

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 11 July 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240003709

APPLICANT REQUESTS: adjustment of her date of rank (DOR) to captain (CPT) with backpay.

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

- DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record)
- Memorandum for Record (MFR) – Subject: Volunteer for Deployment – Regarding (RE): First Lieutenant (1LT) B_, dated 11 May 2020, wherein the applicant volunteers to mobilize with Headquarters and Headquarters Company (HHC), 1-102D Infantry Regiment (Mountain), New Haven, CT in support of the upcoming 2021 deployment to the Horn of Africa
- MFR – Subject: Individual Mobilization Checklist – RE: 1LT B_, dated 11 May 2020, wherein, the applicant initials that:
 - She understands this is voluntary and she is not obligated to fill the request
 - She understands that upon return from mobilization, she would be reassigned to a position vacancy in units statewide, and that the state is not required to return me to the same unit or duty position.
 - She agreed to fill the position identified on the enclosed request and
 - understands that if approved, she would be involuntarily mobilized for the period indicated
- MFR – Subject: Letter of Vacancy Deployment Manning Document (DMD) – B_, dated 15 June 2020, wherein, the Senior Human Resources Sergeant, HHC, 1-102D Infantry Regiment (Mountain), New Haven, CT states the applicant requested to fill a position vacancy for their upcoming Mobilization
- DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) for period of service ending 18 March 2022
- Letter of support from Lieutenant Colonel D_T_, Deputy G-1, Joint Force Headquarters – CT states that upon her transfer in the battalion she was to be placed in DMD as the “Protection Officer CPT/O-3, 12A DMD” vacancy. When the time to promote came around the applicant’s paperwork reflected, she was misplaced in an E-9 slot under the DMD

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 due to multiple administrative errors in the Connecticut Army National Guard (CTARNG) and Wyoming Army National Guard (WYARNG), she was promoted over two years past her eligibility date. She voluntarily deployed twice in the hopes of developing her skills as an engineer and advancing her career. The applicant explains in her statement which is available for the Board's review in the supporting documents:

- During her deployment to Africa, she was ineligible for the promotion cycle due to coding in the DMD
- She was told she was filling an O-3 slot; she was improperly coded as an E-9
- She inter-state transferred (IST) to Wyoming which had no O-3 slots available
- This promotion administrative issue makes her 2-3 years behind her peer group
- Volunteering for multiple deployments adversely affected her career progression

3. A review of the applicant's service records reflect the following:

a. She was appointed as a Reserve Commissioned Officer of the Army on 21 June 2017, in the rank of second lieutenant.

b. She was promoted to first lieutenant on 21 December 2018, in the CTARNG.

c. She served in Djibouti and Kenya from 10 April 2021 to 6 January 2022.

d. Order Number 0001807573.00, issued by CTARNG, Army Element Joint Force Headquarters, Hartford, CT on 5 May 2022, noted the applicant was an assignment loss on 26 April 2022, for IST to another Army National Guard state.

e. Order Number 0001817434.00, issued by WYARNG, Army Element Joint Force Headquarters, Cheyenne, WY, CT on 11 May 2022, noted the applicant was an assignment gain on 27 April 2022, in Duty Position Title: Platoon Leader.

f. She was promoted to CPT on 4 October 2023, in the WYARNG.

4. In the processing of this case, an advisory opinion was obtained on 7 February 2025. The National Guard Bureau, Chief, Special Actions Branch, recommended disapproval of the applicant's request for her DOR to CPT to be adjusted from 4 October 2023 to an

appropriate date consistent with the normal Unit Vacancy Promotion (UVP) process while a member of the CTARNG in 2021 and backpay. It states in pertinent part:

a. The Soldier states she should have been promoted but was not due to administrative errors in her military records while a member of the CTARNG. She claims that during the period of 2021 while deployed to Djibouti and Kenya, she became ineligible for the promotion cycle due to an error in her coding in the DMD. She was told that she was in an O-3/CPT slot, and later found out during the promotion cycle that her DMD was in error, and that she had been improperly input as an E-9/Sergeant Major and therefore not eligible for promotion. Additionally, the Soldier states that when she returned from deployment, she had an inter-state transfer to the WYARNG.

