

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2024-02777

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

COUNSEL: XXXXXXXXXXXX

HEARING REQUESTED: NO

APPLICANT'S REQUEST

His bad conduct discharge (BCD) be upgraded to an honorable discharge and his narrative reason for separation be changed from "Court-Martial" to "Secretarial Authority" with corresponding separation code.

APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS

According to counsel, the applicant enlisted in the Air Force when he was only 19-years old. Throughout his service, the applicant struggled with multiple mental health issues, including Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), attentive type, that can result in impulsivity, personality disorder, and depression. His mental health struggles peaked after the Air Force appointed him as the Lost and Found Baggage Representative, a position that proved very difficult for the applicant because he felt isolated and alone. During this time, the applicant made what he acknowledges to be a terrible judgment decision to take items home with him from Lost and Found. The Air Force opened an investigation into the applicant in which they charged him with violating Article 92, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) for storing 1,000 .22 rifle cartridges and 23 various shotgun shells in his dormitory room, and violating Article 121, UCMJ, by taking various items of military property, totaling in value of more than \$500.00. The applicant later had to be admitted to a behavioral health center for depression and suicidal ideations in the context of the investigation.

The Air Force preferred special court-martial charges on 29 Mar 04 to which the applicant pled guilty to both charges on 2 Apr 04. On 5 Apr 04, the special court-martial convened where they accepted the applicant's guilty plea and sentenced him to a reduction in rank to airman basic (E-1), confinement for six months, forfeiture of \$745.00 pay per month for six months, and a BCD. The applicant served for a total of 3 years, 6 months, and 13 days before the Air Force separated him with a BCD, a narrative reason of "Court Martial," and a reentry code of 2M.

In counsel's argument, he references Title 10, United States Code § 1552 (10 USC § 1552) and Air Force Instruction (AFI) 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Record (AFBCMR)*, in support of jurisdiction and timeliness.

First and foremost, the applicant accepts full responsibility for his misconduct while in the Air Force. He recognizes he acted in a manner that was detrimental to the discipline, morale, and well-being of his fellow airmen and the Air Force. The applicant comes before the Board today as a contrite and repentant man, but he acknowledges his actions were counter to the high standards expected of the members of our Armed Forces. However, despite the applicant's actions that led to his BCD, he seeks relief from his discharge so he may clear his name and restore his honor.

Since being discharged, the applicant has worked exceptionally hard to prove he is a better man than what his discharge paperwork reflects. After his impulsive lapse in judgment ended his military career, the applicant had difficulties finding job opportunities. He then started taking

courses with a community college and received his certificate in Basic Electrical Wiring (Residential) on 20 Nov 08 as well as his certificate for EPA Refrigerant Recovery/Recycling on 27 Jul 13. He then went on to earn his certificate in Basic Air Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration on 22 Jul 14. After completing a Boating Safety Course in 2020, the applicant decided to pursue new employment opportunities as a security guard. On 2 Feb 21, the applicant became certified in Cardio-Pulmonary Resuscitation. On 1 Jun 21, the applicant applied for an armed employment placement. Then, on 2 Jun 21, he applied for an unarmed placement. The applicant received his OC/Pepper Spray-Handcuff Certification on 14 Jun 21, and on 17 Jun 21, he received his Firearms Training Certificate.

Numerous people came forward to attest to the applicant's character even as he was facing a special court-martial. Counsel provided excerpts from character statements in support of this contention. The applicant's outstanding post-service actions and contributions to his community in the protective industry warrant a records correction under the clemency standard. He remains immensely proud of his military service, but his pride is also tempered by a profound sense of shame for his misconduct that led to his discharge. The applicant was immediately remorseful because his actions cost him his military career. He was also ashamed of how his actions impacted the Air force, his fellow airmen, and his good name. At the time of his special court-martial, numerous people expressed that the applicant was a reliable, trustworthy, and hard-working individual, but they also displayed a strong belief he could be rehabilitated. The applicant's accomplishments and persistence to improve even when he was having employment difficulties shows their belief was, and still is, correct. The applicant has rehabilitated himself and grown past the young person he was when he made that mistake. He now seeks to restore his good name and honor so he can leave this unfortunate chapter of his life in the past and continue to move forward with a clear conscience and continue to provide for his family. The applicant has demonstrated his true character and integrity since being released from confinement and will continue to prove himself as a valuable and respectable member of his community.

