

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 28 August 2024

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20230013396

APPLICANT REQUESTS: reconsideration of his previous request for an upgrade of his under other than honorable conditions (UOTHC) character of service and correction of his DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) to show a different reentry eligibility (RE) code.

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

- DD Form 293 (Application for the Review of Discharge from the Armed Forces of the United States), with self-authored statement
- letter, University of North Carolina (UNC) Charlotte, dated 11 March 2013
- Memorandum, Command Referral for Mental Health Evaluation, dated 20 March 2013
- DA Form 4187 (Personnel Action), dated 21 March 2013
- Enlisted Record Brief (ERB), dated 21 March 2013
- screenshot, Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) profile, dated 27 February 2023

FACTS:

1. Incorporated herein by reference are military records which were summarized in the previous considerations of the applicant's case by the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR) in Dockets Number AR20170002205 on 4 June 2020 and AR20220011946 on 28 June 2023.

2. As a new argument, the applicant states, in effect:

a. Ranger school was placed on his ERB sometime during his permanent change of station. He did not find out until a senior instructor asked him why he was not wearing his tab. He was harassed by "seniors" until he left for Fort Bragg. Once he was at Fort Bragg, he was hounded by an operations Sergeant Major (SGM). Those things were hurtful, and he started drinking heavily and using cannabidiol (CBD) to mask his feelings.

b. The downward spiral sent him to the mental health clinic. He was flagged for improper wear of the uniform for posting "Ranger school here I come" on facebook. The

operations SGM said posting things on facebook is the same as wearing it in public. Criminal Investigations Division (CID) searched his room and found CBD. They mistook it for tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), for which he was given an Article 15.

c. He decided to go to college on an early drop. He signed his DA Form 4187 and began out-processing. The same afternoon, he was flagged for creating fake expiration term of service (ETS) orders. This put a major strain on his mental status. He began to drink more. He felt targeted, possibly because of his faith.

d. He was given the wrong RE code. What he did does not constitute a lifetime ban from service. A recruiter told him RE-4 was only assigned if you put someone's life in danger or you participated in homosexual activity. This is a case of mistaken identity. He was told if he did not sign the discharge paperwork, he would spend five years in a federal prison.

3. The applicant enlisted in the Regular Army on 6 June 2007. Upon completion of initial entry training, he was awarded military occupational specialty 11B (Infantryman). He later reclassified as a 15W (Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Operator). The highest rank he attained was sergeant/E-5.

4. The applicant's DD Form 214 shows he served in the following designated imminent danger pay areas:

- Afghanistan from 3 December 2007 to 15 March 2008
- Iraq from 5 June 2008 to 8 August 2008
- Iraq from 1 December 2008 to 15 November 2009
- Afghanistan from 6 February 2012 to 28 September 2012

5. On 20 March 2013, the applicant was referred for a mental health evaluation by his command. As reasons for the referral, the commander noted the applicant forged false ETS documents and exercised illogical thought processes while attempting to leave the unit, which was a new series of strange and erratic behavior.

6. The applicant accepted nonjudicial punishment under the provisions of Article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), on 23 April 2013, for making an official record, to wit: ETS orders, with intent to deceive, on or about 7 March 2013. His punishment consisted of reduction to specialist/E-4, forfeiture of \$1,152.00 pay per month for two months, 45 days of extra duty, and 45 days of restriction.

7. A Commander's Inquiry was initiated after the applicant arrived at a new unit wearing a Ranger Tab on his uniform. A memorandum for record, dated 19 June 2013, shows:

a. The commander found the applicant did not graduate from Ranger school. Nor did he attend Ranger school at any time. The applicant acquired another Soldier's orders and graduation certificate and altered them to reflect his name and social security number. He then utilized the fraudulent documents to update his Official Military Personnel File (OMPF) and ERB.

b. The commander recommended the Ranger Tab orders and certificate be immediately removed from the applicant's OMPF and ERB. He further recommended a Field Grade Article 15 be initiated against the applicant.

8. Court-martial charges were preferred against the applicant for violations of the UCMJ on 13 September 2013. The relevant DD Form 458 (Charge Sheet) shows the applicant was charged with the wrongful use, possession, and distribution of marijuana, on or about 26 February 2013, and for wrongfully, without authority, wearing a Ranger Tab upon his uniform, from on or about 3 May 2013 until 10 June 2013.

