

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 6 September 2024

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240000658

APPLICANT REQUESTS: a change in his reentry (RE) code.

APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING DOCUMENT(S) CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:  
DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record).

FACTS:

1. The applicant did not file within the 3-year time frame provided in Title 10, U.S. Code, section 1552(b); however, the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR) conducted a substantive review of this case and determined it is in the interest of justice to excuse the applicant's failure to timely file.
2. The applicant states is requesting a change in his RE code because he is considering joining the military now that he can serve.
3. A review of the applicant's service record shows:
  - a. He enlisted in the Regular Army on 12 January 2000.
  - b. The service record includes the applicant's medical evaluations, dated 18 October 2000, for the purpose of administrative separation which indicated he was generally in good health.
    - Standard Form (SF) 88 (Report of Medical Examination)
    - SF 93 (Report of Medical History)
  - c. On 17 October 2000, the applicant requested separation under the provisions of Army Regulation (AR) 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), Chapter 15. He indicated he felt that he had a natural propensity to engage in sexual activity with members of the same sex.
  - d. On 18 October 2000, the applicant's immediate commander notified the applicant of his intent to separate him under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 15 for homosexual conduct. The specific reasons for his proposed recommendation were the

applicant's propensity to engage in sexual activity with members of the same sex. He acknowledged receipt of the notification on the same day.

e. On 18 October 2000, after consultation with legal counsel, he acknowledged:

- the rights available to him and the effect of waiving said rights
- he may encounter substantial prejudice in civilian life if a general discharge under honorable conditions is issued to him
- he may be ineligible for many or all benefits as a Veteran under both Federal and State laws
- he may apply to the Army Discharge Review Board or the ABCMR for upgrading he is ineligible to apply for enlistment in the U.S. Army for a period of 2 years after discharge

f. On 18 October 2000, the immediate commander initiated separation action against the applicant for homosexual conduct. She recommended that his period of service be characterized as honorable. The intermediate commander recommended approval.

g. On 19 October 2000, consistent with the chain of command recommendations, the separation authority approved the discharge recommendation for immediate separation under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 15, for homosexual conduct. He would be issued an Honorable Discharge Certificate.

h. On 26 October 2000, he was honorably discharged from active duty. His DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) shows he completed 9 months and 15 days of active service. It also shows:

- item 25 (Separation Authority) – AR 635-200, paragraph 15-3b
- item 26 (Separation Code) – JRB
- item 27 (Reentry Code) – 4
- item 28 (Narrative Reason for Separation) – Homosexual Admission

4. There is no evidence the applicant has applied to the Army Discharge Review Board for review of his discharge within that board's 15-year statute of limitations.

5. Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) memorandum states that, effective 20 September 2011, it is DOD policy that broad, retroactive corrections of records from applicants discharged under DADT [or prior policies] are not warranted. Although DADT is repealed effective 20 September 2011, it was the law and reflected the view of Congress during the period it was the law. Similarly, DOD regulations implementing various aspects of DADT [or prior policies] were valid regulations during those same or prior periods. Thus, the issuance of a discharge under DADT [or prior

policies] should not by itself be considered to constitute an error or injustice that would invalidate an otherwise properly taken discharge action. An upgrade, if and when warranted, would entail a change to:

- narrative reason for discharge (to "Secretarial Authority" with the Separation Code of JFF)
- characterization of service to honorable
- the RE code to an immediately-eligible-to-reenter category

6. For the above upgrades to be warranted, the memorandum states both of the following conditions must have been met:

- the original discharge was based solely on DADT or a similar policy in place prior to enactment of DADT
- there were no aggravating factors in the record, such as misconduct

7. The memorandum further states that although each request must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, the award of an honorable or general discharge should normally be considered to indicate the absence of aggravating factors.

8. By regulation (AR 601-210):

- RE-1 applies to Soldiers completing their term of active service who are considered qualified to reenter the U.S. Army; they are qualified for enlistment if all other criteria are met
- RE-3 applies to Soldiers who are not considered fully qualified for reentry or continuous service at the time of separation, but the disqualification is waivable; those individuals are ineligible unless a waiver is granted
- RE-4 applies to Soldiers ineligible for reentry

#### BOARD DISCUSSION:

After reviewing the application and all supporting documents, the Board found that 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, regulation, and published Department of Defense guidance for liberal consideration of discharge upgrade requests. The evidence shows the applicant was discharged from active duty due to homosexual admission. The Board found no error or injustice in his separation processing. However, the Board found based upon repeal of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy and a change in Department of Defense policy relating to homosexual conduct, an upgrade is appropriate if the original

discharge was based solely on homosexuality or a similar policy in place prior to enactment of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" and there were no aggravating factors in the record. The Board determined there were no aggravating circumstances and as a result, determined a change to the characterization of service, narrative reason for separation, and corresponding codes is appropriate.

