

SUMMARY: The Applicant was discharged on July 9, 2024 in accordance with Department of the Air Force Instruction 36-3211, *Military Separations*, with an Uncharacterized / Entry Level Separation Service Characterization for Erroneous Entry. The Applicant requested a change to the Reentry Code.

The Applicant requested the Board be completed based on a Record Review. The Board was conducted on September 04, 2025. 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 did not include any documented misconduct leading up to their discharge.

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 were diagnosed by a psychologist in basic training and were separated because of a mental issue they were having at that time. The Applicant felt that the discharge was unfair because they didn't understand the impact of the provider's documentation and was unaware what the provider wrote at that time. The Applicant attest that they don't have mental health issues, and if they knew, they would have denied the conditions. The Applicant is requesting that the Board upgrade their reentry code so they can rejoin.

The DRB determined the discharge was proper and equitable. A review of the Applicant's records revealed in the third week of basic military training they presented to the clinic for thoughts of suicidal ideation (SI), self-harm, and thoughts of wanting to harm others on a daily basis. During their meeting with the provider, the Applicant disclosed a history of self-harm and self-injury which was not reported at MEPS and is disqualifying for general military service, per DoDI 6130.03. The Applicant contended they were not aware of the statements written by the provider, but they signed a Mental Health Evaluation Summary acknowledging the information

was accurate to include homicidal thoughts and SI. The Board was not provided any supporting documentation from the Applicant to support an upgrade and therefore denied the Applicant's request.

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?

The Applicant contended in their application, DD Form 293, "I was diagnosed (sic) by a psychologist in basic training and got separated (sic) by the mental issue I was having at that time. This results me can't re-enter in military. This is unfair to me because I didn't know how bad they had written about my case. I just have stress at that time, all I need is find someone can sit down and have good conversation. But I think the psychologist made my condition look too serious to re-enter. I definitely (sic) have no mental issue, I didn't know what she exactly wrote about me at that time, if I know I will definitely (sic) deny the conditions I don't really have. So I am asking to change my reentry code in order to rejoin."

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

A review of the Applicant's service treatment records revealed that they were seen at the Behavioral Analysis Services clinic while at Basic Military Training in June 2024 and reported that they had been having suicidal thoughts with plans and homicidal thoughts towards the person who recycled since the third week of training. It was also disclosed that they had a history of suicidal thoughts with plans years ago, indicating that they had suicidal thoughts prior to their military service. They were not given a mental disorder diagnosis, but they were noted to have a history of suicidal ideation and self-harm.

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

The Applicant was discharged from service for erroneous entry, specifically, they failed to disclose their history of suicidal ideation and self-harm during their enlistment process. The Applicant denied having any mental issues and denied the condition they had. Their military and service treatment records contrast with their contention. The Applicant clearly had difficulties adjusting to the military environment and BMT, causing them to have suicidal ideation with plans and homicidal ideation towards their military training instructor. They disclosed having a history of suicidal thoughts years before they entered the military, which they did not report during their enlistment process. Should they have disclosed this significant history, they would have been rendered disqualified to enter the military. There is no evidence or records to support the Applicant's contention that their psychologist "made his condition too serious to re-enter." The Applicant's prior service mental health condition had caused their discharge but does not excuse or mitigate their discharge. There is no evidence that their prior service mental health condition was aggravated by their military service. Their military service exacerbated their pre-existing condition, but once the stressors of BMT were removed, they no longer experienced emotional distress or suicidal and homicidal ideation.

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

Since the Applicant's mental health condition does not excuse or mitigate their discharge, their mental health condition also does not outweigh their discharge. The Applicant is requesting a change to their reentry (RE) code to allow them to reenlist. They were discharged under ELS and were furnished with an RE code of 2C.

This RE code is consistent with the regulation, DAFI 36-3211, under which they were discharged for the reason of erroneous entry. There is no impropriety or inequity identified with their discharge from a mental health perspective.

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. The DRB voted unanimously to **deny** the Applicant’s request. Therefore, the awarded Service Characterization shall remain Uncharacterized / Entry Level Separation, the Narrative Reason for separation shall remain Erroneous Entry, and the Reentry Code shall remain 2C. The DRB results were approved by the Presiding Officer on September 9, 2025.

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://afrbaportal.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)