

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 11 March 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20230011915

APPLICANT REQUESTS: in effect, correction of his DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) period ending 5 November 2004 to show in:

- Item 4a (Grade, Rate, or Rank) 4b (Pay Grade) restore rank to private first class/E-3
- item 12f (Foreign Service): list his foreign time
- item 13 (Decorations, Medals, Badges, Citations and Campaign Ribbons Awarded or Authorized) deployment medals
- item 18 (Remarks) deployment to Iraq
- item 28 (Narrative Reason for Separation) medical retirement
- appearance before the Board

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

- Three DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record)(online)
- Applicant Letters
- Veterans Affairs (VA) Letter
- Congressional Email
- Privacy Act Release Statement

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 in effect, he would like acknowledgement of his Iraq service. He volunteered for reassignment for duty in Iraq, resulting in medals for his service. He would like a medical retirement, based on a VA service connection. His records were either willfully or negligently deleted but he suffered indignities in Iraq unfairly resulting in his showing up having volunteered as a private first class/E-3 and leaving as a private/E-1. He was forced to guard terror detainees by himself, clear a building by himself resulting in issues in his life. He sought help in Iraq and was denied by the

commander even after the psychologist recommended it. His command kept baiting him for weeks with leave, but he would not get it because he had a 5 o'clock shadow. The applicant lists post-traumatic stress (PTSD) disorder as related to his request. He is displeased with the decision of this board from some time ago. He is apparently wrong and feels extremely foolish running around thinking he is a Veteran and more so a war Veteran. He was subject to ill treatment not because he was willfully disobedient or rebellious but because of mistakes he made. Did he or did he not travel to see a psychologist in Balad, Iraq? It is hurtful for what happened for him to live in shame like he does when he is certain he sought treatment and when he got back stateside, to no regard.

3. The applicant provides:

a. VA Letter, 21 August 2023 shows service connection disability for tinnitus evaluated at 10%.

b. Emails to the Army Review Boards Agency (ARBA), 12 September 2024, 30 September 2024, 19 October 2024, and 14 November 2024 where he states, in effect, his records have been deleted and someone falsified them.

c. A letter to Mr. Secretary from the applicant on 11 November 2024 states he was changed over in Iraq not because he lost people, but unnecessary things like threats, hacking his email, being called into the office late at night for command to threaten him.

4. The applicant's service records show:

a. He enlisted in the Regular Army on 12 February 2003.

b. During the applicant's military service, which included service in Kuwait from 1 September 2003 through 30 March 2004 the applicant was:

- Absent without leave (AWOL) on 25 May 2004
- dropped from the rolls (DTR)
- he was apprehended by military authorities and returned to military control on 4 July 2004
- he was present for duty on 4 July 2004
- court martial charges were preferred against the applicant on 8 July 2004 for AWOL
- he stated, on 8 July 2004 he went AWOL because his girlfriend was having pregnancy problems
- the applicant requested discharge in lieu of trial by court martial (CM) on 9 July 2004 under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations), Chapter 10

- there were no legal objections to further processing the applicant's request
- his commander recommended trial by special court martial on 26 July 2004
- his commander recommended approval of his request and issuance of a under other than honorable conditions discharge
- the separation authority approved his request for discharge and directed an under other than honorable conditions discharge

c. He was discharged under other than honorable conditions. His DD Form 214 shows was discharged under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 10 in lieu of trial by court marital. He had lost time from 25 May 2004 to 3 July 2004. He completed 1 year, 7 months, and 14 days net active service. He was awarded or authorized the National Defense Service Medal and the Army Service Ribbon.

- item 4a (Grade, Rate, or Rank): PV1
- item 4b (Pay Grade): E1
- item 12i (Effective Date of Pay Grade) "2004 02 25"

d. The applicant's available record is void of any documentation to show he received a Medical Evaluation Board, or Physical Evaluation Board, IDES processing. In addition, his record is void of service in Iraq and medals awarded or authorized.

5. The applicant was charged due to the commission of an offense punishable under the UCMJ with a punitive discharge. By regulation AR 635-200, Chapter 10 such discharges are voluntary requests for discharge in lieu of trial by court-martial.

