

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 6 November 2024

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240003493

APPLICANT REQUESTS:

- an upgrade of his bad conduct discharge
- a video/telephonic appearance before the Board

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 he is requesting an upgrade of his bad conduct discharge. He was confused during his time in service and did not know who to turn to. He believed the first sergeant (1SG) treated him differently than the white Soldiers and he was unable to deal with his 1SG. The applicant did not believe he could turn to anyone for help. To avoid dealing with the pressure of the treatment he was receiving from the 1SG, he elected to shoot himself in the foot in hopes of getting relieved. He was young, 18 years old, and did not understand nor have knowledge of how to solicit support. He understands the importance of utilizing the chain of command today. He was informed by fellow Veterans he could request a discharge upgrade. He is active in his community and an advocate for other Veterans who struggled while serving in the military. The applicant marked other mental health on his DD Form 149 as a condition related to his request.
3. A review of the applicant's service record shows:
  - a. He enlisted in the Regular Army on 3 August 1989.

b. On 21 December 1990, he was convicted by a general court-martial of two specifications of malingering by intentionally injuring himself and one specification of being absent without leave (AWOL) from on or about 21 October 1990 to on or about 3 October 1990. His sentence included reduction to the private (E-1), forfeiture of all pay and allowances, confinement for 6 months, and a bad conduct discharge.

c. On 15 April 1991, the convening authority approved the sentence and except for the bad conduct discharge, ordered it executed. The record of trial was forwarded to the Judge Advocate General of the Army for appellate review.

d. General Court-Martial Order Number 103, dated 8 November 1991, after Article 71(c) was complied with and the sentence was affirmed, ordered the bad conduct discharge executed.

e. On 2 December 1991, he was discharged from active duty with a bad conduct characterization of service. His DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) shows he completed 1 year, 10 months, and 13 days of active service with 168 days of lost time. He was assigned separation code JJD and the narrative reason for separation listed as "As a Result of Court-Martial, Other," with reentry code 4. It also shows he was awarded or authorized:

- National Defense Service Medal
- Army Service Ribbon
- Expert Marksmanship Qualification Badge with Hand Grenade Bar
- Marksman Marksmanship Qualification Badge with Rifle Bar (M-16)
- Parachutist Badge

4. On 19 August 2024, the applicant was notified by the Army Review Boards Agency that he was required to provide a copy of medical documentation to support his claim of other mental health conditions. The applicant was provided 30 days to submit supporting documentation with a suspense of 19 September 2024. The applicant has not provided a response to date.

5. By regulation (AR 15-185), an applicant is not entitled to a hearing before the ABCMR. Hearings may be authorized by a panel of the ABCMR or by the Director of the ABCMR.

6. By regulation (AR 635-200), a member will be given a bad conduct discharge pursuant only to an approved sentence of a general or special court-martial. The appellate review must be completed, and the affirmed sentence ordered duly executed.

7. 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.

8. MEDICAL REVIEW:

a. The applicant is applying to the ABCMR requesting an upgrade of his bad conduct discharge. He contends he experienced mental health conditions that mitigate his misconduct. 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: 1) The applicant enlisted in the Regular Army on 3 August 1989; 2) On 21 December 1990, he was convicted by a general court-martial of two specifications of malingering by intentionally injuring himself and one specification of being AWOL; 3) The applicant was discharged on 2 December 1991-As a Result of Court-Martial, Other with a bad conduct characterization of service.

b. The Army Review Board Agency (ARBA) Medical Advisor reviewed the available supporting documents and the applicant's available military service records. The VA's Joint Legacy Viewer (JLV) was also examined. No additional medical records were provided for review.

c. The applicant asserts he was experiencing mental health conditions while on active service, which mitigates his misconduct. There is insufficient evidence the applicant reported or was diagnosed with a mental health disorder, while on active service.

d. A review of JLV provided insufficient evidence the applicant has ever been diagnosed with a mental health condition, and he does not receive any service-connected disability.

