

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 21 March 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20230012331

APPLICANT REQUESTS:

- removal of the general officer memorandum of reprimand (GOMOR), 29 March 2019, and all allied documents from his Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR)
- removal of the DA Form 67-10-1 (Company Grade Plate (O1-O3; WO1-CW2) Officer Evaluation Report (OER)) covering the period 22 June 2018 through 8 June 2019 and all allied documents from his AMHRR
- approval of DA Form 638 (Recommendation for Award), 26 March 2019 for the Army Commendation Medal
- reconsideration of the Fiscal Year 2022 promotion board to chief warrant (CW) officer 3/4/5 without the derogatory information
- personal appearance hearing before the Board via video/telephone

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

- DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record)
- Memorandum (Request for Removal GOMOR and OER with a rating period 20180622 – 20190608), with all associated documents to include of grant the approval of DA Form 63[8] Army Commendation Medal of (Applicant)), (24 Pages) with 26 Enclosures –
 - Enclosure 1 – GOMOR, 1a – Memorandum (Filing Determination on Reprimand), and 1b – Memorandum (GOMOR Response) (222 Pages)
 - Enclosure 2 – DA Form 1574-1 (Report of Proceedings by Investigating Officer (IO)), 2a – Memorandum (Appointment as IO), and 2b – Memorandum (Administrative Investigation Findings and Recommendations) with 16 Exhibits (58 Pages)
 - Enclosure 3 – DA Form 67-10-1 [Referred OER], 3a – 10th Regional Support Group (RSG) Email Correspondence (FW: Evaluation and Referred Report), and 3b – Memorandum (OER Appeal (20180622-20190608) with 22 Enclosures (82 Pages)

- Enclosure 4 – Army Review Boards Agency Memorandum (Resolution of Unfavorable Information for – (Applicant)), Case Number AR20230002130
- Enclosure 5 – Memorandum (Initiation of Elimination), 5a – DA Form 268 (Report to Suspend Favorable Personnel Actions (FLAG)), 24 March 2021, 5b – Board of Inquiry (BOI) Findings and Recommendations, 5c – DA Form 1574-2 (Report of Proceedings by Board of Officers), 5d–5p – BOI Statements, 5q – Memorandum (Officer Elimination Action (Applicant), and 5r – Memorandum (U.S. Army Human Resource Command (HRC) (Closing of Elimination Action) (32 Pages)
- Enclosure 6 – DA Form 638, Audit Report Suspension of Favorable Personnel Actions Table, and Orders 141-01
- Enclosure 7 – Investigation Documents (22 Pages)
- Enclosure 8 – Memorandum (10th RSG Assumption of- Command Orders), and 8a – Memorandum (Duty Appointment – Property Book Officer (PBO))
- Enclosure 9–9d – Email Correspondence (Global Combat Support System – Army (GCSS-A)), and 9e – Headquarters DA Exercise Order 010-15
- Enclosure 10 – Command Supply Discipline Program, DA Inspector General (IG) Report (36 Pages)
- Enclosure 11 – Applicant's Subordinate (Sergeant First Class (SFC) A____) Performance Memoranda
- Enclosure 12 – Email Correspondence (Toxic Leadership) and IG Findings (22 Pages)
- Enclosure 13 – Subordinate Social Media Email Correspondence
- Enclosure 14 – Subordinate Pass Approval
- Enclosure 15 – DA Form 1587 (Notice of Delegation of Authority – Receipt for Supplies)
- Enclosure 16 – Manning Documents (Modified Table of Organization and Equipment and Table of Distribution and Allowance)
- Enclosure 17 – Commanders Email Correspondence with the applicant (RE: Assessment Invite)
- Enclosure 18 – initiation of Commander's Investigation and DA Form 268, 25 February 2019
- Enclosure 19 – Email Correspondence with HRC (RE: Assignment Call)
- Enclosure 20 – Memorandum (Contemplation of Relief for Cause)
- Enclosure 21 – Closing of Elimination Documents
- Enclosure 22 – Awards
- Enclosure 23 – Permanent Change of Station DA Form 31 (Request and Authority for Leave) and Orders 142-01

