

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 8 January 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240005944

APPLICANT REQUESTS: reconsideration of his previous request for upgrade of his under other than honorable conditions (UOTHC) discharge to an honorable discharge or a general under honorable conditions discharge. Also, a personal appearance before the Board.

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

- DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record)
- Counsel Argument (18 pages)
- Exhibit 1 - DD Form 214
- Exhibit 2 - Affidavit of applicant
- Exhibit 3 – Compact Disc
- Exhibit 4 – Official Military Personnel File (OMPF) (204 pages)
- Exhibit 5 - 2015 ABCMR Decision
- Exhibit 6 - Wilkie Memo
- Exhibit 7 - 1993 Plea Agreement and Sentencing Record
- Exhibit 8 - South Carolina Department of Corrections Records
- Exhibit 9 - North Carolina Foster Care Licensing Records
- Exhibit 10 - Articles of Organization for Bryan Bernard's Trucking Company
- Exhibit 11 - Local News Article about applicant and J.J.
- Exhibit 12 - Certificates of Theology and Ordination
- Exhibit 13 - Academic Degrees and Divinity School Transcript
- Exhibit 14 - December 2022 Sermon Given by applicant
- Exhibit 15 - (4) Character References and Letters of Recommendation
- Exhibit 16 - Criminal Background Checks
- Exhibit 17 - North Carolina National Guard Facebook Post about applicant's daughter, B.B.
- Exhibit 18 - Military Photo of applicant's father, C.B.
- Exhibit 19 - Assorted Photos of applicant and Family
- Exhibit 20 - Prior Decisions from Other Military Review Boards
- Exhibit 21 - Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist Clinical Pastoral Education Residency Program Letter

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 AR20140009788 on 10 February 2015.

2. The applicant states in a three-page affidavit:

a. He made the biggest mistake of his life on 6 June 1993. He let himself down, along with letting down his family, his unit, and his community. He has no excuses for this behavior. All he can offer to this Board is his most sincere and heartfelt apology. He thinks about what he did that day often and have asked for forgiveness. He asks for forgiveness from this Board. He has committed his life to never making that mistake again, and to ensuring that other young men do not make the same poor decisions that he made. He has never been in trouble with the law since then, and he has grown from this experience tremendously.

b. He talks about his childhood and his father being a paratrooper in with the 82d Airborne Division and he chose to follow in his father's footsteps. He had the utmost pride in his military service and feel the Army similarly recognized the effort he put in, as he was promoted to sergeant in 1993. He found value in being a part of something bigger than himself and hoped that he would be able to have a career with the Army.

c. Ultimately, some poor and irresponsible decisions he made while off base on 6 June 1993 totally changed the trajectory of his life when he got into an altercation. He knew what he did was wrong and ultimately pled guilty to an assault charge stemming from his actions that night. He was fortunate enough to be eligible to participate in the Shock Incarceration Program, an intensive program South Carolina offered, which would allow him to be released on parole early. After completing the program, he was released on 4 March 1994.

d. As a result of his actions, the Army discharged him roughly two months after his release from prison. Back then, he knew he had messed up and accepted responsibility for his behavior. The Army made the right decision. After his conviction and discharge, he had to rebuild his life, and despite his early release, he had to deal with and accept the consequences of his actions. He was a 23-year-old with a less-than-honorable discharge and a felony conviction. Even now, he still openly accepts one of the consequences of his actions by indicating his felony on applications for school, jobs, and other forms. Before he could start college at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington, he had to meet with the school's dean because of potential concerns related to that conviction.

e. Getting an administrative job with New Hanover Regional Medical Center was one part of the rebuilding process, allowing him to handle financial tasks and interact with patients. It was a job he had for several years until he needed to step away to help care for his ailing father. After his father's death in 2004, he decided to take a chance by starting his own trucking company. While he started with just one truck, the company eventually grew into a three-truck operation, handling both short and long-distance transportation of general cargo and military equipment. But like a lot of small businesses, the Great Recession really hurt his company and eventually forced him to shut it down by liquidating everything. After that, he went to work for FedEx and did that for a few years until he began having health issues.

f. All the while, as part of his effort to rebuild his life, he focused on being a loving and caring father. He is the proud father of six children, including three who followed in the family tradition of joining the military. This made him very happy, as he always regarded his decision to join the Army as one of the best things he ever did.

