

1. Applicant's Name: [REDACTED]

- a. **Application Date:** 30 June 2020
- b. **Date Received:** 7 July 2020
- c. **Counsel:** None

2. REQUEST, ISSUES, BOARD TYPE, AND DECISION:

a. **Applicant's Requests and Issues:** The current characterization of service for the period under review is bad conduct. The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable.

The applicant seeks relief contending, in effect, to have post-deployment undiagnosed mental deficiencies that the applicant was unable to address on the applicant's own. While deployed to Iraq their camp was frequently attacked with indirect fire, resulting in the applicant being awarded a combat action badge. The applicant's good friend was killed during a vehicle-borne improvised explosive device attack. The applicant developed a drinking and drug abuse dependency that the applicant took to members of the enlisted command. The applicant did not receive the help needed to address the applicant's issues. Once the circumstances had reached a point that judicial punishment was to be administered, the applicant was still not afforded the opportunity to have these issues addressed. Since separating from the military, the applicant has been able to work through most of the applicant's issues and has become a highly productive member of society. The applicant is seeking full restoration of the applicant's military combat veteran benefits in the hopes that the applicant can begin to seek professional guidance in overcoming the applicant's remaining deficiencies. The applicant has worked through them with the help of self-education, and support from friends and family. At the time the applicant submitted an application to the Army Review Board Agency, the applicant did not have any supporting medical documentation and the applicant's conditions had not been professionally addressed. The applicant further details the contentions in an allied self-authored statement provided with the application.

b. **Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 11 October 2023, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the applicant's in-service diagnosis of Adjustment Disorder and post-service the applicant is service connected for PTSD, MDD, and GAD partially mitigated the applicant's misconducts of - FTR, Disrespect, wrongfully use 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDA), wrongfully use marijuana (THC), and going AWOL. Therefore, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade of the characterization of service to General Under Honorable Conditions.

Please see Section 9 of this document for more detail regarding the Board's decision.

(Board member names available upon request)

3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:

a. **Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization:** Court-Martial (Other) / AR 635-200, Chapter 3 / JJD / RE-4 / Bad Conduct

b. **Date of Discharge:** 14 September 2007

c. Separation Facts:

(1) Pursuant to Special Court-Martial Empowered to Adjudge a Bad-Conduct Discharge: As announced by Special Court-Martial Order Number 7, 26 December 2006, on 22 September 2006, the applicant was found guilty of the following:

Charge I, in violation of Article 86

Specification 1: On or about 23 March 2006, without authority, fail to go at the time prescribed to the applicant's appointed place of duty, to wit: 0530 First Sergeant's meeting, at building 8386. Plea: Guilty. Finding: Guilty.

Specification 2: On or about 19 June 2006, without authority, fail to go at the time prescribed to the applicant's appointed place of duty, to wit: 0530 meeting with Captain T__ C.H__, at building 8386. Plea: Guilty. Finding: Guilty.

Specification 3: On or about 27 June 2006, without authority, fail to go at the time prescribed to the applicant's appointed place of duty, to wit: 0600 company formation. Plea: Guilty. Finding: Guilty.

Charge II, in violation of Article 91, Specification: On or about 18 May 2006, was disrespectful in deportment toward Sergeant (SGT) B__ A. F__, a noncommissioned officer, by not responding and walking away while the said SGT F__ was questioning the applicant. Plea: Not Guilty. Finding: Dismissed by the military judge pursuant to the pretrial agreement.

Charge III, in violation of Article 112a

Specification 1: Between on or about 27 May 2006 and on or about 30 May 2006, wrongfully use 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDA), a schedule I controlled substance, commonly known as ecstasy. Plea: Guilty, except the words, "Fort Riley," substituting therefor the words, "Milford Lake." Of the excepted words, Not Guilty. Of the substituted words, Guilty. Finding: Guilty, except the words, "Fort Riley", substituting therefor the words, "Milford Lake." Of the excepted words, Not Guilty. Of the substituted words, Guilty.

Specification 2: Between on or about 1 May 2006 and on or about 30 May 2006, wrongfully use marijuana (THC). Plea: Guilty, except the words, "Fort Riley," substituting therefor the words, "Milford Lake." Of the excepted words, Not Guilty. Of the substituted words, Guilty. Finding: Guilty, except the words, "Fort Riley", substituting therefor the words, "Milford Lake." Of the excepted words, Not Guilty. Of the substituted words, Guilty.

Charge IV, in violation of Article 134, Specification: On or about 22 March 2006, at or near Fort Riley, KS, a place under exclusive or concurrent federal jurisdiction, unlawfully activate the fire alarm in building 7224, in violation of Kansas Statute Annotated, Section 21-4110, assimilated into Federal law by 18 U.S. Code, Section 13. Plea: Not Guilty. Finding: Dismissed by the military judge pursuant to the pretrial agreement.

