senior airman] to E-1 [airman basic], and an involuntary discharge from the Air Force. She worked with an attorney during the court-martial process with a final reduction in rank from E-4 to E-3 [airman first class], 30 days hard labor without confinement, and the ability to remain in the Air Force.

After she served her 30 days of hard labor and took her punishment, the Air Force tried to figure out what to do with her. She felt like her name was tarnished in the security forces world and wanted some sort of lateral training so she could stay in the Air Force. Her commanding officer started the process to discharge her, and her rebuttal was denied.

During this time, she was diagnosed with strep throat and scheduled for a tonsillectomy. Her command went to lengths to get her surgery cancelled because they wanted her out of the Air Force. One of her doctors had to call her command and lecture them that she was still attached to the Air Force, still covered under TRICARE, and how dare they try to deny her healthcare. Ultimately, the applicant was administratively separated and issued a general discharge, under honorable conditions, on 20 Jan 17.

During her career in the Air Force, she earned multiple awards. She returned home and started going to college full time. She was accepted into a competitive radiology program and is slated for graduation in 2020 with an associate degree. She also works part-time and has been leading a productive and successful life without any instance of misconduct since her involuntary discharge from the Air Force. She does not believe she should be punished the rest of her life for one small mistake she made when she was so young and does not want her discharge to get in the way of her new career. She would also like to make use of her GI Bill. She served honorably while on active duty and continues to serve honorably as a civilian; hence, the general discharge no longer serves a purpose.

There is a procedural defect in this case. The request for administrative separation can be both command-initiated and initiated by the service member. In this case, there was a hasty command-initiated request for separation. The command must provide the member reasonable time to overcome deficiencies, but in this case, there was a rush to judgment that there was a problem that could not be fixed. She was able to perform her duties and there was a jump to the conclusion that she was guilty and malicious. The command should have evaluated whether she had a long-term problem or whether there had been a misunderstanding. Although the command was authorized to administratively separate her, the fundamental reason for the discharge was substantially deficient. There was no fully determined reason to initiate her elimination. The instruction allows for the service member to be able to fix the problem, but she was not allowed these opportunities. The command in this case did not have the proper authority to administratively separate the applicant. Finally, the under honorable conditions (general) discharge does not serve a further purpose. The events that took place are no longer relevant to the applicant's life and she has lived since in a responsible manner. There is no valid equitable purpose to leave the discharge in place.

The appeal should consider the entirety of the applicant's military career reflected in her personnel records, medical records, and personal affidavit. She has received statements from supervisors, co-workers, and friends attesting to her character since her service in the Air Force. She requests this derogatory information be removed from her record. The success of this appeal and future actions by the Air Force and AFBCMR will have a significant impact on her ability to receive proper benefits and recognition and she will continue this fight up through the Secretary of the Air Force.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

## STATEMENT OF FACTS

The applicant is a former Air Force airman first class (E-3)

On 3 Nov 16, according to DD Form 2329, *Record of Trial by Summary Court-Martial*, the applicant was arraigned and found guilty of violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), and sentenced to hard labor without confinement for 30 days, reduction in grade to E-3, and a reprimand.

On 16 Nov 16, the applicant's commander recommended the applicant be discharged from the Air Force, under the provisions of Air Force Instruction 36-3208, *Administrative Separation of Airmen*, Chapter 5, Section 5H, paragraph 5.52.4.. The specific reason for the action was:

- Between on or about 4 Apr 16 and on or about 5 Apr 16, at or near [Air Force base], [applicant] wrongfully endeavored to impede an investigation into wrongful use of controlled substances by airmen assigned to [unit], including the case of *United States v. Airman First Class XXXX*, by calling airman basic (AB) XX and informing him that the AFOSI would be searching XXXX's residence, text messaging XXXX that the AFOSI was looking for him and XXXX, and text messaging XXXX, asking him to delete her text messages to him that pertained to the AFOSI investigation, such conduct being prejudicial to good order and discipline in the armed forces. For this misconduct, she was found guilty at a summary court-martial that convened on 3 Nov 16.

On 21 Dec 16, the Staff Judge Advocate found the discharge action legally sufficient.

On 28 Dec 16, the discharge authority directed the applicant be discharged for commission of a serious offense, with an under honorable conditions (general) service characterization. Probation and rehabilitation were considered, but not offered.

