

**SUMMARY:** The Applicant was discharged on January 12, 2016 in accordance with Air Force Instruction 36-3208, *Administrative Separation of Airmen*, with an Honorable Service Characterization for Personality Disorder. The Applicant requested a change to the Narrative Reason for separation.

The Applicant requested the Board be completed based on a Record Review. The Board was conducted on March 5, 2026. 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.

**DISCUSSION:** The Discharge Review Board (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 Reentry Code. In reviewing discharges, the Board presumes regularity in the conduct of governmental affairs unless there is substantial credible evidence to rebut the presumption, including evidence submitted by the Applicant. The Board thoroughly reviewed 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 DRB provided a notice to inform the service member of resources available to help answer their questions about the application process and/or to help them supplement their application, to include information on the types of evidence that can be submitted to support a claim; information regarding potential eligibility for mental health treatment and evaluation services offered by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA); general information regarding Veterans Service Organizations that may assist with DRB applications, and their right to retain counsel; a link to a database of legal services organizations that serve members of the military, veterans, and their families; the weblink to the VA's Directory of Veteran's Service Organizations; and information regarding reasonable accommodation requests from the DRB in the application and adjudication process.

The Applicant's record of service included the following documented misconduct leading up to their discharge:  
-Article 15 for dereliction of duties, sleeping on post

The documentary evidence the Board considered as part of the review includes, but is not limited to the DD Form 293, *Application for the Review of Discharge from the Armed Forces of the United States*, and any additional documentation submitted by Applicant and/or counsel; the Applicant's personnel file from the Automated Records Management System (ARMS); and the DRB Brief detailing the Applicant's service information and a summary of the case.

The Applicant stated they sought mental health treatment for sleep-related issues and was administered a personality test. They stated they were unaware that the test results would be used to assess their overall mental state, which ultimately led to the initiation of an administrative discharge. They contended the basis for their discharge, personality disorder, was not justified as they stated they had "never been medically diagnosed to have" a personality disorder. The Applicant stated they expressed a desire to remain in the service and believed the discharge was a result of being misguided and not knowing how to properly contest the action. They stated their current narrative reason and separation code is preventing them from reenlisting.

The DRB determined the discharge was proper and equitable. An administrative and medical review of the Applicant's record reveals they were discharged due to being diagnosed with Other Specified Personality Disorder (Borderline, Histrionic, and Dependent Traits) which was so severe that their ability to function effectively in the military environment was significantly impaired. In addition, the Applicant received an

Article 15 for sleeping on post. Although the Board did not identify any errors or injustices in the discharge, this is a presumptive grant because the Narrative Reason for Separation contains sensitive information (i.e., diagnostic disclosures) that are no longer used as of 2018. In accordance with the Under Secretary of Defense memorandum, Guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records Regarding Equity, Injustice, or Clemency Determinations, dated 25 June 2018, the change to the Narrative Reason for Separation is appropriate based on a policy change.

**LIBERAL CONSIDERATION:** Due to the Applicant's contentions or evidence of a mental health diagnosis and/or experiences of sexual assault or sexual harassment and/or records documenting that one or more symptoms of mental health conditions and/or experiences of sexual assault or sexual harassment existed/occurred during military service found in the Applicant's record, the Board considered the case based on the liberal consideration (LC) standards required by guidance from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and 10 USC §1553. The Board included a member who is a physician, clinical psychologist, psychiatrist or social worker with training on mental health issues connected with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) or traumatic brain injury (TBI) or other trauma. Specifically, the Board reviewed the four questions the Under Secretary of Defense provided that Boards should consider when weighing evidence in requests for modification of discharges due in whole or in part to mental health conditions, including PTSD: TBI, sexual assault, and sexual harassment. The Board considered the following:

1. Did the veteran have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge?

*Available records revealed that the Applicant was diagnosed with Specified Personality Disorder during their time in service. Additionally, they were determined to have a service-connected disability for Major Depression by the Veterans Administration (VA). On the DD293 application the Applicant requested relief in the form of their narrative reason for discharge to be changed and for their separation code to be upgraded so they could reenlist. They contended that they only sought help from mental health for managing their sleep and were not informed about the purpose of the personality test, believing it was part of their sleep treatment. They further contended the basis for their discharge, personality disorder, was not justified as they contended, they had "never been medically diagnosed to have" a personality disorder. Lastly, they contended that they consistently told their mental health providers they wanted to stay in the Air Force and did not want to be administratively separated. The Applicant also marked "Other Mental Health" as an issue/condition related to their request.*

2. Did that condition exist/experience occur during military service?

*A review of available records revealed that the Applicant was first referred to mental health by their PCM in March 2015 for sleep related issues. They had their initial mental health appointment in April 2015 and described having problems with sleep related to their shift work. At this initial appointment, they also described experiencing possible auditory and visual hallucinations. A review of available records revealed that the mental health provider determined that diagnostic clarity was needed, based on the Applicant's symptom presentation. Psychological testing was completed less than a week after their initial intake appointment and the provider used this information, along with clinical information obtained in later sessions, to ultimately diagnose the Applicant with Specified Personality Disorder (Histrionic, Borderline, and Dependent traits). Although other diagnoses were considered, this was ultimately the only mental health diagnosis the Applicant had during their time in service.*

*The Applicant engaged in individual therapy sessions as well as Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT) Skills Training group sessions from April 2015 until December 2015, with a two month pause in treatment between late June and late August. A review of records revealed that the Applicant and their individual therapist had agreed that the Applicant had met all of their treatment goals, and they mutually decided to terminate treatment in June 2015. When they re-engaged in treatment two months later, the Applicant wanted to address their feelings of isolation and depression and was also processing an assault they experienced in May 2015, that they were now expected to testify about in court-martial proceedings. The Applicant had a different individual therapist for the treatment that renewed in August, and this therapist was clear that the Applicant's reported*

*isolation and depression issues were directly related to their personality disorder diagnosis and associated interpersonal functioning.*

3. Does that condition, or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge?

*A review of the Applicant's DD214 revealed the Applicant was discharged with an Honorable characterization with a narrative reason of Personality Disorder with 1 year, 11 months, 15 days time in service. The Applicant is requesting a change to her narrative reason for discharge, and an upgrade to their separation code and reentry code so that they can reenlist.*

*The Applicant contended that they only sought out mental health support for their sleep issues related to their duty position. A review of available records revealed that while the Applicant was referred to mental health by their PCM largely for sleep issues. However, at their initial intake appointment at mental health, they revealed recent experiences that were potentially auditory and visual hallucinations. Symptoms and experiences like hallucinations are indicators of more serious mental illness and require in-depth examination to determine the nature of the experiences. The Applicant also endorsed experiencing suicidal thoughts approximately three months prior to the initial mental health appointment. Overall, there is sufficient medical evidence that the Applicant was seen in mental health for more than just sleep issues, and that these additional issues were expressed during their initial appointment with mental health professionals.*

*Regarding the Applicant's contention that they repeatedly communicated their desire to their mental health providers that they wanted to stay in the Air Force and not be separated, a review of the available records revealed insufficient evidence to support this contention. During the Applicant's treatment with their first mental health provider (April through June 2015), record entries in June included that the provider educated the patient about the administrative separation recommendation and that they took the feedback appropriately. In the following session, the provider noted the patient had come to acceptance about the likelihood of administrative separation. During treatment with the Applicant's second mental health provider, there is evidence that in October 2015, the Applicant, across more than one therapy session, had questions about the memo written by mental health recommending administrative separation and did express their desire to continue in the Air Force and not be separated. In two separate medical record entries, the provider noted, "Pt reported they do not want to get out of AF and would like to potentially cross train to another career field" and "That they were initially agreeable to the recommendation of administrative separation based on personality disorder diagnosis. They have since decided that they would like to stay in the USAF." The memorandum from mental health was provided to the Applicant's leadership in July 2015. While the Board understands the Applicant's desire at that time to remain in the Air Force, in this situation, the regulations of the Air Force take precedence over an individual Airman's preferences. Specifically, service members with unsuiting conditions, such as Specified Personality Disorder, require mental health personnel to recommend administrative separation to the service member's commander when the unsuiting condition is so severe that their ability to function in the military environment is significantly impaired.*

