

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 9 September 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240008831

APPLICANT REQUESTS:

- Amendment of her unacceptable conduct narrative reason for separation
- In effect, removal of the General Officer Memorandum of Reprimand (GOMOR) from her Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR).

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

- DD Form 293 (Application for the Review of Discharge)
- Medical documentation showing she made an appointment with the Substance Use Disorder Clinical Care (SUDCC) and at her discharge from the SUDCC she was diagnosed with alcohol use disorder, unspecified, depressive disorder, unspecified, and primary support issues on 30 August 2023
- GOMOR documentation showing she was reprimanded for conduct unbecoming of an officer and refusal to breathalyze, her rebuttal statement to the GOMOR where she addressed the conduct which led to the GOMOR
- SUDCC memorandum showing she self-referred on 21 March 2023 after returning from deployment recognizing she was drinking excessively as a way to cope and manage intense negative emotions secondary to past trauma
- Separation packet, showing she was initiated for elimination with failure to respond to alcohol rehabilitation efforts, failure to report on more than one occasion, and adverse information filed in her AMHRR as the specific reasons for elimination
- Character reference, from Chaplain H.C.R. who attested to the applicant's strong moral character, integrity, dedication to the Army values, noting her resilience and consistent performance in challenging situations, he expressed his confidence in the applicant's ability to grow and learn from her current experience
- Congressional inquiry packet showing she requested assistance from her senator for the review of the matter surrounding her permanently filed GOMOR and subsequent separation
- Memorandum for record showing observation of the professional relationship between Major W. and the applicant, showing a witness wrote on behalf of the applicant referencing the scrutiny she faced, stern treatment, and public

reprimands from Major W., the witness viewed the applicant as professional, levelheaded, and diligent

- Memorandum for record from the applicant detailing multiple instances of mistreatment, unfair treatment, and marginalization, many of which she believed were rooted in homophobia and personal bias from her leadership, she described being isolated from peers, publicly reprimanded, denied fair professional development, and experienced inconsistent command decisions related to her performance and rehabilitation support
- Letters from the Office of the Inspector General (IG) showing the IG was unable to assist in the removal or filing of her GOMOR and related matters
- Letters and correspondence from the Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison transmitting an application for the applicant who requested congressional assistance regarding her GOMOR and narrative reason for separation, she sought support from her congressional representative

FACTS:

1. The applicant states she acknowledged she made poor decisions and mismanaged her discomfort and pain, which led to the use of alcohol and a loss of trust in her as an officer. She believes her leadership disregarded Soldier welfare, lacked transparency, and missed opportunities to course correct with Army protocols. She asserted Soldiers who sought help for substance use demonstrated courage and respect although preemptive command referrals suggested unfavorable intentions towards Soldiers rather than support. She expressed remorse while asserting that her leadership failed to uphold welfare and transparency, prematurely referred for treatment, and demonstrated discriminatory behavior that contributed to her emotional distress and her unfair separation from the Army.

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

a. Having had prior service in the Army National Guard, she entered active duty on 20 April 2017, executed her oath of office on 24 October 2017, and commissioned in the rank of second lieutenant/O-1.

b. On 29 August 2023, a memorandum for the commander shows the applicant's immediate commander requested initiation of a GOMOR and submitted evidence of the applicant failing to report on several occasions due to her overindulgence of alcohol, her command referral to SUDCC and continued abuse of alcohol leading to her refusal to submit a required breathalyzer test.

c. On 30 September 2023, her commander reprimanded her for conduct unbecoming of an officer and refusal to breathalyze. Additionally stating, the Army and the command had consistently emphasized the standards of a commissioned officer,

she was charged with the responsibility of setting the example for subordinates to emulate, clearly her actions fell significantly below the standards expected of an officer in the U.S. Army. She displayed an inability to use sound judgment, there was no excuse for her behavior, and further incidents of the nature may result in more serious legal action taken against her. She acknowledged receipt of the reprimand on 3 October 2023.

d. On 16 October 2023, she submitted a rebuttal statement to her GOMOR. She summarized her alcohol use disorder, mental health and trauma, the investigation, career management, an incident on 26 July 2023, her performance, and her closing remarks where she requested the GOMOR to be locally filed.

