



Work-Product

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

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2025-01780

Work-Product

COUNSEL: NONE

HEARING REQUESTED: NO

APPLICANT’S REQUEST

Her narrative reason for separation be changed to reflect a medical separation.

APPLICANT’S CONTENTIONS

She served honorably but under general conditions while facing serious physical and mental health issues during service. She opted out of being processed through a Medical Evaluation Board (MEB) to seek care through the Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) where she is now 100 percent service-connected. Because her DD Form 214, *Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*, states “Condition, Not a Disability” she is being denied education benefits and was advised by the DVA to have this remark removed. On her applicant, she checked post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), other mental health, sexual assault/harassment, and reprisal/whistleblower.

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 19 Jan 21, the applicant’s commander recommended the applicant be discharged from the Air Force, under the provisions of AFI 36-3208, *Administrative Separation of Airmen*, paragraph 5.11 for personality disorder or mental disorder not constituting a physical disability. The specific reason for the action was due to the evaluation done by the mental health clinic on 16 Oct 20. In this evaluation, the applicant was diagnosed with adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depressed mood which was determined to be so severe, it significantly impacting her ability to function in a military environment. Her commander also noted her condition resulted in an adverse effect on her assignment and duty performance to include avoidance of work environment and dysfunction at work. It was noted her condition was significantly improved on weekends and extended time away from work, but she was not demonstrating notable improvement with treatment. It was further noted, she was assessed for PTSD and it was determined she did not meet the criteria, and she did not have a condition which qualified as a disability for referral to an MEB.

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2025-01780

Work-Product

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

On 2 Feb 21, the Staff Judge Advocate found the discharge action legally sufficient.

On 3 Feb 21, the discharge authority directed the applicant be discharged for personality disorder or mental disorder not constituting a physical disability with an honorable service characterization. Probation and rehabilitation were considered but not offered.

On 11 Feb 21, the applicant received an honorable discharge. Her narrative reason for separation is “Condition, Not a Disability” and she was credited with 1 year, 5 months, and 16 days of total active service.

For more information, see the excerpt of the applicant’s record at Exhibit B and the advisory at Exhibit C.

MEDICAL REVIEW

The AFRBA Psychological Advisor completed a review of all available records and finds insufficient evidence to support the applicant’s request to change her narrative reason based on her mental health condition. The applicant clearly had problems adjusting to the military environment, causing her to experience anxiety and depression during service. She received different levels of care consisting of outpatient, intensive outpatient program (IOP), and inpatient psychiatric hospitalization treatment over a six-month period from Jun 20 to Dec 20 for her adjustment difficulties and emotional distress. She was consistently given only one mental disorder diagnosis by different, duly qualified mental health providers during service of adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depressed mood. There is no error or injustice identified with this diagnosis. It was well documented she had difficulties adjusting to a situational stressor, which was being in the military, causing her to feel anxious and depressed. Her anxiety and depressive symptoms caused her marked distress and significant impairment in her occupational and other important areas of functioning. Additionally, once her situational stressor of being in the military had been terminated, her symptoms did not persist for more than six months, as evidenced by her not receiving or requiring any mental health treatment within one year of her discharge. There was no report of any anxiety or depression caused by her adjustment issues to the military within this time period as well. Her military mental health providers opined her stressors and symptoms would dissipate once she was no longer in the military, and her available records support their opinions and assessments. These indicators are the diagnostic criteria for adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depressed mood, which she fully met, according to the current Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition, Text Revision. Her adjustment disorder is an unsuited mental health condition meeting the criteria for an administrative separation, which she appropriately received. Her narrative reason of “Condition, Not A Disability” accurately reflected her reason for discharge. Therefore, there is no error or injustice with her narrative reason for separation, and her discharge for having an unsuited mental health condition.

The applicant designated PTSD in her petition and submitted a document from the DVA reporting she had been service-connected at 70 percent for PTSD. There is no medical evidence or records