BOARD VOTE:

Mbr 1      Mbr 2      Mbr 3

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

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Board determined the evidence presented is sufficient to warrant relief. As a result, the Board recommends that all Department of the Army records of the individual concerned be corrected by amending the applicant's DD Form 214, for the period ending 26 October 2000 to show in:

- item 25 (Separation Authority): Army Regulation 635-200
- item 26 (Separation Code): JFF
- item 27 (Reentry Code): 1
- item 28 (Narrative Reason for Separation): Secretarial Authority

■

■

■

---

■

■

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

## REFERENCES:

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

2. Army Regulation 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), in effect at the time, sets forth the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel. Chapter 15, in effect at the time, prescribed the criteria and procedures for the investigation of homosexual personnel and their discharge from the Army. When the sole basis for separation was homosexuality, a discharge under other than honorable conditions could be issued only if such characterization was otherwise warranted and if there was a finding that during the current term of service the Soldier attempted, solicited or committed a homosexual act by using force, coercion or intimidation; with a person under 16 years of age; with a subordinate; openly in public view; for compensation; aboard a military vessel or aircraft; or in another location subject to military control if the conduct had, or was likely to have had, an adverse impact on discipline, good order or morale due to the close proximity of other Soldiers of the Armed Forces. In all other cases, the type of discharge would reflect the character of the Soldier's service.

3. Army Regulation 601-210 (Regular Army and Army Reserve Enlistment Program) covers eligibility criteria, policies, and procedures for enlistment and processing into the RA and the United States Army Reserve. Table 3-1 included a list of the RA RE codes. RE codes are numbered 1, 3, and 4.

- RE-1 applies to Soldiers completing their term of active service who are considered qualified to reenter the U.S. Army; they are qualified for enlistment if all other criteria are met
- RE-3 applies to Soldiers who are not considered fully qualified for reentry or continuous service at the time of separation, but the disqualification is waivable; those individuals are ineligible unless a waiver is granted
- RE-4 applies to Soldiers ineligible for reentry

4. DADT policy was implemented in 1993 during the Clinton presidency. This policy banned the military from investigating service members about their sexual orientation. Under that policy, service members may be investigated and administratively discharged if they made a statement that they were lesbian, gay, or bisexual; engaged in physical contact with someone of the same sex for the purposes of sexual gratification; or married, or attempted to marry, someone of the same sex.

5. Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) memorandum, dated 20 September 2011, subject: Correction of Military Records Following Repeal of Section 654 of Title 10, U.S. Code, provides policy guidance for Service Discharge Review Boards (DRBs) and Service Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records (BCM/NRs) to follow when taking action on applications from former service members discharged under DADT or prior policies. The memorandum states that, effective 20 September 2011, Service DRBs should normally grant requests, in these cases, to change the:

- narrative reason for discharge (to "Secretarial Authority" with the SPD code of JFF)
- characterization of service to honorable
- the RE code to an immediately-eligible-to-reenter category

6. For the above upgrades to be warranted, the memorandum states both of the following conditions must have been met: the original discharge was based solely on DADT or a similar policy in place prior to enactment of DADT and there were no aggravating factors in the record, such as misconduct. The memorandum further states that although each request must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, the award of an honorable or general discharge should normally be considered to indicate the absence of aggravating factors.

7. The memorandum also recognized that although BCM/NRs have a significantly broader scope of review and are authorized to provide much more comprehensive remedies than are available from the DRBs, it is Department of Defense (DOD) policy that broad, retroactive corrections of records from applicants discharged under DADT [or prior policies] are not warranted. Although DADT is repealed effective 20 September 2011, it was the law and reflected the view of Congress during the period it was the law. Similarly, DOD regulations implementing various aspects of DADT [or prior policies] were valid regulations during those same or prior periods. Thus, the issuance of a discharge under DADT [or prior policies] should not by itself be considered to constitute an error or injustice that would invalidate an otherwise properly taken discharge action.

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//