- Enclosure 24 – DA Form 4187 (Personnel Action) Involuntary Foreign Service Tour Extension
- Enclosure 25 – Good Conduct Packet, 25a – Peer Leadership Award, 25b – DA Form 1059 (Service School Academic Evaluation Report), 25c – two OERs, and 42 Character Reference Statements
- Enclosure 26 – Memorandum (Command Philosophy)

FACTS:

1. The applicant states:

a. HRC directed a "Show Cause" for elimination BOI based on adverse derogatory information. However, the GOMOR and referred-OER was supported by a DA Form 1574-1 without the approving authority signature. On 10 September 2021 the BOI found the adverse derogatory information was not supported by preponderance of the evidence and unsubstantiated all alleged misconduct. The applicant appealed the referred OER through HRC, but HRC returned the packet without action on 23 June 2022 because the thru date exceeded three years.

b. On 30 March 2023, the Department of the Army Suitability Evaluation Board (DASEB) determined the GOMOR had served its intended purpose. The continuation of both adverse documents GOMOR and referred OER with a rating period 20180622-20190608 in the appellant's AMHRR is unjust, denial fundamental fairness and serves as an ongoing injustice.

c. Not granting his request would be an injustice, contribute to ongoing unfairness and his increased anxiety and stress. The Board should correct the injustice as the documents contain errors, violations of regulations, and serve an ongoing injustice.

2. The applicant provides over 600 pages of documentation related to his service, GOMOR, the contested OER, and his requested Army Commendation Medal.

3. The applicant's service record shows:

a. After having prior enlisted service, the applicant was appointed as a warrant officer of the Army in the U.S. Army Reserve (USAR) on 9 June 2016.

b. On 25 February 2019, the applicant's commander initiated a DA Form 268 against him for a commander's investigation [Enclosure 18].

c. On 12 March 2019, the memorandum (Administrative Investigation Findings and Recommendations) [Enclosure 2b] shows the IO was appointed to determine whether the applicant's leadership was counterproductive and/or toxic as defined by Army

Regulation 600-100. He concluded the applicant's leadership attributes and processes created a counterproductive work environment and his leadership style met the description of "toxic" leadership. The IO recommended the applicant receive an OER consistent with his displayed performance and potential, likely to display a "needs improvement," and any other corrective action the disciplinary authority deemed as warranted. The applicant noted the associated DA Form 1574-1 [Enclosure 2] is not signed by appointing commander.

d. On 26 March 2019, the applicant's supervisor recommended him for the Army Commendation Medal for his service from 7 October 2016 to 22 May 2019. His company commander recommended approval of the award by on 4 April 2019. However, the approval authority never signed for approval [Enclosure 6].

e. The Commanding General, U.S. Army Japan, reprimanded the applicant in writing on 29 March 2019 [Enclosure 1], wherein he stated:

You are hereby reprimanded for creating a toxic leadership climate within the 10th Support Group, S-4, Property Book Office. An AR 15-6 investigation revealed that you were disrespectful, defiant, combative, and a non-team player, with a leadership style described as "Chiefs way or no way". You have shown-up late for meetings, disregarded the direction of superiors, and addressed senior NCOs in a demeaning manner. You have specifically denied passes for subordinates that you were directed to issue by your superior, and you refuse to delegate responsibilities, creating a single point of failure for actions and processes. This type of leadership, the climate it creates, and the effect it has on the overall morale in the 10th Support Group is unacceptable.

As a Chief Warrant Officer, you are charged with the responsibility of setting the example for Subordinates to emulate. Clearly, your actions fell below the standards expected of a Chief Warrant Officer in the United States Army. There is no excuse for your irresponsible and improper behavior, and further incidents of this nature may result in more serious action being taken against you. I trust that your future duty performance will reflect the degree of professionalism expected of every Warrant Officer assigned to this command.