*Regarding the Applicant's contention they were unaware of the purpose of the psychological testing, a review of the available records revealed that at the initial intake appointment, the provider determined that psychological testing would be helpful for diagnostic clarification. It seems unlikely that the provider who referred for psychological testing, or the provider who completed the testing, did not discuss the purpose of the testing. However, even if it were to be granted that the Applicant was unaware of the purpose of the testing, an event such as this does not rise to the level of injustice or impropriety that would support a mental health related rationale for the need of some form of relief.*

*Lastly, the Applicant contended that the basis for their discharge, personality disorder, was not justified as they went to mental health for help with sleep issues and "not because they thought I had a personality disorder for which I've never been medically diagnosed to have." A review of available records revealed that the Applicant's sole mental health diagnosis during their time in service was Specified Personality Disorder. Thus,*

*the Applicant was indeed diagnosed with a Personality Disorder, and this diagnosis is a legitimate basis for administrative discharge.*

*Overall, there is no error or injustice identified with the Applicant's discharge from service from a mental health perspective to support an upgrade to their separation code or reentry code. Their separation code of JFX indicates they were separated with a personality disorder, and their reentry code of 2C is defined as Involuntary Separation with Honorable Discharge. These codes capture the reason and details of how they were separated from the Air Force. Of note, in accordance with the Barna memorandum, dated 12 January 2018, the Applicant's narrative reason of "Personality Disorder" should be changed to "Condition, Not a Disability" and their separation code be changed to the appropriate "FV" code. Making these changes adheres to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) and grants the Applicant's relief request to remove Personality Disorder from her DD 214.*

4. Does that condition, or experience outweigh the discharge?

*Since the Applicant's condition does not mitigate or excuse the discharge, it also does not outweigh the discharge.*

Additionally, the Board considered the factors laid out in the attachment to the Under Secretary of Defense memorandum, *Guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records Regarding Equity, Injustice, or Clemency Determinations*, dated 25 June 2018, known as the "Wilkie Memo." The Board considered the factors listed in paragraphs (6)(a) -(6)(l) and (7)(a) -(7)(r) of this memorandum and found no evidence of inequity or impropriety.

**FINDING AND CONCLUSION:** After a thorough review of the available evidence, to include the Applicant's issues, summary of service, service/medical record entries, and discharge process, the Board found the discharge was proper and equitable. However, based on policy change, the DRB voted unanimously to **approve** the Applicant's request. Therefore, the awarded Service Characterization shall remain "Honorable," the Narrative Reason for separation shall change to Condition, Not a Disability, and the Reentry Code shall remain 2C. The DRB results were approved by the Presiding Officer on March 6, 2026.

Should the Applicant wish to appeal this decision, they must request a personal appearance before this Board before applying for relief to the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR). In accordance with DAFI 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records*, all Applicants before the AFBCMR must first exhaust available administrative avenues of relief before applying to the AFBCMR otherwise their AFBCMR case will be administratively closed until such time that the Applicant avails themselves of the available avenue of relief. Therefore, should the Applicant wish to appeal this decision, they must first exercise their right to make a personal appearance before the AFDRB.

Instructions on how to appeal an AFDRB decision can be found at <https://afrbportal.azurewebsites.us>

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, MD 20762-6435  
Attachment:  
Examiner's Brief (Applicant Only)