

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 3 April 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240010046

APPLICANT REQUESTS: in effect, correction of his DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) to show the following awards:

- Army Achievement Medal (2nd Award)
- Army Good Conduct Medal (1st Award)
- Expert Marksmanship Qualification Badge with Pistol Bar (M-1911A1)
- Sharpshooter Marksmanship Qualification Badge with Grenade Bar (M-203)
- Expert Field Medical Badge

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

- DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record)
- DD Form 214

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, in effect:

- He served on active duty as a medical specialist, from 1983 to 1986
- When he was stationed in Germany, he qualified as Sharpshooter on the M-203 Grenade Launcher and Expert on the M-1911A1 pistol
- Additionally, he was supposed to receive two Army Achievement Medals; one was for earning the Expert Field Medical Badge; the other was for being an undefeated boxer and beating his unit's rival while he was a member of Army Europe's boxing team
- The applicant notes that none of the aforementioned awards are reflected on his DD Form 214
- The applicant has provided no documentary evidence to support his requests

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

- On 11 May 1983, after obtaining his parent's permission, the applicant enlisted into the Regular Army for 3 years; he was 17 years old
- Upon completion of initial entry training and the award of military occupational specialty 91A (Medical Specialist), orders assigned him to Walter Reed Army Medical Center (WRAMC) in Washington, D.C.; he arrived, on 1 October 1983
- Effective 1 September 1984, his WRAMC leadership promoted him to specialist four (SP4)/E-4
- On 20 November 1984, following the receipt of reassignment instructions, the applicant arrived in Germany and reported to his new unit, an infantry battalion
- On 21 April 1986, as a result of nonjudicial punishment (NJP) under Article 15, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), the applicant's leadership demoted him to private first class (PFC)/E-3
- The associated DA Form 2627 (Record of Proceedings under Article 15, UCMJ) is unavailable for review; however, a DA Form 4187 (Personnel Action) shows the applicant violated Article 92 (this article addresses either the failure to obey a lawful order/general regulation or the dereliction of duty))
- On or about 30 April 1986, the applicant completed his tour in Germany and orders reassigned him to Fort Dix, NJ for separation processing; on 1 May 1986, the Army honorably released the applicant from active duty and transferred him to the U.S. Army Reserve
- The applicant's DD Form 214 shows he completed 2 years, 11 months, and 21 days of his 3-year enlistment contract
- Item 13 (Decorations, Medals, Badges, Citations, and Campaign Ribbons Awarded or Authorized), DD Form 214 lists the Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, Sharpshooter Marksmanship Qualification Badge with Grenade Bar, and Marksman Marksmanship Qualification Badge with Rifle Bar
- The applicant's DA Form 2-1 (Personnel Qualification Record Part II) contains no entries for the award of Army Achievement Medals, the Army Good Conduct Medal, Expert Field Medical Badge, or marksmanship qualifications on the M-203 and M-1911A1
- The applicant's service record is void of supporting Permanent Orders (PO) or documentation for the Army Achievement Medal, Expert Field Medical Badge, or marksmanship qualifications on the M-203 and M-1911A1
- Additionally, the applicant's service record does not contain PO awarding him the Army Good Conduct Medal, and there are no disqualification statements indicating the applicant's unit commander disapproved the Army Good Conduct Medal

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 record of service, documents submitted in support of the petition, and executed a comprehensive review based on law, policy, and regulation. The evidence of record shows the applicant served on active duty between 11 May 1983 and 1 May 1986 and completed training as a medical specialist. The applicant requested award of the Army Achievement Medal (2nd Award), Army Good Conduct Medal (1st Award), Expert Marksmanship Qualification Badge with Pistol Bar (M-1911A1), Sharpshooter Marksmanship Qualification Badge with Grenade Bar (M-203), Expert Field Medical Badge. As it pertains to the Army Good Conduct Medal, the applicant accepted NJP on 21 April 1986, and was demoted to PFC. Additionally, his service record is void of orders awarding him the Army Good Conduct Medal. As it pertains to the remainder of his awards and decorations requests, the Board noted the applicant provides no supporting documentation and his service record does not support his contention. Therefore, the Board denied relief.

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.

4/16/2025

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.

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) 600-8-22 (Military Awards), in effect at the time, provided guidance for military awards.

a. Paragraph 2-22 (Army Achievement Medal). The Army Achievement Medal was awarded to any member of the Armed Forces who, while serving in any capacity with the Army in a non-combat area on or after 1 August 1981, distinguished himself/herself by meritorious service or achievement of a lesser degree than required for award of the Army Commendation Medal.

b. Chapter 3 (Good Conduct Medal).