This is an administrative reprimand imposed under the provisions of AR 600-37 and not as punishment under Article 15, Uniform Code of Military Justice. You are advised that in accordance with AR 600-37, Paragraph 3-5b, I am considering whether to direct this reprimand be filed permanently in your Army Military Human Resource Record. Prior to making my filing decision, I will consider any matters you submit in extenuation, mitigation, or rebuttal. You will be provided, by separate cover, a copy of the evidence which forms the

basis for this reprimand. You will immediately acknowledge receipt of this reprimand in writing. You will forward any matters you wish me to consider through your chain of command within seven calendar days, using the format prescribed in Army Regulation 600-37, paragraph 3-7.

f. On 19 April 2019, the applicant submitted a 15-page memorandum for the commanding general, (GOMOR Response) [Enclosure 1b], wherein he objected the claims against him.

g. On 9 May 2019, after carefully considering the circumstances of the misconduct and all matters submitted by the applicant in defense, extenuation, or mitigation; the commanding general directed permanently filing the GOMOR and all enclosures in the applicant's AMHRR [Enclosure 1a].

h. His referred OER covering the period 22 June 2018 through 8 June 2019 shows his Rater as major (MAJ) S____ C. T____, Group S4; his Senior Rater (SR) as lieutenant colonel (LTC) K____ V. S____, Group Executive Officer; and no supplementary reviewer. His rater digitally signed on 6 June 2019, the SR signed on 19 June 2019, and the applicant did not sign the report [Enclosure 3].

(1) Part I (Administrative, block c (Rank), his rank as "CW2";

(2) Part III (Duty Description), block c (Significant Duties and Responsibilities): Serves as the Group PBO for a forward deployed Regional Support Group, comprised of a Headquarters, Headquarters Company, 247th Military Police Detachment, and a geographically separated ammunition depot. Provides property accounting management and supervise the Global Combat Support System Anny (GCSS-A) and Decision Support Tool (DST) creating equipping efficiencies to enhance readiness. Ensues 100% property accountability is maintained for equipment valued at \$250 million. Directs and monitors the redistribution of equipment throughout the command to support operational needs. Coordinates with the Force Modernization Activity to integrate emerging technologies. Primary advisor to the Group Commander and supporting units on property accounting and supply discipline. Provides logistics support for Bi-lateral, Joint, and Contingency support. Supervises and responsible for the health and welfare of two NCOs and one Soldier.;

(3) Part IV (Performance Evaluation – Professionalism, Competencies, and Attributes) (Rater), block e (This Officer's Overall Performance is Rated as), his rater rated his overall performance as "UNSATISFACTORY" and commented: "[Applicant's] performance was detrimental to the efficiency, good order, and discipline of the S4. His impediment towards mission success compounded a burden on the section and his immediate subordinate Soldiers. The applicant's resistance to perform to the best of his ability and build a cohesive team, required his direct leadership to cultivate innovative

solutions to accomplish the 10th Support Group mission. The applicant declined to complete the DA Form 67-10-1A (OER Support Form) in preparation for his evaluation."; and

(4) Part VI (Senior Rater), block a (Potential Compared with Officers Senior Rated in Same Grade), the SR marked "QUALIFIED" and commented: Rated Soldier refuses to sign. Service member has been notified of the referred report on 7 June 2019. (Applicant's) potential is currently limited unless he has a significant change in attitude. He created a toxic work environment based on substantiated AR 15-6 findings, and the applicant failed to adhere to the Army values. Consider for Warrant Officer Advanced Course when eligible."

i. On 24 March 2021, the applicant's commander-initiated elimination actions and required him to show cause for retention. On 16 December 2021, HRC noted a BOI conducted on 9 September 2021 and approved on 24 November 2021, determined the applicant would be retained on active duty and closed his elimination action.

j. On 8 June 2022, the applicant appealed his OER for the period covering 20180622-20190608 to HRC. On 23 June 2022, HRC returned his request without action.

k. On 29 March 2023, the DASEB voted to approve the transfer of the GOMOR, 29 March 2019, and all related documents to the restricted portion of his AMHRR [Enclosure 4]. This action was not retroactive and, therefore, did not constitute grounds for promotion reconsideration, if previously non-selected. The Board further directed the decision memorandum and allied documents also be filed in the restricted section of the applicant's AMHRR.

