

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 22 April 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240010018

APPLICANT REQUESTS: upgrade of his under other than honorable conditions discharge to honorable.

APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING DOCUMENT(S) CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:
DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record)

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, his request for an upgrade is based on his satisfactory service record prior to any disciplinary infraction. He also indicated that posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and other mental health was related to his request; however, he did not provide evidentiary documents in support of his request.
3. A review of the applicant's service record shows:
 - He enlisted in the Regular Army on 12 January 2005
 - The complete facts and circumstance related to the applicant's discharge are not available for review
 - It is unclear when his commander notified him of his intent to separate him under the provisions of AR 635-200, chapter 14-12c, commission of a serious offense, with a character of service of under other than honorable conditions
 - On 6 January 2006, he was advised by consulting counsel of the basis for the contemplated action to separate him, he waived consideration of his case and appearance before by an administrative separation board

- He was afforded the opportunity to consult with appointed counsel; however, he declined the opportunity, waving his thirty days to submit statements or matters in his own behalf
- His Battalion and Brigade Commanders recommended elimination from the service for Commission of a Serious Offense, with a character of service of under other than honorable conditions
- On 12 January 2006, the separation authority approved separation under the provisions of AR 635-200, chapter 14-12c for commission of a serious offense; he directed the applicant's service be characterized as under other than honorable conditions
- Accordingly, he was discharged on 10 February 2006 with an under other than honorable conditions character of service, he completed 9 months and 29 days net active service this period

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. MEDICAL REVIEW:

a. The applicant is applying to the ABCMR requesting an upgrade of his under other than honorable conditions (UOTHC) discharge to honorable. On his DD Form 293, the applicant indicated Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), and Other Mental Health Issues are related to his 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) the applicant enlisted in the Regular Army on 12 January 2005, 2) the complete facts and circumstances related to the applicant's discharge are not available for review, 3) the applicant was discharged on 10 February 2006 under the provisions of AR 635-200, chapter 14-12c for commission of a serious offense, with a separation code of JKQ and reentry code of '3.'

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

c. An in-service Report of Mental Status Evaluation dated 07 December 2005 and conducted for the purposes of misconduct shows all domains of the mental status evaluation (MSE) were within normal limits. It was documented that he reported daily use of marijuana since age 17 and used until about a month prior to enlisting in the Army at age 19. The evaluating provider documented that the applicant had the mental capacity to understand and participate in the proceedings, was mentally responsible, and met retention standards IAW AR 40-501, Chapter 3. He was diagnosed with Marijuana Abuse and was psychiatrically cleared for any administrative action deemed appropriate by command.

d. An undated memorandum pertaining to the recommendation for separation under the provisions of AR 635-200, paragraph 14-12c shows he was recommended for separation from service for the following reasons: pending charges for murder, attempted robbery with a dangerous, and conspiracy on 22 November 2005; absent without leave from 11 November 2005 to 22 November 2005 and tested positive for marijuana on 17 October 2005.

e. A review of JLV shows the applicant is not service-connected through the VA for any conditions.

f. Based on the available information, it is the opinion of the Agency Medical Advisor that there is insufficient evidence that the applicant had a condition or experience during his time in service that mitigated his misconduct. However, he contends that his misconduct was related to PTSD and Other Mental Health Issues, and, per liberal guidance, his assertion is sufficient to warrant the Board's consideration.

g. Kurta Questions:

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge? Yes, the applicant contends his misconduct was related to PTSD and Other Mental Health Issues.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? Yes, per the applicant's assertion.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? No. A review of records shows the applicant was diagnosed with Marijuana Abuse in-service, which is not a mitigating condition. He is not service connected through the VA for any BH conditions and he did not provide any medical documentation supporting his assertion of PTSD or Other Mental Health Issues. In absence of documentation supporting his assertion, there is insufficient evidence to establish his misconduct was related to or mitigated by PTSD or Other Mental Health Issues and insufficient evidence to support an upgrade based on BH mitigation. However, he contends that his

misconduct was related to PTSD and Other Mental Health Issues, and, per liberal guidance, his assertion is sufficient to warrant the Board's consideration.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

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. The applicant was separated for misconduct - commission of a serious offense. The Board found no error or injustice in the separation proceedings and designated characterization of service assigned during separation. The Board concurred with the medical advisor's review finding insufficient evidence to establish his misconduct was related to or mitigated by PTSD or Other Mental Health Issues.

BOARD VOTE:

Mbr 1 Mbr 2 Mbr 3

: : : GRANT FULL RELIEF

: : : GRANT PARTIAL RELIEF

: : : GRANT FORMAL HEARING

████ █████ █████ 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.

██████████

██████████ ██████████

██████████

██

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. 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 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations) 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.

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. 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.

4. 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.

5. On 25 July 2018, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness issued guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records (BCM/NRs) regarding equity, injustice, or clemency determinations. Clemency generally refers to relief specifically granted from a criminal sentence. BCM/NRs may grant clemency regardless of the type of court-martial. However, the guidance applies to more than clemency from a sentencing in a court-martial; it also applies to other corrections, including changes in a discharge, which may be warranted based on equity or relief from injustice.

a. This guidance does not mandate relief, but rather provides standards and principles to guide Boards in application of their equitable relief authority. In determining whether to grant relief based on equity, injustice, or clemency grounds, BCM/NRs shall consider the prospect for rehabilitation, external evidence, sworn testimony, policy changes, relative severity of misconduct, mental and behavioral health conditions,

official governmental acknowledgement that a relevant error or injustice was committed, and uniformity of punishment.

b. Changes to the narrative reason for discharge and/or an upgraded character of service granted solely on equity, injustice, or clemency grounds normally should not result in separation pay, retroactive promotions, and payment of past medical expenses or similar benefits that might have been received if the original discharge had been for the revised reason or had the upgraded service characterization.

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//