



Wor... Work-Product

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

### RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2025-01525

Work-Product

COUNSEL: Work-Product

HEARING REQUESTED: YES

### APPLICANT'S REQUEST

1. His reentry (RE) code be updated.
2. His record be updated to reflect he completed four years of service.
3. He be granted all entitlements and benefits for his four years of service with an honorable discharge.

### APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS

He should have had the opportunity to finish his four year contract with the Air Force. A memorandum indicated his reenlistment eligibility was denied for knowing someone who abused drugs. He never knew anyone who abused drugs, and he did not know what drugs someone else was using. He is almost sure his life would have taken a different turn if he would have had the chance to finish the remaining time on his contract.

His discharge was upgraded from a general (under honorable conditions) to an honorable discharge. He should not have been discharged from the beginning. He stated he was not a drug abuser, nor did he use drugs. He has had over 40 years to think about the wrong which was done to him. He wants to be awarded the time as if he completed the four years on his contract, and all of the benefits which come with four years of honorable service. He believes an injustice occurred and it is never too late to correct a wrong. He joined the Air Force because he believed in the American idea and it is his duty to fight for an injustice, which is what American soldiers fight for.

In support of his request, he provides case documents from his Air Force Discharge Review Board (AFDRB) upgrade request.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

### STATEMENT OF FACTS

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2025-01525

Wor... Work-Product

Work-Product

Wor...

The applicant is a former Air Force airman basic (E-1).

On 2 Mar 81, the applicant's commander recommended the applicant be discharged from the Air Force, under the provisions of AFM 39-12, *Separation for Unsuitability, Misconduct, Resignation, or Request for Discharge for the Good of the Service and Procedures for the Rehabilitation Program*, paragraph 2-15c for drug abuse. The specific reasons for the recommendation were:

- a. On 20 Feb 81, a Memorandum for Record (MFR) was written, indicating the applicant was identified as a drug abuser as a result of his arrest on or about 15 Feb 81 for alleged possession/use of cannabis products. He was offered an opportunity to attend the drug rehabilitation center. The applicant declined to attend the rehabilitation center.
- b. On 23 Feb 81, a Letter of Reprimand (LOR) was issued for alleged possession/use of cannabis products while entering the base on or about 15 Feb 81.

On 24 Mar 81, the Staff Judge Advocate found the discharge action legally sufficient.

On 1 Apr 81, the discharge authority directed the applicant be discharged for drug abuse, with a general (under honorable conditions) service characterization. Probation and rehabilitation were considered but not offered.

On 1 Apr 81, the applicant received a general (under honorable conditions) discharge. His narrative reason for separation was "Misconduct – Drug abuse – Evaluation Officer" with an RE code of "2C," which denotes "Separated Under AFM 39-12." He was credited with 8 months and 3 days of total active service.

On 20 Apr 82, the applicant submitted a request to the AFDRB for an upgrade of his discharge to honorable, and contended, the facts did not justify a general (under honorable conditions) service characterization.

On 10 Jan 84, the AFDRB concluded the discharge was consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the discharge regulation and was within the discretion of the discharge authority and the applicant was provided full administrative due process. However, the AFDRB further concluded the overall quality of the applicant's service was more accurately reflected by an honorable discharge.

On 17 Jan 84, the applicant was issued a revised DD Form 214, *Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*, to reflect he received an honorable discharge. Additionally, his narrative reason for separation was changed to "Directed by the Secretary of the Air Force" with the corresponding separation program designator (SPD) of "JFF." On the same date, an MFR was written, indicating the applicant's request to change his RE code was denied due to his unsuitability for further military service. The rationale was based on the applicant's awareness of other service members who abused drugs but was unwilling to disclose their identities to Air Force officials.

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

## **AIR FORCE EVALUATION**

AFPC/DPMSSR recommends denying the application, finding no error or injustice with the discharge processing or the calculation of the amount of time spent on active-duty prior to his separation. It has been approximately 44 years since the applicant was discharged from service. The applicant's request to be given additional years of service, which he did not perform in the Air Force uniform, is excessive and would result in an unfair precedent, placing the service at a disadvantage. AFPC cannot legislate awarding hypothetical years of service the applicant may or may not have completed had he not been discharged. It is not certain the applicant would have remained in the service and not been subject to either an incentive for early voluntary separation or another situation where involuntary separation was warranted.

AFPC/DPMSSM recommends denying the application, finding no error or injustice with the RE code. At the time the applicant's DD Form 214 was corrected, the RE code 3K, which is currently used by the Board to grant relief, did not exist.

The complete advisory opinions are at Exhibits C and D.

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

The Board sent copies of the advisory opinions to the applicant on 4 Apr 25 for comment (Exhibit E) but has received no response.

## **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION**

1. The application was not timely filed; however, it is in the interest of justice to excuse the failure to timely file.
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 finds his discharge was consistent with the substantive requirements of the discharge regulation and was within the commander's discretion. Moreover, while the AFDRB on 10 Jan 84 concluded the discharge was in accordance with regulations and the applicant was provided due process, the AFDRB upgraded the applicant's discharge based on his overall quality of service. The Board concurs with the rationale and recommendations of AFPC/DPMSSR and AFPC/DPMSSM and finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the applicant's contentions. The Board does not find it in the interest of justice to credit the applicant for a period of service he did not serve. Giving credit for additional years of service the applicant did not perform duties would result in an unfair precedent. The applicant has also provided no evidence which would lead the Board to believe his RE code as reflected on his DD Form 214 was incorrect

or contrary to the provisions of the governing regulation at the time of his separation and during the subsequent correction of his DD Form 214. The applicant also requests benefits and entitlements he would have received for his four years of service. Since the Board does not recommend crediting the applicant with any additional service time, the Board finds insufficient evidence to warrant granting any additional relief. 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-2025-01525 in Executive Session on 26 Jun 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 12 Aug 24.

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

Exhibit C: Advisory Opinion, AFPC/DPMSSR, dated 20 Mar 25.

Exhibit D: Advisory Opinion, AFPC/DPMSSM, dated 3 Apr 25.

Exhibit E: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 4 Apr 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.

8/29/2025

X

Work-Product

Board Operations Manager, AFBCMR  
Signed by: USAF

**AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2025-01525**

Work-Product