

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 20 November 2024

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240004384

APPLICANT REQUESTS: reconsideration of his previous request for upgrade of his under other than honorable conditions discharge.

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

- DD Form 293 (Application for the Review of Discharge from the Armed Forces of the United States)
- DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty)

FACTS:

1. Incorporated herein by reference are military records which were summarized in the previous consideration of the applicant's case by the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR) in Docket Number AR20170004740 on 4 December 2020.

2. The applicant states he was harassed based on his race and suffered discriminatory harassment while serving in the military. He suffered post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and mental anguish, back injury due to physical altercations provoked by his superior officers/comrades who made his time serving a living hell, because of his skin color. As stated before, he was the only black in his company. However, they used racial slurs offensive and derogatory remarks. They would rip-up (tear) his bed, break open his locker, put shaving cream in his boots so he would suffer great abuse by the superior officers. Therefore, he did encounter physical abuse as well as mental abuse during cleanup detail after a comrade vomited everywhere. After trying to explain the event. Next thing, he knew he was forced to take/sign separation papers under duress and accused of something, he was not guilty of but had no one to trust or advocate for him.

3. The applicant enlisted in the Regular Army (RA) on 20 February 1980. He held military occupational specialty 91E (Dental Specialist).

4. Applicant's medical records extracts shows excerpts of his medical history from 1980 through 1981 regarding his medical visits, results, notes with additional medical annotations.

5. The complete facts and circumstances surrounding his discharge are not available for review with this case. However, the record contains:

a. Separation authority approval which shows on 13 May 1981, he approved his request for discharge under the provisions of Army Regulation (AR) 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), chapter 14-33b (patterns of misconduct) and directed his service be characterized under other than honorable conditions and reduced to the lowest grade of private/E-1.

b. DD Form 214, which shows he was discharged from active duty on 29 May 1981. His DD Form 214 shows he completed 1 year, 3 months and 10 days of net active service this period. It also shows:

- Item 24 (Character of Service): Under Other than Honorable Conditions
- Item 25 (Separation Authority): AR 635-200, paragraph 14-33b (1)
- Item 26 (Separation Code): JKA
- Item 27 (Reenlistment Code): RE-3
- Item 28 (Narrative Reason for Separation): Misconduct – Frequent Incidents of a Discreditable Nature with Civil or Military Authorities

6. There is no evidence the applicant applied to the Army Discharge Review Board (ADRB) for review of his discharge within the ADRB's 15-year statute of limitations.

7. In his previous request (AR20170004740) on 4 December 2020, after reviewing the application and all supporting documents, the Board determined 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. The application submitted was denied by the ABCMR.

8. By regulation, (AR 635-200) sets forth the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel. Chapter 14 establishes policy and prescribes procedures for separating members for misconduct.

9. 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 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 request and available military records, the Board determined there is insufficient evidence of in-service mitigating factors to overcome the misconduct. The applicant provided no post service achievements or character letters of support that might have mitigated the discharge characterization.

2. The Board noted, the applicant's service record exhibits numerous instances of misconduct during his enlistment period for 1 year, 3 months and 10 days of net active service this period. Furthermore, the Board agreed the applicant has not demonstrated by a preponderance of evidence an error or injustice warranting the requested relief, specifically an upgrade of the under other than honorable conditions (UOTHC) discharge. Therefore, the Board found reversal of the previous Board determination is without merit and denied relief.

BOARD VOTE:

Mbr 1 Mbr 2 Mbr 3

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

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Board found 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 to amend the decision of the ABCMR set forth in Docket Number AR20170004740 on 4 December 2020.



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. Army Regulation (AR) 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel) sets forth the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel. Chapter 14 establishes policy and prescribes procedures for separating members for misconduct. Specific categories include minor disciplinary infractions, a pattern of misconduct, commission of a serious offense, and convictions by civil authorities. Action will be taken to separate a member for misconduct when it is clearly established that rehabilitation is impracticable or is unlikely to succeed. A discharge under other than honorable conditions is normally appropriate for a Soldier discharged under this chapter. However, the separation authority may direct a general discharge if such is merited by the Soldier's overall record. Only a general court-martial convening authority may approve an honorable discharge or delegate approval authority for an honorable discharge under this provision of regulation.

a. Paragraph 3-7a (1) 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 acceptable conduct and performance of duty for Army personnel, or is otherwise so meritorious that any other characterization would be clearly inappropriate. Only the honorable characterization may be awarded a member upon completion of his or her period of enlistment or period for which called or ordered to active duty or active duty for training, or where required under specific reasons for separation, unless an entry level status separation (uncharacterized) is warranted.

b. Paragraph 3-7b (1) 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 3-7b (2) states a characterization of under honorable conditions may be issued only when the reason for the member's separation specifically allows such characterization. It will not be issued to members upon separation at expiration of their period of enlistment, military service obligation, or period for which called or ordered to active duty.

2. The Acting Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) provided clarifying guidance to Service DRBs and Service BCM/NRs on 24 February 2016 [Carson Memorandum]. The memorandum directed the BCM/NRs to waive the statute of limitations. Fairness and equity demand, in cases of such magnitude that a Veteran's petition receives full and fair review, even if brought outside of the time limit. Similarly, cases considered previously, either by DRBs or BCM/NRs, but without benefit of the application of the Supplemental Guidance, shall be, upon petition, granted de novo review utilizing the Supplemental Guidance.

3. The Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) provided clarifying guidance to Service DRBs and Service BCM/NRs on 25 August 2017 [Kurta Memorandum]. The memorandum directed them to give liberal consideration to veterans petitioning for discharge relief when the application for relief is based in whole or in part on matters relating to mental health conditions, including PTSD, traumatic brain injury (TBI), sexual assault, or sexual harassment. Standards for review should rightly consider the unique nature of these cases and afford each veteran a reasonable opportunity for relief even if the sexual assault or sexual harassment was unreported, or the mental health condition was not diagnosed until years later. 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.

a. Guidance documents are not limited to under other than honorable conditions discharge characterizations but rather apply to any petition seeking discharge relief including requests to change the narrative reason, re-enlistment codes, and upgrades from general to honorable characterizations.

b. An honorable discharge characterization does not require flawless military service. Many veterans are separated with an honorable characterization despite some relatively minor or infrequent misconduct.

c. Liberal consideration does not mandate an upgrade. Relief may be appropriate, however, for minor misconduct commonly associated with mental health conditions, including PTSD; TBI; or behaviors commonly associated with sexual assault or sexual harassment; and some significant misconduct sufficiently justified or outweighed by the facts and circumstances.

4. 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//