

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 26 September 2024

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20230014765

APPLICANT REQUESTS: through counsel, removal of the general officer memorandum of reprimand (GOMOR), 17 January 2019, from his Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR).

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

- DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record under the Provisions of Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1552)
- Counsel's Petition, with enclosures –
 - Memorandum (Personal Statement in Support of Removing GOMOR from AMHRR – (Applicant)), 3 November 2023
 - Report of Investigation (ROI), 17 October 2018, with allied documents (40 pages)
 - Headquarters, 94TH Training Division (Force Sustainment), Memorandum (GOMOR)), 17 January 2019
 - GOMOR Rebuttal Packet with 11 attachments (25 pages), including –
 - Memorandum (Request to Rescind or File Locally GOMOR – (Applicant)), 1 March 2019
 - Affidavit of Non-Prosecution, 5 February 2019
 - Headquarters, 94TH Training Division (Force Sustainment), Memorandum (Filing Determination on Reprimand), 6 March 2019
 - Department of the Army Suitability Evaluation Board (DASEB) Docket Number AR20210005404, 6 April 2021
 - DASEB Memorandum (Resolution of Unfavorable Information for – (Applicant), Case Number AR20210005404), 8 April 2021

FACTS:

1. Counsel states the applicant was reprimanded in writing for allegations of striking his girlfriend with a cell phone and slapping a phone out of her son's hands causing

scratches to his neck and chest on 15 September 2018 at Joint Base Andrews, MD. His girlfriend, Specialist (SPC) [REDACTED] also alleged that he fled the scene while intoxicated.

a. The applicant denied any wrongdoing and fully denied his girlfriend's version of events. He was not subjected to administrative separation proceedings, was promoted to the rank of staff sergeant (SSG)/E-6, and has served honorably throughout his Army career. Accordingly, he requests consideration of the facts and circumstances and removal of the GOMOR in the interest of fairness, clear legal error, and justice.

b. The applicant has been unjustifiably accused and condemned for a crime he did not commit. He aspires to continue serving and become a commissioned officer. He has consistently denied the allegations in the GOMOR and served as a model Soldier since the allegations. He was promoted to SSG despite having the GOMOR in his file. However, he feels the GOMOR will restrict him from further service based on the accusations.

c. The GOMOR should have been rescinded after his girlfriend provided an affidavit recanting her allegations. However, the issuing authority (IA) abused his discretion to do something in face of the recanted domestic violence accusations.

2. The applicant's memorandum (Personal Statement in Support of Removing GOMOR from AMHRR – Applicant) provides his service history and his version of the details of the alleged abuse incident, as later detailed in these proceedings.

3. He enlisted in the U.S. Army Reserve on 30 November 2012.

4. He was serving in the Active Guard Reserve (AGR) in the rank/grade of sergeant (SGT)/E-5 when he became the subject of a 2018 ROI for violating Article 128 (Assault) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). The investigation noted the applicant was accused of striking SPC [REDACTED] in the face with her cellphone and slapping a phone out of [REDACTED] hands [SPC [REDACTED] 8-year-old child], causing scratches on his neck and chest on or about 15 September 2018.

a. The case background noted, on 15 September 2018, SFS [Security Forces Specialist]/BDOC [Base Defense Operations Center] was notified of an assault that took place at Joint Base Andrews, MD involving [REDACTED] and the applicant. Patrols were dispatched and completed a statement from [REDACTED] alleging during a verbal altercation, the applicant struck her in the face with her cell phone. [REDACTED] asked the applicant to leave and told her 8-year-old dependent to get help, at which point the applicant slapped a phone out of his hand, causing scratches on his neck and chest. The applicant left the installation before patrols could arrive. SFS completed Air Force (AF) Form 1361 (Pick Up Restriction Order) for the applicant's apprehension

upon returning to Joint Base Andrews. Alert Photo took photographs to document injuries sustained by [REDACTED] and her 8-year-old dependent. On 18 September 2018, the applicant was detained by Aberdeen Proving Grounds (APG) Military Police (MP) entering the installation due to the existing AF Form 1361. SFS traveled to APG to contact the applicant, while he was in custody. SFS initiated an investigation to determine whether the allegations were true and uncover any other criminal activity the Air Force was unaware of.

