

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 8 November 2024

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240003319

APPLICANT REQUESTS:

- an upgrade of his under other than honorable conditions discharge
- a video and/or telephonic appearance before the Board

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

- DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record)
- Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Form 21-4138 (Statement in Support of Claim) dated 29 January 2024

FACTS:

1. The applicant did not file within the 3-year time frame provided in Title 10, U.S. Code (USC), 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 provides VA Form 21-4148 (Statement in Support of Claim), dated 29 January 2024, that shows in Section II (Remarks), details referencing his Chapter 10 discharge. He reenlisted for an assignment to Heidelberg, Germany but was never issued his plane ticket and travel documents. He went to his chain of command for assistance but was told to "get it done." After no help from the chain of command and not receiving his plane ticket and travel documents he decided to go to Fort Belvoir, Virginia, seeking assistance from a friend. While at Fort Belvoir he received a call from his chain of command ordering him back to Fort McPherson, GA. Once he returned to Fort McPherson, he was directed to cut grass and perform similar duties while he waited for his punishment. He stated he was given an ultimatum of incarceration at Fort Leavenworth, KS, or immediate discharge by accepting a Chapter 10 discharge. He realized years later that was not the correct process for punishment under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). He proclaimed he did go unauthorized to Fort Belvoir but did so to get assistance that he was absolutely not getting from his chain of command. This has been an egregious mischaracterization of justice; please review his record and upgrade his undeserved character discharge.

3. A review of the applicant's service record shows:

a. He enlisted in the Regular Army on 4 June 2002 for 8 years and continued service through one reenlistment.

b. The complete facts and circumstances surrounding the applicant's discharge are unavailable for the Board's review.

c. On 15 June 2005, he was discharged from active duty with an under other than honorable conditions characterization of service. His DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) shows he completed 2 years, 10 months, and 18 days of active service with 54 days of lost time. He was assigned separation code KFS and the narrative reason for separation listed as "In Lieu of Trial by Court-Martial", with reentry code 4.

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

5. In reaching its determination, the Board can consider the applicant's petition and his service record in accordance with the published equity, injustice, or clemency determination guidance.

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 request, supporting documents, evidence in the records, and published Department of Defense guidance for liberal consideration of discharge upgrade requests. The Board considered the applicant's statement and record of service, the frequency and nature of the applicant's misconduct and the reason for separation. The applicant was charged with an offense punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice with a punitive discharge. After being charged, he consulted with counsel and voluntarily requested discharge in lieu of trial by court-martial. The Board found no error or injustice in the separation proceedings and designated characterization of service. Based on a preponderance of the evidence, the Board concluded that the characterization of service the applicant received upon separation was not in error or unjust.

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.

3. Prior to closing the discussion, the Board determined his Enlisted Record Brief shows awards not annotated on his DD Form 214 and administratively added his award of the Army Commendation Medal, Army Service Ribbon, and National Defense Service Medal.

BOARD VOTE:

Mbr 1 Mbr 2 Mbr 3

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

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

1. 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 for correction of the records of the individual concerned.

2. Prior to closing the discussion, the Board determined the applicant was authorized awards not annotated on his DD Form 214. As a result, amend his DD Form 214 for the period ending 15 June 2005, to add:

- Army Commendation Medal
- Army Service Ribbon
- National Defense Service Medal

■

■ ■

■

■

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, USC, 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 (AR) 15-185 (ABCMR) prescribes the policies and procedures for correction of military records by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the ABCMR. The ABCMR begins its consideration of each case with the presumption of administrative regularity, which is that what the Army did was correct. The ABCMR is not an investigative body and decides cases based on the evidence that is presented in the military records provided and the independent evidence submitted with the application. The applicant has the burden of proving an error or injustice by a preponderance of the evidence. Additionally, it states in paragraph 2-11 that applicants do not have a right to a hearing before the ABCMR. The Director or the ABCMR may grant a formal hearing whenever justice requires.

3. AR 635-5 (Separation Documents), in effect at the time, states the DD Form 214 is a summary of the Soldier's most recent period of continuous active duty. It provides a brief, clear-cut record of all current active, prior active, and prior inactive duty service at the time of release from active duty, retirement, or discharge. The information entered thereon reflects the conditions as they existed at the time of separation.

4. AR 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), in effect at the time, sets forth the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel.

a. An honorable discharge is a separation with honor. 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.

b. A general discharge is a separation from the Army under honorable conditions. When authorized, it is issued to a member whose military record is satisfactory but not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge.

c. Chapter 10 of this regulation states an individual who has committed an offense or offenses, the punishment for any of which includes a bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge, may submit a request for discharge in lieu of trial by court-martial. An Under Other than Honorable Discharge Certificate normally is appropriate for a member who is discharged for the good of the service.

5. On 25 July 2018, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness issued guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records (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 based on equity, injustice, or clemency grounds, BCM/NRs 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//