9. A letter from the Brigade Judge Advocate, Headquarters, 4th Brigade Combat Team, Fort Bragg, NC, dated 13 September 2013, states [the applicant's] misconduct was being further investigated. It appeared his ERB contained additional false information. There were further questions over most of his deployments and awards. The government was prepared to offer the applicant a summary court-martial with a waiver for an UOTHC discharge, which would meet the command's intent and offer the applicant an opportunity to avoid conviction at court-martial.

10. The applicant consulted with legal counsel on 23 September 2013.

a. He was advised of the basis for the contemplated trial by court-martial, the maximum permissible punishment authorized under the UCMJ, the possible effects of a UOTHC discharge, and the procedures and rights that were available to him.

b. After receiving legal counsel, he voluntarily requested discharge, in lieu of trial by court-martial, under the provisions of Army Regulation (AR) 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations), Chapter 10. 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 acknowledged making this request free of coercion. He further acknowledged understanding if his discharge request were 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.

c. He was advised he could submit any statements he desired in his behalf. He elected not to submit a statement.

11. The applicant's chain of command recommended approval of the requested discharge.

12. On 24 October 2013, the separation authority approved the recommended discharge and directed the applicant be reduced to private/E-1 and the issuance of a UOTHC characterization of service.

13. The applicant was discharged on 1 November 2013, under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 10, in lieu of trial by court-martial. His DD Form 214 confirms his character of service was UOTHC, with separation code KFS and reentry code RE-4. He was credited with 6 years, 4 months, and 26 days of net active service. He was awarded or authorized the:

- Afghanistan Campaign Medal with two campaign stars
- Iraq Campaign Medal with two campaign stars
- Army Commendation Medal (2nd award)
- Army Good Conduct Medal
- National Defense Service Medal
- Global War on Terrorism Service Medal
- Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development Ribbon
- Army Service Ribbon
- Overseas Service Ribbon (2nd award)
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization Medal
- Combat Infantryman Badge
- Parachutist Badge

14. The Army Discharge Review Board reviewed the applicant's request for an upgrade of his UOTHC discharge and change to his RE code, on 29 January 2016. The Board denied his request upon finding the separation was both proper and equitable.

15. The ABCMR reviewed the applicant's request for an upgrade of his UOTHC character of service, on 4 June 2020. In the processing of the case, the Army Review Boards Agency (ARBA) clinical psychologist/medical advisor provided an advisory opinion, which stated there is documentation to support a behavioral health condition at the time of the applicant's discharge. However, his diagnoses were not mitigating factors in his premeditated and purposeful acts of falsifying documents and distribution of marijuana. After careful consideration, the Board determined the applicant's discharge characterization was appropriate and denied his request for relief.

16. The ABCMR reconsidered his request for an upgrade of his UOTHC character of service and change to his RE code, on 28 June 2023. In the processing of the case, the ARBA Behavioral Health (BH) Advisor provided an advisory opinion.

a. The BH Advisor determined the applicant was never diagnosed with schizoaffective disorder while in service, but was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), adjustment disorder, and cannabis use. He later received a 70 percent (%) service-connected disability rating from the VA for PTSD. The BH Advisor further opined that substance possession and use are often self-medicating behaviors which can be associated with the natural history and sequela of numerous disorders. However, there was no nexus between his mental health condition and behaviors such as marijuana distribution, forging documents, or wrongfully wearing a Ranger Tab. Additionally, it would be inappropriate to change his RE code, as he would not meet the standard for enlistment with schizoaffective disorder nor PTSD.

b. The Board considered the applicant's record, supporting documents, and Department of Defense liberal guidance, and determined there was insufficient evidence of in-service mitigating factors to overcome the misconduct. Furthermore, the Board determined the character of service and RE code the applicant received were not in error or unjust. His request for relief was denied.

17. The applicant provides the following:

a. A letter from UNC Charlotte, dated 11 March 2013, shows the applicant was admitted to the school for the Summer 2013 academic period.

b. Four documents from the applicant's OMPF are summarized, in pertinent part, in the Record of Proceedings above.

c. A screenshot of his VA profile shows he has a 70% service connected disability rating for PTSD.

