

Work-Product



Work-Product

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2024-00813

Work-Product

COUNSEL: Work-Product

HEARING REQUESTED: NO

APPLICANT'S REQUEST

1. His Letter of Reprimand (LOR), issued 11 Jan 23 be expunged and removed from his Officer Selection Record (OSR), Master Personnel Records Group (MPerRGp) and his Unfavorable Information File (UIF).
2. His 2022-2023 referral Officer Performance Brief (OPB) be removed from his record.
3. His Promotion Proprietary Action (PPA) be removed.
4. He be reinstated on the P0420D major (O-4) promotion list with the corresponding original date of rank of promotion, 1 Jul 22, with retroactive entitlement to all pay and benefits.

APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS

He was issued an LOR by his group commander (GP/CC) for an allegation of assault consummated by battery against an enlisted female. The only eyewitness to this touching described it as an "accident/accidental" shove. The complainant made a statement riddled with logical fallacies and inaccuracies. He maintains that he never intentionally committed an assault consummated by battery nor was he culpably negligent. Not only did he respond to the LOR, he also asked higher-up leadership to consider rescission of the sustained LOR, which was denied. Furthermore, on 27 Feb 23, the complainant, posted a video to the social media platform TikTok where she is in uniform, smiling and dancing, with the words "SA'd" (i.e. sexually assaulted) and then she "gets the rest of the week off." From this video, it is clear she had a motive to fabricate a story and her credibility should be absolutely put into question when determining whether or not the LOR was just.

The LOR, which fails to meet the preponderance of the evidence standard required for adverse administrative actions and resulted in a referral OPB and a PPA in which he lost his promotion to major, was inappropriate and had lasting tangible effects on his career. Not only did it prohibit his ability to continue to serve, but it has also affected his ability to join the Air Force Reserve. He urges the Board to review his submission in its entirety in order to better understand the faulty investigation, the lack of credibility of the complainant, and the resulting legally insufficient LOR

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2024-00813

Work-Product

Work-Product

Work-Product

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The applicant is an honorably separated Air Force captain (O-3).

On 19 May 22, according to an *Air Force Office of Investigations (AFOSI) Report of Investigation (ROI)*, dated 7 Jul 22, an investigation was initiated based on information from the Security Forces Squadron (SFS) that [Work-Prod...] had reported to them she had been sexually assaulted by <applicant> while they were both TDY to [Work-Prod...]. The ROI reflects the period of report from 19 May 22 – 27 Jun 22.

On 29 Jun 22, according to AF Form 4363, *Record of Promotion Proprietary Action*, provided by applicant, he was notified by his squadron commander (SG/CC) that his projected promotion to major, with a projected date of promotion of 1 Jul 22, was delayed for the following: “I am recommending a delay of your promotion under DAFI 36-2501, *Officer Promotions and Selective Continuation*, paragraph 5.4, because you are currently under criminal investigation for allegedly slapping the buttocks of a female SrA while you were TDY to [Work-Prod...]. If true, this conduct could be a violation of Article 120, UCMJ, Abusive Sexual Contact. Because this investigation is ongoing, I have attached the notice of investigation from OSI as a supporting document.”

According to Special Order [Work-Product] dated 1 Jul 22, the applicant was promoted to the grade of major, effective and with a date of rank of 1 Jul 22.

On 19 Aug 22, according to Special Orders [Work-Product] and [Work-Product] dated 1 Jul 22, states: “Major promotion order revoked totally based on the initiation of a Promotion Propriety action.”

On 23 Aug 22, according to AF Form 3070C, *Record of Non-Judicial Punishment Proceedings (Officer)*, provided by applicant, the applicant’s GP/CC notified the applicant they were considering recommending [Work-Product] punish him under Article 15, UCMJ for the following: “Violation of UCMJ, Article 120; You, did, at or near Fairbanks, [Work-Prod...], on or about 6 May 22, touch the buttocks of [Work-Pro...], with your hands, with an intent to gratify your sexual desire, without her consent.”

On 29 Aug 22, according to AF Form 3070C, the applicant elected to demand trial by court-martial in lieu of non-judicial punishment.