On 20 Jan 17, the applicant received a general (under honorable conditions) discharge. Her narrative reason for separation is "Misconduct (Serious Offense)" with Reentry Code 2B [Separated with general or under other than honorable conditions discharge], and she was credited with 4 years, 3 months, and 26 days of total active service.

On 27 Jul 17, the applicant submitted a request to the AFDRB for an upgrade to her discharge.

On 8 Nov 18, the AFDRB found insufficient evidence of an inequity or impropriety that would warrant a change to the applicant's discharge, and the discharge received was deemed appropriate.

On 11 Sep 19, the applicant submitted an appeal of their previous findings to the AFDRB for an upgrade to her discharge.

On 8 Nov 22, the AFDRB concluded through the applicant's testimony that she did not provide evidence to indicate the circumstances surrounding her discharge were improper or inequitable, and the administrative actions taken by her chain of command were appropriate.

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

## **POST-SERVICE INFORMATION**

On 25 May 23, the Board sent the applicant a request for post-service information, including a standard criminal history report from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI); however, she has not replied.

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

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

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

On 25 Jul 18, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness 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 25 May 23, 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 that any other characterization would be inappropriate.

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

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

- The use of force or violence to produce serious bodily injury or death.

- Abuse of a special position of trust.

- Disregard by a superior of customary superior - subordinate relationships.

- Acts or omissions that endanger the security of the United States.

- Acts or omissions that endanger the health and welfare of other members of the DAF.

- Deliberate acts or omissions that seriously endanger the health and safety of other persons.

- Rape, sexual assault, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, rape of a child, sexual abuse of a child, sexual harassment, and attempts to commit these offenses.

## AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The AFRBA Psychological Advisor finds insufficient evidence to support the applicant's request.

This psychological advisor has reviewed the available records and finds insufficient evidence has been presented that would warrant overturning the AFDRB's previous decisions. Neither the applicant nor her legal counsel identified the traumatic experience causing her to develop PTSD, did not discuss how she sustained a TBI, did not clarify her other mental health condition as designated on her application to the AFBCMR, and did not discuss how her mental health condition or TBI may excuse or mitigate her discharge. Her service treatment records indicated she sought mental health treatment twice during service, the first time began in May 14 for having anxiety and depression caused by work stress that was resolved rather quickly after initiating treatment, and again starting in Jun 16 for having anxiety, depression, and suicidal ideation caused by being under investigation and possible discharge. She was given a diagnosis of adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depressed mood during both iterations of treatment for her situational stressors relating to her occupational and legal problems (different stressors each time). There was no evidence she was diagnosed with PTSD or TBI during or after service, nor was there any evidence she was service-connected by the Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) for these conditions. She denied being diagnosed with PTSD and TBI during her out-processing assessment on 29 Feb 16 and screened negative for PTSD when

assessed by her DVA provider during her recent intake evaluation on 29 Aug 23. There was no evidence she had a mental health condition, including PTSD or TBI, impairing her judgment when she engaged in her serious offense/misconduct of obstructing justice between on or about 4 Apr 16 and 5 Apr 16. When she was assessed for out-processing purposes several weeks earlier, she denied having any mental health conditions or concerns. It was not until after she was under investigation for her misconduct that she developed mental health symptoms and as her military mental health providers had stated, her emotional reaction was appropriate to her situation. Her symptoms appeared to have improved once the stressors of her investigation and legal issues had ended.

The applicant was diagnosed with the same diagnosis of adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depressed mood after service from her Compensation and Pension (C&P) examiner which was about four months post-discharge. Even though she received the same diagnosis, her C&P examiner clarified her post-service diagnosis was caused by her situational stressor of adjusting to civilian life after the military. Her post-service adjustment disorder was not related to her military service. She returned to mental health treatment at the DVA several years later in Aug 23 for complaints of depression that stemmed from an incident occurring while she was in the military in 2016. The incident was not specified but presumably was related to her misconduct, investigation, and/or summary court-martial as they occurred in the same year and were highly stressful experiences for her. Her mental health conditions that were reported or diagnosed post-service did not cause or attribute to her misconduct per her treatment records. They were in response to the consequences of her misconduct and discharge action.