18. Discharges under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 10, are voluntary requests for discharge for the good of the service, in lieu of a trial by court-martial. An UOTHC character of service is normally considered appropriate.

19. The Board should consider the applicant's argument and/or evidence in accordance with the published equity, injustice, or clemency determination guidance.

20. MEDICAL REVIEW:

1. The applicant is applying to the ABCMR requesting a reconsideration of his previous request for upgrade of his under other than honorable conditions (UOTHC)

characterization of service and his DD Form 214 to show a different reentry eligibility code. On his DD Form 293, the applicant indicated that Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) Other Mental Health Issues, and Sexual Assault/Harassment are related to his request. 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 in the Regular Army (RA) on 06 June 2007 as an 11B (infantryman) though later reclassified as a 15W (Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Operator).
- The applicant was deployed four times: Afghanistan: 03 December 2007 to 15 March 2008 and 06 February 2012 to 28 September 2012; Iraq: 05 June 2008 to 08 August 2008 and 01 December 2008 to 15 November 2009.
- The applicant received an Article 15 on 23 April 2013 for making an official record with an intent to deceive (falsified ETS orders).
- The findings of a commander's inquiry dated 19 June 2013 documented that the commander found that the applicant did not graduate from ranger school and had altered another Soldier's orders and graduation certificate.
- Court-martial charges were preferred against the applicant on 13 September 2013 for wrongful use, possession, and distribution of marijuana and for wrongfully and without authority wearing a Ranger Tab on his uniform. A letter from the Brigade Judge Advocate dated 13 September 2013 documented that the applicant's misconduct was further being investigated due to questions over most of his deployments and awards.
- After consulting with legal, the applicant voluntarily requested discharge in lieu of trial by court-martial under the provisions of Army Regulation (AR) 635-200, Chapter 10. He was discharged on 01 November 2013 under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 10 in lieu of court-martial.
- On 29 January 2016, the Army Discharge Review Board (ARDB) denied the applicant's previous request to upgrade his discharge and change to his RE code.
- The applicant subsequently petitioned the ABCMR to upgrade his UOTHC character of service on 04 June 2020. The BH Advisor opined that the applicant's BH condition(s) did not support mitigation for pre-meditated acts and the Board denied relief. His case was reconsidered again on 28 June 2023. The BH Advisor supported partial mitigation based on the nexus between self-medicating, substance possession and use, and his BH diagnoses. The Advisor documented that there was no nexus between his mental health condition(s) and marijuana distribution, forging documents, or wrongfully wearing a Ranger Tab. Furthermore, the provider documented that it would be inappropriate to change his RE code as his conditions did not meet the standard for enlistment and his diagnosis of Schizoaffective Disorder would likely fail retention standards. As such, the Board denied the applicant's request.

2. The Army Review Board Agency (ARBA) Medical Advisor reviewed the ROP and casefiles, supporting documents and the applicant's military service and available medical records. The applicant's mental health history is well-documented in the previous BH Advisory. A summary is also provided below. Lack of citation or discussion in this section should not be interpreted as lack of consideration.

3. Review of the applicant's in-service medical records indicate he self-referred to BH as a walk-in on 07 November 2012 due to nightmares and deployment visions since returning from deployment in 2008 and stated was exposed to combat during each of his deployments. His chief complaint was documented as nightmares, sleep concerns and anger and he was diagnosed with Adjustment Disorder with Anxiety. At a psychiatry visit on 28 November 2012, the applicant was diagnosed with PTSD and prescribed Zoloft (antidepressant). During a subsequent psychiatry visit in December 2012, it was documented that the applicant discontinued the medication due to an increase in irritability though noted he could continue to take Ambien until he ran out of the original prescription. On 24 January 2013, psychiatry treatment was terminated due to clinical improvement and he was no longer taking psychotropic medications. It was recommended that he continue psychotherapy as well as relaxation and anger management groups. On 05 February 2013, the applicant was discharged from BH care as he reported that he no longer needed psychotherapy and the provider documented that no follow-up was needed. On 20 March 2013, the applicant was command-directed BH evaluation (CDBHE) with the reasons for referral documented as forging false ETS documents and that he 'exercised illogical thought processes while attempting to leave the unit.' The commander documented that this as a 'new series of strange and erratic behavior with the Soldier.' At the time of the visit the BH provider ordered a urinalysis to which the applicant tested positive for THC and was subsequently referred to the Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP). The applicant was enrolled in ASAP from 22 April 2013 through 17 July 2013 and his diagnosis was documented as Cannabis-Related Disorders. The applicant self-referred to BH on 09 August 2013 as he reported he received an Article 15 for disrespecting a senior noncommissioned officer (NCO), his 1SG. The applicant endorsed experiencing occupational stressors and reaching a 'significant point of anger.' It was also documented that the applicant felt 'remorseful and regretful' regarding his current situation. The provider diagnosed with applicant with Adjustment Disorder with Anxiety. He met with the provider for two additional visits with his final in-service BH appointment documented on 21 October 2013. Review of the records shows that the applicant's BH providers documented that he met retention standards IAW AR 40-501. There is no documentation in the available medical records that the applicant reported MST.

