

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 24 March 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240007441

APPLICANT REQUESTS:

- Upgrade of his under other than honorable conditions discharge
- Change narrative reason for separation from “misconduct” to “secretarial authority”
- Change separation code from “JKK” to “JFF”
- Change Reentry Code from “3” to “1”
- Foreign Service credit for service in Somalia
- Add Ranger School and Airborne School

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

- DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record)
- Engagement Agreement with the Veterans Consortium to represent the applicant
- Final Brief to ABCMR (25 pages) addressed below
- Exhibit 1 - DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty)
- Exhibit 2 - Applicant statement addressed below
- Exhibit 3 - Medical Opinion Psychologist (9 pages) in support of his claim (the complete opinion is available for the Board's review in supporting documents)
- Exhibit 4 - Medical Opinion LLPC, MA in support of his claim (the complete opinion is available for the Board's review in supporting documents)
- Exhibit 5 - Psychotherapy Progress note in support of his claim showing a diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder and major depressive disorder (the complete opinion is available for the Board's review in supporting documents)
- Exhibit 6 - Support letter A.J.M. who served with the applicant and spoke of his service and commitment (the entire letter is available for the Board's review in supporting documents)
- Exhibit 7 - Support letter J.M. who served with the applicant and was his roommate for a period while assigned at 75th Ranger Regiment (the entire letter is available for the Board's review in supporting documents)
- Exhibit 8 - Support letter Private First Class (PFC) S__ who served with the applicant and spoke of his motivation and dedication to the unit and those he

served with (the entire letter is available for the Board's review in supporting documents)

- Exhibit 9 - Support letter M.W. who served with the applicant and spoke of his knowledge, leadership, and dedication (the entire letter is available for the Board's review in supporting documents)
- Exhibit 10 - Airborne Course Certificate showing successful completion on 22 November 1991
- Exhibit 11 - Ranger Certificate showing he completed the Ranger Indoctrination Program (RIP) on 18 December 1991
- Exhibit 12 - (4) Selected Counseling Statements showing multiple instances of disrespect and failure to follow instructions
- Exhibit 13 - DA Form 2627 (Record or Proceedings under Article 15, Uniform Code of Military Justice)
- Exhibit 14 - Sworn Statement regarding him admitting to using marijuana on 9 April 1995
- Exhibit 15 - Memo regarding urinalysis due to having probable cause

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 injustice - applying liberal consideration, the onset of serious mental illness to include major depressive disorder (MDD) and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) mitigated the changes in behavior that led to his administrative separation. Injustice - meritorious contributions as a Ranger and while deployed to respond to the crisis in Somalia are not outweighed by his infractions. Clemency – the passage of time, reflection, and his acknowledgement of responsibility, all weigh in favor of granting relief as a matter of clemency. The part that youth and immaturity played on his conduct should not be overlooked, nor should the adverse effects he continues to suffer to this day. The applicant explains in his 6 pages statement which is available for the Board's review in supporting documents:

- His childhood while growing up
- His decision to be a Ranger and the effects it took on him
- Injuries that he sustained
- Deployment to Mogadishu
- Mental health deterioration
- Post deployment activities
- Post service life

- Therapy for his PTSD and MDD
- Acknowledgement of his actions

3. Counsel states in a 25-page brief in support of the application which is available for the Board's review in supporting documents:

a. The applicant's service over four years in the Army, his training, and deployments. Restating the applicant's statement and experiences while deployed and post deployment. He describes the applicant's post deployment and contributions that led to him using marijuana. Counsel discusses the applicant's mental health and treatments.

b. Counsel argues the applicant's discharge is inequitable because his mental health conditions were major contributing factors to the misconduct that led to his separation. Also, his conduct during service was otherwise exemplary and merits an upgrade to an honorable discharge. Counsel elaborates the following areas:

- He has PTSD and MDD that may mitigate the misconduct that led to his discharge, evidenced by post-service diagnoses by civilian providers
- His mental health conditions existed during service, evidenced by post service diagnoses, medical assessments, and sworn affidavits
- His mental health conditions were major contributing factors in the events that led to his discharge and thus mitigated his misconduct
- His mental health conditions outweigh his discharge

c. Counsel concludes stating the Board should view the applicant's PTSD and MDD as mitigating factors because his mental health conditions existed during service and contributed to the misconduct that led to his discharge. Due to his sacrifices and achievements during service, his records should reflect an honorable discharge, with "Secretarial Authority" as the narrative reason. These changes would be in the interests of justice, in keeping with liberal consideration. With the passage of time, reflection, and greater understanding of the mental illnesses and moral injuries that affect him to this day, clemency is appropriate to relieve him from the burden and stigma associated with the end of his military service.

4. During the processing of this case verification from Defense Finance Accounting System was received showing the applicant served in Somalia from 931024 – 940325 (24 October 1993 – 25 March 1994). This will be administratively corrected and not require action by the board. Also, Item 14 (Military Education) of the DD Form 214 will be administratively corrected to reflect:

- Basic Airborne Course 3 weeks 1991
- Ranger Indoctrination Program 3 weeks 1991

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

a. He enlisted in the Regular Army on 16 July 1991. He held military occupational specialty 11B (Infantryman).

b. DA Form 2-1 (Personnel Qualification Record – Part II) shows in item 17 (Civilian Education and Military Schools):

- Basic Airborne Course 3 weeks completed 1991
- RIP 3 weeks completed 1991

c. DA Form 2-1 shows in item 35 (Record of Assignments):

- 911202 Student RIP Headquarter and Headquarters Company 75th Ranger Regiment Fort Benning, GA
- 920106 Grenadier Rifleman Co A 1/75th Ranger Battalion, Hunter Army Airfield, GA
- 931004 Automatic Rifleman A Co 3-15thh Infantry Battalion, Fort Stewart, GA

d. He received non-judicial punishment on 6 December 1994, for on or about 11 November 1994, unlawfully grab another member by the neck with his hands clasped around his throat. He was reduced to PFC/E-3 (suspended, to be automatically remitted if not vacated on or before 6 February 1995).

e. A probable cause to conduct a command directed urinalysis produced on 11 July 1995, shows on 28 March 1995, the applicant was reported as absent without leave (AWOL). During the inventory of his personal property, a substance that resembled marijuana was found. The Military Police were notified, and a field drug test was conducted. The test confirmed that the substance was marijuana. After consultation with the Brigade prosecutor, it was determined that probable cause existed for a command directed urinalysis.

f. On 20 July 1995, his commander notified him of his intent to separate him under the provisions (UP) of Army Regulation (AR) 635-200 (Personnel Separation – Enlisted Personnel), chapter 14 due to patterns of misconduct and commission of a serious offense, misconduct – abuse of illegal drugs. He acknowledged the same day.

g. On 21 July 1995, he was advised by consulting counsel of the basis for the contemplated action to separate him and its effects; of the rights available to him; and

the effects of any action by him waiving his rights. He waived consideration of his case be an administrative separation board and counsel.

h. His chain of command recommended approval and that his character of service be under other than honorable conditions.

i. On 3 August 1995, the separation authority approved separation; he directed his service be characterized as under other than honorable conditions and he be reduced to the lowest enlisted grade (E-1).

j. Accordingly, he was discharged under other than honorable conditions on 15 August 1995. His DD Form 214 shows he completed 4 years and 29 days net active service this period. It also shows:

- Item 14 (Military Education): None
- Item 25 (Separation Authority): AR 635-200, paragraph 14-12c(2)
- Item 26 (Separation Code): JKK
- Item 27 (Reentry Code): 3
- Item 28 (Narrative Reason for Separation): Misconduct

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

7. 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.