On 6 Jan 23, according to AF 4363, document provided by applicant, he was notified by his SQ/CC his promotion delay under DAFI 36-2501, paragraph 5.4, was being extended until 1 Mar 23.

On 11 Jan 23, according to an LOR, the applicant’s GP/CC issued him an LOR as the result of an investigation which disclosed that on or about 7 May 22, at or near <redacted>, he was TDY and decided to go to multiple bars and drink alcohol with a group of four enlisted airmen, to include [Work-Pro...]. As [Work-Prod...] was entering the second bar, <redacted> Bar, he slapped her buttocks with both of his hands from a position immediately behind her. His decision to go to multiple bars and drink alcohol with enlisted airmen then slap [Work-Prod...]’s buttocks shows an undue familiarity with the enlisted force and constitutes a clear violation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), Article 128, Assault Consummated by Battery. On that same date, he acknowledged receipt and had three (3) duty days to provide a response for consideration.

On 23 Jan 23, he provided his response.

On 21 Mar 23, according to AF Form 4364, *Record of Promotion Delay Resolution*, the applicant was notified of his SQ/CC's recommendation that his pending promotion delay be resolved and his name be removed from the promotion list. On 12 Apr 23, the applicant acknowledge receipt of this notification. Further, on 18 Apr 23, he indicates that he consulted with a lawyer and submitted a written statement.

On 21 Mar 23, according to memorandum *Request for Rescission of Administrative Action*, provided by applicant, he appealed his LOR to the <redacted> Air Force Commander, contending the standard of proof for adverse administrative actions and the preponderance of the evidence, had not been met.

On 28 Mar 23, according to a *Response to Request for Rescission of Letter of Reprimand memorandum*, the <redacted> denied the applicant's request stating the requested relief rests only with the BCMR.

On 10 May 23, according to AF Form 4364, the wing judge advocate (WG/JA) review found the record to be legally sufficient and on 11 May 23, the Wing Commander recommended the applicant's name be removed from the promotion list.

On 28 Sep 23, according to AF Form 4364, the Judge Advocate General's (AF/JA) legal review followed by the General Counsel's legal review on 30 Sep 23, found the record legally sufficient.

On 15 Oct 23, according to AF Form 715, *Officer Performance Brief, (O-1 thru O-6)*, for the period of 16 Oct 22 – 31 Aug 23, the applicant received a referral report, which reflects the following in the section titled *Referral Report*: During this reporting period, <applicant> slapped the buttocks of a female subordinate in violation of Article 128 for which he received a LOR. It further reflects on 13 Oct 23 he was notified a referral report was rendered and he had three (3) duty days in which to provide a response.

On 16 Oct 23, according to AF Form 4364, the Secretary of the Air Force approved the applicant's removal from the promotion list, followed by the applicant acknowledgement of receipt of the decision on 20 Oct 23.

According to a document provided by the applicant, on 17 Oct 23, he provided a response to the referral OPB.

On 6 Apr 24, according to the applicant's DD Form 214, *Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*, he resigned in the grade of captain (O-3). He was credited with 11 years, 5 months, and 14 days of active service this period and a total of 15 years, 2 months, and 9 days of total active service.

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

APPLICABLE AUTHORITY/GUIDANCE

Department of the Air Force Instruction (DAFI) 36-2907, *Adverse Administrative Actions*, 14 Oct 22:

1.2.3. All adverse information as defined by this instruction will be permanently placed in the MPerRGp. **(T-0)** Except for the set aside of a court-martial or nonjudicial punishment, removal of adverse information from the MPerRGp may only be directed pursuant to an Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR) recommendation.

2.2. Standard of Proof. The Standard of Proof for adverse administrative actions is the “preponderance of evidence.” This standard will be used when evaluating the evidence and every element of the alleged offenses. A preponderance of the evidence exists when it is more likely than not that events have occurred as alleged. Preponderance of the evidence is not determined by the number of witnesses or exhibits, but by all the evidence and evaluating facts such as a witness’ behavior, opportunity for knowledge, information possessed, ability to recall, as well as related events and relationships being considered. Consider whether such proof is available before initiating the administrative action. If such proof is lacking, administrative action may be determined legally insufficient and, as a result, could be set aside. There is no requirement to prove any allegation beyond a reasonable doubt.