The applicant's legal counsel claimed the applicant texted the airmen who were at her house watching television at the time to tell them to get out of her house as AFOSI was looking for them because she did not want to be a part of it. Regardless of her actual intentions for contacting them, she knew what she was doing at the time, at least for her reasoning of not wanting to be involved according to her personal testimony. Nevertheless, the applicant and her legal counsel did not fully address all of her misconduct and reasons for discharge. It is reminded she was convicted at a summary court-martial and notified of discharge action for calling XXXX to inform him that AFOSI would be searching the residence of XXXX, texting XXXX that AFOSI was looking for him and XXXX, and she sent a text message to XXXX asking him to delete her text messages to him pertaining to AFOSI's investigation. The applicant and her legal counsel did not address any of these other serious misconducts that she had committed. She did more than just inform them to get out of her house because she did not want to be a part of the situation and it was not "one small mistake" as asserted, but it was a series of poor behaviors and decisions on her part. Again, her behaviors indicated she knew what she was doing at the time, and no evidence her mental health condition contributed to these poor behaviors. Her misconducts were egregious and could not be excused or mitigated by her mental health condition, even if it were possible that she had a mental health condition at the time of her misconduct, which her records do not support.

The psychological advisor concurs with the AFDRB's prior decisions and finds insufficient evidence to support her request for the desired changes to her records based on her mental health condition. There is no evidence her mental health condition had a direct impact on her misconduct and discharge and no evidence of an error or injustice with her discharge from a mental health perspective.

Liberal consideration was applied to the applicant's prior two petitions to the AFDRB. The AFDRB did not find sufficient evidence that her misconduct and discharge could be excused, mitigated, or outweighed by her mental health condition. The AFDRB also answered the four questions from the Kurta Memorandum in the most recent petition to demonstrate their findings and decisions. This psychological advisor concurs with the AFDRB's findings and rationale and also finds that with liberal consideration being applied to her request, there is still insufficient

evidence to support her request. The answers/responses provided to the four questions from the Kurta Memorandum from the AFDRB were sound and still relevant and applicable to this current petition, especially since no new or different information or records were submitted to the AFBCMR that were not already considered by the AFDRB. It is reminded that liberal consideration does not mandate an upgrade of her discharge. For this current petition, liberal consideration is applied again to her petition due to the designation of "PTSD" and "Other Mental Health" on her application to the AFBCMR. The following are responses to the four questions from the Kurta Memorandum from the available records for review, which are similar to the AFDRB's findings:

1. Did the veteran have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge?

The applicant marked "PTSD" and "Other Mental Health" on her application to the AFBCMR and provided no clarifying information about these conditions including the onset and causes of these conditions, whether they occurred during service, and how her mental health condition, including PTSD and TBI, caused her misconduct and discharge. Her legal counsel requested liberal consideration be applied because of guidance from policies about PTSD and TBI particularly when they are service-connected. Her legal counsel did not discuss how she incurred PTSD, sustained a TBI, and how these conditions caused or impacted her misconduct and discharge.

2. Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service?

There is evidence the applicant sought mental health treatment twice during her time in service. The first time was in May 14 for having anxiety/panic attacks and depression caused by work stress, and the second time starting in Jun 16 for having anxiety, depression, and suicidal ideation caused by being under investigation and possible discharge from service. She received a diagnosis of adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depressed mood from both iterations of treatment but for different situational stressors as well as conditions of occupational problems and problems related to other legal circumstances. Several weeks before her misconduct occurred in Apr 16, she received an out-processing assessment from her PCM [Primary Care Manager] in Feb 16 and she denied having any PTSD, TBI, or any other mental health condition. There is no evidence her condition of PTSD or TBI had existed or occurred during service.

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

The applicant's first mental health treatment in 2014 had pre-dated her misconduct by at least two years and was resolved quickly after she initiated treatment. There is no evidence she had recurring anxiety, panic attacks, or depression from the same situational stressors since that time. Her second treatment in 2016 was in response to the aftermath of her misconduct and poor decisions, which was a different set of situational stressors. There is no evidence the applicant had a mental health condition impairing her judgment at the time of her misconduct and no evidence her mental health condition had caused or impacted her misconduct leading to her discharge from service. Her mental health condition does not excuse or mitigate her discharge especially since her misconduct was considered egregious and serious.

4. Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge?

Since her mental health condition does not excuse or mitigate her discharge, her condition also does not outweigh her original discharge.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit D.