8. MEDICAL REVIEW:

a. The applicant is applying to the ABCMR requesting an upgrade of his under honorable conditions (general) discharge along with accompanying administrative changes. The applicant contends his request is related to his experience of mental health conditions including PTSD that mitigate his misconduct. The specific facts and circumstances of the case can be found in the ABCMR Record of Proceedings (ROP). Pertinent to this advisory are the following: 1) The applicant enlisted in the Regular Army on 16 July 1991; 2) The applicant reported and provided documentation of a deployment to Somalia while on active service from 24 October 1993 to 25 March 1994; 3) On 6 December 1994, he received NJP for choking another service member which was initially suspended; 4) On 28 March 1995, the applicant was reported as AWOL leading to a 11 July 1995 command directed urinalysis on 10 April 1995, which was positive for cannabis; 5) The applicant was counseled for 7 charges accrued between 07 February 1994 and 26 April 1995 including: 2 counts of disrespecting an NCO, 1 count of failure to follow instructions, 1 count of disobeying a lawful order, 1 count of

failing to be at his place of duty, 1 count that incorporated his previous Article 15 for violating Article 128, and 1 count of his previous positive urinalysis. On 21 July 1995, the applicant's command notified him of their intent to separate him due to the previously mentioned patterns of misconduct and commission of a serious offense misconduct- abuse of illegal drugs, as the reasons for separation; 6) The applicant was discharged on 13 January 2006, Chapter 14-12c, by reason of misconduct. His character of service was under other than honorable conditions. The applicant completed 4 years and 29 days net active service this period.

b. The Army Review Board Agency (ARBA) Medical Advisor reviewed the available supporting documents and the applicant's available military and medical service records. The VA's Joint Legacy Viewer (JLV) and the applicant's provided hardcopy medical documentation was also examined.

c. The applicant asserts he experienced mental health conditions including PTSD while on active service, which mitigates his misconduct. There is insufficient evidence the applicant reported or was diagnosed with a mental health condition while on active service. On 05 July 1995, the applicant was seen by a psychologist and underwent a Mental Status Exam as part of the administrative separation process. This examination did not result in the applicant being diagnosed with a mental health condition.

d. A review of JLV did not reveal any results. There is insufficient evidence that the applicant is VA service-connected for any mental health condition. The applicant provided hardcopy files of a one-time psychological evaluation on 11 April 2024 by a licensed civilian psychologist who diagnosed the applicant with PTSD due to his experiences while in military service. This evaluation was based on the applicant's C-file, the applicant's report, and the applicant's fellow service members. The applicant also included a 25 February 2023 memorandum from the applicant's civilian mental health provider that documented the applicant engaging in mental health treatment beginning on 19 December 2022 until the present for the treatment of PTSD, chronic and major depressive disorder, recurrent, moderate. His treating mental health provider also attributed the applicant's symptoms to his experiences while on active service.

e. Based on the available information, it is the opinion of the Agency Medical Advisor that there is sufficient evidence to support the applicant had a condition or experience that partially mitigates his misconduct.

f. Kurta Questions:

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the misconduct? Yes, the applicant asserts he experienced PTSD and other mental health conditions, which mitigate his misconduct. He was diagnosed by his primary mental health provider as well as an independent psychological examiner with PTSD due to his