b. The synopsis noted the investigation revealed that the applicant assaulted [REDACTED] and her 8-year-old dependent. [REDACTED] provided a sworn statement on 15 September 2018 stating the applicant assaulted her and her 8-year-old dependent. On 15 September 2018, Alert Photo took seven photographs to document injuries sustained by [REDACTED] and her 8-year-old dependent. On 18 September 2018, the applicant was detained by [REDACTED] entering the installation due to the existing AF Form 1361. SFS traveled to [REDACTED] to charge, interview, and book the applicant requested legal counsel and declined to make a statement. On 24 September 2018, [REDACTED] provided a sworn statement to SFS which contradicted her original statement made at the time of the incident implying she was at fault for the altercation, exaggerated her first statement, and no longer wished to participate in the investigation. [REDACTED] agreed to speak with SFS after a canvas of the neighborhood for witnesses was conducted. On 18 October 2018, [REDACTED] provided a sworn statement that detailed how [REDACTED] 8-year-old dependent told him about the assault. [REDACTED] agreed to speak with SFS after being reached out to as an implied witness in [REDACTED] second statement. Due to the applicant being a U.S. Army Active Reservist, the 11th Wing Staff Judge Advocate declined to prosecute. SFS contacted 5-80 Ordnance Battalion Command for the purpose of handing the case file over to the appropriate legal entity.

5. The Commanding General, Headquarters, 94TH Training Division (Force Sustainment), reprimanded him in writing on 17 January 2019 wherein he stated:

On 15 September 2018, Air Force Security Forces (AFSF) responded to calls of an assault taking place in family housing on Joint Base Andrews, MD. Earlier, you had gone to the home seeking to reconcile your relationship with an ex-girlfriend. However, you began drinking and would not leave the residence after repeated requests for you to leave. When AFSF arrived on scene, they found the situation had escalated, and learned that you had struck the face of the victim with her cell phone. Then, when the victim told her eight-year-old son to get help, you slapped the phone out of his hands causing scratches to his neck and chest. You fled from the scene prior to the police arriving. On September 18, 2018, [REDACTED] Military Police arrested you when you attempted to enter the installation. Therefore, you are hereby being reprimanded.

As a noncommissioned officer [NCO], you are the backbone of the Army; you set the standard. Unfortunately, you have failed in this regard. Your wholly inappropriate actions have not only undermined your ability to effectively enforce these high standards, but they have brought discredit upon your unit and the United States Army Reserve. Moreover, your conduct casts serious doubt not only on your leadership, but also on your ability for continued service in any capacity.

This is an administrative reprimand imposed under the provisions of AR [Army Regulation] 600-37 [Unfavorable Information] and not as punishment under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. You are advised that in accordance with AR 600-37, Paragraph 3-4b, I am considering whether to file this reprimand in your Official Military Personnel File [OMPF]. Prior to making my filing decision, I will consider any matters you submit on your behalf. You will acknowledge receipt of this reprimand in writing. You will also forward any matters you wish me to consider within 30 calendar days to: Office of the Staff Judge Advocate, 94th Training Division, Fort Lee, VA.

6. As previously noted, SPC [REDACTED] provided an Affidavit of Non-Prosecution on 5 February 2019, recanting her story.

7. His memorandum for Commander, Headquarters, 94TH Training Division (Force Sustainment) (Request for Rescind or File Locally GOMOR – (Applicant)), 1 March 2019, states:

Sir, I respectfully request you rescind or file locally the GOMOR dated 17 January 2019.

BLUF [bottom line up front], I never struck SPC [REDACTED] in the face with her cell phone, nor did I slap the phone out of her son's hands. Further, I was not drinking while at her parent's residence. In her 15 September 2018 statement claiming that I hit her, SPC [REDACTED] misrepresented my actions to investigators because she was angry with me for catching her in a lie about communicating and having relations with SPC [REDACTED]. In her 24 September 2018 statement, SPC [REDACTED] admitted to investigators that my hand hit her face, not because I struck her, but because she was pulling my arms in a downward motion to take the phone away from me. In an affidavit on 5 February 2019, SPC [REDACTED] stated definitively that I did not assault her or her son, indicating that she falsely characterized my actions in her 15 September 2018 statement. Further, she also stated in the affidavit that she preferred the Army take no further action against me.