6. On 26 January 2007, and 2019, the Army Discharge Review Board (ADRB) determined the applicant was equitably discharge and denied his request for a change in the character and/or reason of his discharge.

7. On 12 August 2019, the Army Discharge Review Board (ADRB) determined that relief was warranted and voted to upgrade the applicant's characterization of service to General, Under Honorable Conditions. On 16 September 2019, the ARBA letter shows the applicant's DD Form 214 upgraded his characterization of service to under honorable conditions (general).

8. On 26 May 2022, the applicant's DD Form 214 was corrected, and a DD Form 215 (Correction of DD Form 214) was issued on 26 May 2022 to show:

- item 12f (Foreign Service) 0000 07 00
- item 18 (Remarks) Served in a Designated Imminent Danger Pay Area// Service in Kuwait 20030901-20040330//Nothing Follows
- the applicant's service records have been corrected

9. On 1 June 2022, ARBA Docket Number AR20210003158, shows the ADRB determined the applicant was equitably discharge and denied his request for a change in the character and/or reason of his discharge.

10. By regulation, (AR 15-185), the ABCMR may, in its discretion, hold a hearing or request additional evidence or opinions. Applicants do not have a right to a hearing before the ABCMR. The Director or the ABCMR may grant a formal hearing whenever justice requires.

11. MEDICAL REVIEW:

a. Background: The applicant is applying to the ABCMR requesting consideration of a change to the narrative reason for separation to medical retirement as well as several other corrections to his DD Form 214. He contends he experienced an undiagnosed mental health condition, including PTSD, that mitigates his misconduct.

b. The specific facts and circumstances of the case can be found in the ABCMR Record of Proceedings (ROP). Pertinent to this advisory are the following:

- The applicant enlisted into the Regular Army on 12 February 2003. He deployed to Kuwait from 1 September 2003 to 30 March 2004.
- The applicant was AWOL on 25 May 2004 and apprehended on 4 July 2004. Court martial charges were preferred against him on 8 July 2004 for being AWOL, and he requested discharge in lieu of trial by court marital on 9 July 2004.
- The applicant was discharged on 5 November 2004 under other than honorable conditions. His DD Form 214 shows he was discharged under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 10 in lieu of trial by court marital. He had lost time from 25 May 2004 to 3 July 2004. He completed 1 year, 7 months, and 14 days net active service.
- On 12 August 2019, ADRB determined that relief was warranted and voted to upgrade the applicant's characterization of service to General, Under Honorable Conditions. On 16 September 2019, the ARBA letter shows the applicant's DD Form 214 upgraded his characterization of service to under honorable conditions (general).

c. Review of Available Records: The Army Review Board Agency (ARBA) Behavioral Health Advisor reviewed the supporting documents contained in the applicant's file. The applicant asserts he deployed to Iraq and sought help but was denied it by the commander even after a psychologist recommended it, and he indicated PTSD as an issue related to his request. He is also asking for consideration of a medical retirement based on his VA rating. A VA Rating Decision letter dated 21 August 2023 showed he is service connected for tinnitus at 10% and a previous denial of service connection for depressive disorder (dysthymia) with anxious distress is "confirmed and continued."

There was insufficient evidence that the applicant was diagnosed with PTSD or another psychiatric condition while on active service.

