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|  **AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL DOCUMENT**  | CASE NUMBER FD-2020-00103 |
|  GENERAL: The applicant was discharged on 22 Apr 05 in accordance with AFI 36-3208 with an Honorable discharge for Failure to Complete a Course of Instruction. The applicant appealed to change to the discharge narrative reason. The board was conducted on 2 Sep 20. The applicant initially chose to have a personal appearance before the Discharge Review Board (DRB), but due to lack of responses from the applicant in regards to scheduling the appearance, the President of the AFDRB authorized to complete its review of the discharge, per DOD 1332.8, E3.2.6.2. The applicant did not have a prior records only review, therefore, the board deemed him eligible for one. The applicant was 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 2 to 1 to *approve* the applicant’s request to change the discharge narrative reason to *Secretarial Authority*.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 did not include disciplinary actions.The applicant contended the discharge was improper because he self-eliminated from training and did not fail out of training. The applicant states that he chose to separate because he hoped to become a pilot, but was training to become a navigator. He insists that he was informed there would be not be enough pilot jobs for all trainees and that he could not cross-train to another AFSC. He states that he was informed he would be transferred to the Army because the Air Force was reducing through force shaping. He insists that instead of being transferred to the Army he separated. The applicant states he contacted AFPC after he was unable to join the Marine Corps. He insists that he did not discover the impact the narrative reason would have on his future military plans until he attempted to join the NY ANG. The applicant believes he separated to accommodate force shaping efforts and was unaware the narrative reason would prevent a return to service. The applicant is currently a detective with the NYPD where he has been a member since he separated. The DRB recognized the applicant’s intent to enter the Air Force through pilot training. The board noted the Air Force was downsizing due to a force shaping initiative while the applicant was in training. The board determined an error of procedure existed associated with the discharge because the applicant was denied the opportunity to retrain into a non-flying career. CONCLUSION: The board found neither the evidence of record, nor that provided by the applicant substantiated any inequity. However, sufficient evidence existed to convince the board the discharge was improper. Therefore, the board determined the discharge narrative reason was more accurately described as “Secretarial Authority.” The DRB results were approved by the board president on 13 Sep 20. If desired, the applicant can request a list of the board members and their votes by writing to: Air Force Review Boards AgencyAttn: Discharge Review Board3351 Celmers LaneJoint Base Andrews, NAF Washington, MD 20762-6602 Attachment:Examiner's Brief (Applicant Only) |