

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 15 May 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240011540

APPLICANT REQUESTS:

- an upgrade of her discharge under other than honorable conditions to honorable
- correction of her separation authority to a less-stigmatizing authority
- correction of her separation program designator (SPD) code to reflect honorable service
- correction of her reentry eligibility (RE) code to "RE-1"
- correction of her narrative reason for separation to "Secretarial Authority"

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

- DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record under the Provisions of Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1552)
- Legal Brief Cover Letter, 10 July 2024
- Legal Brief in Support of Application, undated (26 pages), with seven exhibits (215 pages)
 - Exhibit 1 – Applicant's Personal Declaration, 10 July 2024 (10 pages)
 - Exhibit 2 – Official Military Personnel File (54 pages)
 - Exhibit 3 – Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Records (142 pages)
 - Exhibits 4-7 – Four Character References (9 pages)

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 defers to counsel.
3. Counsel states:

a. The applicant enlisted in the U.S. Army in October 1987 and was excited about the positive impact military service would have on her career and how it could shape the rest of her life. However, after arriving at her first duty station in Ansbach, Germany, the applicant found herself in an abusive relationship with a fellow Soldier. The relationship went from a fairytale to her worst nightmare – verbal arguments were frequent and soon became physical with frequent incidents of rape and sexual assault by her boyfriend and sexual assault by another sergeant in her unit. The trauma from the sexual assaults impacted her well-being, directly affected her Army career, and changed her life forever, leading to her receiving nonjudicial punishment (NJP) four times, which ultimately led to her discharge under other than honorable conditions.

b. The abuse against the applicant was not only physical but psychological. The applicant did not report any of the rapes that occurred and it took her years to realize she was raped because she was made to believe by her boyfriend that even though she said "no," it was what she was supposed to do. One incident of physical abuse by her boyfriend of punching her in the face left her with a broken orbital bone, which had to be repaired surgically with a plastic plate inserted to support her orbital bone.

c. Despite the hardships the applicant faced during her service in the Army, she has led and continues to lead an accomplished civilian life. She raised three children, committed herself to the workforce, and climbed the corporate ladder, now managing and training many employees. The applicant was traumatized and degraded in the Army, but her current life is a testament to her true character. She eventually sought treatment and was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and military sexual trauma (MST). The applicant continuously utilizes VA mental health services and is enrolled in and attends a weekly group therapy program for survivors of MST.

d. The applicant had her spirit of excitement for service in the Army ripped from her when she was sexually assaulted multiple times while serving abroad in Germany. The misconduct that the Army relied upon to justify her discharge under other than honorable conditions stems directly from incidents of physical and mental abuse, as well as MST from those in her chain of command, all of which developed into PTSD. The applicant constantly suffers from the aftermath and struggles daily with her MST and PTSD. While the applicant has succeeded in finding ways to live an honorable life post-service, she cannot escape the past. Therefore, the applicant respectfully asks the Board to consider her MST and PTSD as mitigating factors in her misconduct and grant her the requested relief.

4. The applicant's personal declaration provides a more detailed synopsis of that addressed in counsel's legal brief and summarized above. The applicant describes her life before joining the Army; her memories of her early Army training; the traumatic experiences she endured during her tour in Ansbach, Germany; and her post-service

personal and professional triumphs despite her mental health struggles with PTSD and MST.

5. Counsel provides the applicant's Official Military Personnel File covering her enlistment from entry to discharge (54 pages).

6. A review of the applicant's service records shows:

a. She enlisted in the Regular Army on 21 January 1988.

b. She was stationed in Germany from 8 August 1988 to 30 October 1990.

c. She accepted NJP under the provisions of Article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) on three occasions as follows:

- 31 August 1989 – for being disrespectful in deportment toward a noncommissioned officer (NCO) on or about 13 August 1989 – her punishment included reduction in rank/grade to private/E-2, suspended to be automatically remitted of not vacated before 30 November 1989 – suspension vacated based on disobeying the order from an NCO and simple assault and communicating a threat to a private first class (PFC)/E-3 on or about 30 September 1989
- 10 October 1989 – for disobeying a lawful order from an NCO and unlawfully biting and communicating a threat to a PFC/E-3 on or about 30 September 1989 – her punishment included reduction to private/E-1, suspended to be automatically remitted of not vacated before 9 December 1989
- 24 January 1990 – for being disrespectful in deportment toward an NCO and disobeying a lawful order from an NCO on or about 15 December 1989 – her punishment consisted of reduction in rank/grade to private/E-1

d. Her service records include three medical forms showing she sustained a broken orbital bone injury to her left eye when someone accidentally struck her in the face during a fight. She was treated, referred for civilian medical care, and received surgery to repair her injury as shown in:

- Standard Form 558 (Emergency Care and Treatment), 19 February 1990
- DD Form 2161 (Referral for Civilian Medical Care), 2 March 1990
- Standard Form 600 (Chronological Record or Medical Care), 6 March 1992 (sic)

e. She accepted NJP under the provisions of Article 15 of the UCMJ on 2 April 1990 for making a false official statement to military police on or about 19 February 1990.

f. The DA Form 2329 (Record of Trial by Summary Court-Martial), 29 May 1990, shows she was found guilty of failing to obey lawful orders from superior commissioned officers on or about 15 April 1990. She was sentenced to forfeiture of \$300 pay per month for 1 month and restriction for 45 days. The sentence was approved and ordered duly executed on 6 June 1990.

g. On 11 June 1990, her immediate commander notified her of his intent to separate her for continued misconduct under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), chapter 14 (Separation for Misconduct), paragraph 14-12 (Acts or Patterns of Misconduct). The reasons for his proposed action were the applicant's summary court-martial, field-grade NJP, and three company-grade NJPs. She acknowledged receipt of the notification of separation action on the same day.

h. On 12 June 1990 after consultation with legal counsel, she acknowledged:

- the rights available to her and the effect of waiving said rights
- having less than 6 years of total service, she is not entitled to have her case heard by an administrative separation board
- she may encounter substantial prejudice in civilian life if issued a discharge under other than honorable conditions
- she may apply to the Army Discharge Review Board (ADRB) or the ABCMR for upgrading her service characterization
- she will be ineligible to apply for enlistment for a period of 2 years after discharge
- she requested a personal appearance hearing and consideration of her case before an administrative separation board, and elected not to submit statements in her own behalf

i. Her intermediate commander recommended her separation from the service and issuance of an Under Other than Honorable Conditions Discharge Certificate.

j. On 12 July 1990 after another consultation with legal counsel, she acknowledged:

- the rights available to her and the effect of waiving said rights
- having less than 6 years of total service, she is not entitled to have her case heard by an administrative separation board
- she may encounter substantial prejudice in civilian life if issued a general discharge under honorable conditions
- she may apply to the ADRB or the ABCMR for upgrading her service characterization
- she will be ineligible to apply for enlistment for a period of 2 years after discharge

- she elected not to submit statements in her own behalf

k. The memorandum from a medical social worker and family advocacy representative, U.S. Army Medical Department Activity, Nuernberg, Germany, 5 September 1990, shows the applicant was interviewed by the medical social worker and assessed for information regarding her emotional and functional status.

(1) During the interview, the applicant described her relationship with her ex-boyfriend and the events that contributed to a series of administrative consequences by her chain of command. She admitted to making mistakes and using poor judgment in her relationship. Issues of power and control, possessiveness, emotional impulsivity, and inability to separate, despite the risk of harm to herself, were discussed.

(2) The assessment revealed the applicant was enthralled in a relationship that she placed above all else and which deteriorated to become mutually abusive and potentially life-threatening. The medical social worker noted the applicant could avoid the recurrence of such a relationship and engage in successful personal and professional relationships in the future with appropriate support and counseling.

l. The memorandum from the 4th Brigade, 1st Armored Division, Germany, 5 September 1990, shows the applicant was notified to appear before a board of officers and enlisted members on 6 September 1990 to determine whether she should be discharged from active duty for the commission of a serious offense.

m. A board of officers and enlisted members convened on 6 September 1990 and found her discharge under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, chapter 14, was warranted and supported by a preponderance of the evidence. The board recommended her separation from the military and issuance of an Under Other than Honorable Conditions Discharge Certificate.