e. Based on the available information, it is the opinion of the Agency Medical Advisor that there is insufficient evidence to support the applicant had a condition or experience that mitigates his misconduct.

f. Kurta Questions:

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the misconduct? Yes, the applicant asserts he experienced mental health conditions which mitigates his misconduct.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? Yes, the applicant asserts he experienced mental health conditions that mitigates his misconduct while on active service.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the misconduct? No, there is insufficient evidence beyond self-report the applicant was experiencing a mental health condition, while he was on active service. The applicant did go AWOL and engage in self-harm to avoid duty, which could be avoidant and erratic behavior and a natural sequelae to some mental health conditions. However, the presence of misconduct is not sufficient evidence of the presence of a mental health condition. Yet, the applicant contends he was experiencing a mental health condition or an experience that mitigates his misconduct, and per Liberal Consideration his contention alone is sufficient for the board's consideration.

#### 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 the medical review, the Board concurred with the advising official finding insufficient evidence to support the applicant had a condition or experience that mitigates his misconduct. The opine noted, the applicant's record is absent sufficient evidence to support he has ever been diagnosed with a mental health condition, and he does not receive any service-connected disability.
2. The Board determined there is insufficient evidence of in-service mitigating factors to overcome the misconduct of intentionally injuring himself and going AWOL. The Board noted, the applicant provided no post service achievements or character letters of support for the Board to weigh a clemency determination. ABCMR is only empowered to change the severity of the sentence imposed in the court-martial process and then only if clemency is determined to be appropriate. Based on a preponderance of evidence, the Board determined that the character of service the applicant received upon separation was not in error or unjust. Therefore, the Board denied relief.
3. 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

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

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

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.



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 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.

a. 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.

b. The ABCMR may, in its discretion, hold a hearing or request additional evidence or opinions. 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. Army Regulation 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), in effect at the time, sets forth the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel.

a. Paragraph 3-7a (Honorable discharge) states 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 the acceptable conduct and performance of duty for Army personnel, or is otherwise so meritorious that any other characterization would be clearly inappropriate.

b. Paragraph 3-7b (General discharge) states 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. Paragraph 3-7c (Under Other Than Honorable Conditions) states a discharge under other than honorable conditions is an administrative separation from the service under conditions other than honorable. It may be issued for misconduct, fraudulent entry, homosexuality, security reasons, or for the good of the service.

d. Paragraph 3-11 (DD Form 259A (Bad Conduct Discharge Certificate) states a member will be given a bad conduct discharge pursuant only to an approved sentence of a general or special court-martial. The appellate review must be completed and the affirmed sentence ordered duly executed.

4. Title 10, U.S. Code, section 1552, provides that the Secretary of a Military Department may correct any military record of the Secretary's Department when the Secretary considers it necessary to correct an error or remove an injustice. With respect to records of courts-martial and related administrative records pertaining to court-martial cases tried or reviewed under the UCMJ, action to correct any military record of the Secretary's Department may extend only to correction of a record to reflect actions taken by reviewing authorities under the UCMJ or action on the sentence of a court-martial for purposes of clemency. Such corrections shall be made by the

Secretary acting through boards of civilians of the executive part of that Military Department.

5. On 3 September 2014, the Secretary of Defense directed the Service Discharge Review Boards (DRBs) and Service Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records (BCM/NRs) to carefully consider the revised post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) criteria, detailed medical considerations and mitigating factors when taking action on applications from former service members administratively discharged under other than honorable conditions and who have been diagnosed with PTSD by a competent mental health professional representing a civilian healthcare provider in order to determine if it would be appropriate to upgrade the characterization of the applicant's service.

6. 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 DRBs and BCM/NRs 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. 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. The guidance further describes evidence sources and criteria and requires boards to consider the conditions or experiences presented in evidence as potential mitigation for misconduct that led to the discharge.

7. 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.

8. Section 1556 of Title 10, United States Code, requires the Secretary of the Army to ensure that an applicant seeking corrective action by the Army Review Boards Agency (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.

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//