e. On 2 November 2023, the GOMOR was directed to be filed in the applicant's AMHRR. She acknowledged the filing determination on 16 November 2023.

f. She was honorably discharged on 20 March 2024, in accordance with Army Regulation (AR) 600-8-24 (Personnel – General – Officer Transfers and Discharges) for unacceptable conduct, in the grade of O-3. She completed 6 years, 11 months, and 1 day of net active service with 10 months and 4 days of prior service. She served 8 months and 25 days of foreign service. She was awarded or authorized the following decorations, medals, badges, citations, and campaign ribbons:

- Army Commendation Medal (2nd award)
- Army Achievement Medal (2nd awards)
- National Defense Service Medal
- Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal
- Global War on Terrorism Service Medal
- Humanitarian Service Medal
- Armed Forces Service Medal
- Army Service Ribbon
- Overseas Service Ribbon
- Basic Aviation Badger
- Air Assault Badge

3. MEDICAL REVIEW:

a. The applicant is applying to the ABCMR requesting a change of her narrative reason for her discharge. She contends that she experienced mental health conditions including Alcohol Use Disorders related to her request. 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) Following the successful completion of prior enlistment in the Army National Guard, she applicant entered in the Regular Army on 20 April 2017; 2) On a 29 August 2023 memorandum, the applicant's immediate

commander requested initiation of a GOMOR due to the applicant's overindulgence of alcohol, subsequently failing to report on several occasions, and refusing to submit to a breathalyzer test, despite a previous command referral to Substance Use Disorder Clinical Care (SUDCC); 3) On 30 September 2023, her commander formally reprimanded her for conduct unbecoming of an officer and refusal to breathalyze; 4) On 16 October 2023, the applicant submitted a rebuttal statement to her GOMOR, requesting it be filed locally, which was subsequently denied; 5) The applicant was discharged on 20 March 2024, Army Regulation (AR) 600-8-24- for unacceptable conduct. Her character of service was honorable. She completed 6 years, 11 months, and 1 day of net active service with no time lost. She previously completed 10 months and 4 days of prior service and 8 months and 25 days of foreign service (Kuwait).

b. The Army Review Board Agency (ARBA) Medical Advisor reviewed the available supporting documents and the available military service and medical records. The VA's Joint Legacy Viewer (JLV) and civilian hardcopy medical records provided by the applicant were also reviewed. Lack of citation or discussion in this section should not be interpreted as lack of consideration.

c. The applicant asserts she experienced mental health conditions including Alcohol Use Disorders that warrant a change in her narrative reason for discharge. The applicant's initial contact with mental health was on 04 September 2019 as a result of a Command Directed Evaluation (CDE). This referral was due to occupational problems with her command and within her unit and a proposed move to a new unit. The applicant denied any mental health symptoms or treatment at this time and no diagnosis was generated as a result of this evaluation. An additional CDE was completed on 27 January 2020 due to reported boundary issues on the part of the applicant with enlisted subordinates including a co-occurring 5-16, SHARP, and fraternization investigations against the applicant. Again, the applicant denied any mental health symptoms and no diagnosis was rendered at that time. The applicant was referred for a safety check for unknown reasons on 10 July 2020, where the applicant continued to deny any mental health symptoms. On 15 July 2020, the applicant self-referred to the mental health clinic due to feeling targeted by her chain of command resulting in the diagnosis of Adjustment Disorder, Unspecified. Beginning on 04 August 2020, the applicant began to repeatedly attend (8) walk-in appointments with both the mental health clinic, Primary Care Manager (PCM), and Primary Care Mental Health (PCMH) (two on the same day on two occasions), prior to her scheduled mental health intake appointment on 27 August 2020. She asserted that the reason for her walk-in appointments were due to increasing distress from continued difficulties between herself and her unit. She primarily maintained varying diagnoses of Adjustment Disorder including Adjustment Disorder, Unspecified and Adjustment Disorder with Mixed Anxiety and Depressed Mood, during these encounters. She was seen 3 additional times and reported gradual resolution of symptoms. Her mental health chart was closed as her symptoms resolved on 10 February 2021. However, on 18 December 2020, the applicant's PCM noted the