4. A review of JLV shows the applicant is 70% service-connected through the VA for PTSD. He completed 5 Compensation and Pension (C&P) examinations dated 08 September 2015, 05 October 2016, 29 August 2018, 26 September 2022, 15 October 2022, and 17 November 2022. Review of his exams show that the applicant was

diagnosed with several BH conditions: Adult Antisocial Behavior (2015 and 2016); Schizoaffective Disorder (2018); Antisocial Personality Disorder, Alcohol Use Disorder, Severe (September 2022); Antisocial Personality Disorder, Insomnia, Unspecified, Alcohol Use Disorder, Severe (October 2022); PTSD, Chronic, Schizoaffective Disorder, Bipolar Type, First Episode, currently in full remission, Alcohol Use Disorder, Severe (November 2022). The C&P provider who conducted his evaluation in November 2022 documented that AUD is often considered a secondary diagnosis due to attempts to self-medicate, which was consistent with the applicant's report. The provider documented there were two deployment-related stressors associated with the applicant's diagnosis of PTSD, noted as his NCO being killed by an explosion and being part of the detail to recover the truck as well as his friend being severely injured by that same explosion. Review of a Department of Veterans Affairs Rating Decision Letter dated 23 January 2023 documented that the applicant was granted service-connection for PTSD with AUD, in full remission Schizoaffective Disorder, Bipolar (claimed as sleep disturbance/insomnia, unspecified).

5. Regarding VA treatment, he contacted the Veteran's Crisis Line (VCL) on 08 October 2014 to inquire about VA services due to experiencing stress as he had not been able to secure employment due to his discharge. Records show the applicant received services for homelessness through the VA starting in 2016. The applicant began working with the Veterans Justice Outreach (VJO) program in 2016 while in jail. It was documented that he was arrested for attacking a recruiter with a hammer when trying to re-join the military. While in jail, he was prescribed Olanzapine (antipsychotic). It was also documented the applicant was prescribed Prazosin for nightmares. A BH note dated 28 February 2017 documented that the applicant denied experiencing MST. Records documented that the applicant had a history of involuntary psychiatric hospitalization in May 2022 for two months following an incident wherein he pulled a knife on his stepfather to scare him and was unable to provide a coherent reason for his behavior. Review of his records indicate that he continued treatment on-and-off with psychiatry through the VA with his last BH visit on 04 June 2024. VA records show that he had been prescribed various antipsychotics and mood stabilizers to include Olanzapine, Risperdal, and Oxcarbazepine. His current medication list shows that he is currently prescribed Prazosin and Naltrexone (used to treat alcohol cravings) and his diagnoses at the time of his last visit were documented as Schizoaffective Disorder, Depressed Type, Unspecified Depression, and AUD.

6. Based on the available information, it is the opinion of the Agency Behavioral Health Advisor that there is sufficient evidence that the applicant had a BH-condition in-service that is potentially mitigating. Records show that he was diagnosed with PTSD in-service and has subsequently been 70% service-connected through the VA for PTSD and Schizoaffective Disorder, Bipolar Type. There is no evidence in the available records that the applicant reported a history of MST. Given the nature of his misconduct, there is only support for partial mitigation.

