

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 5 February 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240006385

APPLICANT REQUESTS: reconsideration of her previous request to upgrade her separation code.

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), 13 August 1981
- Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Benefits Summary Letter, 8 February 2024
- VA Form 26-1880 (Request for a Certificate of Eligibility), 8 February 2024

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 AR20230002998 on 4 June 2024.

2. The applicant states she is 100 percent, service connected from the VA and she is trying to purchase a stable home to live in. She just became financially able to purchase a home.

3. The applicant provides:

a. A VA summary of benefits letter dated 8 February 2024, which shows her combined service-connected evaluation is 100 percent. She is considered totally and permanently disabled due to her service-connected disabilities.

b. VA Form 26-1880, dated 8 February 2024, requesting a certificate of eligibility from the VA.

4. A review of the applicant's service record shows:

a. SF 93 (Report of Medical History), dated 24 February 1981, shows she underwent a medical examination for the purpose of enlisting in the Navy. The applicant answered no to foot trouble and stated she was in good health.

b. SF 88 (Report of Medical Examination), dated 24 February 1981, shows the examining physician found her qualified for enlistment. The examiner marked normal for feet.

c. She enlisted in the Regular Army on 7 July 1981.

d. On 28 July 1981, the applicant was given a temporary profile for flat feet.

e. On 4 August 1981, she was given a permanent profile for flat feet.

f. A Disposition Form, dated 7 August 1981, shows the applicant was placed in an outpatient medical hold status, due to pes planus (flat feet) with the restrictions of no crawling, stooping, running, jumping, marching for more than a quarter mile, or standing for more than 15 minutes, or continuous wearing of combat boots. She was found to have a physical defect, which affected her training/assignment.

g. DA Form 4707 (Entrance Physical Standards Board (EPSBD) Proceedings), dated 7 August 1981, shows she was evaluated at Walson Army Hospital, Fort Dix, NJ. The Board found the applicant was medically unfit for enlistment in accordance with current medical fitness standards and in the opinion of the evaluating physicians the condition existed prior to service (EPTS). It also shows:

(1) Date of Original Injury: Lifelong

(2) Chief Complaint: Painful flat feet, bilaterally

(3) History of Present Illness: Patient [applicant] came to the Reception Center with moderate-to-moderate severe flat feet, bilaterally. The applicant attempted to undergo training and training proved to be too much for the applicant.

(4) Physical Examination: Moderate severe pes planus, left. Moderate pes planus, right.

(5) Diagnosis: Pes planus, both feet; lifelong history. LD EPTS

(6) Recommendation: Applicant unfit for enlistment according to Army Regulation (AR) 40-501 (Standards of Medical Fitness), chapter 2-10b (5), flat feet, and should be separated from the service under the provisions of AR 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), paragraph 5-7.

h. On 7 August 1981, the medical approving authority approved the findings and recommendations of the EPSBD proceedings.

i. On the same date, the applicant's EPSBD proceedings were forwarded to the applicant's unit for appropriate action.

j. On 10 August 1981, the applicant acknowledged she was informed of the medical findings. She also acknowledged she understood that legal advice of an attorney employed by the Army was available to her and that she could consult with civilian counsel at her own expense. She further acknowledged she understood she could request a discharge from the Army without delay or request retention on active duty, and if retained she could be involuntarily reclassified into another military occupational specialty. The applicant concurred with the proceedings and requested a discharge from the Army without delay.

k. On the same date, the applicant's immediate commander recommended approval of the discharge.

l. On 12 August 1981, the separation authority approved the recommended discharge.

m. The applicant was discharged on 13 August 1981. Her DD Form 214 shows she was discharged under the provisions of AR 635-200, paragraph 5-7, by reason of discharge of personnel who did not meet procurement medical fitness standards. Her service was characterized as honorable. This form shows in:

- Item 11 (Primary Specialty): Trainee
- Item 12c (Net Active Service This Period): 1 month, 7 days
- Item 13 (Decorations, Medals, Badges, Citations and Campaign Ribbons Awarded or Authorized): None
- Item 14 (Military Education): None
- Item 26 (Separation Code): **JFT**
- Item 27 (Reenlistment Code): RE-3

5. On 4 June 2024 and in ABCMR Docket Number AR20230002998, the ABCMR determined that the evidence presented did not demonstrate the existence of a probable error or injustice. Therefore, the Board determined the overall merits of the case were insufficient as a basis for correction of the records of the applicant concerned.

6. The Board should consider the applicant's overall 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. Upon review of the applicant's petition and available military records, the Board determined the applicant was discharged on 13 August 1981 under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, paragraph 5-7, due to a condition that did not meet procurement medical fitness standards. Her service record clearly documents that she was diagnosed with moderate to severe pes planus (flat feet), a condition determined by medical authorities to have existed prior to service (EPTS) and to have rendered her unfit for enlistment.

2. Furthermore, the Entrance Physical Standards Board (EPSBD) proceedings found her condition was lifelong, significantly interfered with training, and warranted separation. The Board noted, the applicant's separation code "JFT" accurately reflects the reason for her discharge and is consistent with regulatory guidance in effect at the time. The Board found no evidence of error, injustice, or improper processing in the applicant's separation or the assignment of her separation code. Therefore, the Board denied relief.

BOARD VOTE:

Mbr 1 Mbr 2 Mbr 3

:	:	:	GRANT FULL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT PARTIAL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT FORMAL HEARING
XXX	XXX	XXX	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 AR20230002998 on 4 June 2024.

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 15-185 (Army Board for Correction of Military Records) prescribes the policies and procedures for correction of military records by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR). It states 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. The ABCMR will decide cases based on the evidence of record. It is not an investigative body.
2. Army Regulation 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), paragraph (5-7 changed to 5-11), in effect at the time, stated that members who were not medically qualified under procurement medical fitness standards when accepted for enlistment would be separated. Medical proceedings, regardless of the date completed, must establish that a medical condition was identified appropriate medical authority within 4 months of the member's initial entrance on active duty or active duty for training.
3. Army Regulation 635-5-1 (SPD Codes) provides the specific authorities (regulatory or directive), reasons for separating Soldiers from active duty, and the SPD codes to be entered on the DD Form 214. It states that the SPD code of JFT is the appropriate code to assign to Soldiers separated under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, paragraph 5-11 for failure to meet procurement medical fitness standards - no disability.

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//