she had PTSD or was diagnosed with PTSD during service. In fact, her military mental health providers had assessed her for PTSD and determined she did not meet the criteria for PTSD. Her service treatment records reported the applicant attempted to get diagnosed with PTSD, refused to sign her administrative separation paperwork because it did not say she had a diagnosis of PTSD, she felt she had PTSD but had difficulties articulating her symptoms, and she did not meet the three main symptoms of PTSD of avoidance, reexperiencing, and hyperarousal during service. There were discussions indicating the applicant may pursue a diagnosis of PTSD from the DVA, possibly for service connection and other benefits. The applicant was not diagnosed with PTSD until about a year after her service by her mental health provider at the DVA. She claimed she was sexually assaulted by a person she was dating during her military service before the holidays in 2020, and this was the traumatic event, along with her childhood sexual trauma, that caused her to develop and be diagnosed with PTSD. There are no records she reported being sexually assaulted to any of her mental health or medical providers during service. Additionally, in her mental health provider's recommendation for an administrative separation letter to her commander, her provider reported she did not file an unrestricted report of sexual assault. Regardless of whether she made a report of sexual assault, there is no medical evidence she had PTSD during service, as discussed, or that this condition was a mitigating factor in her discharge. She reported to her provider at the DVA, she had PTSD symptoms of intrusive thoughts occurring every other day, emotional detachment, avoidance, hyperarousal, hypervigilance, and random nightmares. There are no records she experienced any of these PTSD symptoms during service. Again, her military provider reported she did not have symptoms of avoidance, re-experiencing, and hyperarousal to meet the criteria for PTSD. She had developed PTSD symptoms after her military service. The applicant reported to her providers at the DVA she was sexually assaulted by a person with whom she was in a relationship before the holidays in 2020. At the time of her assault, she was already having difficulties adjusting to the military, problems at work, repeatedly expressed her desire to be discharged, and there were discussions and initiations of discharge action [for undue hardship] in place for her to be separated from service. Moreover, she was receiving mental health treatment and had completed at least one iteration of IOP treatment before her sexual assault occurred. She was also already diagnosed with an adjustment disorder predating her sexual assault experience. Thus, her sexual assault experience, which caused her to develop PTSD, did not cause her maladaptive behavioral problems and subsequent discharge from the Air Force.

The applicant's primary mental health condition, causing her maladaptive behavioral problems during service, was adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depressed mood. To reiterate, this is an unsuiting mental health condition meeting the criteria for administrative separation and is not compensable. There is no evidence or records she had any unfitting mental health conditions, including PTSD, that would meet the criteria to be referred to the MEB for a medical discharge. She was never referred to the MEB for her mental health condition. There was one note stating the MEB results were return to duty (RTD). This annotation appeared to be a reporting error because there are no records of her medical or mental health provider actually referring her to the MEB, and there is no Narrative Summary for the MEB included in her service treatment records. That was the only time MEB results were discussed in her records. Other references to an MEB in her records were from her Primary Care Manager (PCM), who had determined an MEB was not

indicated for her medical condition.

The applicant is requesting to remove or change her narrative reason for separation because it has prevented her from accessing full education benefits. She contends she served honorably but under general conditions. These assumptions and contentions are erroneous. The applicant's narrative reason of "Condition, Not A Disability" would not have precluded her from accessing full education benefits. The narrative reason for separation would not determine this outcome; however, the character of service is a significant factor in this determination. The applicant said she served honorably under general conditions; however, this is incorrect. She received an honorable and not general character of service, so her honorable character of service would allow her access to education benefits. However, another important factor is time in service. In order to receive the full G.I. Bill/education benefits, one must serve at least 36 months of active-duty service. She served 1 year, 5 months, and 16 days of active-duty service, falling short of the required 36 months. Another way to receive full education benefits without serving at least 36 months is being medically discharged due to service-connected disability. In this case, the applicant would need to be medically discharged for PTSD to receive full education benefits. As discussed, the applicant did not have any unfitting mental health conditions, including PTSD, that would result in a medical discharge during service. Consequently, the applicant's request to change her narrative reason for separation, to include a medical discharge, is not supported.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit C.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

1. The application was timely filed.
2. The applicant exhausted other available administrative remedies 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 the AFRBA Psychological Advisor and finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the applicant's contentions. The applicant wants her narrative reason changed so she can qualify for DVA education benefits, however, she does not meet the criteria for a medical separation. During her relatively short period of service, the applicant was diagnosed with an unsuiting mental health disorder that interfered with her duty performance and conduct and was severe enough that her ability to function in the military was significantly impaired. Her diagnosis of adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depressed mood is an unsuiting mental health condition which is not eligible for processing through the MEB for a medical separation. Her narrative reason due to her diagnosis is correctly reflected as a "Condition, Not a Disability." She checked PTSD, sexual assault/harassment, and reprisal/whistleblower on her application but provided no further explanation for this. Nonetheless, the Board evaluated her records to determine if any of these issues impacted her time in the service but found no evidence to suggest otherwise. She did submit her DVA disability ratings which indicated she was service-connected at 70 percent for PTSD due to sexual trauma but her medical records at the time of service do not show she was diagnosed

Work-Product

with PTSD due to sexual trauma nor do they indicate the applicant had ever reported sexual trauma, assault, or harassment during her time in the service. Her records indicate she was evaluated for PTSD and found not to have exhibited symptoms associated with PTSD. 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 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-2025-01780 in Executive Session on 20 Feb 26:

- 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 16 Apr 25.
- Exhibit B: Documentary evidence, including relevant excerpts from official records.
- Exhibit C: Medical Review, AFRBA Psychological Advisor, dated 4 Dec 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.

2/27/2026

Work-Product

Panel Chair
Signed by: USAF

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2025-01780

Work-Product