d. The Joint Legacy Viewer (JLV), which includes medical and mental health records from DoD and VA, was also reviewed and showed the applicant initiated VA mental health treatment on 13 April 2005, and he reported symptoms of depression and suicidal and homicidal ideation (no intent or plan). He also reported a history of hospitalization at the age of 16 related to substance abuse and indicated a diagnosis of Bipolar Disorder. It was determined that he was ineligible for care due to his discharge characterization, and he was provided with community resources. He sought treatment again in July 2018 and reported anxiety secondary to legal and financial problems, and he was provided with supportive counseling and an online program related to problem-solving. The applicant intermittently engaged with primary care mental health and the VA's housing program through 2020, but in December 2021 he completed an intake where he reported a deployment to Iraq but complained only of interpersonal problems with a sergeant and his command. He requested a referral for PTSD treatment, but this was denied due to lack of a true trauma exposure while in the service. He continued to utilize VA for mental health treatment, and in August 2024 he underwent a psychological evaluation, including objective testing, for diagnostic clarification. He was diagnosed with Other Specified Personality Disorder (paranoid and schizotypal personality features), Persistent Depressive Disorder, and Cannabis Abuse, and it was recommended that he engage in a substance abuse treatment. At follow up in September 2024 when these results were reviewed with him, he disagreed and expressed frustration that he was not diagnosed with PTSD. At the most recent contact on 27 February 2025, the applicant and provider were exploring options for an intensive outpatient program (IOP) for cannabis abuse.

e. Compensation and Pension (C&P) PTSD Disability Benefits Questionnaires (DBQ) were obtained, and the Initial exam was conducted on 9 July 2021 and showed that the applicant reported a childhood history of ADD, dyslexia, and other mental health diagnoses, and he was "hospitalized several times or in a placement for several months at a time" and participated in outpatient counseling prior to joining the military. He described verbal altercations and a physical assault between himself and other soldiers while in Iraq, and his primary trauma was related to driving back in the middle of the night as "just one Humvee." He denied any attacks or adverse events but discussed emotionally shutting down during this event. The evaluator concluded a diagnosis of Persistent Depressive Disorder (Dysthymia) with anxious distress and intermittent depressive episodes with a current episode. It was noted that the applicant had a long history of depressive symptoms and had substantial psychological difficulties prior to entering the Army, and his military experience did not seem to be a primary cause of his symptoms. A second DBQ dated 18 July 2023 concluded a diagnosis of Unspecified Depressive Disorder, and documentation indicated the focus of his in-service complaints were related to interpersonal difficulties with superiors. He did not assert any

stressors that rose to the level to meet the necessary criteria for a traumatic event, and the evaluator again discussed his childhood experiences as pre-existing conditions and precursors to his current symptoms. It was concluded that “the evidence does not support that the depression, which is diagnosed, or the anxiety and PTSD, which are not diagnosed, were incurred by an in-service exposure.”

f. Based on the available information, it is the opinion of the Agency Behavioral Health Advisor that there is insufficient evidence to support that the applicant had a condition or experience that would warrant a medical discharge or referral to the Disability Evaluation System. The documentation does not support that the applicant was psychiatrically unfit at the time of discharge for any boardable mental health condition as he did not have persistent or reoccurring symptoms requiring extended or recurrent psychiatric hospitalization or persistent and reoccurring symptoms that interfered with duty performance or necessitated duty limitations (AR 40-501, para 3-33c). There are no mental health records available from the applicant’s time in service, and a review of VA records show that he went through two C&P examinations, and his mental health condition, Persistent Depressive Disorder (Dysthymia) with anxious distress and intermittent depressive episodes, was determined to not be service-related. He has engaged with mental health care through the VA, and his most recent diagnosis resulting from a psychological evaluation in August 2024 is Personality

g. Kurta Questions:

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge? NA; request is for medical retirement

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? Yes, the applicant asserts he was experiencing a mental health condition while on active service.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? No. A review of military medical and mental health records revealed no documentation of any mental health condition(s) while on active service.

h. However, the applicant contends he was experiencing a mental health condition or an experience that mitigates his misconduct, and per Liberal Consideration his contention is sufficient for the board’s consideration.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

After reviewing the application and all supporting documents, the Board determined partial relief was warranted. The applicant’s contentions, the military record, and regulatory guidance were carefully considered. Based upon the available documentation, the Board made the following findings and recommendations related to the requested relief:

- Restore rank to private first class/E-3: DENY, based upon the available documentation showing the applicant was separation with an CH10, Under Other Than Honorable Conditions separation, which by operation of law requires reduction to the lowest enlisted grade. Therefore, the Board concluded there was insufficient evidence of an error or injustice warranting a change to the applicant’s rank.
- Add foreign time: DENY, based upon the available evidence showing the applicant’s military record was previously corrected to reflect his foreign service in Kuwait by publishing a DD Form 215 on 26 May 2022. The Board found insufficient evidence of any service in Iraq; therefore, the Board concluded there was insufficient evidence of an error or injustice warranting adding additional foreign service.
- Add deployment medals: GRANT. Based upon the available documentation and the administrative notes below from the analyst of record, the Board concluded the changes annotated below in administrative notes should be executed.
- Medical retirement: DENY, based upon the available documentation and the findings and recommendations outlined in the medical review, the Board concluded there was insufficient evidence of an error or injustice warranting a change to the applicant’s narrative reason for separation.

BOARD VOTE:

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

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

1. The Board determined the evidence presented is sufficient to warrant a recommendation for partial relief. As a result, the Board recommends that all Department of Army records of the individual concerned be corrected by amending the applicant's DD Form 214 by adding the award annotated below in the administrative notes.
2. The Board further determined the evidence presented is insufficient to warrant a portion of the requested relief. As a result, the Board recommends denial of so much of the application that pertains to all other requested relief.

//SIGNED// X

CHAIRPERSON

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.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE(S):

A review of the applicant's records shows his DD Form 214 omitted administrative entries. As a result, amend the DD Form 214 by adding the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal (GWOTEM).

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. Section 1556 of Title 10, USC, requires the Secretary of the Army to ensure that an applicant seeking corrective action by the Army Review Boards Agency (ARBA) be provided with a copy of any correspondence and communications (including summaries of verbal communications) to or from the Agency with anyone outside the Agency that directly pertains to or has material effect on the applicant's case, except as authorized by statute. ARBA medical advisory opinions and reviews are authored by ARBA civilian and military medical and behavioral health professionals and are therefore internal agency work product. Accordingly, ARBA does not routinely provide copies of ARBA

Medical Office recommendations, opinions (including advisory opinions), and reviews to Army Board for Correction of Military Records applicants (and/or their counsel) prior to adjudication.

3. Title 38 USC, section 1110 (General-Basic Entitlement) states for disability resulting from personal injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty, or for aggravation of a preexisting injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty, in the active military, naval, or air service, during a period of war, the United States will pay to any veteran thus disabled and who was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable from the period of service in which said injury or disease was incurred, or preexisting injury or disease was aggravated, compensation as provided in this subchapter, but no compensation shall be paid if the disability is a result of the veteran's own willful misconduct or abuse of alcohol or drugs.

4. Title 38 USC, section 1131 (Peacetime Disability Compensation - Basic Entitlement) states for disability resulting from personal injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty, or for aggravation of a preexisting injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty, in the active military, naval, or air service, during other than a period of war, the United States will pay to any veteran thus disabled and who was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable from the period of service in which said injury or disease was incurred, or preexisting injury or disease was aggravated, compensation as provided in this subchapter, but no compensation shall be paid if the disability is a result of the veteran's own willful misconduct or abuse of alcohol or drugs.

5. Army Regulation 15-185 (ABCMR) prescribes the policies and procedures for correction of military records by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the ABCMR. The ABCMR begins its consideration of each case with the presumption of administrative regularity, which is that what the Army did was correct.

a. The ABCMR is not an investigative body and decides cases based on the evidence that is presented in the military records provided and the independent evidence submitted with the application. The applicant has the burden of proving an error or injustice by a preponderance of the evidence.

b. The ABCMR may, in its discretion, hold a hearing or request additional evidence or opinions. Additionally, it states in paragraph 2-11 that applicants do not have a right to a hearing before the ABCMR. The Director or the ABCMR may grant a formal hearing whenever justice requires.