SPC [REDACTED] is not my ex-girlfriend. We were and are in a relationship and have been living together for the past year, and she is presently pregnant with our child. While I was on her cell phone speaking with SPC [REDACTED] SPC [REDACTED] grabbed both of my wrists in an attempt to take the phone away from me. I instinctively resisted her pull,

and in the struggle to free my arms from her grasp, the phone hit her in the face. I never hit SPC [REDACTED] and only made contact with her while struggling to free my wrists from her grasp, which I was legally entitled to do. My watch also broke off in the midst of this struggle. Nevertheless, I immediately apologized to SPC [REDACTED] even though the contact was caused by her grabbing my arms. SPC [REDACTED] may have been angry about being accidentally struck, but she was angrier that I had caught her in a lie about having relations with SPC [REDACTED] which caused her to mischaracterize my actions to the investigators. SPC [REDACTED] falsified other details as well, such as that I was drinking and that I slapped the phone out of her son's hand causing scratches. The truth is that SPC [REDACTED] was very upset and angry, and I was trying to calm her down. As her anger toward me escalated, I determined that I had to leave the residence so that she might calm down.

I never restrained or struck SPC [REDACTED] son. Contrary to SPC [REDACTED] statement, her son never left the house, and I never had an opportunity to touch him because SPC [REDACTED] was pulling and grabbing me. When SPC [REDACTED] son tried to exit through the front door, I pushed the door closed and tried to calm him and SPC [REDACTED] down.

To give SPC [REDACTED] time to calm down, I left the residence and went to the PX. When I returned, I noticed there was a car out front. I rang the bell, and no one answered, so I walked to the back of the house and through the window I noticed SPC [REDACTED] in the kitchen with SPC [REDACTED] and her son. I knocked, not banged on the door and asked SPC [REDACTED] if I could have my watch, and she told me her dad would bring it to me. SPC [REDACTED] then told me that her mother instructed her to call the police if I didn't leave to prevent any opportunity for there to be a conflict between myself and SPC [REDACTED]. I did not flee the residence to escape the police or because I assaulted SPC [REDACTED] or her son, but I did leave to avoid any further conflict. Had I believed SPC [REDACTED] or her son were afraid of my presence, I wouldn't have returned to the residence after I left the first time.

On 18 September 2018, guards detained me at Aberdeen south post for questioning related to an investigation. I immediately called SPC [REDACTED] because I was supposed to pick up her son later. SPC [REDACTED] told me that she had to complete an incident report because the neighbors called the police. Later, SPC [REDACTED] left work and drove from [REDACTED] to pick up her son and to meet me at the police station on Aberdeen north post. Had I truly assaulted SPC [REDACTED] and her son, she is not the type of person that would allow me contact with her or her son. In fact, I have continued picking up SPC [REDACTED] son from school and even played basketball with him from the time of the incident.

When deliberating on my request, I respectfully ask that you consider the excellent quality of my duty performance over the past four years and evidence of my good

character. There is not one instance of misconduct throughout my entire career. I have demonstrated my ability to execute the mission and to achieve results beyond my commands' expectations, and I have done so in an honorable and professional manner, without exception.

I was born on [REDACTED] and my parents were naturalized citizens from [REDACTED]. I have two older siblings. I grew up [REDACTED] and always had an interest in humanitarian work. In high school, I played football and ran track. In June 2007, I graduated from [REDACTED]. I then attended the [REDACTED], as a full-time student and pursued a double major in Psychology and Sociology. In June 2011, I earned Bachelor of Arts in Psychology and Sociology. After I graduated, I worked at a nonprofit organization mentoring the youth while I pursued a master's degree. I've always had an interest in serving because many members of my family served in the Officer and NCO Corps. On 30 November 2012, I enlisted in the Army as a human resources specialist. On 1 April 2013, I reported for basic training to Fort Jackson, SC, and on 9 August 2013, I completed my advanced training. Immediately thereafter, I reported to the 353rd Civil Affairs Command, Staten Island, NY, as a human resource specialist. On 9 June 2014, HRC selected me for an AGR tour at 5th Battalion, 80th Regiment (OD), as the human resource sergeant. In January 2014, I completed the Warrior Leader Course, and in March 2017, I completed the Advance Leader Course. In September 2017, I completed the Unit Administrator Course, and in May 2018, I completed the Unit Pay Administrator Course.

I have earned the Army Achievement Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster; the Army Good Conduct Medal; the Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development Ribbon with Roman Numeral Two; the Army Service Ribbon; and the National Defense Service Medal.