g. He also got licensed as a therapeutic foster parent in 1996, which meant helping at-risk children in his local community. Through this work, he brought children into his family who were at risk of going down a dark path in life and provided them with a stable home environment with a lot of love and care. He was so passionate about this work that he served as a foster parent for more than twenty years and for over a dozen different children, and he chose to adopt two of the children that he fostered.

h. However, his life came to a complete stop in May 2015 when a doctor diagnosed him with a kidney disease known as focal segmental glomerulosclerosis. His condition worsened to the point that he was forced to stop working and begin hoping for a kidney transplant, especially since kidney failure is a common complication caused by the disease. He has been fortunate enough in his life to have a strong support system of family and friends, and his best friend J.J. volunteered to see if he was a viable kidney donor. After the screening process confirmed he was a match, J.J. willingly went through surgery to donate one of his kidneys to him. After a successful transplant surgery in August 2016, he hoped that his life could get back to normal again.

i. After his wife of twenty years left him just a few months after the transplant, he fell into a period of depression that left him questioning what to do next with his life. So, after he spent some time reflecting and praying, he decided it was best for him to continue his education. As a result, he got to work and earned an associate degree in general studies from the University of Mount Olive in May 2018. Building on his degree from Mount Olive, he attended the University of North Carolina at Wilmington and earned a Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy and Religion in December 2020.

j. His faith has always been a central part of his life, starting with his attendance of church and Sunday school at a young age. He stayed committed to his faith his whole

life, especially throughout the hardships in his life. During his battle with kidney disease, he completed some coursework through the Interdenominational Theological Center that allowed him to obtain a Certificate in Theology, along with getting ordained as a minister with the Baptist Church in May 2016. Once ordained, he sought to learn how to use his position as a messenger of Christ to help others and give back to the community.

k. He enrolled in Duke University's Divinity School in 2021 to obtain a master's degree in divinity. As part of this program, he was able to get an internship with the Durham VA Hospital, where he served as a chaplain intern for veterans who are receiving treatment at the VA. As part of that work, he provided them with spiritual services and served as someone they could trust and confide in during their time of need. He hopes to continue in this line of work after he gets his degree, as well as provide counseling for young men to help them avoid making the same mistakes he made early on in his life.

l. If given the opportunity, he would go back to the night of 6 June 1993 and make different choices. He is deeply regretful of his decisions and know that what he did was wrong. Ever since that night, he has been trying to make things right by being an upstanding citizen and doing the right thing. It is his hope that the Board see the efforts he has made over the last 30 years and how he has grown from that immature young man to the individual that he is today.

3. The applicant's counsel argues new guidance for the Board and other military review boards was issued in 2018 by Robert Wilkie, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness at the time, that directly impacts what factors this Board should consider in deciding whether to grant relief. In other words, the prior 2014 Board did not have the benefit of the Wilkie Memo's guidance when rendering their decision.

a. As the Wilkie Memo explicitly states, the "[l]ength of time since misconduct" and other aspects of an applicant's post-service life, like "[e]vidence of rehabilitation" and "[a]cceptance of responsibility, remorse, or atonement for misconduct" are factors that the Board should consider. In contrast, this Board previously stated that "[t]he passage of time and post-service conduct are not normally a sufficient basis for changing a properly-issued discharge" when it originally decided the merits of the applicant's case in 2015.

b. Moreover, his 2014 application to the Board was done without the assistance of counsel, resulting in minimal documented corroboration. In contrast, his present application is accompanied by letters of support from people who know him well, documentation of his work as a foster parent, and records demonstrating his efforts to continue bettering himself by pursuing higher education, all of which are relevant under the Wilkie Memo. Such letters constitute letters of recommendation that the Wilkie

Memo directs this Board to consider, while the foster parent and education records serve as evidence of his rehabilitation and efforts to atone for his past misconduct. None of these materials were presented to the Board at the time it originally decided the merits of his case in 2015 based on his 2014 application.

c. Counsel states in light of his complete rehabilitation over the past three decades, his discharge characterization is unjust. As the Wilkie Memo emphasizes, “[i]t is consistent with military custom and practice to honor sacrifices and achievements, to punish only to the extent necessary, to rehabilitate to the greatest extent possible, and to favor second chances in situations in which individuals have paid for their misdeeds.” These themes are all present in his case, especially given his clear efforts to atone and redeem himself for his misdeed on one night over thirty years ago.