6. Army Regulation 635-40 (Personnel Separations Disability Evaluation for Retention, Retirement, or Separation), in effect at the time, establishes the Army Disability Evaluation System and sets forth policies, responsibilities, and procedures that apply in determining whether a Soldier is unfit because of physical disability to reasonably

perform the duties of his office, grade, rank, or rating. Only the unfitting conditions or defects and those which contribute to unfitness will be considered in arriving at the rated degree of incapacity warranting retirement or separation for disability. Once a determination of physical unfitness is made, all disabilities are rated using the Department of Veterans Affairs Schedule for Rating Disabilities (VASRD).

a. Chapter 3-2 states disability compensation is not an entitlement acquired by reason of service-incurred illness or injury; rather, it is provided to Soldiers whose service is interrupted and who can no longer continue to reasonably perform because of a physical disability incurred or aggravated in military service.

b. Chapter 3-4 states Soldiers who sustain or aggravate physically unfitting disabilities must meet the following line-of-duty criteria to be eligible to receive retirement and severance pay benefits:

(1) The disability must have been incurred or aggravated while the Soldier was entitled to basic pay or as the proximate cause of performing active duty or inactive duty training.

(2) The disability must not have resulted from the Soldier's intentional misconduct or willful neglect and must not have been incurred during a period of unauthorized absence.

c. The percentage assigned to a medical defect or condition is the disability rating. The fact that a Soldier has a condition listed in the VASRD does not equate to a finding of physical unfitness. An unfitting, or ratable condition, is one, which renders the Soldier unable to perform the duties of their office, grade, rank, or rating in such a way as to reasonably fulfill the purpose of their employment on active duty. There is no legal requirement in arriving at the rated degree of incapacity to rate a physical condition which is not in itself considered disqualifying for military service when a Soldier is found unfit because of another condition that is disqualifying. Only the unfitting conditions or defects and those which contribute to unfitness will be considered in arriving at the rated degree of incapacity warranting retirement or separation for disability.

7. Title 10, USC, Chapter 61, provides the Secretaries of the Military Departments with authority to retire or discharge a member if they find the member unfit to perform military duties because of physical disability.

a. Soldiers are referred to the disability system when they no longer meet medical retention standards in accordance with AR 40-501 (Standards of Medical Fitness), chapter 3, as evidenced in an MEB; when they receive a permanent medical profile rating of 3 or 4 in any factor and are referred by a Military Occupational Specialty

Medical Retention Board; and/or they are command-referred for a fitness-for-duty medical examination.

b. The disability evaluation assessment process involves two distinct stages: the MEB and PEB. The purpose of the MEB is to determine whether the service member's injury or illness is severe enough to compromise his/her ability to return to full duty based on the job specialty designation of the branch of service. A PEB is an administrative body possessing the authority to determine whether or not a service member is fit for duty. A designation of "unfit for duty" is required before an individual can be separated from the military because of an injury or medical condition. Service members who are determined to be unfit for duty due to disability either are separated from the military or are permanently retired, depending on the severity of the disability and length of military service.

c. The mere presence of a medical impairment does not in and of itself justify a finding of unfitness. In each case, it is necessary to compare the nature and degree of physical disability present with the requirements of the duties the Soldier may reasonably be expected to perform because of his or her office, grade, rank, or rating. Reasonable performance of the preponderance of duties will invariably result in a finding of fitness for continued duty. A Soldier is physically unfit when a medical impairment prevents reasonable performance of the duties required of the Soldier's office, grade, rank, or rating.

8. Title 38, USC, permits the VA to award compensation for a medical condition which was incurred in or aggravated by active military service. The VA, however, is not required by law to determine medical unfitness for further military service. The VA, in accordance with its own policies and regulations, awards compensation solely on the basis that a medical condition exists and that said medical condition reduces or impairs the social or industrial adaptability of the individual concerned. Consequently, due to the two concepts involved, an individual's medical condition, although not considered medically unfitting for military service at the time of processing for separation, discharge, or retirement, may be sufficient to qualify the individual for VA benefits based on an evaluation by that agency. The VA can evaluate a veteran throughout his or her lifetime, adjusting the percentage of disability based upon that agency's examinations and findings.