n. On 12 October 1990, her senior intermediate commander recommended her separation from the service and issuance of an Under Other than Honorable Conditions Discharge Certificate.

o. The memorandum from the U.S. Army Trial Defense Service, Katterbach Branch Office, Germany, 15 October 1990, shows the applicant's defense counsel requested that the separation authority find the recommendation of the administrative separation board invalid due to the board president's decision not to allow the applicant to present newly discovered exculpatory evidence regarding her NJPs for the board members' consideration. The defense counsel further requested that the separation authority convene a new administrative elimination board or, in the alternative, award the applicant a General Discharge Certificate.

p. On 19 October 1990, the separation authority approved the findings and recommendation of the administrative separation board and directed her discharge from the U.S. Army under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, chapter 14, section III (Acts or Patterns of Misconduct), paragraph 14-12b (A Pattern of Misconduct). Her service would be characterized as under other than honorable conditions.

q. On 1 November 1990, she was discharged under other than honorable conditions. Her DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) shows she completed 2 years, 9 months, and 11 days of net active service with no lost time. She was not awarded any personal decorations.

7. Counsel provides 142 pages of the applicant's VA medical records showing she was diagnosed and treated at the VA Medical Center, Atlanta, GA, from 26 October 2023 to 13 March 2024 for anxiety, PTSD secondary to MST, and chronic PTSD subsequent to MST.

8. Counsel provides four character references stating the applicant was a good Soldier with a lot of potential and a great Army career ahead of her; she is a great, energetic, loving, caring friend, employee, and co-worker with outstanding character and good standing in her community. The applicant loves to help others and sets a notable example for others to follow at work and in her community.

9. The applicant's service records are void of any documentation showing she underwent a medical or a psychiatric evaluation as part of consideration for discharge due to misconduct.

10. There is no evidence indicating the applicant applied to the ADRB for a review of her discharge within that board's 15-year statute of limitations.

11. In reaching its determination, the Board may consider the applicant's petition and her service records in accordance with the published equity, injustice, or clemency determination guidance.

12. MEDICAL REVIEW:

a. Background: The applicant is applying to the ABCMR requesting consideration of an upgrade to her characterization of service from under other than honorable conditions (UOTHC) to honorable as well as other changes to her DD Form 214. She contends she experienced an undiagnosed mental health condition, including PTSD, and sexual assault/harassment (MST) that mitigates her misconduct.

b. 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:

- The applicant enlisted into the Regular Army on 21 January 1988.
- The applicant was stationed in Germany from 8 August 1988 to 30 October 1990.
- The applicant accepted NJP on three occasions for the following: being disrespectful in deportment toward a noncommissioned officer (NCO); disobeying a lawful order from an NCO and unlawfully biting and communicating a threat to a PFC/E-3; being disrespectful in deportment toward an NCO and disobeying a lawful order from an NCO.
- She accepted NJP again on 2 April 1990 for making a false statement to military police.
- The Record of Trial by Summary Court-Martial, 29 May 1990, shows she was found guilty of failing to obey lawful orders from superior commissioned officers on or about 15 April 1990.
- On 11 June 1990, her immediate commander notified her of his intent to separate her under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, chapter 14, paragraph 14-12, for continued misconduct. The reasons for his proposed action were the applicant's summary court-martial, field-grade NJP, and three company-grade NJPs.
- A board of officers and enlisted members convened on 6 September 1990 and found her discharge under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, chapter 14, was warranted and supported by a preponderance of the evidence. The board recommended her separation from the military and issuance of an Under Other than Honorable Conditions Discharge Certificate.
- The applicant was discharged on 1 November 1990, and she completed 2 years, 9 months, and 11 days of net active service.

c. Review of Available Records: The Army Review Board Agency (ARBA) Behavioral Health Advisor reviewed the supporting documents contained in the applicant's file. The applicant asserts, in summary, that during her time in Germany she was physically, psychologically, and sexually abused by her boyfriend, and she experienced MST by those in her chain of command. She indicated PTSD and MST as issues or conditions related to her request. The application includes 140 pages of VA records, which will be summarized below. Medical documentation on 19 February 1990 showed that the applicant had been treated in the ER for an eye injury, and subsequent documentation showed surgery for this condition. A Memorandum dated 5 September 1990 authored by a Social Worker, a Family Advocacy Representative, showed that the applicant described a mutually abusive and potentially life threatening relationship with her ex-boyfriend and how this relationship and her behaviors have contributed to a series of administrative consequences by her chain of command. The social worker indicated that the applicant admitted to making mistakes and using poor judgement, and she noted that with appropriate support and counseling, the applicant could avoid recurrence of such a relationship in the future and engage in successful personal and professional relationships. There was insufficient evidence that the applicant was diagnosed with PTSD or another psychiatric condition while on active service.