applicant's disclosure of excessive alcohol use and recommended that the mental health clinic assess her for a possible SUDCC referral. No additional documentation regarding disposition of this referral was available for review. Per a 21 March 2023 SUDCC memorandum, the applicant reportedly self-referred for SUDCC care after returning from a deployment to Kuwait, through noted that she had been drinking heavily since at least 2014. On 31 March 2023, the applicant was diagnosed with and treated for "Alcohol Use, Unspecified with Unspecified Alcohol-Induced Disorder" by SUDCC. She also reinitiated mental health treatment on 24 July 2023 due "low mood and drinking behaviors," however, no diagnosis was specified at that time. Per a 27 July 2023 memorandum, the applicant failed to report to PT or subsequent work due to alcohol intoxication on 26 July 2023 and was recorded as AWOL. This resulted in the command requesting the applicant be designated as a SUDCC treatment failure. On a 28 July 2023 encounter, her SUDCC provider changed her diagnosis to Alcohol Use Disorder, Moderate and the applicant was slotted for civilian residential substance abuse treatment beginning on 31 July 2023. According to her admitting evaluation she was preliminarily diagnosed with Alcohol Use Disorder, Severe and Depressive Disorder, Unspecified. On 31 August 2023, she completed this program and was returned to SUDCC and mental health for continued treatment. The applicant's diagnosis following her reinstatement in mental health treatment as well as in her SUDCC encounters continued to be Alcohol Dependence, Uncomplicated. However, she continued to report continued difficulties in maintaining sobriety from alcohol. On 11 December 2023, the applicant was evaluated by a military mental health provider for an officer elimination evaluation. At that time, the applicant did not meet criteria for any behavioral health condition warranting disposition through medical channels and met medical retention standards IAW AR 40-501, Ch 3. She was subsequently cleared for administrative separation procedures from a mental health perspective. She was referred for SUDCC Intensive Outpatient Program (IOP) for substance abuse treatment on 19 January 2024 due to her continued difficulties with sobriety. She attended IOP from 30 January 2024 to 08 March 2024. She was evaluated by mental health for suicidal ideation (SI) on 09 February 2024 after expressing SI during a visit with her lawyer during her separation process. She was subsequently found to be safe and released the same day. She was referred for additional IOP treatment beginning on 22 March 2024 following her previous IOP discharge on 08 March 2024 and following her discharge from the military. No additional documentation was available regarding the disposition of this referral.

d. A review of JLV revealed that the applicant initiated contact with the VA on 29 March 2024 for physical and mental health concerns. She attended her initial VA mental health evaluation on 09 May 2024, resulting in the diagnoses of anxiety disorder and Chronic Adjustment Disorder. She reported that she would continue supportive therapy with the Vet Center and follow-up with the VA for psychiatric medication. The applicant is currently 80% VA service-connected (SC) for various physical and mental health conditions including 70% VA SC for Chronic Adjustment Disorder.

e. Based on the available information, it is the opinion of the Agency Medical Advisor that there is sufficient evidence to support the applicant was experiencing mental health symptoms associated with an Adjustment Disorder as a result of her occupational problems, which was treated and resolved. In addition, she later reported stress and mental health symptoms associated with the consequences associated with her legal problems. However, she was appropriately evaluated, treated, and identified for separation due to her substance use disorder and resulting treatment failure, which would not warrant a change in her narrative reason for discharge.

f. Kurta Questions:

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the misconduct? Yes, the applicant asserts she experienced mental health conditions including Alcohol Use Disorders during her time in service, which warrant a change in her narrative reason for discharge. The applicant was diagnosed with various forms of Adjustment Disorder beginning in July 2020, which were reported to be primarily resolved in February 2021. She was also treated by SUDCC for Alcohol Use Disorder between March 2023 and 08 March 2024. She has been diagnosed by the VA for service-connected Chronic Adjustment Disorder.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? Yes, the applicant asserts she experienced mental health conditions including Alcohol Use Disorders while on active service. The applicant was diagnosed with various forms of Adjustment Disorder beginning in July 2020, which were reported to be primarily resolved in February 2021. She was also treated by SUDCC for Alcohol Use Disorder between March 2023 and 08 March 2024. She has been diagnosed by the VA for service-connected Chronic Adjustment Disorder.