In support of his request for a discharge upgrade, the applicant provides a personal statement, excerpts from his military human resources record, numerous post-service certificates of training, community college certificates and transcripts, 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 basic (E-1).

On 5 Apr 04, according to Special Court-Martial Order (SCMO) Number XX, dated 26 May 04, the applicant was arraigned at court-martial for the following offenses:

- Charge I – Article 92. Plea: G. Finding: G.
 - Specification: In that [the applicant], who knew of his duties at Charleston Air Force Base (AFB), South Carolina (SC), on or about 5 Dec 03, was derelict in the performance of those duties in that he willfully failed to refrain from storing approximately 1,000 .22 rifle cartridges and 23 boxes of various shotgun shells in his dormitory room, as it was his duty to do. Plea: G. Finding: G.

- Charge II – Article 121. Plea: G. Finding: G.
 - Specification: In that [the applicant] did, at or near Charleston AFB, SC between on or about 1 Mar 03 and on or about 5 Dec 03, steal items, military property, of a value of more than \$500.00, the property of the United States. Plea: G. Finding: G.

The applicant was sentenced to a BCD, confinement for six months, reduction to the grade of airman basic (E-1), and forfeiture of \$795.00 pay per month for six months. The sentence was approved, and except for the BCD, was executed.

On 2 Jun 05, according to SCMO Number XX, the sentence to a BCD, confinement for six months, reduction to the grade of airman basic (E-1), and forfeiture of \$795.00 pay per month for six months, as promulgated in SCMO Number XX, dated 26 May 04, has been finally affirmed. Article 71(c) having been complied with, the BCD will be executed. The sentence was adjudged on 5 Apr 04.

According to DD Form 214, *Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*, on 2 Jun 05, the applicant received a BCD. His narrative reason for separation is "Court-Martial" with separation code "JJD" [Court-Martial (Other)]. The applicant was credited with 3 years, 6 months, and 13 days of total active service.

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

POST-SERVICE INFORMATION

On 31 Jan 25, 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 20 Feb 25 and provided supplemental medical documentation. The applicant provided a copy of his FBI Report with his original application. According to the report, the applicant has had no arrests since discharge.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit 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 (USD P&R) issued clarifying guidance to Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records considering requests by veterans for modification of their discharges due in whole or in part to mental health conditions [PTSD, Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), sexual assault, or sexual harassment]. Liberal consideration will be given to veterans petitioning for discharge relief when the application for relief is based in whole or in part on the aforementioned conditions.

Under Consideration of Mitigating Factors, it is noted that PTSD is not a likely cause of premeditated misconduct. Correction Boards will exercise caution in weighing evidence of mitigation in all cases of misconduct by carefully considering the likely causal relationship of symptoms to the misconduct. Liberal consideration does not mandate an upgrade. Relief may be 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 20 Feb 25, 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 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 for the desired change to his records.