experiences while in military service. In addition to his diagnosis of PTSD, his primary mental health provider also has diagnosed and treated the applicant for major depressive disorder due to his experiences while in military service.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? Yes, the applicant asserts he experienced PTSD while on active service, which mitigates his misconduct. He was diagnosed by his primary mental health provider and an independent psychological examiner with PTSD due to his experiences while in military service following his deployment to Somalia. In addition to his diagnosis of PTSD, his primary mental health provider also has diagnosed and has treated the applicant for major depressive disorder due to his experiences while in military service.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the misconduct? Partially, there is sufficient evidence beyond self-report that the applicant has been diagnosed by a civilian mental health provider with symptoms of PTSD and other mental health conditions that the provider attributed to the applicant's military service. There is evidence that the applicant was deployed to an active combat zone while serving in the military. During his time in service, the applicant engaged in avoidant, erratic, and self-medicating behavior such as going AWOL, disobeying orders, and utilizing drugs. These types of behavior can be natural sequelae to PTSD and depression. Following his time in service, the applicant received treatment by a civilian mental health provider and was diagnosed with PTSD and major depressive disorder that the provider attributed to the applicant's previous combat deployment. However, there is no nexus between the applicant's PTSD and his assault of a fellow service member in that: 1) This manner of misconduct is not a part of the diagnosis or natural sequelae of PTSD; 2) PTSD does not impact one's ability to distinguish right from wrong nor does it increase an individual's penchant for violent behavior towards others. Yet, the applicant contends he experienced mental health condition or experience while on active service, which mitigates his misconduct. The applicant's contention alone is sufficient for consideration per the Liberal Consideration Policy.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

After reviewing the application and all supporting documents, to include the DoD guidance on liberal consideration when reviewing discharge upgrade requests, the Board determined partial relief was warranted. The applicant's contentions, the military record, and regulatory guidance were carefully considered. Based upon the available documentation, the Board made the following findings and recommendations related to the requested relief:

- Discharge Upgrade: GRANT, based upon the misconduct leading to the applicant's separation and the current characterization of service, the Board concluded the current characterization of service was too harsh for the misconduct involved. As a result, the Board recommended upgrading the applicant's characterization of service to General, Under Honorable Conditions.
- Change narrative reason for separation: DENY, based upon the current narrative reason for separation, in the Board's opinion, accurately depicting the justification for the separation.
- Change separation code: DENY, based upon the separation code being tied to the narrative reason for separation and the board's previous recommendation to deny changing the narrative reason for separation.
- Change Reentry Code: DENY, based upon the current entry being consistent with the misconduct involved.
- Add Foreign Service credit: Not addressed, based upon the entries below in the administrative notes.
- Add Ranger School and Airborne School: Not addressed, based upon the entries below in the administrative notes.

BOARD VOTE:

Mbr 1 Mbr 2 Mbr 3

:	:	:	GRANT FULL RELIEF
:XXX	:XXX	:XXX	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 reissuing the applicant a DD Form 214 showing:

- Characterization of Service: Under Honorable Conditions (General)
- Separation Authority: No change
- Separation Code: No change
- Reentry Code: No change
- Narrative Reason for Separation: No change

2. The Board further determined 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 changing any other requested information not reflected above.

3. Prior to closing the case, the Board noted the administrative notes below and recommended those changes also be completed to more accurately reflect the military service of the applicant.

//SIGNED//

X

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.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE(S):

A review of the applicant's records shows his DD Form 214 omitted administrative entries in the following blocks. As a result, amend the DD Form 214 by adding:

- Item 12f (Foreign Service): 0000|05|02 (5 months and 2 days)
- Item 14 (Military Education):
 - Basic Airborne Course 3 weeks completed 1991
 - Ranger Indoctrination Program 3 weeks completed 1991
- Item 18 (Remarks): SERVICE IN SOMALIA FROM 19931024 – 19940325

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 (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, and states that individuals identified as drug abusers may be separated prior to their normal expiration of term of service. The regulation in effect at the time stated individuals in pay grades E-5 and above could be processed for separation upon discovery of a drug offense. Those in pay grades below E-5 could also be processed after a first drug offense and must have been processed for separation after a second offense. The issuance of a discharge under other than honorable conditions was normally considered appropriate.

a. 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. 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. 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.