d. Acknowledging the seriousness of this misconduct, he has asked this Board only to upgrade the character of his discharge, without changing the separation code or removing “misconduct” as the underlying narrative reason on his DD Form 214. He accepts the consequences of his actions to this day. Additionally, leaving “misconduct” as the narrative reason enables the Army to maintain accountability for his actions.

e. Counsel describes the applicant’s significant growth in the nearly thirty years since his discharge. The Wilkie Memo guides this Board toward granting relief in this case, as he has been rehabilitated and has more than paid for his misconduct in the years since his discharge. He has demonstrated academic achievement, exhibited three decades of growth and rehabilitation, and accepted responsibility for his misconduct. Moreover, he continues to exemplify exceptional character and reputation. For these reasons, the Board should grant the requested relief.

f. Counsel describes many other points in his clients behalf including:

- He had a prior period of honorable service before being discharged and describes his opportunity to serve his country as one of the best things that ever happened to him
- His post-service life reflects his extraordinary growth since the incident, including an absence of a criminal conviction post-service
  - Applicant’s candor...
  - Positive or negative post-conviction conduct, including any arrests, criminal charges, or any convictions since the incident at issue...
  - Length of time since misconduct
  - Acceptance of responsibility, remorse, or atonement for misconduct...
  - Character and reputation of applicant...
  - Evidence of rehabilitation...
  - Job history
  - Whether misconduct may have been youthful indiscretion

- Character references
- Letters of recommendation

g. Counsel discusses since his discharge from the Army, the applicant has made every effort to ensure that he exemplifies what it means to be rehabilitated. He has done so by being a committed father to his children, being a hard-working individual, attaining multiple degrees, and using his faith to help those around him. Mr. Bernard has also not been convicted of any crimes since the 1993 incident. His efforts demonstrate that he has atoned for his mistake, and his efforts embody the factors of the Wilkie Memo.

h. In conclusions counsel states the applicant respectfully requests that this Board upgrade his discharge status to honorable or, in the alternative, general (under honorable conditions). In the nearly three decades since his discharge, he has exemplified what it means to not let one moment define you for the rest of your life. His dedication to his family, his success in obtaining and maintaining gainful employment and earning multiple higher education degrees, and his commitment to his faith demonstrate significant rehabilitation and redemption.

(1) He will bear the stain of his 1993 criminal conviction for the rest of his life. He does not deny his actions on 6 June 1993, were wrong and admits it was the worst decision he has made in his life. However, considering his extraordinary growth and complete rehabilitation; there is no longer a tangible benefit to the Army in his OTH discharge. As the Wilkie Memo says, “[i]t is consistent with military custom and practice to honor sacrifices and achievements, to punish only to the extent necessary, to rehabilitate to the greatest extent possible, and to favor second chances in situations in which individuals have paid for their misdeeds.”

(2) All these themes are present in his case. In the nearly thirty years since his discharge, his life has been a story of redemption. A discharge upgrade would be the final step in his long journey toward redemption, serving as recognition of his rehabilitation and continued commitment to personal growth. He embodies the Wilkie Memo’s very essence, warranting a discharge upgrade that reflects the substantial positive changes and contributions he has made in his post-service life. In granting relief, the Board will not erase his criminal conviction but rather will be recognizing the substantial efforts that he has taken to become a better version of himself.

(3) His journey from that regrettable moment thirty years ago stands as a testament to the power of redemption. His commitment to self-improvement, coupled with his unwavering faith and dedication to guiding others, demonstrates a profound transformation. His determination to be a positive force and support for those in need of spiritual guidance underscores his genuine remorse and evolution. He is not defined by a single isolated event but rather by the continuous efforts he has made and will continue to make in becoming a better person. His past should not overshadow the

remarkable strides he has taken and will continue to take in shaping his present and future.

(4) In granting relief to the applicant, the Board would be reinforcing the ideals set out within the Wilkie Memo and acknowledging his redemption and enduring commitment to personal growth. As his best friend J.J. aptly expresses, "If there is any person whose past is not to be taken as indicative of his present and more importantly, his future, [it] is the applicant. (The entire 18-page counsel brief is available for review in documents).