(1) The Good Conduct Medal was awarded for exemplary behavior, efficiency, and fidelity in active Federal military service. It was awarded on a selective basis and there was no right or entitlement to the medal until the immediate commander approved the award and the award was announced in permanent orders.

(2) Unit commanders were authorized to award the Good Conduct Medal to enlisted personnel who met the established criteria and were serving under their command.

(3) Qualifying periods included each 3 years completed on or after 27 August 1940; for the first award only, upon termination of service on or after 27 June 1950, of less than 3 years but more than 1 year; and, for first award only, upon termination of service, on or after 27 June 1950, of less than 1 year when final separation was due to physical disability incurred in line of duty.

(4) The Soldier's record of service had to indicate that he/she had willingly complied with the demands of the military environment, had been loyal and obedient to his/her superiors, had faithfully supported the goals of his or her organization and the Army, and had conducted himself/herself in such an exemplary manner as to distinguish him/ her from his/her fellow Soldiers.

(a) While any record of nonjudicial punishment (NJP) could be in conflict with recognizing the, soldier's service as exemplary, such record should not be viewed as

automatically disqualifying. The commander had to analyze the Soldier's record and give consideration to the circumstances surrounding the NJP.

(b) In each instance of disqualification determined by the unit commander, he or she had to prepare a statement of the rationale for his/her decision. This statement was to include the period of disqualification and had to be referred to the individual for review and comment, as required by AR 600-37 (Unfavorable Information).

(c) If, after receiving the Soldier's comments, the commander decides not to award the Good Conduct Medal, a copy of the commander's statement and the Soldier's response was to be included in the Soldier's official military personnel file.

c. Paragraph 5-10 (Expert Field Medical Badge (EFMB)). The EFMB recognized the attainment of a high state of technical skill in field medical functions.

(1) To be eligible, the enlisted Soldier had to have a medical military occupational specialty (MOS) (such as MOS 91A (Medical Specialist)), be on active duty, and successfully pass all parts of the test prescribed in AR 672-10 (EFMB Test).

(2) Commanders who had the capability to conduct all test phases were also authorized to award the EFMB. The award was announced in orders.

d. Paragraph 5-32 (Basic Marksmanship Qualification Badges). Basic marksmanship qualification badges were awarded to indicate the degree in which an individual had qualified on a specific weapon and in a prescribed record course; basic qualification badges were of three classes: Expert, Sharpshooter, and Marksman.

(1) An appropriate component bar was furnished to denote each weapon with which the Soldier had qualified; each bar was to be attached to the basic badge to reflect the qualification last attained with the respective weapon. Orders were not used to announce marksmanship qualification badges.

(2) The only authorized component bars were as follows:

- Rifle
- Pistol
- Antiaircraft artillery
- Automatic rifle
- Machinegun
- Field artillery
- Tank weapons
- Flamethrower
- Submachine gun

- Rocket launcher
- Grenade
- Carbine
- Recoilless rifle
- Mortar
- Bayonet
- Rifle, small bore
- Pistol, small bore
- Missile
- Aero-weapons

(3) Commanders in the grade or position of lieutenant colonel could award marksmanship qualification badges.

3. AR 672-10, in effect at the time, prescribed the policies, procedures, and responsibilities for the testing requirements for award of the Expert Field Medical Badge (EFMB).

a. Paragraph 1-8 (EFMB Test Prerequisites). EFMB candidates had to volunteer for testing, have their commander's recommendation, and qualify with the M16A1 rifle or assigned weapon.

b. The recommended testing sequence was as follows:

- Day 1 – administration in the morning; written test and Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) in the afternoon
- Day 2 – morning: day compass course; afternoon: Soldier Performance Tasks; night: night compass course
- Day 3 – morning: medical performance tasks; afternoon: litter obstacle course
- Day 4 – morning: 12-mile forced road march; afternoon: awards ceremony

4. AR 15-185 (Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR)), currently in effect, states:

a. Paragraph 2-2 (ABCMR Functions). The ABCMR decides cases on the evidence of record; it is not an investigative body.

b Paragraph 2-9 (Burden of Proof) states:

(1) The ABCMR begins its consideration of each case with the presumption of administrative regularity (i.e., the documents in an applicant's service records are accepted as true and accurate, barring compelling evidence to the contrary).

(2) The applicant bears the burden of proving the existence of an error or injustice by presenting a preponderance of evidence, meaning the applicant's evidence is sufficient for the Board to conclude that there is a greater than 50-50 chance what he/she claims is verifiably correct.

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//