This Psychological Advisor has reviewed the available and submitted records and finds the applicant's mental health condition did not have a direct impact or was a contributing factor to his misconduct resulting in his special court-martial conviction and BCD. Although there is evidence from the applicant's testimony during his special court-martial trial he suffered from ADHD and depression, and his psychiatrist confirmed he was diagnosed with ADHD, depression/general depression, and personality disorder NOS [Not Otherwise Specified], these conditions appeared to have preceded or resulted from his misconduct. The applicant reported having ADHD and depression prior to his service, and his stressful and lonesome duties as a Lost and Found Baggage Representative may have aggravated these prior-service conditions. However, these conditions did not cause his misconduct. The applicant was convicted at a special court-martial for wrongfully storing approximately 1,000 .22 rifle cartridges and 23 boxes of various shotgun shells in his dormitory room and, on diverse occasions, stealing military property, about 47 various items, belonging to the Air Force, with total value of more than \$500.00. These actions and misconducts had occurred multiple times over a prolonged period of time, and as his psychiatrist had testified during his special court-martial proceedings, these repeated misconducts do not demonstrate impulsivity or impulsive behaviors, symptoms of ADHD or Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD). Furthermore, the applicant wrongfully appropriated numerous items, big and small, which also does not support his behaviors were impulsive or were isolated acts. This Psychological Advisor concurs with the psychiatrist's opinion and assessment that conditions of ADHD or ADD do not produce behaviors like these, and it appears the applicant's behaviors were deliberate. His psychiatrist also testified ADD does not make one want to lie or steal, or inhibit one's ability to distinguish between right and wrong, and this was applicable to the applicant. This Psychological Advisor again concurs with the opinion having ADHD or ADD does not cause any of these behaviors or decisions. There is also no evidence the applicant's conditions of depression or personality disorder NOS had caused any of these behaviors. There may be some personality disorders that may cause one to lie and steal, but they do not excuse or mitigate any of his behaviors. His psychiatrist did state the applicant's ADD may have prompted him to blurt out a lie unexpectedly, but the applicant was not convicted nor discharged for being untruthful or dishonest. There is no evidence the applicant's mental health condition had caused any of his convicted offenses and misconduct. There is no evidence he was in emotional distress or had any cognitive or intellectual deficit issues at the time of any of his misconducts that would impair his judgment causing his misconduct. The applicant informed his psychiatrist at the Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA), on 10 Dec 21, there was a misunderstanding about him taking gear home and he was unaware he could not take it for his personal use. This explanation also does not demonstrate his mental health condition, including ADHD, depression, or personality disorder caused his misconduct. Again, his misconducts were generally not consistent with behaviors displayed in individuals who have or were diagnosed with conditions of ADHD, attentive type, general depression, or personality disorder NOS with dependent to borderline traits.

There is evidence the applicant was hospitalized for depression and suicidal ideation "in the context of a military investigation" from his special court-martial transcript. From this report, his depression and suicidal ideation were in response to his stressors of being under investigation, leading him to experience depression and suicidal ideation. These symptoms were the result and consequences of the applicant's own misconduct and did not proceed with his misconduct or investigation. They occurred after his misconduct was discovered, so these symptoms did not cause his misconduct.

According to the applicant's DVA treatment records, he was diagnosed and treated for bipolar disorder as early as 2019, years after his discharge from the Air Force. There is no evidence he had bipolar disorder, or he had experienced a manic or hypomanic episode during service. There is no evidence the applicant's misconduct occurred during any of these types of episodes or that his manic or hypomanic episode caused his misconduct. A condition like bipolar disorder may take time to develop which may have caused him to be diagnosed with bipolar disorder at a later time in his life. The applicant had depression before and during service, which is a symptom of bipolar disorder, but not everyone who has depression or depressive symptoms would develop bipolar disorder. He may have experienced an early onset of bipolar disorder during service because he had depression, but again, there is no evidence his depression caused his misconduct and discharge.

After an exhaustive review of the available records, this Psychological Advisor finds no identifiable error or injustice with his discharge from a mental health perspective. Therefore, his request for an upgrade of his discharge and change of narrative reason for separation based on his mental health condition is not supported.

Liberal consideration is applied to the applicant's request due to his contention of having a mental health condition. It is reminded that liberal consideration does not mandate an upgrade or a change to the records per policy guidance. The following are responses to the four questions from the Kurta Memorandum from the available records for review:

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

The applicant's legal counsel contended the applicant had struggled with multiple mental health issues including ADHD, attentive type, that could result in impulsivity, personality disorder, and depression. His mental health struggles peaked after the Air Force appointed him as the Lost and Found Baggage Representative as he felt isolated and alone in this position. The applicant acknowledged he made a terrible judgment decision to take home items with him from the Lost and Found.