4. The applicant enlisted in the Regular Army on 1 September 1988. He held military occupational specialty 75B (Personnel Administration Specialist). He reenlisted on 23 March 1992. He was promoted to sergeant/E-5 on 1 August 1992.

5. DA Form 2166-7 (NCO Evaluation Report (NCOER)) for the period ending February 1993 shows he received one "Excellence" and four "Success" ratings from his rater. His rater marked the "Fully Capable" box for overall potential for promotion and/or service in positions of greater responsibility. His senior rater rated his overall performance as "Successful" and his overall potential for promotion and/or service in positions of greater responsibility as "Superior."

6. A DA Form 4187 (Personnel Action) shows his duty status was changed from present for duty to civilian confinement effective 7 June 1993.

7. DA Form 2166-7 for the period ending October 1993 shows:

a. His rater marked the "NO" block for "Maintains a high standard of personal conduct on and off duty" and "Has the courage of convictions and the ability to overcome fear - stands up for what's right" and entered the following comments:

- Involved in a serious incident off duty
- Not able to understand the right thing to do from the wrong thing to do

b. His rater gave him "Needs Improvement (Some)" ratings for leadership and responsibility and accountability.

c. His rater marked the "Marginal" box for overall potential for promotion and/or service in positions of greater responsibility.

8. The complete facts and circumstances of his civil conviction and discharge processing are not contained in the available records. However, his records do include a letter, dated 24 February 1994, from the Commander, Headquarters, U.S. Army Personnel Control Facility (PCF), U.S. Army Armor Center and Fort Knox, KY, informing

him he had been assigned to the PCF for discharge. The letter shows he was to be discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation (AR) 635-200 (Personnel Separations - Enlisted Personnel), chapter 14, by reason of conviction by civilian authorities. He indicated he did not intend to appeal his civilian conviction.

9. On 29 April 1994, he was discharged in pay grade E-1 under the provisions of AR 635-200, chapter 14, for misconduct, and his service was characterized as UOTHC. The DD Form 214 issued at that time shows he had completed 4 years, 9 months, and 6 days of net active service this period. He had continuous honorable service from 1 September 1988 to 22 March 1992. He also had time lost from 7 June 1993 - 29 April 1994. The DD Form 214 also shows he was awarded or authorized the:

- Army Achievement Medal (5th Award)
- Army Good Conduct Medal
- National Defense Service Medal
- NCO Professional Development Ribbon
- Army Service Ribbon
- Overseas Service Ribbon
- Sharpshooter Marksmanship Qualification Badge with Hand Grenade Bar
- Marksman Marksmanship Qualification Badge with Rifle Bar
- Driver and Mechanic Badge with Driver "W" Bar

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

11. On 10 February 2015, in ABCMR Docket Number AR20140009788, the Board considered his application but determined the evidence presented does not demonstrate the existence of a probable error or injustice. Therefore, the Board determined that the overall merits of this case are insufficient as a basis for correction of the records of the individual concerned. The Board denied his request.

12. The applicant provides:

a. Exhibit 3 - A compact disc which was not available for review. A video statement by the applicant.

b. Exhibit 4 - OMPF (204 pages) containing but not limited to enlistment/reenlistment documents, awards, course completions, promotions, evaluations, and other documents.

c. Exhibit 5 - 2015 ABCMR Decision resulting in a denial.

d. Exhibit 6 - Wilkie Memo in support of his claim.