Additional Charge I, in violation of Article 86, Specification: On or about 3 August 2006, without authority, the applicant was absent from the unit to wit: Company A, 125th Forward Support Battalion, located at Fort Riley, KS, and did remain so absent until apprehended on or about 9 August 2006. Plea: Guilty. Finding: Guilty.

Additional Charge II, in violation of Article 91, Specification: On or about 3 August 2006, was disrespectful in language toward Staff Sergeant (SSG) R__ L. A__, a noncommissioned

officer, by saying to SSG A___, "you are a jackass," or words to that effect. Plea: Guilty. Finding: Guilty.

Additional Charge III, in violation of Article 92, Specification: On or about 3 August 2006 fail to obey a lawful general regulation, to wit: Paragraph 5-2(f)(12), Fort Riley Command Policies, 24 March 2004, by wrongfully possessing approximately 1,000 firecrackers within the applicant's barracks room of building 7224. Plea: Not Guilty. Finding: Dismissed by the military judge pursuant to the pretrial agreement.

(2) Adjudged Sentence: Reduction to E-1, forfeiture of \$849.00 pay per month for 6 months, to be confined for 6 months, and to be discharged from the service with a Bad Conduct discharge.

(3) Date / Sentence Approved: 26 December 2006 / The sentence was approved and, except for the part of the sentence extending to a bad conduct discharge, would be executed. The applicant was credited with 56 days of confinement towards the sentence to confinement.

(4) Appellate Reviews: The record of trial was forwarded to The Judge Advocate General of The Army for review by the Court of Military Review. The United States Army Court of Criminal Appeals affirmed the approved findings of guilty and the sentence.

(5) Date Sentence of BCD Ordered Executed: NIF

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 7 January 2004 / 3 years

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 19 / High School Graduate / 121

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-2 / 63B10, Wheeled Vehicle Mechanic / 3 years, 4 months, 3 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: None

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: SWA / Iraq (3 February 2005 - 12 January 2006)

f. Awards and Decorations: ICM, ASR, OSR, CAB

g. Performance Ratings: NA

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:

Law Enforcement Report - Final, 16 May 2016, shows an investigation established the applicant was wanted by the District Court of Raleigh County, KS for criminal damage to property and telephone harassment period.

Commander Report of Disciplinary or Administrative Action shows the applicant was referred on 30 May 2006 for possession of controlled substance (marijuana) on 30 May 2006.

Military Police Report, 30 May 2006, shows the applicant was apprehended for: larceny of private property/funds (on post).

Commander Report of Disciplinary or Administrative Action shows the applicant was referred on 28 June 2006 for wrongful use of dangerous drugs (D-Methamphetamine (D-METH) and

Dextroamphetamine-Amphetamine (D-AMP)), wrongful use of marijuana, and wrongful use of drugs (Ecstasy (MDMA) and MDA) on 30 May 2006.

CID Report of Investigation - Initial Final, 28 June 2006, shows an investigation established probable cause to believe the applicant committed the offense of wrongful use of controlled substances (D-AMP, D-METH, MDMA, and THC) after providing a urine sample during a unit urinalysis inspection on 30 May 2006.

Military Police Report, 22 July 2006, shows the applicant was transported by the applicant's unit to the CID office for: use of dangerous drugs - determined by urinalysis test (on post), controlled substance violations, use of marijuana - determined by urinalysis test (on post), and controlled substance violations, use of other controlled substance - determined by urinalysis test (on post).

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: AWOL for 7 days, 3-9 August 2006. This period is not annotated on the DD Form 214 block 29.

3 months, 8 days (CMA, 22 September - 29 December 2006) / Released from Confinement

j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):

(1) Applicant provided: Integris Health Medical Group mental health progress notes, 3 July 2023, showing a diagnosis of PTSD, major depressive disorder, recurrent episode, moderate to severe, and generalized anxiety disorder.

(2) AMHRR Listed: None

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: DD Form 293; self-authored letter; two third party letters; Integris Health Medical Group mental health progress notes.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: The applicant has been able to work through most of the applicant's issues through self-education and support from friends and family, and most recently the Integris Health Medical Group mental health office. The applicant has become a highly productive member of society.