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

The applicant's entire service treatment records are not available or submitted by the applicant for review. A transcript of his special court-martial trial was provided revealing the applicant was hospitalized for depression and suicidal ideation in the context of a military investigation. He was diagnosed with ADHD, attentive type, depression/general depression, and personality disorder NOS with dependent to borderline traits during service. The applicant's psychiatrist testified he had been treated for ADHD and personality disorder prior to his military service. The applicant was diagnosed with bipolar disorder several years after his discharge by his community and DVA providers. There is no evidence the applicant had bipolar disorder or experienced a manic or hypomanic episode during service.

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

There is no evidence the applicant's mental health condition, including ADHD, depression, or personality disorder NOS had a direct impact or was a contributing factor to his misconduct of wrongfully storing and appropriating numerous items belonging to the Air Force for which he was convicted at special court-martial resulting in his BCD. His misconduct had occurred multiple times and over a prolonged period of time and does not demonstrate they were impulsive behaviors but appeared to be deliberate. There is no evidence the applicant was in emotional distress or had any cognitive or intellectual deficit issues at the time of any of his misconducts that would impair his judgment causing his misconduct. Therefore, his mental health condition does not excuse or mitigate his discharge.

4. Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge?

Since the applicant's mental health condition does not excuse or mitigate his discharge, his mental health condition also does not outweigh his original discharge.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit E.

AF/JAJI recommends denying the application finding insufficient evidence to recommend relief on the basis of legal error.

The applicant entered active duty in Nov 01 and attained the rank of airman first class (E-3) prior to his court-martial in 2004. Consistent with his pleas, the applicant was convicted of one charge and one specification of wrongfully possessing rifle cartridges and shotgun shells in his dormitory in violation of Article 92, UCMJ. He was also convicted, consistent with his pleas, of one charge and one specification of larceny in violation of Article 112, UCMJ for stealing numerous items of military property (of a value of more than \$500). The thefts took place on numerous occasions from 1 Mar 03 through 5 Dec 04¹. On 5 Apr 04, the applicant was sentenced to a BCD, confinement for six months, forfeiture of \$795.00 pay per month for six months, and reduction to airman basic (E-1).

The U.S. Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals issued an unpublished opinion on 7 Jan 05, denying the applicant's appeal, and denying relief. *United States v. [applicant]*. His request for review by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces was also subsequently denied. *United States v. [applicant]*.

The applicant asserts his outstanding post-service actions and contributions to his community in the protective [security] industry warrant a records correction under the clemency standard. He also indicated his request is related to mental health, and in support of his contention, the applicant's legal counsel submitted a partial transcript from the applicant's special court-martial. The transcript included testimony from a mental health provider and the applicant's own unsworn statement. The AFBCMR's Psychological Advisor reviewed these records and found insufficient evidence to support the applicant's request for the desired changes to his records from a mental health perspective.

The applicant supplied a 2023 FBI Identity History Summary Check for consideration. He appears to have no additional arrests or convictions between 2005 and 2023.

In accordance with 10 USC § 1552(f), because the applicant's request for a discharge upgrade pertains to records resulting from a court-martial conviction and sentence, the AFBCMR can only take two types of action: (1) correction of a record to reflect an action taken by reviewing authorities under the UCMJ (e.g. convening authority clemency or appellate corrections); or (2) action on the sentence of a court-martial for purposes of clemency. The applicant has provided no evidence of an error in any record of action taken by a reviewing authority of his court-martial. Therefore, the only correction for consideration is action on the applicant's court-martial sentence for the purposes of clemency.

The Board may determine clemency is warranted or appropriate in the applicant's case, or there is a basis for relief under the equity, injustice, or clemency considerations pursuant to the Wilkie Memorandum, or the guidance for liberal consideration of mental health issues pursuant to the Kurta Memorandum. Nevertheless, the Board should consider important factors to the contrary. First, the Psychological Advisor determined there was insufficient mental health-related information to support the applicant's request. Second, in accordance with paragraph 19 of the attachment to the Kurta Memorandum, "[p]remeditated misconduct is not generally excused by

¹ Typographical error; should read 5 Dec 03.

mental health conditions...” The applicant’s offenses involve premeditated misconduct, specifically offenses related to violating a lawful order and larceny.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit F.

