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|  **AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL DOCUMENT**  | CASE NUMBERFD-2020-00322 |
|  GENERAL: The applicant was discharged on 02 Apr 2018 in accordance with AFI 36-3208 with a(n) Entry Level/Uncharacterized discharge for Adjustment Disorder. The applicant appealed for a change to the discharge narrative reason and a change to the reenlistment eligibility code. The board was conducted on 04 Jun 2020.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. Pursuant to 10 USC §1553, the board included a member who is a psychiatrist/ psychologist with training on mental health issues connected with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) or traumatic brain injury (TBI), and training on mental health disorders.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 upgrade her discharge characterization to Honorable and to change the reenlistment eligibility code to 3K.However, the board voted unanimously to *approve* 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 made no contentions that the discharge was inequitable/improper. She states that she dealt with physical medical issues along with personal issues during her time in service. The personal issue became an emotional burden since she was unable to assist the situation from afar and even after her discharge. She notes that she has been cleared by a therapist so that she can reenlist. The applicant believed she deserved a second chance in order to have the opportunity to serve in the military again. In accordance with AFI 36-3208, Airmen are in entry level status during the first 180 days of continuous active military service. If separated during this time, they normally receive an Entry Level Separation that is not characterized. Because it is Air Force policy to not characterize this type of separation, the applicant’s request to “upgrade” it to Honorable could not be approved. The applicant’s request for a change of re-entry code to allow for re-enlistment could not be supported due to current policies. Under DoDI 6130.03, Medical Standards for Appointment, Enlistment, or Induction in the Military Services, under Learning, Psychiatric, and Behavioral Condition, the applicant’s reported history of mental health conditions or disorders prior to and during service are considered disqualifying conditions for induction into military service. Liberal consideration is also not applied to the applicant’s petition due to his reason for ELS discharge being exempt for consideration under this policy. Per guidance from the Department of Defense, applicant requests to change the narrative reason should be approved when the original narrative reason was Adjustment Disorder and there were no aggravating factors in the record, such as misconduct. The board determined the facts in this case met the criteria and, therefore approved the applicant’s request to change the narrative reason. CONCLUSION: The board found neither the evidence of record, nor that provided by the applicant substantiated an inequity. However, sufficient evidence existed to convince the board the discharge was improper due to changes in policy. Therefore, the board determined the discharge narrative reason was more accurately described as “Secretarial Authority.” The board did not change the characterization or the reenlistment eligibility code. The DRB results were approved by the board president on 16 Jun 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) |