3. AR 635-5 (Personnel Separations - Separation Documents) prescribes the separation documents prepared for Soldiers upon retirement, discharge, or release from active military service or control of the Army. It establishes standardized policy for the preparation of the DD Form 214. The regulation states:

a. Item 12f states enter the total amount of foreign service completed during the period covered in block 12c.

b. Item 14, from the ERB, list formal in-service (full-time attendance) training courses successfully completed during the period of service covered by the DD Form 214. Include title, length in weeks, and year completed. When in doubt, refer to the course description in DA Pam 351-4 to determine its usefulness to the Soldier after transitioning from the Army.

c. Item 18, for an active-duty Soldier deployed with his or her unit during their continuous period of active service, enter "SERVICE IN (NAME OF COUNTRY DEPLOYED) FROM (inclusive dates for example, YYYYMMDD - YYYYMMDD)."

4. AR 635-5-1 (Separation Program Designator (SPD) Codes) provides SPD codes are three-character alphabetic combinations that identify reasons for, and types of, separation from active duty. Appendix C shows SPD codes:

- JKK – Misconduct, AR 635-200, paragraph 14-12c(2)
- JFF – Secretarial Authority, AR 635-200, paragraph 5-3

5. AR 614-200 (Enlisted Assignments and Utilization Management) defines SQIs and their order of precedence. It states the SQI is the fifth character of the military occupational specialty code and may be used with any MOS unless otherwise restricted. The SQI will be withdrawn and deleted from the MOS awarded when qualification skills are lost or when the soldier withdraws from a voluntary program (for example, airborne or ranger duty). It defines the SQIs in the following order of precedence:

- S—special operations support personnel
- V—ranger—parachutist
- P—parachutist
- G—ranger

6. AR 600-8-22 (Military Awards) provides the criteria for award and revocation of badges and tabs.

a. The regulation states the Parachutist Badge will be revoked when the awardee initiates action which results in termination of airborne status or withdrawal of any Career Management Field 18 MOS, 180A or specialty skill identifier 18A before he completes 36 cumulative months of airborne duty. Any parachutist badge with bronze star for a combat jump will be retained regardless of time on airborne status. Any parachutist badge will be retained if the Soldier is unable to complete 36 cumulative months of airborne duty through no fault of his own, for example, injury or reassignment under favorable conditions.

b. The Ranger Tab is awarded for successful completion of a Ranger Course conducted by the U.S. Army Infantry School or the Ranger Training Command. The regulation states the Ranger Tab may be revoked by the Commander, U.S. Army Infantry School based on the recommendation of the field commander (colonel or above) of the individual in question, if in the opinion of that commander the individual has exhibited a pattern of behavior, expertise or duty performance that is inconsistent with expectations of the Army, that is, that Ranger qualified Soldiers continuously demonstrate enhanced degrees of confidence, commitment, competency and discipline. Award of the Ranger Tab may be revoked for the following under any of the following conditions:

- dismissal, dishonorable discharge or conviction by courts-martial for desertion in time of war
- refusal to accept assignment to a Ranger coded position
- failure to maintain prescribed standards of personal fitness and readiness to accomplish missions commensurate with position and rank
- upon relief or release for cause

7. AR 601-210 (Regular Army and Reserve Components Enlistment Program), governs eligibility criteria, policies, and procedures for enlistment and processing of persons into the Regular Army, the U.S. Army Reserve, and Army National Guard for enlistment per DODI 1304.26. It also prescribes the appointment, reassignment, management, and mobilization of Reserve Officers' Training Corps cadets under the Simultaneous Membership Program. Chapter 4 provides the criteria and procedures for waiverable and non-waiverable separations. Table 3-1, defines reentry eligibility (RE) codes:

a. RE-1 Applies to: Person completing his or her term of active service who is considered qualified to reenter the U.S. Army. Eligibility: Qualified for enlistment if all other criteria are met.

b. RE-3 Applies to: Person who is not considered fully qualified for reentry or continuous service at time of separation, but disqualification is waivable. Eligibility: Ineligible unless a waiver is granted.

c. RE-4 Applies to: Person separated from last period of service with a non-waivable disqualification. This includes anyone with a DA imposed bar to reenlistment in effect at time of separation or separated for any reason (except length of service retirement) with 18 or more years of active Federal service. Eligibility: Ineligible for enlistment.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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. 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. 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//