In my duty assignments over the last four years, my raters and senior raters have consistently rated and referred to me as a top-notch NCO and my duty performance has never failed to meet expectations. In addition to my technical and operational achievements, I have taken all opportunities made available to me to lead and mentor my fellow Soldiers. SFC [sergeant first class] [REDACTED] my current rater, states that I am "reliable and committed to helping all Soldiers no matter the task." Further, SFC [REDACTED] noted that I perform my job without direct supervision; continue to be an asset to the organization; and fully support SHARP [Sexual Harassment/Assault Response and Prevention], EO [Equal Opportunity], and EEO [Equal Employment Opportunity]. 1LT [first lieutenant] [REDACTED] my senior rater, states that I display "strong perseverance and aptitude;" that I have the ability to be "an extremely effective NCO;" and I will be a "strong asset to any unit." In my previous evaluation, 1 LT [REDACTED] states, "Sergeant [REDACTED] is the hardest working and most responsible sergeant I have worked with thus far in my career. He has

excellent organizational skills; he is a great communicator and leader. Promote ahead of peers. Groom for a key leadership position." CPT [Captain] [REDACTED] my previous senior rater, states that I am a "strong NCO who is a total Army asset" who should be selected "ahead of peers" for SSG. Further, "[SGT [REDACTED] consistently performed the duties of an E-6 with professionalism and accuracy, [was] a role model for junior Soldiers [whose] merits deserve selection for career development training ahead of peers [and he] stands out as one of the top five junior NCOs I have worked with.

My superiors, fellow Soldiers, and those who know me well confirm that I am a level headed professional with good judgement. CPT [REDACTED] states, "The Applicant is an outstanding Soldier and a true professional. He has always been dependable, trustworthy, and selfless. His efforts in the S-1 were the focal point in the overall success of the BNs personnel readiness. He worked long hours and never hesitated to go the extra mile when anyone in the command needed his help. I could always trust that the applicant was going to do exactly what was expected of him and more. Based on my experience with working alongside of the applicant I highly recommend that he is retained."

SGM [Sergeant Major] [REDACTED] (U.S. Army, Retired) has 35 years of Army service and has known me for four years. He states, "I can honestly state that one of the main things that I found impressive and refreshing about the applicant was his mindset and drive. I consider him as a trustworthy individual who cares about the well-being of others. Many Soldiers of the 5-80th Regiment (OD) know that the applicant has been what many would consider a one-person shop for longer than half his tenure with the unit. The applicant's ability to make sound judgments was the catalyst of his success. The applicant demonstrates the Army Values and that can go without questioning."

SFC [Sergeant First Class] [REDACTED] was my predecessor at 5-80th Regiment (OD) in human resources. He states, "the applicant is one of the few Soldiers that I have ever seen pick up the human resource profession with ease. With the applicant, I can use a delegate style of leadership with no worries of the products' end result. His ability to make good decisions inside and outside of work is what compliments his great character. I have seen the applicant in tense situations where he remained level-headed and overcame roadblocks. One of the things that I like about the applicant is that he is not afraid to seek guidance as he formulates his approach on things. He is a thinker and moves with intelligence. I can speak of the applicant as having good character; he's very serene and conscious of others."

SSG [REDACTED] is a fellow Soldier and peer of mine who's also a human resource NCO. She states, "The applicant is a not only a dependable NCO, but also one who is well respected amongst his peers. He is known to exhibit the qualities of what a

Soldier is supposed to be as well as an NCO. He is very knowledgeable in his military duties as a human resource professional, and he exudes these behaviors at all times with all colleagues, both superiors and subordinates alike."

In closing, I did not intentionally strike SPC [REDACTED] or scratch her son, and I was not drinking while at her residence. To act as I have been alleged to is in total opposition of my demonstrated personality and moral character and contrary to the opinions of those who know me well. Therefore, I respectfully request that you rescind or file locally the GOMOR dated 17 January 2019. Thank you for your time and consideration.

8. On 6 March 2019 after carefully considering the circumstances of the misconduct; the recommendations made by the applicant's chain of command; and all matters submitted by the applicant in defense, extenuation, or mitigation; the commanding general directed permanently filing the GOMOR on the performance portion of his OMPF. All enclosures were forwarded with the reprimand for filing as appropriate.

9. He was promoted to the rank/grade of SSG/E-6 effective 1 May 2020.

10. On 6 April 2021 in Docket Number AR20210005404, the DASEB determined the evidence presented did not establish clearly and convincingly that the GOMOR was untrue or unjust and the overall merits of the case did not warrant removal of the GOMOR from his AMHRR. The DASEB noted:

a. The applicant requests removal of a GOMOR from his AMHRR. In order to remove a GOMOR from the official record, the burden of proof rests with the appellant 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 AMHRR. Appeals that merely allege an injustice or error without supporting evidence are not acceptable and will not be considered.

b. The appellant contends the GOMOR should be removed because it is untrue.

c. Careful consideration was given to the evidence submitted, the documents in the AMHRR, the appellant's contentions (complainant did not tell the truth and provided statement requesting no action be taken against him because the allegations were untrue) and the Board determined the evidence submitted is insufficient as a basis to remove the GOMOR.

