

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 10 January 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240004300

APPLICANT REQUESTS: an upgrade of his under other than honorable conditions (UOTHC) character of service.

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

- DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record)
- DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty), for the period ending 13 August 1997

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 was a model Soldier. Unfortunately, he made one terrible decision and had a positive drug test. It was a major lapse in judgement, but he thinks the penalty of a potential court-martial was too severe. He has been a model citizen since this incident.
3. The applicant enlisted in the Regular Army on 28 September 1990, for a 4-year period. Upon completion of initial entry training, he was awarded military occupational specialty 92G (Cook). He reenlisted on 17 February 1994 in the pay grade of E-4.
4. Court-martial charges were preferred against the applicant; however, the relevant DD Form 458 (Charge Sheet) is not available for review.
5. The applicant's record is void of a separation packet containing the specific facts and circumstances surrounding his discharge processing. However, his DD Form 214 shows he was discharged on 13 August 1997, under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), Chapter 10, in lieu of trial by court-martial. His service was characterized as UOTHC, with separation code KFS and reentry code RE-4. He completed 6 years, 9 months, and 29 days of active service, with

lost time from 3 February 1996 to 19 February 1996. He was awarded or authorized the following:

- Army Commendation Medal
- Army Achievement Medal (2nd award)
- Army Good Conduct Medal
- National Defense Service Medal
- Noncommissioned Officer's Professional Development Ribbon
- Army Service Ribbon
- Overseas Service Ribbon (2nd award)
- Expert Marksmanship Qualification Badge with Rifle bar and Grenade bar

6. The issuance of a discharge under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 10, required the applicant to have requested from the Army, voluntarily, willingly, and in writing, a discharge in lieu of trial by court-martial. It is presumed that all requirements of law and regulation were met, and the rights of the applicant were fully protected throughout the separation process. No evidence to the contrary has been provided.

7. The Board should consider the applicant's argument and/or evidence 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 partial relief was 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. Upon review of the applicant's service record, the Board determined he served a period of continuous honorable service from 28 September 1990 to 16 February 1994 and his record should reflect that service accordingly.

BOARD VOTE:

Mbr 1      Mbr 2      Mbr 3

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

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

1. The Board determined the evidence presented is sufficient to warrant partial 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 13 August 1997, to show Continuous Honorable Active Service from 28 September 1990 to 16 February 1994.

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 upgrading his characterization of service.

4/10/2025

X [REDACTED]

CHAIRPERSON

[REDACTED]

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 Army Board for Correction of Military Records (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 regulation provides that the ABCMR begins its consideration of each case with the presumption of administrative regularity. The applicant has the burden of proving an error or injustice by a preponderance of the evidence. It is not an investigative body.
3. Army Regulation 635-5 (Separation Documents) establishes the standardized policy for preparing and distributing the DD Form 214. Regulatory guidance provides for an additional entry for continuous honorable active service when a Soldier who previously reenlisted without being issued a DD Form 214 was discharged with any characterization of service except honorable.
4. Army Regulation 635-200 (Personnel Separations Enlisted ), in effect at the time, set forth the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel.
  - a. Chapter 10 of that regulation provides, in pertinent part, that a member who has committed an offense or offenses for which the authorized punishment includes a punitive discharge may, submit a request for discharge for the good of the service in lieu of trial by court-martial. The request may be submitted at any time after charges have been preferred and must include the individual's admission of guilt. Although an honorable or general discharge is authorized, a discharge under other than honorable conditions is normally considered appropriate.
  - b. An honorable discharge is a separation with honor and entitles the recipient to benefits provided by law. 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.
  - c. A general discharge is a separation from the Army under honorable conditions. When authorized, it is issued to a Soldier whose military record is satisfactory but not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge.
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/NR) 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 on the basis of equity, injustice, or clemency grounds, Boards 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//