d. The Joint Legacy Viewer (JLV), which contains medical and mental health records for both DoD and VA, was reviewed and showed the applicant initiated mental health treatment at the VA on 6 October 2023 and reported a history of mental health treatment related to her military experience of domestic violence and MST. She reported nightmares, anxiety, intrusive memories, and a history of relationship problems, and she was diagnosed with PTSD, Chronic. She engaged in Cognitive Processing Therapy, an evidence-based treatment for PTSD, and she completed all 12 sessions.

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

f. Kurta Questions:

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge? Yes. The applicant asserts she had an undiagnosed mental health condition, PTSD resulting from MST, at the time of the misconduct. Records from her time in service showed that she met with a social worker, who documented intimate partner violence (IPV) and indicated this relationship had an impact on her negative behaviors. Additionally, she was diagnosed with PTSD from MST by the VA in 2023, and she completed an evidence-based treatment protocol for PTSD in 2024.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? Yes, the applicant asserts she was experiencing a mental health condition while on active service.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? Yes. A review of military medical and mental health records revealed evidence of IPV, which resulted in an orbital fracture to the applicant, and documentation by a social worker relating to how this relationship had impacted the applicant's behavior. VA records showed she has been diagnosed with and treated for PTSD resulting from MST. The applicant asserts a mitigating experience, MST, and there is an association between MST and misconduct related to being disrespectful and disobeying a lawful order. Typically, there would be no nexus between misconduct related to unlawfully biting, communicating a threat, or making a false statement and PTSD/MST. However, this misconduct occurred in the context of intimate partner violence with the applicant being both the perpetrator and the victim. It is not uncommon for victims of IPV to make false statements or to recant stories of abuse.

g. The applicant contends she experienced MST and was experiencing a mental health condition that mitigates her misconduct, and per Liberal Consideration her assertion of MST alone is sufficient for the board's consideration.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

1. After reviewing the application, all supporting documents, and the evidence found within the applicant's military records, the Board found that partial relief was warranted. Counsel's contentions, the applicant's military records, and regulatory guidance were carefully considered. 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 reviewed the applicant's personnel records, disciplinary history, and the medical advisory opinion provided by qualified medical authorities. The medical advisory concluded that there is sufficient evidence to support that the applicant had a condition or experience that at least partially mitigates her misconduct. The advisory noted that the applicant's medical and behavioral health circumstances during her period of service may have contributed to the misconduct that ultimately led to adverse administrative action.

2. The Board reviewed and concurred with the medical advisory's findings. Under governing regulations, the Board is authorized to consider medical conditions and experiences as mitigating factors when evaluating misconduct. Mitigation does not excuse misconduct but may reduce the degree of culpability or provide context for the behavior. In this case, the applicant's medical advisory establishes a nexus between her condition or experience and the misconduct. The Board acknowledged that while the misconduct was documented and warranted disciplinary action, the applicant's circumstances partially explain her inability to meet military standards. The Board emphasized that recognition of mitigation does not automatically compel relief but is an important factor in assessing whether an error or injustice occurred. Therefore, the Board granted relief.