7. STATUTORY, REGULATORY AND POLICY REFERENCE(S):

a. Section 1553, Title 10, United States Code (Review of Discharge or Dismissal) provides for the creation, composition, and scope of review conducted by a Discharge Review Board(s) within established governing standards. As amended by Sections 521 and 525 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020, 10 USC 1553 provides specific guidance to the Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records and Discharge Review Boards when considering discharge upgrade requests by Veterans claiming Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), sexual trauma, intimate partner violence (IPV), or spousal abuse, as a basis for discharge review. The amended guidance provides that Boards will include, as a voting board member, a physician trained in mental health disorders, a clinical psychologist, or a psychiatrist when the discharge upgrade claim asserts a mental health condition, including PTSD, TBI, sexual trauma, IPV, or spousal abuse, as a basis for the discharge. Further, the guidance provides that Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records and Discharge Review Boards will develop and provide specialized training specific to sexual trauma, IPV, spousal abuse, as well as the various responses of individuals to trauma.

b. Multiple Department of Defense Policy Guidance Memoranda published between 2014 and 2018. The documents are commonly referred to by the signatory authorities' last names (2014 Secretary of Defense Guidance [Hagel memo], 2016 Acting Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Carson memo], 2017 Official Performing the Duties of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Kurta memo], and 2018 Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Wilkie memo].

(1) Individually and collectively, these documents provide further clarification to the Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records when considering requests by Veterans for modification of their discharge due to mental health conditions, including PTSD; TBI; sexual assault; or sexual harassment. Liberal consideration will be given 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; TBI; sexual assault; or sexual harassment. Special consideration will be given to Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) determinations that document a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment potentially contributed to the circumstances resulting in a less than honorable discharge characterization. Special consideration will also be given in cases where a civilian provider confers diagnoses of a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment if the case records contain narratives supporting symptomatology at the time of service or when any other evidence which may reasonably indicate that a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment existed at the time of discharge might have mitigated the misconduct that caused a discharge of lesser characterization.

(2) Conditions documented in the service record that can reasonably be determined to have existed at the time of discharge will be considered to have existed at the time of discharge. In cases in which a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment may be reasonably determined to have existed at the time of discharge, those conditions will be considered potential mitigating factors in the misconduct that caused the characterization of service in question. All Boards will exercise caution in weighing evidence of mitigation in cases in which serious misconduct precipitated a discharge with a less than Honorable characterization of service. Potentially mitigating evidence of the existence of undiagnosed combat related PTSD, PTSD-related conditions due to TBI or sexual assault/harassment as causative factors in the misconduct resulting in discharge will be carefully weighed against the severity of the misconduct. PTSD is not a likely cause of premeditated misconduct. Caution shall be exercised in weighing evidence of mitigation in all cases of misconduct by carefully considering the likely causal relationship of symptoms to the misconduct.

c. Army Regulation 15-180 (Army Discharge Review Board), dated 25 September 2019, sets forth the policies and procedures under which the Army Discharge Review Board is authorized to review the character, reason, and authority of any Servicemember discharged from active military service within 15 years of the Servicemember's date of discharge. Additionally, it prescribes actions and composition of the Army Discharge Review Board under Public Law 95-126; Section 1553, Title 10 United States Code; and Department of Defense Directive 1332.41 and Instruction 1332.28.

d. Army Regulation 635-200 provides the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel.

(1) Chapter 3, Section II provides the authorized types of characterization of service or description of separation.

(2) Paragraph 3-7a states an Honorable discharge is a separation with honor and is appropriate when the quality of the Soldier'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.

(3) Paragraph 3-7b states a General discharge is a separation from the Army under honorable conditions and is issued to a Soldier whose military record is satisfactory but not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge. A characterization of under honorable conditions may be issued only when the reason for separation specifically allows such characterization.

(4) Paragraph 3-7c states Under Other Than Honorable Conditions discharge is an administrative separation from the Service under conditions other than honorable and it may be issued for misconduct, fraudulent entry, security reasons, or in lieu of trial by court martial based on certain circumstances or patterns of behavior or acts or omissions that constitute a significant departure from the conduct expected of Soldiers in the Army.

(5) Paragraph 3-10 states a Soldier will be given a dishonorable discharge pursuant only to an approved sentence of a general court-martial. The appellate review must be completed, and the affirmed sentence ordered duly executed. Questions concerning the finality of appellate review should be referred to the servicing Staff Judge Advocate.

(6) Paragraph 3-11 states a Soldier will be given a bad conduct discharge pursuant only to an approved sentence of a general or special court-martial. The appellate review must be completed, and the affirmed sentence ordered duly executed. Questions concerning the finality of appellate review should be referred to the servicing Staff Judge Advocate.

e. Army Regulation 635-5-1 (Separation Program Designator (SPD) Codes) provides the specific authorities (regulatory or directive), reasons for separating Soldiers from active duty, and the SPD codes to be entered on the DD Form 214. It identifies the SPD code of "JJD" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 3, Court-Martial (other).

f. Army Regulation 601-210, Regular Army, and Reserve Components Enlistment Program, governs eligibility criteria, policies, and procedures for enlistment and processing of persons into the Regular Army, the U.S. Army Reserve, and Army National Guard for enlistment per DODI 1304.26. It also prescribes the appointment, reassignment, management, and mobilization of Reserve Officers' Training Corps cadets under the Simultaneous Membership Program. Chapter 4 provides the criteria and procedures for waiverable and nonwaiverable separations. Table 3-1, defines reentry eligibility (RE) codes:

RE-1 Applies to: Person completing his or her term of active service who is considered qualified to reenter the U.S. Army. Eligibility: Qualified for enlistment if all other criteria are met.