2.3.5. Letter of Reprimand. Administrative censure for violation of standards which is more severe than a Record of Individual Counseling (RIC), Letter of Counseling (LOC), Letter of Admonishment (LOA) and indicates a stronger degree of official censure. It may also be issued when other, less severe methods have failed to correct behavior.

DAFI 36- 2406, *Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems*, 1.10. Referral Evaluations. 1.10.1. Purpose. Referral procedures are established to allow the ratee due process by giving the ratee an opportunity to respond and/or rebut any negative ratings or comments before it becomes a matter of record. Additionally, it allows evaluators to consider all the facts, including any they may not have been aware of, prior to the evaluation becoming a matter of record.

1.10.2.2. Any evaluator whose ratings or comments causes an evaluation to become a referral evaluation must give the ratee the opportunity to comment on the evaluation.

1.10.2.9. All original documents will remain attached to the original evaluation.

1.10.4. Who Refers a Performance Evaluation? 1.10.4.1. Any evaluator whose rating(s) or comment(s) causes the evaluation to be a referral will refer the evaluation to the ratee.

1.10.5.3. The Referral Reviewer. (The Evaluator Named in the Referral Document. 1.10.5.3.1. Must allow the ratee 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-extended active duty) to submit a rebuttal. **(T-1)** If the ratee needs additional time, e.g., due to the non-availability of an Area Defense Counsel or the referral reviewer has returned the rebuttal because it is more than 10 pages, the referral reviewer may grant an extension. However, the referral reviewer will not review the evaluation until the 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-extended active members) have passed, even if the ratee has indicated that they will not submit comments.

1.10.5.3.2.2. Place the applicable mandatory statement in the evaluator’s comment block of the appropriate evaluation.

1.10.5.3.2.2.1. If the ratee provided comments, enter the statement: "I have carefully considered (ratee's name) comments to the referral document of (date)." Ensure this date is the date of the referral memorandum, not the evaluation close-out date or the date of the ratee’s rebuttal. Subsequent evaluators do not enter this statement.

1.10.5.3.2.2.2. If the ratee does not forward comments within 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-extended active duty) (plus mailing time and any approved extensions), prepare an endorsement to the evaluation and include the statement: "Comments from the ratee were requested but were not received within the required period." (T-1) Then forward the evaluation for normal processing.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION

AFPC/DPMSSM recommends denying the request to remove the LOR from his records. Upon review of the documentation provided by the applicant and careful analysis of the pertinent facts, it has been determined there is insufficient evidence to support the claims of error or injustice in relation to the administration of the LOR. He was administered an LOR for Assault Consummated by Battery, by slapping an enlisted airman on the buttocks. The issuance of the LOR by the commander aligns with the guidelines outlined in DAFI 36-2907 and no procedural norms have been identified that would warrant exclusion of it from his records. He acknowledged receipt at which time he was advised he had three duty days to provide a response. He provided a written response and the issuing authority advised him that his response was considered when deciding to sustain the LOR. Additionally, a review of the applicant's MPerRGp shows the LOR and the applicant's response to the LOR has been filed accordingly.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit C.

AFPC/JA recommends granting the applicant's request to remove the LOR from his records. The Chief, Officer Personnel Law, defers to others to address the referral OPB and the promotion issues, and limits their advisory opinion to addressing the LOR. In this regard, the applicant has proven a material error or injustice warranting relief. By regulation, Air Force commanders and supervisors are charged with the responsibility to administratively censure inappropriate behavior in appropriate circumstances. As stated in DAFI 36-2907, "Adverse administrative actions are intended to improve, correct, and instruct subordinates who violate Department of the Air Force (DAF) standards whether on or off duty." LORs are discretionary in nature, must be supported by the preponderance of the evidence, and will not be disturbed unless the evidence is not sufficient and/or the action constitutes abuse of discretion.