4. The applicant is currently serving in the USAR at the Fort Knox Medical Recruiting Brigade.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

1. After reviewing the application and all supporting documents, the Board found that partial relief was warranted. The Board carefully considered the applicant's record of service, documents submitted in support of the petition and executed a comprehensive review based on law, policy, and regulation.

a. GOMOR Removal. Grant. The Board determined the GOMOR administered to the applicant demonstrates an injustice and supports removal. The Board considered the unsubstantiated findings of the Board of Inquiry, the letters of support, and the DASEB's prior action, and concluded continued filing of the GOMOR is not in the best interest of the Army.

b. OER Removal. Grant. The Board determined the OER is directly tied to the same unsubstantiated allegations and concluded retaining this evaluation would perpetuate an inaccurate reflection of the applicant's performance.

c. SSB. Grant. Based on the GOMOR and OER materially impacting the applicant's promotion consideration, the Board concluded an SSB is necessary to provide equitable review of the applicant's record absent the unjust documents.

d. ARCOM. Deny. The Board majority determined the request for retroactive award of the ARCOM is not supported. The BOI's findings, while unsubstantiated, do not establish entitlement to an award. Awards are discretionary and based on documented achievement; in this case, sufficient substantiating evidence has not been provided. The Board minority determined the applicant's provided DA Form 638 was sufficient to sustain award of the ARCOM.

2. The applicant's request for a personal appearance hearing was carefully considered. In this case, the evidence of record was sufficient to render a fair and equitable decision. As a result, a personal appearance hearing is not necessary to serve the interest of equity and justice in this case.

BOARD VOTE:

Mbr 1 Mbr 2 Mbr 3

:	:	:XXX	GRANT FULL RELIEF
:XXX	:XXX	:	GRANT PARTIAL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT FORMAL HEARING
:	:	:	DENY APPLICATION

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

1. The Board determined the evidence presented is sufficient to warrant partial relief. As a result, the Board recommends that all Department of the Army records of the individual concerned be corrected by:

- removing the General Officer Memorandum of Reprimand, dated 29 March 2019, with auxiliary documents from his AMHRR
- removing the DA Form 67-10-1 covering the period 22 June 2018 through 8 June 2019 from his AMHRR, and placing a statement in the applicant's record for the rating period as non-rated time
- referring his records to a special selection board (SSB) to be considered for promotion to CW2/W-2 and if selected, any subsequent grades under the criteria for any years in which he was in or above the primary zone of consideration based on his date of rank for WO1/W-1
- if selected for promotion by an SSB, retroactively promoting him to CW2/W-2 and paying him any additional pay and allowances he would then be due as a result of the promotion and correction

2. The Board further determined that 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 awarding the applicant the ARCOM.

X //SIGNED//

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.

REFERENCES:

1. Army Regulation 15-185 (Army Board for Correction of Military Records) prescribes the policies and procedures for correction of military records by the Secretary of the Army acting through the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR). The ABCMR will decide cases on the evidence of record; it is not an investigative body. The ABCMR begins its consideration of each case with the presumption of administrative regularity. The applicant has the burden of proving an error or injustice by a preponderance of evidence. The ABCMR may, in its discretion, hold a hearing (sometimes referred to as an evidentiary hearing or an administrative 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.

2. Title 10, U.S. Code, section 628 (Special Selection Boards), paragraph (b)(1), states if the Secretary of the Military Department concerned determines, in the case of a person who was considered for selection for promotion by a promotion board but was not selected, that there was material unfairness with respect to that person, the Secretary may convene an SSB under this subsection to determine whether that person (whether or not then on active duty) should be recommended for promotion. In order to determine that there was material unfairness, the Secretary must determine: the action of the promotion board that considered the person was contrary to law in a matter material to the decision of the board or involved material error of fact or material administrative error; or the board did not have before it material information for its consideration.

3. Army Regulation 600-8-29 (Officer Promotions) prescribes the officer promotion function of military human resources support operations. It provides for career progression based upon recognition of an officer's potential to serve in positions of increased responsibility. Additionally, it precludes promoting officers who are not eligible or become disqualified, thus providing an equitable system for all officers.

a. Paragraph 2-7 (Promotion Eligibility) states captains, MAJs, and lieutenant colonels must serve at least 3 years of time in grade to be considered for promotion.

b. Chapter 6 (Special Selection Boards) states a special selection board may be convened to consider or reconsider commissioned officers for promotion when Headquarters, Department of the Army, determines that one or more of the following circumstances exists:

(1) Administrative Error. An officer was not considered from in or above the promotion zone by a regularly scheduled board because of an administrative error.