(3) Does the condition experience actually excuse or mitigate the misconduct? No, the applicant was diagnosed and treated for Adjustment Disorder while serving in the military due to ongoing difficulties with her command and unit, which resolved before her reported substance use disorder. The applicant repeatedly did not follow orders and went AWOL on one occasion. These types of erratic and avoidant behaviors can be a natural sequelae of certain mental health conditions. However, the predominant condition that led to the applicant's discharge was a substance use disorder and subsequent treatment failure. The applicant was appropriately evaluated, identified, and provided various forms of treatment for her substance abuse. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence at this time warranting a change to the applicant's narrative reason for separation. Yet, the applicant's assertion that mental health conditions are related to her request for a change in her narrative reason for discharge are sufficient for consideration per the Liberal Consideration Policy.

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 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.

a. Narrative Reason: The Board concurred with the medical advisory opinion who states that although there was evidence to support that the applicant was experiencing mental health symptoms associated with an Adjustment Disorder as a result of her occupational problems, it was treated and resolved. In addition, she later reported stress and mental health symptoms associated with the consequences associated with her legal problems. However, she was appropriately evaluated, treated, and identified for separation due to her substance use disorder and resulting treatment failure, which would not warrant a change in her narrative reason for discharge. Therefore, the Board determined there was not error or injustice and denied relief.

b. Remove GOMOR from Service Record: Deny. The Board noted that the applicant's was charged with the responsibility of setting the example for subordinates to emulate, and as an officer, her actions fell significantly below the standards expected of an officer in the U.S. Army. She displayed an inability to use sound judgment, there was no excuse for her behavior. Therefore, based on a preponderance of the evidence, the Board concluded that the GOMOR she received was proper and there was no error or injustice and denied relief.

2. Based upon the misconduct leading to the applicant's separation and the following recommendation found in the medical review related to the liberal consideration:

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the misconduct? Yes, the applicant asserts she experienced mental health conditions including Alcohol Use Disorders during her time in service, which warrant a change in her narrative reason for discharge. The applicant was diagnosed with various forms of Adjustment Disorder beginning in July 2020, which were reported to be primarily resolved in February 2021. She was also treated by SUDCC for Alcohol Use Disorder between March 2023 and 08 March 2024. She has been diagnosed by the VA for service-connected Chronic Adjustment Disorder.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? Yes, the applicant asserts she experienced mental health conditions including Alcohol Use

Disorders while on active service. The applicant was diagnosed with various forms of Adjustment Disorder beginning in July 2020, which were reported to be primarily resolved in February 2021. She was also treated by SUDCC for Alcohol Use Disorder between March 2023 and 08 March 2024. She has been diagnosed by the VA for service-connected Chronic Adjustment Disorder.

(3) Does the condition experience actually excuse or mitigate the misconduct? No, the applicant was diagnosed and treated for Adjustment Disorder while serving in the military due to ongoing difficulties with her command and unit, which resolved before her reported substance use disorder. The applicant repeatedly did not follow orders and went AWOL on one occasion. These types of erratic and avoidant behaviors can be a natural sequelae of certain mental health conditions. However, the predominant condition that led to the applicant’s discharge was a substance use disorder and subsequent treatment failure. The applicant was appropriately evaluated, identified, and provided various forms of treatment for her substance abuse. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence at this time warranting a change to the applicant’s narrative reason for separation. Yet, the applicant’s assertion that mental health conditions are related to her request for a change in her narrative reason for discharge are sufficient for consideration per the Liberal Consideration Policy.

The Board concluded there was insufficient evidence of an error or injustice warranting a change to the applicant’s characterization of service.

BOARD VOTE:

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

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

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.