(1) Family violence is unacceptable and incompatible with the Army Core Values. All leaders will take proactive measures and immediate steps to prevent domestic violence in their units and its effect on Soldiers and Families. Family violence can result in serious physical, emotional, and psychological injuries, and in the most

severe cases, result in death. All leaders have a moral and professional obligation to immediately act upon known or suspected incidents of domestic and child abuse.

(2) The complainant's Affidavit of Non-Prosecution was duly noted. However, unaccompanied by a statement from the IA or formal investigation it is insufficient as a basis to remove the GOMOR.

(3) The IA reviewed the GOMOR packet which included the appellant's rebuttal, a Report of Investigation, Incident Report Summary, and the complainant's statement. The IA determined the GOMOR was warranted and due to the nature of the incident the IA elected to file the GOMOR in the appellant's AMHRR.

(4) The appellant may disagree with the IA's decision to issue him a GOMOR, however, it was within the IA's authority to do so. One of the main differences between the military and civilian responses to domestic violence is the authority of the commanding officer when a service member commits abuse. The commanding officer can use judicial, administrative, or other punishments to respond to the reported incident.

(5) The governing regulation states the officer who directed the filing of an administrative GOMOR, admonition, or censure may request its revision, alteration, or removal, if a later investigation determines it was untrue or unjust, in whole or in part. The basis for such determination must be provided to the DASEB in sufficient detail so as to justify the request. Counsel/appellant did not submit a letter from the IA stating the GOMOR was untrue, unjust, filed erroneously, or new evidence was being considered.

(6) The filing of the GOMOR was not unjust. The governing regulation permits the issuance of a written reprimand when there is reasonable belief that someone has deviated from the Army values, personal conduct, or the expectations of a Soldier. The reprimand may be filed in the appellant's AMHRR permanently to permit the Army to consider all available relevant information when considering the appellant for positions of leadership, trust, and responsibility.

(7) The DASEB does not have an automatic removal policy based upon implementation of new Army personnel management programs, the noted misconduct being a single incident, or excellent prior or post service since the imposition of the GOMOR. Moreover, the DASEB, in compliance with Army Regulation 600-37, does not have a policy of removing unfavorable information based on an alleged injustice resulting from non-selection for promotion, schooling, previous evaluations or special assignments.

d. The appellant has not provided clear and convincing evidence to support the removal of the GOMOR. Once a GOMOR is properly filed in the AMHRR, it is presumed

to be administratively correct and filed pursuant to an objective decision by competent authority.

e. Based on the available evidence, the appellant has not provided clear and convincing evidence which shows the GOMOR is inaccurate, unjust, or otherwise flawed.

11. The DASEB Memorandum (Resolution of Unfavorable Information for – (Applicant), Case Number AR20210005404), 8 April 2021 notified the applicant of the denial of his request.

12. On 1 September 2021, the applicant was released from active duty for reenlistment in the USAR. He was concurrently ordered to AGR status and assigned to his current duty station.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

1. After reviewing the application, all supporting documents, and the evidence found within the military record, the Board found relief is warranted.

2. The Board found the decision to reprimand the applicant was supported by the evidence available to the GOMOR imposing authority; however, the Board found the decision to file the GOMOR in the performance portion of the applicant's AMHRR was too harsh. The Board agreed that the event described in the available records was an isolated incident that was not of such severity that it should have become part of the applicant's AMHRR. Based on a preponderance of the evidence, the Board determined the GOMOR and all allied documents, to include any DASEB proceedings, should be removed from the applicant's AMHRR.

BOARD VOTE:

Mbr 1 Mbr 2 Mbr 3

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	GRANT FULL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT PARTIAL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT FORMAL HEARING
:	:	:	DENY APPLICATION

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Board determined the evidence presented is sufficient to warrant a recommendation for relief. As a result, the Board recommends that all Department of the Army records of the individual concerned be corrected by removing the GOMOR, 17 January 2019, and all allied documents, to include any DASEB proceedings, from his AMHRR.

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.

REFERENCES:

1. 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 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 DASEB to justify the request.

2. 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 OMPF, 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 Army Board for Correction of Military Records or other 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.

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//