(2) Material Unfairness. The action of the promotion board that considered the officer from in or above the promotion zone was contrary to law in a material to the division of the board or involved material error or fact or material administrative error; or the board that considered the officer from in or above the promotion zone did not have before it for its consideration material information.

4. Army Regulation 15-6 (Procedures for Administrative Investigations and Boards of Officers) establishes procedures for conducting preliminary inquiries, administrative investigations, and boards of officers when such procedures are not established by other regulations or directives.

a. Paragraph 5-2 states IOs may use whatever method they deem most efficient and effective for acquiring information. Although witnesses may be called to present formal testimony, information may also be obtained by personal interview, correspondence, telephone inquiry, or other informal means.

b. Paragraph 5-4 provides the right to respond to adverse information.

(1) Although the investigation procedures are not intended to provide a hearing for interested persons, field grade officers have a right to respond to adverse information in a report of proceedings. This right exists regardless of whether adverse administrative action is recommended or contemplated against the field grade officer.

(2) When a field grade officer has the right to respond pursuant to this paragraph, the portion of the report of investigation and supporting evidence pertaining to the adverse information will be referred to the officer after being properly redacted. The officer will have at least 10 business days to respond. The referral and processing of any response will be conducted in accordance with paragraph 2-8c.

(3) The right of a field grade officer to respond to adverse information should not influence the conduct of an investigation. The officer's right to respond to adverse information will not serve as a substitute for attempting to interview the individual during the investigation.

(4) The field grade officer's response to the adverse information may include anything the officer deems to be relevant to the finding, including, but not limited to, a rebuttal memorandum prepared by the officer or his representative, additional evidence in any format, and letters of support. All materials provided in response to adverse information will be included as an exhibit to the report of proceedings.

(5) The right to respond to adverse information is extended by this regulation only to field grade officers, because such findings or recommendations may be considered in future promotion boards that will consider those officers for promotion.

This does not require nor preclude approval authorities from extending this opportunity to any other individual who is the subject of adverse information in the report of proceedings.

5. Army Regulation 600-37 (Unfavorable Information) sets forth policies and procedures to ensure the best interests of both the Army and Soldiers are served by authorizing unfavorable information to be placed in, transferred within, or removed from an individual's AMHRR.

a. An administrative memorandum of reprimand may be issued by an individual's commander, by superiors in the chain of command, and by any general officer or officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the Soldier. The memorandum must be referred to the recipient and the referral must include and list applicable portions of investigations, reports, or other documents that serve as a basis for the reprimand. Statements or other evidence furnished by the recipient must be reviewed and considered before a filing determination is made.

b. A memorandum of reprimand may be filed in a Soldier's Official Military Personnel File (OMPF) only upon the order of a general officer-level authority and is to be filed in the performance folder. The direction for filing is to be contained in an endorsement or addendum to the memorandum. If the reprimand is to be filed in the OMPF, the recipient's submissions are to be attached. Once filed in the OMPF, the reprimand and associated documents are permanent unless removed in accordance with chapter 7 (Appeals).

c. Paragraph 7-2 (Policies and Standards) states that once an official document has been properly filed in the OMPF, it is presumed to be administratively correct and to have been filed pursuant to an objective decision by competent authority. Thereafter, the burden of proof rests with the individual concerned to provide evidence of a clear and convincing nature that the document is untrue or unjust, in whole or in part, thereby warranting its alteration or removal from the OMPF.

d. Paragraph 7-3c (Filing Authority to Redress Actions) states an officer who directed filing an administrative memorandum of reprimand, admonition, or censure in the AMHRR may request its revision, alteration, or removal, if evidence or information indicates the basis for the adverse action was untrue or unjust, in whole or in part. An officer who directed such a filing must provide a copy of the new evidence or information to the Department of the Army Suitability Evaluation Board to justify the request.

