



Work-Product

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2024-01108

Work-Product

COUNSEL: NONE

HEARING REQUESTED: YES

APPLICANT'S REQUEST

1. His DD Form 214, *Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*, Block 28, *Narrative Reason for Separation*, be corrected from "Completion of Active Duty Training" to "Completion of Active Duty."
2. He be given a medical separation.

APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS

He received a medical separation but was never given his final paperwork. The Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) pointed out his final discharge paperwork states he received a discharge due to physical impairment, but it should say discharge due to disability. Furthermore, his DD Form 214 states he was in a training status which is incorrect. He was on active-duty orders with the Red Horse Squadron. Both of these issues are causing problems with his DVA claim.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The applicant is a former Air Force Reserve (AFR) senior airman (E-4).

On 16 Jan 11, DD Form 214 reflects the applicant was honorably discharged after serving seven months and nine days of active duty. He was discharged, with a narrative reason for separation of "Initial Active Duty Training."

Dated 8 Feb 11, Reserve Order **Work-Product** indicates the applicant was on active-duty orders from 7 Feb 11 through 13 Feb 11 for Annual Training (AT).

Dated 11 Feb 11, Reserve Order **Work-Product** indicates the applicant was on active duty for training orders from 14 Feb 11 through 15 Jun 11.

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2024-01108

Work-Product

Controlled by: SAF/MRB
CUI Categories: **Work-Product**
Limited Dissemination Control: N/A
POC: SAF.MRBC.Workflow@us.af.mil

On 16 Jun 11, DD Form 214 reflects the applicant was honorably discharged after serving 4 months and 11 days of active duty. He was discharged, with a narrative reason for separation of "Completion of Required Active Duty Training."

On 15 Mar 14, the applicant acknowledged receipt of the memorandum initiating separation action due to physical disqualification.

Dated 3 Apr 14, the applicant's administrative discharge action due to physical disqualification was found legally sufficient.

On 18 Aug 14, the discharge authority directed the applicant be discharged with an honorable service characterization per AFI 36-3209, *Separation and Retirement Procedures for Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Members*, paragraph 3.14 for physical disqualification.

Dated 24 Apr 15, Reserve Order [Work-Product] indicates the applicant was honorably discharged from the AFR for physical disqualification, effective 26 Apr 15.

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

AIR FORCE EVALUATION

ARPC/DPTS recommends denying the applicant's request to have his DD Form 214 reflect "Completion of Required Active Duty." He was on active-duty training orders for the purpose of upgrade training from 6 Feb 11 to 16 Jun 11. Should the applicant have official documentation supporting the contrary, we encourage him to send it to ARPC/DPTS.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit C.

The AFBCMR Medical Advisor recommends denying the applicant's request finding insufficient medical evidence, either supplied by the applicant or found in his electronic health records, to support his implied contention he should have been medically separated or retired for his unfitting asthma. The agencies and processes evaluating the applicant's fitness for duty reached the correct decision in recommending his disqualification, based on the information available at the time, and now. There was no error or injustice that would need to be remedied.

For an individual to go through the fitness-for-duty process, there must first be a medical condition that is disqualifying for military service, in accordance with the AFI 48-123, *Medical Examinations and Standards*. Additionally, a Physical Evaluation Board (PEB) action may be justified when there has been a failure of improvement or resolution of a condition after receiving optimum medical treatment or it has required duty and/or mobility restrictions for 365 days or more, as would be depicted on an AF Form 469, *Duty Limitation Report*, or legacy AF Form 422, *Physical Profile Serial Report*. The applicant's record contained ample evidence of such a condition, symptomatic reactive airway disease, or asthma, controlled with inhaled steroids and bronchodilators, that had significantly impaired his duty performance, prevented him from

performing the essential duties of his position in a RED HORSE squadron, and resulted in medical disqualification. However, the applicant's record contained no evidence this condition was incurred in the line of duty (LOD), or was permanently aggravated by military service, which would have been necessary for him, an AFR member at the time, to have gone through the military's Disability Evaluation System (DES) for consideration of a medical separation or retirement. On the contrary, the applicant's record clearly indicated his disqualifying asthma was appropriately adjudicated for LOD status and was found to have existed prior to service (EPTS-LOD not applicable).

There is no evidence the applicant received, or is receiving, disability compensation from the DVA for his asthma. Nonetheless, it should be noted the military's DES, established to maintain a fit and vital fighting force, can by law, under Title 10, U.S.C., only offer compensation for those service incurred diseases or injuries which specifically rendered a member unfit for continued active service and were the cause for career termination; and then only for the degree of impairment present at the time of separation and not based on post-service progression of disease or injury. To the contrary, the DVA, operating under a different set of laws, Title 38, U.S.C., is empowered to offer compensation for any medical condition with an established nexus with military service, without regard to its impact upon a member's fitness to serve, the narrative reason for release from service, or the length time transpired since the date of discharge. The DVA may also conduct periodic reevaluations for the purpose of adjusting the disability rating awards as the level of impairment from a given medical condition may vary (improve or worsen) over the lifetime of the veteran. In short, even if the DVA had granted the applicant a service connection and/or a disability rating for asthma, this would not in itself constitute evidence the condition would have made him eligible for a medical separation or retirement under the DES.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit D.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The Board sent a copy of the advisory opinion to the applicant on 20 Nov 24 for comment (Exhibit E) 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 and recommendation of ARPC/DPTS and the AFBCMR Medical Advisor and finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the applicant's contentions. The Board finds the applicant was properly evaluated for his medical condition of asthma which rendered him unfit for continued military service; however, his asthma was determined to have EPTS without evidence of permanent service aggravation. Therefore, he was discharged from the AFR with a non-duty related fitness determination, finding his asthma EPTS and was not incurred in the line of duty. Furthermore, the Board finds the evidence does

not support the applicant's request to have his DD Form 214 reflect a non-training status. His orders from the period of 7 Feb 11 through 15 Jun 11 correctly show he was in a training status performing upgrade training at his home station. 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 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-2024-01108 in Executive Session on 18 Dec 24 and 21 Dec 24:

Work-Product

, Panel Chair

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 20 Feb 24.

Exhibit B: Documentary evidence, including relevant excerpts from official records.

Exhibit C: Advisory Opinion, ARPC/DPTS, w/atchs, dated 18 Jul 24.

Exhibit D: Advisory Opinion, AFBCMR Medical Advisor, dated 19 Nov 24.

Exhibit E: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 20 Nov 24.

Taken together with all Exhibits, this document constitutes the true and complete Record of Proceedings, as required by DAFI 36-2603, paragraph 4.12.9.

1/2/2025

Work-Product

Board Operations Manager, AFBCMR
Signed by: USAF