The elements of Assault Consummated by Battery are as follows: 1. That the accused did bodily harm to a certain person; 2. That the bodily harm was done unlawfully; and 3. That the bodily harm was done with force or violence. The UCMJ defines "bodily harm" as "an offensive touch of another, however slight." To be "unlawful," the assault "must be done without legal justification or excuse and without the lawful consent of the person affected." According to the UCMJ, "If bodily harm is inflicted unintentionally and without culpable negligence, there is no battery." "Culpable negligence" is defined as "a degree of carelessness greater than simple negligence. It is a negligent act or omission accompanied by a culpable disregard for the foreseeable consequences to others of the act or omission."

The adverse actions resulted from an incident involving the applicant and a female enlisted member, [Work-Pro...], while they were TDY to <redacted>. Specifically, they, along with several other members of their unit, went out for drinks at a local bar one night. Upon leaving the bar, five of them decided to visit one last bar before heading back to the hotel. When they arrived at this bar, they encountered numerous homeless people crowding the door. The applicant held open the door while others entered. At some point, he began to push the group inside to rush past the homeless

people. According to [Work-Prod...]'s statement to the AFOSI, the applicant "used both hands and aggressively slapped my butt." [Work-Prod...], indicated he immediately apologized, but it made her uncomfortable. Inside the bar, she told one of the other females in the group, [Work-Prod...], about the incident and claims she also told one of the male members of the group, [Work-Product], on the way back to the hotel that her "bottom was sore from how hard [applicant] hit [her]." According to the applicant's response to the LOR, "As I held the door, I caught movement out of my eye to the right and felt uneasy, wanting to get everyone into the building and off the street. I swung my right arm palm-down from my side straight up and out to urge people through the door, striking one person on the backside in the process." He indicated that he did not realize it was [Work-Prod...] at the time, but when she turned around, he apologized and said it was an accident. According to [Work-Prod...]'s statement to AFOSI, [Work-Prod...] approached her inside the bar and said, "[Applicant] just smacked my ass." When [Work-Prod...] questioned why, [Work-Prod...] responded, "We were all crushed in the doorway; probably just an accident or accidental shove." [Work-Prod...] did not witness the incident, but believed it was, in fact, an "accident of herding people into a bar." According to [Work-Product] statement to AFOSI, "[Applicant] was holding the door open with his left hand while rushing people through the door with his right hand. He was in a hurry to get people inside the bar because of a recent shooting at the hotel across the street from the bar. While rushing people through the door, [applicant's] right hand accidentally hit [Work-Prod...] on the buttocks." [Work-Product] indicated while he did not actually see what happened with [Work-Prod...], he thought the applicant touched everyone as he "rushed them into the bar." As a result of the incident, the applicant's commander served him with an LOR for violation of Article 128, UCMJ, Assault Consummated by Battery.

The evidence is not sufficient to support an Assault Consummated by Battery. While the applicant did do "bodily harm" to [Work-Prod...], as the "touch" was offensive to her, a preponderance of the evidence indicates it is more likely than not it was inflicted unintentionally and without culpable negligence. The applicant, [Work-Prod...], and [Work-Product] all characterized the incident as accidental. [Wo...] herself told [Work-Pro...] "it was probably just an accident." Given the circumstances; applicant was holding the door open for everyone, there were numerous homeless people crowding the entry, and there was a recent shooting nearby, it is reasonable to conclude the applicant was simply trying to protect everyone by quickly ushering them inside and in doing so, accidentally brushed [Work-Prod...]'s backside, as she was the last one through the door before the applicant. He immediately apologized, lending further credence to the theory it was accidental. There is no doubt [Work-Prod...] did not consent to, nor appreciate, being touched by the applicant. However, the evidence indicates it was an accident; if anything, an act of simple negligence, rather than assault consummated by battery.

Therefore, the LOR is legally unsupportable.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit D.

AF/JAJI recommends denying the applicant's request. There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate a legal error or injustice. The applicant's GP/CC issued him an LOR stemming from an incident in which the applicant was found to have slapped the buttocks of a female enlisted airman while entering a bar. The airman claimed the applicant slapped her buttocks from behind with both of his hands. The applicant claimed he accidentally touched the airman while ushering a group through the doorway. No other airmen directly witnessed the incident. The GP/CC considering both the AFOSI ROI and the applicant's response to the LOR, decided to sustain the LOR. The applicant was then issued a referral OPB for the relevant reporting period, which was maintained by the applicant's additional rater. Following a promotion delay and the procedures

of a PPA, the Secretary of the Air Force (SecAF) removed the applicant's name from the promotion list.