6. Army Regulation 600-8-104 (Army Military Human Resource Records Management) prescribes Army policy for the creation, utilization, administration, maintenance, and disposition of the AMHRR. The AMHRR includes, but is not limited to the Official Military

Personnel File, finance-related documents, and non-service-related documents deemed necessary to store by the Army.

a. Paragraph 3-6 (Authority for Filing or Removing Documents in the AMHRR Folders) provides that once a document is properly filed in the AMHRR, the document will not be removed from the record unless directed by the ABCMR or another authorized agency.

b. Appendix B (Documents Required for Filing in the AMHRR and/or Interactive Personnel Electronic Records Management System) shows memorandums of reprimand, censure, and admonition are filed in accordance with Army Regulation 600-37.

7. Army Regulation 600-8-2 (Suspension of Favorable Personnel Actions (FLAG)) prescribes Army policy for the suspension of favorable personnel actions (Flag) function of the military personnel system. It is linked to Army Regulation 600-8 (Military Personnel Management) and provides principles of support, standards of service, and policies regarding the initiation, transfer, removal, and management of Flags. A properly imposed Flag prohibits the recommendation for, and receipt of, individual awards and decorations, except as outlined in Army Regulation 600-8-2.

8. Army Regulation 600-8-22 (Military Awards) prescribes Army policy, criteria, and administrative instructions concerning individual and unit military awards. The Army Commendation Medal is awarded to any service member of the Armed Forces of the United States who distinguishes him or herself by heroism, meritorious achievement, or meritorious service. Award of the Army Commendation Medal requires a formal recommendation, approval through the chain of command, and announcement in orders.

9. Army Regulation 623-3 (Evaluation Reporting System) prescribes the policy for completing evaluations reports and associated support forms that are the basis for the Army's Evaluation Reporting System.

a. Paragraph 2-12 (Rater) states the rater will provide an objective and comprehensive evaluation of the rated Soldier's performance and potential, as applicable, on the evaluation report.

b. Paragraph 3-20(d) (Unproven Derogatory Information) provides that any mention of unproven derogatory information in an evaluation report can become an appealable matter if the derogatory information is shown to be unfounded.

c. Paragraph 3-26 (Referred Evaluation Reports) provides that any report with negative remarks about the rated officer's values or leader attributes/skills/actions in the

rating official's narrative evaluations will be referred to the rated officer by the senior rater for acknowledgment and comment before being forwarded to Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA).

d. Paragraph 4-7 (Policies) states evaluation reports accepted for inclusion in the official record of a Soldier are presumed to be administratively correct, to have been prepared by the proper rating officials, and to represent the considered opinion and objective judgment of rating officials at the time of preparation. An appeal will be supported by substantiated evidence. An appeal that alleges an evaluation report is incorrect, inaccurate, or unjust without usable supporting evidence will not be considered. The determination regarding adequacy of evidence may be made by the HQDA Evaluation Appeals Branch. Appeals based on administrative error only will be adjudicated by the HQDA Evaluation Appeals Branch. Alleged bias, prejudice, inaccurate or unjust ratings, or any matter other than administrative error are substantive in nature and will be adjudicated by the Army Special Review Board. These are generally claims of an inaccurate or an unjust evaluation of performance or potential or claims of bias on the part of the rating officials.

e. Paragraph 4-8 (Timeliness) states substantive appeals will be submitted within 3 years of an evaluation report "THRU" date. Failure to submit an appeal within this time would require the appellant to submit his or her appeal to the ABCMR. The Army Special Review Board will not accept appeals over 3 years old or appeals from Soldiers who are no longer serving on active duty or as part of the U.S. Army Reserve or Army National Guard.

f. Paragraph 4-11 (Burden of Proof and Type of Evidence) states to justify deletion or amendment of a report, the applicant must produce evidence that established clearly and convincingly that the presumption of regularity should not be applied to the report under consideration or that action was warranted to correct a material error, inaccuracy, or injustice. Clear and convincing evidence must be of a strong and compelling nature, not merely proof of the possibility of administrative error or factual inaccuracy. The burden of proof rests with the appellant.

10. Department of the Army Pamphlet 623-3 (Evaluation Reporting System) provides procedural guidance for completing and submitting evaluation reports and associated support forms to HQDA that are the basis for the Army's Evaluation Reporting System. Paragraph 6-1 (Deciding to Appeal) states an appellant who perceives that an evaluation report is inaccurate in some way has the right to appeal for redress to the appropriate agency. However, before actually preparing an appeal, an objective analysis of the evaluation report in question should be made.

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//