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| **AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL DOCUMENT** | CASE NUMBER FD-2019-00322 |
| GENERAL: The applicant was discharged on 31 May 13 in accordance with AFI 36-3208 with an Honorable discharge for Non-Retention on Active Duty. The applicant appealed for a change to the discharge narrative reason, and a change to the reenlistment eligibility code. The board was conducted on 7 Jan 20.  The applicant was offered a personal appearance before the Discharge Review Board (DRB), but declined and requested the board be completed based on a records only review. The applicant was not represented by counsel.  The attached examiner’s brief (provided to applicant only), extracted from available service records, contains pertinent data regarding the circumstances and character of the applicant’s military service.    FINDING: The DRB voted unanimously to *deny* the applicant’s request to change the discharge narrative reason to Secretarial Authority, and to change the reenlistment eligibility code to 3K.  DISCUSSION: The DRB, under its responsibility to examine the propriety and equity of an applicant’s discharge, is authorized to change the characterization of service and the narrative reason for discharge if such changes are warranted. If applicable, the board can also change the applicant’s reenlistment eligibility code. In reviewing discharges, the board presumes regularity in the conduct of governmental affairs unless there is substantial credible evidence to rebut the presumption, to include evidence submitted by the applicant. The board completed a thorough review of the circumstances that led to the discharge and the discharge process to determine if the discharge met the pertinent standards of equity and propriety.  The applicant’s record of service included two Article 15’s. Her misconduct included: failure to go at prescribed time to designated place of duty; and failure to adhere traffic laws on base.  The applicant contended the discharge narrative reason and reenlistment eligibility code are improper because her AF100 and DD214 have inadequate details and do not reflect the same information. The applicant states that she has been proven to be an above average on her evaluations, and she made sure to improve and excel in her duties if she received any disciplinary actions. The applicant is currently employed as a contractor with DoD agencies. She is requesting the change in order to return to military service with the Air National Guard.  The DRB reviewed the applicant’s entire record and found the discharge narrative reason displayed on the DD214 and the AF100 do not match. The Board determined the discharge narrative reason displayed on the DD214 is correct. The Board determined the inconsistent information on the DD214 and AF100 did not constitute evidence of impropriety or inequity to warrant any changes.  CONCLUSION: The board found insufficient evidence of an inequity or impropriety that would warrant a change to the applicant’s discharge. Therefore, the discharge received by the applicant was deemed to be appropriate and her request was not approved.  The DRB results were approved by the board president on 10 Feb 20. If desired, the applicant can request a list of the board members and their votes by writing to:  Air Force Review Boards Agency  Attn: Discharge Review Board  3351 Celmers Lane  Joint Base Andrews, NAF Washington, MD 20762-6602  Attachment: Examiner's Brief | |