In accordance with DAFI 36-3803, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)*, 3.4.4, "[t]he applicant has the burden of proof of providing evidence in support of their allegation(s) of an error or injustice," the BCMR is bound to draw every reasonable inference from the evidence in favor of the principles who resolved the questions of fact and took the actions at issue. Deference is not blind as the BCMR can reverse an arbitrary or capricious decision for abuse of power in accordance with *Roberts v. United States*, 741, F.3d 152, 158 (D.C. Cir 2014). Therefore, a rational factfinder could conclude it is more likely than not the alleged misconduct occurred under the applicable preponderance of the evidence standard, as defined in DAFI 36-2907. The referral OPB and the removal from the promotion list were follow-on actions to the LOR, for which the applicant had the opportunity to submit additional matters for consideration by multiple reviewing authorities, including the SecAF. Concerning AFPC/JA's legal advisory, every reasonable inference from the evidence supports the decisions of the principals who resolved the questions of facts and took the actions at issue.

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 16 Jul 24 for comment (Exhibit F), but has received no response.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION

AFPC/DPMSPE addresses only the applicant's request to remove the referral OPB from his record and recommends granting the applicant's request. The applicant contends the contested referral OPB was rendered unjust based on a legally insufficient LOR he received based on a faulty investigation and lack of credibility. However, after careful review of the evaluation in his MPerRGp (ARMS record), they found numerous errors on the evaluation that it was not accomplished in accordance with DAFI 36-2406, paragraph 1.10. The first error on the evaluation is the rater failed to document in his assessment why the OPB was being referred IAW with paragraph 1.10.4.1 and the dates the rater signed the evaluation and the date of the referral memorandum of the back of the AF Form 715 do not match IAW with paragraph 1.10.5.1. Next, the referring reviewer failed to put one of the mandatory statements of where the applicant provided a rebuttal IAW paragraph 1.10.5.1.3.2.2.1 or 1.10.5.1.3.2.2.2. Lastly, based on the supporting documents [provided by the applicant] it appears the applicant's rebuttal was not attached to the OPB when it became a matter of record. Through no fault of the applicant, the rebuttal from the applicant is missing; therefore, they cannot conclude the applicant was afforded due process. Although the mention of the contested LOR may be valid and completely within the evaluator's authority to do so, the OPB is incomplete and should be removed from his record and replace with DAF 77, *Letter of Evaluation*.

Therefore, they recommend approval to void the report in its entirety based on it being incomplete. However, they defer all other aspects of the applicant's request to the relevant appropriate agencies or offices of primary responsibility.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit G.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The Board sent a copy of the advisory opinion to the applicant on 17 Jul 24 for comment (Exhibit H), and the applicant replied on 14 Aug 24. In his response, the applicant contended the AFPC/JA advisory supports his contention the evidence does not support the charge of Assault Consummated by Battery; thus, the LOR is not supported by either the evidence or a preponderance of the evidence. Further, the issuance of the LOR was a violation of his due process rights for the following reasons: 1. Upon his refusal to accept NJP and election of trial by court-martial for the alleged violation of Article 120, Sexual Abusive Contact, he provided a rebuttal to his GP/CC to provide to the court-martial convening authority, <redacted> Commander. This rebuttal caused a delay and the response from the <redacted> Commander. The response was to an LOR for an Article 128, a completely different UCMJ charge. 2. The <redacted> Commander not granting his request to be tried by court-martial. Further, there is a disparity from the AF Form 4363 and the AF Form 973. He never had the opportunity of review or comment on this document and only discovered it when he was reviewing his entire military record. The order states: "Major <redacted> promotion order revoked totally based on initiation of Promotion Propriety action" and is signed by a GS-06, dated 19 Aug 22, and an "OFFICIAL" is placed in the signature block of the authenticating official with the exact same date of 19 Aug 22. With the same date and no wet signature it is plausible that is was never reviewed by the Administrative Assistant to SecAF. With a date of 19 Aug 22 on the AF Form 973 and the NJP dated 23 Aug 22, no determination of a charge or actions had been authorized to implement a removal from the promotion list. Therefore, no action could be taken in processing the AF Form 973 to totally revoke the promotion order.