b. The WYARNG, did a review of the Soldier's claim and documents presented. The WYARNG concluded the applicant technically was occupying an O-3 position and that she met the minimum time requirement for promotion to CPT; however, she was not federally recognized through the CTARNG Federal Recognition Board in accordance with National Guard Regulation 600-100 (Commissioned Officers Federal Recognition and Related Personnel Actions).

c. An additional review of the Soldier's claim by the CTARNG also concluded that the Soldier was eligible for UVP promotion, but not selected for promotion based on their internal management/assignment board. The CTARNG did state that if the Soldier had not IST to WYARNG she would have competed during the Fiscal Year 2021 management/assignment board and may or may not have been selected for promotion.

d. This opinion was coordinated with the WYARNG and CTARNG.

5. On 14 February 2025, the applicant was provided a copy of the advisory opinion and afforded 15 days to provide comments. She did not respond.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

After reviewing the application, all supporting documents, and the evidence found within the military record, the Board found that partial 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, and regulation. The Board reviewed and non-concurred with the National Guard Bureau's advisory noting the inconsistency between the WYARNG stating the applicant was technically occupying a CPT position and meeting time in grade requirements, however, not going before a federal recognition board, and the CTARNG stating the applicant was eligible for UVP promotion, but not selected for promotion based on their internal management/assignment board. Therefore, the Board recommends that the applicant's

record be presented before a Special Selection Board/Federal Recognition Board to determine the applicant's appropriate date of rank due to administrative errors.

BOARD VOTE:

Mbr 1 Mbr 2 Mbr 3

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

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

1. The Board determined the evidence presented is sufficient to warrant a recommendation for partial relief. As a result, the Board recommends that all Department of the Army records of the individual concerned be corrected by authorizing a Special Selection Board/Federal Recognition Board to determine the applicant's appropriate date of rank due to administrative errors. If selected for promotion given the appropriate date of rank and applicable back pay and allowances as a result of the correction.
2. The Board further determined that the evidence presented is insufficient to warrant a portion of the requested relief. As a result, the Board recommends denial of so much of the application that pertains to amending her date of rank and effective date of rank.

x //signed//

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. 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 135-155 (Army National Guard and Reserve – Promotion of Commissioned Officers and Warrant Officer) set out the minimum TIG requirements before an officer may be considered for promotion from 1LT to CPT. Army Regulation 135-155 does not grant an officer an affirmative right to be promoted. It merely sets the minimum requirements before an Officer may be promoted.

3. National Guard Regulation 600-100 (Commissioned Officers Federal Recognition and Related Personnel Actions) prescribes policies and procedures governing the appointment, assignment, temporary federal recognition, reassignment, transfers between States, Branch (BR) transfers, Area of Concentration designation, utilization, BR detail, and attachment of commissioned officers of the ARNG.

a. The promotion of officers in the ARNG is a function of the State. As in original appointments, a commissioned officer promoted by State authorities has a state status in the higher grade under which to function. However, to be extended federal recognition in the higher grade, the officer must have satisfied the requirements prescribed herein.

b. National Guard officers may be considered and found qualified for federal recognition of their state promotion using two distinct processes: State Federal Recognition Boards and DA Mandatory Boards. Under either process, the precedent for an actual promotion in the ARNG is State assignment and appointment to the next higher grade. Selection for promotion does not automatically constitute an approved promotion action.

c. The DOR is the date the officer actually or constructively was appointed or promoted to a specific grade. The DOR is used in calculating time in grade toward promotion consideration in the next higher grade. It is the date used to determine the relative seniority for officers holding the same grade.

d. To be considered in a promotable status the officer must be (1) assigned to the higher graded position, (2) a State Promotion is published, and (3) the officer's federal recognition packet is assigned to a scroll.

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//