AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD HEARING RECORD								
NAME OF SERVICE MEMBER (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL)		G	GRADE			AFSN/SSAN		
		A	A1C					
TYPE GEN PERSONAL APPEARANCE		X -	X RECORD REVIEW					
YES No		ADD	ADDRESS AND OR ORGANIZATION OF COUNSEL					
X			j vysoji <u>.</u>	VOT	E OF THE BO	A D D		
MEMBER SITTING			HON		UOTHC	OTHER	DENY	
				GEN			X	
							X	
							X	
						- Marie,	X	
 							X	
ISSUES A93.01	INDEX NUMBER A66.00]	EXHIBITS SU	BMITTED TO	THE BOARD)	
A94.05		1						
		$\frac{2}{3}$	2 APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE					
		4						
			COUNSEL'S RELEASE TO THE BOARD					
			ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS SUBMITTED AT TIME OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE					
			TAPER	ECORDING O	F PERSONAL	APPEARANC	E HEARING	
HEARING DATE	CASE NUMBER							
15 Mar 2007	FD-2006-00431							
APPLICANT'S ISSUE AND THE BOARD'S DECISIONAL RATIONAL ARE DISCUSSED ON THE ATTACHED AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE								
Case heard in Washington, D.C.								
Advise applicant of the decision of the Board, the right to a personal appearance with/without counsel, and the right to submit an application to the AFBCMR.								
Names and votes will be made available to the applicant at the applicant's request.								
, ,								
<u> </u>	INDORSEMENT			n	ATE: 3/16/200	7		
TO:	A STATE OF THE STA	FROM:	OF THE 412		Worth Service	dem Sedico		
SAF/MRBR 550 C STREET WEST, SUITE 40			ISCHARGE I	FORCE PERSONN REVIEW BOARD /ING, 3RD FLOOR	EL COUNCIL			
RANDOLPH AFB, TX 78150-4742 ANDREWS AFB, MD 20762-7002								

AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE

FD-2006-00431

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 available pertinent data on the applicant and the factors leading to the discharge.

FINDINGS: Upgrade of discharge is denied.

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

ISSUES:

Issue 1. Applicant contends discharge was inequitable because it was too harsh. The records indicated the applicant received an Article 15 and one Letter of Reprimand for misconduct. The misconduct included inhaling nitrous oxide with the intent to become intoxicated and wrongfully using "magic mushrooms", a Schedule I controlled substance. 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.

Issue 2. Applicant contends that he should not be penalized indefinitely for a mistake he made when young. The DRB recognized the applicant was 21 years of age when the discharge took place. However, there is no evidence he was immature or did not know right from wrong. The Board opined the applicant was older than the vast majority of first-term members who properly adhere to the Air Force's standards of conduct. The DRB concluded that the characterization of the applicant's discharge was appropriate due to the misconduct.

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