- e. Exhibit 7 - 1993 Plea Agreement and Sentencing Record related to his civil case.
- f. Exhibit 8 - South Carolina Department of Corrections Records which shows the offense of assault and battery sentenced on 7 June 1993 for a period of 5 years.
- g. Exhibit 9 - North Carolina Foster Care Licensing Records related to his foster care programming.
- h. Exhibit 10 - Articles of Organization for Bryan Bernard's Trucking Company documenting his limited liability company.
- i. Exhibit 11 - Local News Article about applicant and J.J. which donated a kidney to the applicant.
- j. Exhibit 12 - Certificates of Theology and Ordination proving his credentials.
- k. Exhibit 13 - Academic Degrees and Divinity School Transcript showing his completions and transcripts from different institutions.
- l. Exhibit 14 - December 2022 Sermon Given by applicant. A compact disc which was not available for review. Counsel states this exhibit is a selected portion of a roughly 40-minute sermon the applicant gave, which counsel cut down for the Board's convenience but included to demonstrate the passion behind the applicant's faith.
- m. Exhibit 15 - (4) Character References and Letters of Recommendation speaking to his high character, pastoral responsibilities, leadership, pillar of the community to name a few. (The letters are available for review in Exhibit 15 of documents).
- n. Exhibit 16 - Criminal Background Checks revealing no criminal offense in the state of North Carolina.
- o. Exhibit 17 - North Carolina National Guard Facebook Post about applicant's daughter, B.B. showing that his daughter enlisted in the NC Army National Guard as a 12B (Combat Engineer).
- p. Exhibit 18 - Military Photo of applicant's father, C.B. showing his legacy.
- q. Exhibit 19 - Assorted Photos of applicant and Family.
- r. Exhibit 20 - Prior Decisions from Other Military Review Boards not the applicant.

s. Exhibit 21 - Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist Clinical Pastoral Education Residency Program Letter inviting him to participate in the 2024-2025 Clinical Pastoral Education Residency program.

13. By regulation, AR 15-185 (Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR)) states ABCMR members will review all applications that are properly before them to determine the existence of an error. The ABCMR will decide cases on the evidence of record. It is not an investigative body. The ABCMR may, in its discretion, hold a hearing. 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.

14. By regulation AR 635-200 (Personnel Separations-Enlisted Personnel) sets forth the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel. Chapter 14 (Separation for Misconduct) deals with separation for various types of misconduct, which includes drug abuse.

15. 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 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. One potential outcome was to deny relief based on the applicant's misconduct with a civilian conviction. However, upon review of the applicant's request and available military records, the Board majority determined based on the applicant prior service before his misconduct and his post service achievement, relief is warranted with an upgrade of his under other than honorable character of service to under honorable (general) conditions

2. The Board acknowledged the applicant's misconduct on 6 June 1993 was serious and led to a civilian conviction and subsequent discharge under Chapter 14, the applicant has consistently demonstrated sincere remorse and accountability for his actions. He accepted the consequences without appeal and has spent the past three decades rebuilding his life in a manner that reflects personal growth, civic responsibility, and a commitment to service. The Board agreed, the applicant's post service achievements, including earning multiple degrees, founding a small business, serving as a therapeutic foster parent for over twenty years, and becoming an ordained minister

are commendable and reflect a sustained effort to contribute positively to his community.

3. The Board found the applicant’s work as a chaplain intern at the Durham VA Hospital further illustrates his dedication to supporting fellow veterans and guiding others away from the mistakes he once made. The applicant’s transformation from a young man who made a regrettable decision to a father, mentor, and spiritual leader is compelling. Given his honorable service prior to the incident, his strong performance evaluations, and his exemplary post-service conduct. The Board determined an upgrade to under honorable (general) conditions discharge is warranted and consistent with the principles of equity.

4. 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:

<u>Mbr 1</u>	<u>Mbr 2</u>	<u>Mbr 3</u>	
:	XXX	XXX	GRANT FULL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT PARTIAL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT FORMAL HEARING
XXX	:	:	DENY APPLICATION

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Board determined the evidence presented is sufficient to warrant a recommendation for relief. As a result, the Board recommends that all Department of the Army records of the individual concerned be corrected by reissuing the applicant a DD Form 214 showing his characterization of service as General Under Honorable Conditions.

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. 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.

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.

2. AR 635-200 (Personnel Separations-Enlisted Personnel) sets forth the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel. Chapter 14 (Patterns of Misconduct) deals with separation for various types of misconduct. The issuance of a discharge under other than honorable conditions was normally considered appropriate.

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.

d. Paragraph 14-12b a pattern of misconduct consisting of (1) Discreditable involvement with civil or military authorities. (2) Conduct prejudicial to good order and discipline. Discredit able conduct and conduct prejudicial to good order, and discipline includes conduct violative of the accepted standards, of personal conduct found in the UCMJ, Army regulations, the civil law, and time-honored customs and traditions of the Army.

3. On 25 July 2018, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness issued guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and 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. 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, 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. 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//