APPLICANT’S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The Board sent copies of the advisory opinions to the applicant on 20 Feb 25 for comment (Exhibit G) and the applicant replied on 22 Mar 25. In his response, counsel contends the applicant does not deflect his plea nor responsibility by incorporating his mental health conditions that existed when he committed the offenses in question. Furthermore, the applicant does not claim legal error should result in the upgrade of his discharge. Rather, he offers this evidence to provide color and context to the circumstances which led to his conviction and discharge. The applicant understands his actions in taking home items from the Lost and Found as well as storing ammunition in his dormitory is inconsistent with Air Force service and seeks redemption from this Board through clemency. Counsel provided an excerpt from the applicant’s statement at sentencing in support. The applicant furthered his allocution for his offenses by highlighting his severe depression, ADHD, ADD, and suicidal ideation following his isolation working Lost and Found to give the military judge context as to his circumstances before committing the offenses. At no point does the applicant say he is not responsible for his conduct due to his mental health concerns.

The applicant has submitted a plethora of examples of post-service conduct that warrant an upgrade from this Board. The applicant included character statements from individuals who supervised him while in service, knew him his whole life, and supervised him in a civilian capacity. The applicant also provided certifications, post-service work history, and an FBI background check indicating no criminal convictions other than the charged conduct at the applicant’s court-martial. In short, and consistent with his initial petition, the applicant demonstrates sufficient rehabilitation under the Wilkie memorandum to warrant an upgrade to his discharge from this Board with his outstanding post-service accomplishments.

Additionally, the Applicant has provided this Board with his entire medical records in his possession to give further context to his mental health status while in service. The applicant respectfully requests this Board review these records with the understanding he is not claiming his mental health conditions should alleviate his responsibility.

The applicant’s complete response is at Exhibit H.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

1. The application was timely filed. Given the requirement for passage of time, all discharge upgrade requests under fundamental fairness or clemency 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 USC § 1552(b).

2. The applicant exhausted all available non-judicial relief before applying to the Board.

3. After reviewing all Exhibits, to include his rebuttal, 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 finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the applicant’s contentions. There is no evidence the applicant’s mental health condition, including ADHD, depression, or personality disorder NOS had a direct impact or was a contributing factor

to his misconduct. His misconduct had occurred multiple times, and over a prolonged period of time, and does not demonstrate it was impulsive behavior but appeared to be deliberate. There is no evidence the applicant was in emotional distress or had any cognitive or intellectual deficit issues at the time of any of his misconducts that would impair his judgment causing his misconduct. Liberal consideration was applied; however, the applicant's mental health condition does not excuse or mitigate his discharge.

Additionally, the Board concurs with the rationale and recommendation of AF/JAJI and finds no evidence the sentence of the military court was improper or that it exceeded the limitations set forth in the UCMJ. The only correction for consideration by the Board is action on the applicant's court-martial sentence for the purposes of clemency.

The Board considered the passage of time, the overall quality of the applicant's service, the seriousness of the offenses committed, and the applicant's post-service conduct and criminal history. However, the Board finds no basis for clemency in the case. Therefore, the Board recommends against correcting the applicant's records.

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-2024-02777 in Executive Session on 21 May 25:

, 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 7 Aug 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 31 Jan 25.
Exhibit D: Applicant's Response, w/atchs, dated 20 Feb 25.
Exhibit D: FBI Report, dated 23 Oct 23.
Exhibit E: Advisory Opinion, AFRBA Psychological Advisor, dated 28 Jan 25.
Exhibit F: Advisory Opinion, AF/JAJI, dated 11 Feb 25.
Exhibit G: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Counsel, dated 20 Feb 25.
Exhibit H: Counsel's Response, dated 22 Mar 25.

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