

IN THE CASE OF: ██████████

BOARD DATE: 11 January 2024

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20230006239

APPLICANT REQUESTS: Upgrade of his under other than honorable conditions (UOTHC) discharge.

APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING DOCUMENT(S) CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:

DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record)

FACTS:

1. The applicant did not file within the 3-year time frame provided in Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1552(b); however, the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR) conducted a substantive review of this case and determined it is in the interest of justice to excuse the applicant's failure to timely file.
2. The applicant states he was erroneously declared a thief. He was asked to retrieve his sergeant's bike and put it in the deuce and a half. The military said he stole the bike.
3. On 3 August 1982, the applicant enlisted in the Regular Army for 4 years. Upon completion of training, he was awarded military occupational specialty 63B (Light Wheel Vehicle/Power Generation Mechanic).
4. On 8 December 1983, he accepted non-judicial punishment under Article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) for being disrespectful in language and deportment toward his superior noncommissioned officer on or about 9 September 1983 and willfully disobeying the order from an officer on or about 24 September 1983. His punishment included reduction in grade to E-2, forfeiture of \$150.00 pay, detention of \$300.00 for one month, and 14 days restriction and extra duty.
5. Court-martial charges were preferred against the applicant on 13 February 1984, for violations of the UCMJ. His DD Form 458 (Charge Sheet) shows he was charged with one specification of stealing a bicycle, of a value of about \$100; and one specification of committing an assault on a German civilian, by striking him on the head with a means likely to produce grievous bodily harm.

6. The applicant consulted with legal counsel and was advised of the basis for the contemplated trial by court-martial; the maximum permissible punishment authorized under the UCMJ; the possible effects of an undesirable discharge; and the procedures and rights that were available to him.

a. Subsequent to receiving legal counsel, the applicant voluntarily requested discharge under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), Chapter 10, for the good of the service – in lieu of trial by court-martial. In his request for discharge, he acknowledged his understanding that by requesting discharge, he was admitting guilt to the charge against him, or of a lesser included offense that also authorized the imposition of a bad conduct or dishonorable discharge. He further acknowledged he understood that if his discharge request was approved, he could be deprived of many or all Army benefits, he could be ineligible for many or all benefits administered by the Veterans Administration, and he could be deprived of his rights and benefits as a Veteran under both Federal and State laws.

b. He declined to submit a statement in his own behalf.

7. Consistent with the chain of command's recommendations, the separation authority approved the applicant's request for discharge in lieu of trial by court-martial on 15 February 1984. He further directed the applicant's reduction to the lowest enlisted grade and the issuance of a DD Form 794A (UOTHC Discharge Certificate).

8. On 1 March 1984, the applicant voluntarily declined a separation medical examination.

9. The applicant was discharged on 1 March 1984. His DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) confirms he was discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 10, for the good of the service in lieu of court-martial. He was discharged in the lowest enlisted grade and his service was characterized as UOTHC. He was assigned Separation Code KFS and Reentry Codes 3 and 3C. He completed 1 year, 6 months, and 29 days of net active service this period.

10. The applicant was charged due to the commission of an offense punishable under the UCMJ with a punitive discharge. Subsequent to being charged, he consulted with counsel and requested discharge under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 10. Such discharges are voluntary requests for discharge in lieu of trial by court-martial.

11. In reaching its determination, the Board can consider the applicant's petition, arguments and assertions, and service record in accordance with the published equity, injustice, or clemency guidance.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The Board carefully considered the applicant's request, evidence in the records, and published Department of Defense guidance for consideration of discharge upgrade requests. The Board considered the applicant's statement, his record of service, the frequency and nature of his misconduct, the reason for his separation, and whether to apply clemency. The Board found insufficient evidence of in-service mitigating factors and the applicant provided no evidence of post-service achievements or letters of reference in support of a clemency determination. Based on a preponderance of the evidence, the Board determined the character of service the applicant received upon separation was not in error or unjust.

BOARD VOTE:

<u>Mbr 1</u>	<u>Mbr 2</u>	<u>Mbr 3</u>	
:	:	:	GRANT FULL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT PARTIAL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT FORMAL HEARING
■	■	■	DENY APPLICATION

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

The evidence presented does not demonstrate the existence of a probable error or injustice. Therefore, the Board determined the overall merits of this case are insufficient as a basis for correction of the records of the individual concerned.

4/1/2024

X [Redacted Signature]

CHAIRPERSON

[Redacted Name]

I certify that herein is recorded the true and complete record of the proceedings of the Army Board for Correction of Military Records in this case.

REFERENCES:

1. Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1552(b), provides that applications for correction of military records must be filed within 3 years after discovery of the alleged error or injustice. This provision of law also allows the ABCMR to excuse an applicant's failure to timely file within the 3-year statute of limitations if the ABCMR determines it would be in the interest of justice to do so.

2. Army Regulation 635-200 sets forth the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel. The version in effect at the time provided that:

a. An honorable discharge is a separation with honor and entitles the recipient to benefits provided by law. The honorable characterization is appropriate when the quality of the member's service generally has met the standards of acceptable conduct and performance of duty for Army personnel or is otherwise so meritorious that any other characterization would be clearly inappropriate.

b. A general discharge is a separation from the Army under honorable conditions. When authorized, it is issued to a Soldier whose military record is satisfactory but not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge.

c. Chapter 10 provided that a member who had committed an offense or offenses, for which the authorized punishment included a punitive discharge, could submit a request for discharge for the good of the service in lieu of trial by court-martial. The request could be submitted at any time after charges had been preferred and must have included the individual's admission of guilt. Although an honorable or general discharge was authorized, a UOTHC discharge was normally considered appropriate.

3. On 25 July 2018, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness issued guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records (BCM/NR) regarding equity, injustice, or clemency determinations. Clemency generally refers to relief specifically granted from a criminal sentence. BCM/NRs may grant clemency regardless of the type of court-martial. However, the guidance applies to more than clemency from a sentencing in a court-martial; it also applies to other corrections, including changes in a discharge, which may be warranted based on equity or relief from injustice.

a. This guidance does not mandate relief, but rather provides standards and principles to guide Boards in application of their equitable relief authority. In determining whether to grant relief on the basis of equity, injustice, or clemency grounds, BCM/NRs shall consider the prospect for rehabilitation, external evidence, sworn testimony, policy changes, relative severity of misconduct, mental and behavioral health conditions,

official governmental acknowledgement that a relevant error or injustice was committed, and uniformity of punishment.

b. Changes to the narrative reason for discharge and/or an upgraded character of service granted solely on equity, injustice, or clemency grounds normally should not result in separation pay, retroactive promotions, and payment of past medical expenses or similar benefits that might have been received if the original discharge had been for the revised reason or had the upgraded service characterization.

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//