3. The Board considered the following Kurta questions under liberal consideration:

a. Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge? Yes. The applicant asserts she had an undiagnosed mental health condition, PTSD resulting from MST, at the time of the misconduct. Records from her time in service showed that she met with a social worker, who documented intimate partner violence (IPV) and indicated this relationship had an impact on her negative behaviors. Additionally, she was diagnosed with PTSD from MST by the VA in 2023, and she completed an evidence-based treatment protocol for PTSD in 2024.

b. Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? Yes, the applicant asserts she was experiencing a mental health condition while on active service.

c. Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? Yes. A review of military medical and mental health records revealed evidence of IPV, which

resulted in an orbital fracture to the applicant, and documentation by a social worker relating to how this relationship had impacted the applicant's behavior. VA records showed she has been diagnosed with and treated for PTSD resulting from MST. The applicant asserts a mitigating experience, MST, and there is an association between MST and misconduct related to being disrespectful and disobeying a lawful order. Typically, there would be no nexus between misconduct related to unlawfully biting, communicating a threat, or making a false statement and PTSD/MST. However, this misconduct occurred in the context of intimate partner violence with the applicant being both the perpetrator and the victim. It is not uncommon for victims of IPV to make false statements or to recant stories of abuse.

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 amending her DD Form 214 to show her character of service as under honorable conditions (general).
2. The Board further determined that 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 correction of the separation authority, SPD code, RE code, and narrative reason for separation to Secretarial Authority.

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 601-210 (Regular Army and Army Reserve Enlistment Program), in effect at the time, governed eligibility criteria, policies, and procedures for enlistment and processing of persons into the Regular Army and U.S. Army Reserve. Table 3-6 provided the following list of RE codes:
 - RE code "1" applied to persons completing an initial term of active service who were fully qualified when last separated – fully qualified for enlistment
 - RE code "2" applied to persons separated before completing a contracted period of service whose reenlistment is not contemplated – fully qualified for enlistment

- RE code "3" applied to persons who are not qualified for continued Army service, but the disqualification is waivable – ineligible for enlistment unless a waiver is granted
- RE code "4" applied to persons separated from their last period of service with a nonwaivable disqualification – ineligible for enlistment

3. Army Regulation 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations), effective 17 October 1990 and in effect at the time, set forth the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel.

a. An honorable discharge was a separation with honor and entitled the recipient to benefits provided by law. The honorable characterization was appropriate when the quality of the member's service generally had met the standards of acceptable conduct and performance of duty for Army personnel or was otherwise so meritorious that any other characterization would be clearly inappropriate.

b. A general discharge was a separation from the Army under honorable conditions. When authorized, it was issued to a member whose military record was satisfactory but not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge.

c. A discharge under other than honorable conditions was an administrative separation from the service under conditions other than honorable. It might be issued when the reason for separation is based upon a pattern of behavior that constitutes a significant departure from the conduct expected of Soldiers of the Army. When a member was to be discharged under other than honorable conditions, the separation authority would direct an immediate reduction to the lowest enlisted grade.

d. Chapter 14 established policy and prescribed procedures for separating members for misconduct. Specific categories included minor disciplinary infractions, a pattern of misconduct, commission of a serious offense, conviction by civil authorities, desertion, or absences without leave. Action would be taken to separate a member for misconduct when it was clearly established that rehabilitation was impracticable or was unlikely to succeed.

4. Army Regulation 635-5-1 (Separation Program Designators), in effect at the time, prescribed the specific authorities (regulatory, statutory, or other directives), the reasons for the separation of members from active duty service, and the separation program designator codes to be entered on the DD Form 214. The separation code "JKM" was the appropriate code to assign to Soldiers separated under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, paragraph 14-12b.

5. On 3 September 2014, the Secretary of Defense directed the Service Discharge Review Boards (DRBs) and Service Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records

(BCM/NRs) to carefully consider the revised PTSD criteria, detailed medical considerations and mitigating factors when taking action on applications from former service members administratively discharged under other than honorable conditions and who have been diagnosed with PTSD by a competent mental health professional representing a civilian healthcare provider in order to determine if it would be appropriate to upgrade the characterization of the applicant's service.

6. On 25 August 2017, the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness issued clarifying guidance for the Secretary of Defense Directive to Discharge Review Boards (DRB) and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records (BCM/NR) when considering requests by veterans for modification of their discharges due in whole or in part to: mental health conditions, including PTSD; traumatic brain injury; sexual assault; or sexual harassment. Boards are to give liberal consideration to veterans petitioning for discharge relief when the application for relief is based in whole or in part to 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.

7. On 25 July 2018, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness issued guidance to Military DRBs and 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 on the basis of 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.

8. Title 10, U.S. Code, section 1556, 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 communication (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//