The action taken by Air Force leadership against him was unethical, illegal, and not supported by the evidence. The witnesses have described the incident as an accident. In this situation he was doing what he has always done, protecting his fellow service members. Safety was his biggest concern and he finds it difficult to understand how this situation got so out of balance and has cost him everything in his military career and put so much hardship and stress on him and his family. The truth is he did not commit this crime and he should not be treated as a criminal and stripped of his rank and career due to an incident that <redacted> herself stated was an accident.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit I.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

1. The application was timely filed.
2. The applicant exhausted all available non-judicial relief before applying to the Board.
3. The Board reviewed the complete evidence of record to reach its own independent determination, and after reviewing all Exhibits, the Board concludes the applicant is not the victim of an error or injustice and expunging the applicant's Letter of Reprimand from his official military record is not warranted. The applicant contends that he never intentionally committed assault consummated by battery and that the resulting LOR failed to meet the preponderance of the evidence standard. While the Board notes the conflicting advisory opinions, we afforded both AF/JAJI and AFPC/JA advisories equal consideration, and one by nature was given greater weight. The AF/JAJI advisory closely scrutinized the LOR and pointedly discussed the sufficiency of the evidence. The applicant's commander issued him an LOR for slapping the buttocks of a female enlisted member while entering a bar. The applicant does not deny he touched the victim, but states it was "accidental" while ushering her through the doorway and although the "touch" may

have been unintentional, it was nonetheless offensive to the complainant, and the evidence is sufficient to support Assault Consummated by Battery. Given the circumstances, the Board determines the applicant's decision to go to multiple bars and drink alcohol with enlisted airmen then slap the buttocks of an enlisted female airman showed an undue familiarity with the enlisted force and constitutes a clear violation of the UCMJ. The Board finds the type of behavior violates Air Force standards and professionalism expected of an Air Force commissioned officer. In addition, the Board determines the subsequent related adverse actions (referral Officer Performance Brief, Promotion Propriety Action) to be appropriate. His 31 Aug 23 OPB meets the criteria of AFI 36-2406, as the reference to his LOR is reasonably specific and clearly outlines the event/behavior of the applicant, to include the resulting action and the PPA action was pursuant to Congressional mandate, Department of Defense, and Air Force policies, which require all adverse information to be filed in an officer's Master Personnel Records Group record and Officer Selection Brief. As such, the Board finds the evidence does not demonstrate an error or injustice warranting the removal of the LOR or the referral OPB as they were neither unjust or inaccurate as written and fell well within the commander's authority. Moreover, the Board does not find the applicant's situation unique compared to similarly situated officers. Therefore, the Board recommends against correcting the record.

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 Department of the Air Force Instruction (DAFI) 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)*, paragraph 2.1, considered Docket Number BC-2024-00813 in Executive Session on 10 Dec 24, 14 Jan 25 and 30 May 25:

Work-Product

Panel Chair

Work-Product

Panel Member

Work-Product

Panel Member

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

- Exhibit A: Application, DD Form 149, w/atchs, dated 1 Mar 24.
- Exhibit B: Documentary evidence, including relevant excerpts from official records.
- Exhibit C: Advisory Opinion, AFPC/DPMSM, dated 9 May 24.
- Exhibit D: Advisory Opinion, AFPC/JA, dated 3 Jun 24.
- Exhibit E: Advisory Opinion, AF/JAJI, dated 15 Jul 24.
- Exhibit F: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 16 Jul 24.
- Exhibit G: Advisory Opinion, AFPC/DPMSPE, dated 16 Jul 24.
- Exhibit H: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 17 Jul 24.
- Exhibit E: Applicant's Response, w/atchs, dated 14 Aug 24.

Work-Product

Work-Product

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.

6/23/2025

X

Work-Product

Work-Product

Board Operations Manager, AFBCMR
Signed by: USAF

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2024-00813

Work-Product

Work-Product