AF/JAJI recommends denying the application. After careful review, the applicant has not provided sufficient evidence of error or injustice that would undermine her discharge.

On 4 Apr 16, the applicant, who was a dog handler, conducted a drug search as part of an AFOSI investigation into illegal drug use by multiple members of the applicant's squadron. After the

search, the applicant telephoned XXXX to warn him AFOSI would be searching XXXX's residence; text messaged XXXX that AFOSI would be looking for him and XXXX, and later asked XXXX to delete her text messages regarding the AFOSI investigation. On 3 Nov 16, she was found guilty at summary court-martial of wrongfully impeding an investigation in violation of Article 134, UCMJ. She was sentenced to hard labor without confinement for 30 days, a grade reduction to E-3, and a reprimand. A discharge is not an available sentencing option at summary court-martial.

On 20 Jan 17, she was discharged from the Air Force and her DD Form 214, *Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*, reflects a service characterization of under honorable conditions (general), and a narrative reason for separation of Misconduct (Serious Offense). The Staff Judge Advocate's (SJA) recommendation prior to the administrative discharge notes her misconduct would normally warrant an under other than honorable conditions (UOTHC) service characterization, but that a UOTHC discharge would require a hearing before an administrative discharge board. Due to the significant time it would take to conduct a discharge board, and the negative impact on good order and discipline to keep the applicant's case open, the SJA recommended a general discharge without a discharge board hearing.

The applicant, via counsel, alleged three errors or injustices: Allegation 1) the underlying basis of her separation was procedurally defective at the time of discharge; Allegation 2) the adverse action, to include the administrative discharge, was unfair at the time; and Allegation 3) the under honorable conditions (general) discharge is inequitable.

Regarding Allegation 1, the applicant provided insufficient evidence that the administrative discharge was procedurally defective. Her basis for this allegation is "there was a jump to the conclusion that she was guilty and malicious" instead of evaluating whether she "had a long-term problem or whether there had been a misunderstanding." This is not evidence of procedural error.

Regarding Allegations 2 and 3, she had provided insufficient evidence that the discharge or service characterization were either unfair or inequitable. The applicant was a security forces member who used her position and access to obstruct a criminal investigation against her associates in which she was participating. The advisor concluded a general discharge was not unfair or inequitable based on the applicant's serious misconduct. Finally, the advisor agreed with the pre-discharge SJA analysis that the applicant's misconduct would normally have warranted a UOTHC discharge.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit E.

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

The Board sent copies of the advisory opinions to the applicant on 10 Oct 23 for comment (Exhibit F) but has received no response.

## **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION**

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, 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 and recommendation of AF/JAJI and finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the



applicant's contentions. The applicant did not identify the traumatic experience which caused her to develop PTSD, or discuss how she sustained a TBI, or clarify other mental health conditions as designated on her application. In fact, she denied being diagnosed with PTSD or TBI during an out-processing assessment with her PCM on 29 Feb 16. Additionally, there was no indication or evidence a mental health disorder caused the applicant's misconduct. It was not until after she was under investigation for misconduct that she developed mental health symptoms, and her military mental health provider stated her emotional reaction was appropriate to her situation. Liberal consideration was applied; however, the applicant's mental health condition does not excuse or mitigate her discharge. Further, the applicant provided no evidence in support of her allegations of unfairness and/or inequity regarding her discharge. It appears the discharge was consistent with the substantive requirements of the discharge regulation and was within the commander's discretion. The discharge was not unduly harsh or disproportionate to the offenses committed. Finally, in the interest of justice, the Board considered upgrading the discharge based on clemency; however, given the evidence presented, and in the absence of post-service information/criminal history provided by the applicant, the Board finds no basis to do so. 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-2023-01390 in Executive Session on 21 Feb 24:

, Panel Chair  
, Panel Member  
, Panel Member

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

Exhibit A: Application, DD Form 149, w/atchs, dated 24 Apr 23.  
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 25 May 23.  
Exhibit D: Advisory Opinion, AFRBA Psychological Advisor, dated 27 Sep 23.  
Exhibit E: Advisory Opinion, AF/JAJI, dated 5 Oct 23.  
Exhibit F: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Counsel, dated 10 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.

X

---

Board Operations Manager, AFBCMR