9. Army Regulation 600-8-4 (Line of Duty Policy, Procedures, and Investigations) prescribes policies and procedures for investigating the circumstances of disease, injury, or death of a Soldier providing standards and considerations used in determining LOD status.

a. A formal LOD investigation is a detailed investigation that normally begins with DA Form 2173 completed by the medical treatment facility and annotated by the unit

commander as requiring a formal LOD investigation. The appointing authority, on receipt of the DA Form 2173, appoints an investigating officer who completes the DD Form 261 and appends appropriate statements and other documentation to support the determination, which is submitted to the General Court Martial Convening Authority for approval.

b. Paragraph 1-7a states the worsening of a pre-existing medical condition over and above the natural progression of the condition as a direct result of military duty was considered an aggravated condition. Commanders must initiate and complete LOD investigations, despite a presumption of Not In the Line of Duty, which can only be determined with a formal LOD investigation.

c. Paragraph 2-6 states an injury, disease, or death is presumed to be in LOD unless refuted by substantial evidence contained in the investigation. LOD determinations must be supported by substantial evidence and by a greater weight of evidence than supports any different conclusion. The evidence contained in the investigation must establish a degree of certainty so that a reasonable person is convinced of the truth or falseness of a fact.

10. On 3 September 2014, the Secretary of Defense directed the Service Discharge Review Boards (DRB) and Service Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records (BCM/NR) to carefully consider the revised post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) criteria, detailed medical considerations and mitigating factors when taking action on applications from former service members administratively discharged UOTHC and who have been diagnosed with PTSD by a competent mental health professional representing a civilian healthcare provider in order to determine if it would be appropriate to upgrade the characterization of the applicant's service.

11. On 25 August 2017, the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness issued clarifying guidance for the Secretary of Defense Directive to DRBs and BCM/NRs when considering requests by veterans for modification of their discharges due in whole or in part to: mental health conditions, including PTSD; Traumatic Brain Injury; sexual assault; or sexual harassment. Boards are to give liberal consideration to veterans petitioning for discharge relief when the application for relief is based in whole or in part to those conditions or experiences. The guidance further describes evidence sources and criteria and requires Boards to consider the conditions or experiences presented in evidence as potential mitigation for misconduct that led to the discharge.

12. The Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) issued guidance to Service DRBs and Service BCM/NRs on 25 July 2018 [Wilkie Memorandum], 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 court-martial forum. However, the guidance applies to more than clemency from a

sentencing in a court-martial; it also applies to any other corrections, including changes in a discharge, which may be warranted on equity or relief from injustice grounds.

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, Boards 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.

13. Army Regulation 600-8-22 (Military Awards) This regulation prescribes Department of the Army (DA) policy, criteria, and administrative instructions concerning individual and unit military awards. The goal of the total Army Awards Program is to foster mission accomplishment by recognizing excellence of both military and civilian members of the force and motivating them to high levels of performance and service.

a. 2–20. Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal (GWOTEM). The GWOTEM was established by EO 13289, 12 March 2003 to recognize Servicemembers of the Armed Forces of the United States who are deployed abroad for service in the Global War on Terrorism on or after 11 September 2001 to a date to be determined. Specific operations approved for the GWOTEM are provided in paragraphs 2–20d and 2–20f. The GWOTEM is only awarded once per named operation, regardless of the number of deployments and periods of service supporting that operation. Effective 9 February 2015 (retroactive to 11 September 2001), separate deployments and periods of service in support of different named operations are recognized by bronze service stars.

b. Award of the GWOTEM is limited to Servicemembers deployed abroad in support of OEF, OIF, OND, OFS in the following designated specific geographic areas of eligibility: numerous areas and Iraq, and Kuwait.

14. Army Regulation 635-8 (Separation Documents), prescribes the separation documents that must be prepared for Soldiers upon retirement, discharge, or release from active-duty service or control of the Active Army. It established standardized policy for preparing and distributing the DD Form 214. The general instructions stated all available records would be used as a basis for preparation of the DD Form 214. By regulation, Army Regulation (AR) 635-5 (Separation Documents)

- item 4a (Grade, Rate, or Rank) enter active-duty grade or rank at time of separation
- item 4b (Pay Grade) enter active duty pay grade at the time of separation
- item 12i (Effective Date of Pay Grade) enter the effective date of promotion to pay grade

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//