

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 2 September 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240011004

APPLICANT REQUESTS:

- an upgrade of his under other than honorable conditions discharge to general, under honorable conditions.
- a video/telephonic appearance before the Board

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 during the final weeks of basic training, he suffered a serious ankle injury. He feared he would not graduate but was encouraged by his drill sergeants to return to training despite the pain. He ultimately completed the 25-mile ruck march and graduated, but the injury did not fully heal. He began using cocaine to cope with the pain. This marked the beginning of a series of struggles that led to challenges at his next duty station. He believed the Army failed to support him during this time, choosing instead to threaten him with a court-martial and discharge. The discharge he received has continued to impact his life in countless negative ways. He respectfully requests that his discharge be reviewed and upgraded to a general discharge, considering the circumstances surrounding his injury and the events that followed.
3. A review of the applicant's service record shows:
 - a. He enlisted in the Regular Army on 13 January 1998.
 - b. His DA Form 2-1 (Personnel Qualification Record) shows in Block 21 (Time Lost) 4 August 1998 – 14 September 1998 (42 days).

c. A DA Form 458 (Charge Sheet) shows court-martial charges were preferred on the applicant for being absent without leave (AWOL) from 4 August 1998 through 15 September 1998.

d. On 18 September 1998, the applicant consulted with legal counsel and requested a discharge in lieu of trial by court-martial under the provisions of Army Regulation (AR) 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), Chapter 10. He acknowledged:

- he was making the request of his own free will
- maximum punishment
- he was guilty of at least one or more of the charges against him or of a lesser included offense
- he does not desire further rehabilitation or further military service
- if his request for discharge was accepted, he may be discharged under other conditions other than honorable
- he would be deprived of many or all Army benefits, he may be ineligible for many, or all benefits administered by the Veterans Administration,
- he may be deprived of his rights and benefits as a Veteran under both Federal and State law
- he must apply to the Army Discharge Review Board or the Army Board for the Correction of Military Records for a review of discharge, but there was no automatic upgrading
- he may expect to encounter substantial prejudice in civilian life

g. On 8 April 1999, consistent with the chain of command recommendations, the separation approval authority approved the applicant's request for discharge in lieu of trial by courts-martial. He would be issued an Under Other Than Honorable Conditions Discharge Certificate and reduced to the lowest enlisted pay grade.

h. 14 April 1999, he was discharged from active duty with an under other than honorable conditions characterization of service. His DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) shows he completed 1 year, 1 month, and 20 days of active service with 42 days of lost time.

4. On 7 May 2025, the applicant was notified by the Army Review Boards Agency that he was required to provide a copy of medical documentation to support his claim of injury. The applicant was provided 10 days to submit supporting documentation with a suspense of 21 May 2025. The applicant has not provided a response to date.

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

6. By regulation (AR 15-185), an applicant is not entitled to a hearing before the ABCMR. Hearings may be authorized by a panel of the ABCMR or by the Director of the ABCMR.

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 Army Review Boards Agency (ARBA) Medical Advisor was asked to review this case. Documentation reviewed included the applicant's ABCMR application and accompanying documentation, the MHS Genesis (DoD electronic Medical), Joint Longitudinal Viewer (JLV) (a Repository of DoD and VA electronic medical record), the electronic Physical Evaluation Board (ePEB), the Medical Electronic Data Care History and Readiness Tracking (MEDCHART) application, and the Interactive Personnel Electronic Records Management System (iPERMS).

b. The ARBA Medical Advisor made the following findings and recommendations:

c. The applicant is applying to the ABCMR requesting an upgrade of his under other than honorable conditions discharge to under honorable conditions, (General)

d. Due to the period of the Applicant's service, there was no electronic medical record available for review.

e. Review of his supporting documentation showed there was no medical documents submitted by the applicant.

f. Therefore, there was not sufficient evidence to support the applicant's request at this time.

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. The applicant was charged with being absent without leave from 4 August 1998 through 15 September 1998, punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice with a punitive discharge. After being charged, he consulted with counsel and voluntarily requested discharge in lieu of trial by court-martial. The Board found no error or injustice in the separation proceedings and designated characterization of service. Based on a preponderance of the evidence, the Board concluded that the characterization of service the applicant received upon separation was not in error or unjust.

2. The applicant's request for a personal appearance hearing was carefully considered. In this case, the evidence of record was sufficient to render a fair and equitable decision. As a result, a personal appearance hearing is not necessary to serve the interest of equity and justice in this case.

BOARD VOTE:

<u>Mbr 1</u>	<u>Mbr 2</u>	<u>Mbr 3</u>	
:	:	:	GRANT FULL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT PARTIAL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT FORMAL HEARING
XXX	XXX	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. 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 15-185 (ABCMR) prescribes the policies and procedures for correction of military records by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the ABCMR. The ABCMR begins its consideration of each case with the presumption of administrative regularity, which is that what the Army did was correct.

a. The ABCMR is not an investigative body and decides cases based on the evidence that is presented in the military records provided and the independent evidence submitted with the application. The applicant has the burden of proving an error or injustice by a preponderance of the evidence.

b. The ABCMR may, in its discretion, hold a hearing or request additional evidence or opinions. Additionally, it states in paragraph 2-11 that applicants do not have a right to a hearing before the ABCMR. The Director or the ABCMR may grant a formal hearing whenever justice requires

3. Army Regulation 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), in effect at the time, sets forth the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel.

a. Paragraph 3-7a (Honorable Discharge) states 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.

b. Paragraph 3-7b (General Discharge) states 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. Chapter 10 of this regulation states an individual who has committed an offense or offenses, the punishment for any of which includes a bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge, may submit a request for discharge for the good of the service. An Under Other than Honorable Discharge Certificate normally is appropriate for a member who is discharged for the good of the service.

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/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.

5. Section 1556 of Title 10, United States Code, requires the Secretary of the Army to ensure that an applicant seeking corrective action by the Army Review Boards Agency (ARBA) be provided with a copy of any correspondence and communications (including summaries of verbal communications) to or from the Agency with anyone outside the Agency that directly pertains to or has material effect on the applicant's case, except as authorized by statute. ARBA medical advisory opinions and reviews are authored by ARBA civilian and military medical and behavioral health professionals and are therefore internal agency work product. Accordingly, ARBA does not routinely provide copies of ARBA Medical Office recommendations, opinions (including advisory opinions), and reviews to Army Board for Correction of Military Records applicants (and/or their counsel) prior to adjudication.

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//