7. Kurta Questions:

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge? Yes, the applicant was diagnosed with PTSD in-service. Post-discharge, the applicant was 70% service-connected through the VA for PTSD and Schizoaffective Disorder, Bipolar Type.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? Yes, the applicant was diagnosed with PTSD in-service. Post-discharge, the applicant was 70% service-connected through the VA for PTSD and Schizoaffective Disorder, Bipolar Type.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? Partially. The applicant's records document that the applicant has several potentially mitigating BH conditions or experiences to include PTSD, Schizoaffective Disorder, and self-assertion of MST. Although there is no evidence in the available records that the applicant experienced MST, his assertion alone is sufficient to establish that the applicant was a victim of MST. Consistent with the previous BH Advisor's findings, as substance possession and use are consistent with self-medicating and avoidance behaviors, there is a nexus between the applicant's possession and use of marijuana and his diagnoses of PTSD and Schizoaffective Disorder as well as his experience of MST. However, Liberal Consideration is not afforded for pre-meditated acts such as marijuana distribution, forging documents, or wrongfully wearing Ranger tabs. As such, partial mitigation is supported.

8. As the applicant's service connected BH conditions fail to meet procurement standards IAW DODI 6130.03, and his diagnosis of Schizoaffective Disorder would fail retention standards IAW AR 40-501, upgrading his re-entry code is not supported.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

1. After reviewing the application, all supporting documents, and the evidence found within the military record, the Board found that relief was not warranted. The Board carefully considered the applicant's record of service, documents submitted in support of the petition and executed a comprehensive and standard review based on law, policy and regulation, and published Department of Defense guidance for liberal and clemency determinations requests for upgrade of his characterization of service. Upon review of the applicant's petition, available military records and medical review, the Board concurred with the BH advising opine stating it would be inappropriate to change the applicant's RE code, as he would not meet the standard for enlistment with schizoaffective disorder nor PTSD. The Board carefully considered the advising official finding sufficient evidence that the applicant had a BH-condition in-service that is potentially mitigating.

2. However, the Board carefully considered the applicants four deployments and his decorations and awards. Notwithstanding the medical opine finding partial mitigation, the Board determined the applicant's misconduct of attempted stole valor and distribution of marijuana could not be mitigated. The Board found insufficient evidence of in-service mitigating factors to excuse the applicant's falsifying official records for personal gain. Based on the preponderance of evidence, the Board denied relief.

BOARD VOTE:

Mbr 1 Mbr 2 Mbr 3

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

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Board found 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 to amend the decision of the ABCMR set forth in Docket Number AR20170002205 on 4 June 2020 and AR20220011946 on 28 June 2023.

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. Section 1556 of Title 10, U.S. Code, requires the Secretary of the Army to ensure that an applicant seeking corrective action by 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.

2. AR 601-210 (Active and Reserve Components Enlistment Program) covers eligibility criteria, policies, and procedures for enlistment and processing into the Regular Army, U.S. Army Reserve, and Army National Guard. Table 3-1 provides a list of RE codes.

- RE code "1" applies to Soldiers completing their term of active service, who are considered qualified for enlistment if all other criteria are met
- RE code "2" is no longer in use but applied to Soldiers separated for the convenience of the government, when reenlistment is not contemplated, who are fully qualified for enlistment/reenlistment
- RE code "3" applies to Soldiers who are not considered fully qualified for reentry or continuous service at time of separation, whose disqualification is waivable – they are ineligible unless a waiver is granted
- RE code "4" applies to Soldiers separated from last period of service with a non-waivable disqualification

3. AR 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations), in effect at the time, set forth the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel.

a. Chapter 10 of that regulation provides, in pertinent part, that a member who has committed an offense or offenses for which the authorized punishment includes a punitive discharge may, submit a request for discharge for the good of the service in lieu of trial by court-martial. The request may be submitted at any time after charges have been preferred and must include the individual's admission of guilt. Although an honorable or general discharge is authorized, a discharge under other than honorable conditions is normally considered appropriate.

b. Paragraph 3-7a provides that 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.

c. Paragraph 3-7b provides that 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.

4. 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 Discharge Review Boards (DRB) and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records (BCM/NR) 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. Standards for review should rightly consider the unique nature of these cases and afford each veteran a reasonable opportunity for relief even if the sexual assault or sexual harassment was unreported, or the mental health condition was not diagnosed until years later. Boards are to give liberal consideration to Veterans petitioning for discharge relief when the application for relief is based in whole or in part on those conditions or experiences.

5. On 25 July 2018, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness issued guidance to Military DRBs and BCM/NRs 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, 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.

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//