AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD HEARING RECORD

NAME OJ<SERVICE MEMBER (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL)

GRADE Al<SN/SSAN

X NAME OF COUNSEL AI	AL APPEARANCE ND OR ORGANIZATION		R ECORD	REVIEW RGANIZATION OF COU	NSEL	
			,	VOTE OF THE BOARD	1	
MEM	BERS SITTING	H	ION GEN	UOTHC:	OTHER	DENY
						X
						X
						X
						x
						X
ISSUES	INDEX NUMBER	····		S SUBMITI'ED TO TH		
A94.05	A67.IO		ORDER APPOINTING THE BOARD			
			APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE			
			LETTER OF NOTIFICATION			
IIEARJNG DATE	CASE NUMBER FD2003-0011		BRJ EF OF PERSONNEL FJLE			
9 APR 03 FI			COUNSEL'S RELEASE TO THE BOARD			
			ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS SUBMITTED AT TIME OF			
			PERSONAL APPEARANCE			
	SIONAL DATIONAL ADE DISCUSSUD ON THE	TTACHED AID EODCED	TAPE RECORDING OF PERSONAL APPERANCE HEARING SCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE.			
Case heard at Washington, D.	c. on of the Board, the right to a p	personal appear	ance with/wit	thout counsel :		
Advise applicant of the decision submit an application to the A					and the rigi	ht to
	FBCMR.					
	FBCMR.				DATE: 9 A	
	FBCMR. INJ>ORSEMENT FF	ROM: SEC AIR 1 1535	RETARY OF THI FORCE DISCHA	E AIR FORCE PER RGE REVIEW B(ANDREWS AFF	DATE: 9 A SONNEL CO DARD	APR 03

GENERAL: The applicant appeals for upgrade of discharge to Honorable.

The applicant was offered a personal appearance before the Discharge Review Board (DRB) but declined to exercise this right.

The attached brief contains the available pertinent data on the applicant and the factors leading to the discharge.

FINDINGS: Upgrade of discharge is denied.

The board finds that neither evidence of record nor that provided by the applicant substantiates an inequity or impropriety, which would justify a change of discharge.

ISSUE: Applicant contends that his discharge was too harsh due to the fact that everything snowballed from a single, insignificant event made significant by someone who had more stripes than he. The record indicates the applicant received six Letters of Reprimand for failure to maintain his dormitory room in inspection order, being late for work several times, negligence in losing four military ID Cards, and for being insubordinate towards an NCO, violation of dormitory standards, and failure to obey an order. In addition, he received five Letters of Counseling for failure to pass his CDC test, lost his ID Card for the 2°d time, operating a golf cart in a reckless manner, being late for an appointment, late for work and sleeping during training. The DRB opined that through these administrative actions, the applicant had ample opportunities to change his negative behavior. The Board concluded the misconduct was a significant departure from conduct expected of all military members. The characterization of the discharge received by the applicant was found to be appropriate.

CONCLUSIONS: The Discharge Review Board concludes that the discharge was consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the discharge regulation and was within the discretion of the discharge authority and that the applicant was provided full administrative due process.

In view of the foregoing findings the board further concludes that there exists no legal or equitable basis for upgrade of discharge, thus the applicant's discharge should not be changed.

Attachment: Examiner's Brief