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 600-8-24 (Personnel – General – Officer Transfers and Discharges), in effect at the time of the applicant's service, prescribed policies and procedures governing transfer and discharge of all commissioned and warrant officers of the Active Army, The Army National Guard of the U.S., and the USAR when serving on active duty for a period of 30 or more consecutive days unless otherwise stated. This regulation included policy statements, operating tasks, rules in support of operating tasks, and sequential steps or each operating task. Chapter 4 pertains to eliminations.

a. Paragraph 4-2b provided elimination action could be or would be initiated against an officer as a result of misconduct, moral or professional dereliction, or in the interests of national security:

- Discreditable or intentional failure to meet personal financial obligations
- Mismanagement of personal affairs that are unfavorably affecting performance of duty
- Mismanagement of personal affairs to the discredit of the Army
- Intentional omission or misstatement of fact in official statements or records for the purpose of misrepresentation
- Acts of personal misconduct
- Alcohol and drug-related misconduct
- Intentional neglect of or failure to perform duties
- Conduct unbecoming an officer
- Conduct or actions that result in the loss of a professional status
- Drug dependent or identified as having committed an act of personal misconduct involving drugs
- Act of child/spouse maltreatment or abuse and/or other acts of family violence
- Failure of a course at a service school because of misconduct, moral or professional dereliction
- Conviction by court-martial that did not impose a punitive discharge for a sexually violent offense

b. Paragraph 4-2c provided the following reasons require an officer's record to be reviewed for consideration of terminating appointment. Standing alone, one of these conditions may or may not support elimination, however, this derogatory information combined with other known deficiencies form a pattern that, when reviewed in conjunction with the officer's overall record, requires elimination.

- Punishment under Uniform Code of Military Justice, Article 15
- Conviction by court-martial

- The final denial or revocation of an officer's secret security clearance by appropriate authorities
- A relief for cause Officer Evaluation Report
- Adverse information filed in the AMHRR (Army Military Human Resource Records)
- Failure of a course at a service school
- Any substantiated adverse finding or conclusion from an officially documented investigation, proceeding, or inquiry (except minor traffic infractions)

2. Army Regulation 600-8-104 (Army Military Human Resource Records (AMHRR) Management), 7 May 2014 prescribes policies governing the AMHRRs Management Program. The AMHRR includes, but is not limited to, the Official Military Personnel File, finance-related documents, and non-service-related documents deemed necessary to store by the Army.

a. Paragraph 3-6 states that once a document is properly filed in the AMHRR, the document will not be removed from the record unless directed by the ABCMR or other authorized agency.

b. Appendix B shows letters/memorandums of reprimand, censure, and admonition are filed in the performance folder unless directed otherwise by the Department of the Army Suitability Elimination Board.

3. Army Regulation 600-37 (Unfavorable Information) sets forth policies and procedures to authorize placement of unfavorable information about Army members in individual official personnel files; ensures that unfavorable information that is unsubstantiated, irrelevant, untimely, or incomplete is not filed in individual official personnel files; and ensures that the best interests of both the Army and the Soldier are served by authorizing unfavorable information to be placed in and, when appropriate, removed from official personnel files.

a. Chapter 3 (Unfavorable Information in Official Personnel Files) states an administrative memorandum of reprimand may be issued by an individual's commander, by superiors in the chain of command, and by any general officer or officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the Soldier. The memorandum must be referred to the recipient and the referral must include and list applicable portions of investigations, reports, or other documents that serve as a basis for the reprimand. Statements or other evidence furnished by the recipient must be reviewed and considered before a filing determination is made.

b. Paragraph 3-5 (Filing of Nonpunitive Administrative Memoranda of Reprimand, Admonition, or Censure) states nonpunitive administrative letters of reprimand, admonition, or censure in official personnel files, such as a memorandum of reprimand,

may be filed in a Soldier's Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR) only upon the order of a general officer-level authority and is to be filed in the performance folder. The direction for filing is to be contained in an endorsement or addendum to the memorandum. If the reprimand is to be filed in the AMHRR, the recipient's submissions are to be attached. Once filed in the AMHRR, the reprimand and associated documents are permanent unless removed in accordance with chapter 7 (Appeals).

c. Paragraph 7-2 (Policies and Standards) states once an official document has been properly filed in the AMHRR, it is presumed to be administratively correct and to have been filed pursuant to an objective decision by competent authority. Thereafter, the burden of proof rests with the individual concerned to provide evidence of a clear and convincing nature that the document is untrue or unjust, in whole or in part, thereby warranting its alteration or removal from the AMHRR.

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/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.

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//