RE-3 Applies to: Person who is not considered fully qualified for reentry or continuous service at time of separation, but disqualification is waiverable. Eligibility: Ineligible unless a waiver is granted.

RE-4 Applies to: Person separated from last period of service with a nonwaiverable disqualification. This includes anyone with a DA imposed bar to reenlistment in effect at time of separation or separated for any reason (except length of service retirement) with 18 or more years active Federal service. Eligibility: Ineligible for enlistment.

8. SUMMARY OF FACT(S): The Army Discharge Review Board considers applications for upgrade as instructed by Department of Defense Instruction 1332.28.

The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable. The applicant's AMHRR, the issues, and documents submitted with the application were carefully reviewed. The applicant's AMHRR indicates the applicant was adjudged guilty by a court-martial and the sentence was approved by the convening authority. Court-martial convictions stand as adjudged or modified by appeal through the judicial process.

The Board is empowered to change the discharge only if clemency is determined to be appropriate. Clemency is an act of mercy, or instance of leniency, to moderate the severity of the punishment imposed.

The applicant's DD Form 214 shows the applicant served 3 years, 4 months, and 3 days during which the applicant served 11 months and 10 days in Iraq (3 February 2005 - 12 January 2006). The applicant tested positive for D-AMP, D-METH, MDMA, and THC after providing a urine sample during a unit urinalysis inspection on 30 May 2006. On 14 September 2006, the applicant was discharged with a bad conduct characterization of service and was 23 years old at the time.

The applicant contends, in effect, to have post-deployment undiagnosed mental deficiencies that the applicant was unable to address on the applicant's own. The applicant's friend was killed during a vehicle-borne improvised explosive device attack. The applicant provided Integris Health Medical Group mental health progress notes, 3 July 2023, showing a diagnosis of PTSD, major depressive disorder, recurrent episode, moderate to severe, and generalized anxiety disorder. The applicant's AMHRR is void of a mental status evaluation.

The applicant contends, in effect, the applicant developed a drinking and drug abuse dependency that the applicant took to members of the enlisted command and did not receive the help needed to address the applicant's issues. The did not provide evidence for this contention and the AMHRR does not contain any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command. Six CID reports shows the applicant tested positive for D-AMP, D-METH, MDMA, and THC after providing a urine sample during a unit urinalysis inspection on 30 May 2006. The Army Review Board Agency provided the six CID reports to the applicant at the email address provided in the application on 6 September 2023 requesting comments but received no response from the applicant.

The applicant contends, in effect, while deployed to Iraq their camp was frequently attacked with indirect fire, resulting in the applicant being awarded a combat action badge. The Board will consider the applicant's service accomplishments and the quality of service according to the DODI 1332.28.

The applicant is seeking full restoration of the applicant's military combat veteran benefits. The applicant should contact a local office of the Department of Veterans Affairs for further assistance.

The applicant's first sergeant's third party statement speaks highly of the applicant while serving in the military. The first sergeant states the usual redeployment reset program failed to fully reach the applicant. The unit was disbanding, Soldiers, equipment and all assets were being reassigned throughout the Army. It was a turbulent, high operations tempo time where predictability was lost. Leaders were removed and reassigned, and cohesion was lost. The two third party statements recognize the applicant's good conduct after leaving the Army.

9. BOARD DISCUSSION AND DETERMINATION:

a. As directed by the 2017 memo signed by A.M. Kurta, the board considered the following factors:

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor, a voting member, reviewed the applicant's DOD and VA health records, applicant's statement, and/or civilian provider documentation and found that the applicant has the following potentially mitigating diagnoses: the applicant held an in-service diagnosis of Adjustment Disorder. Post-service, the applicant submitted medical records listing PTSD, MDD, and GAD.

(2) Did the condition exist, or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The applicant held an in-service diagnosis of Adjustment Disorder.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Partial.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that the applicant's assertion the PTSD diagnosis relates to combat, and possibility this assertion is at least partially accurate, the basis for separation is partially mitigated. Given the nexus between trauma, avoidance, difficulty with authority, and substance use, the majority of charges are mitigated. Pulling a fire alarm and possession of firecrackers is not mitigated.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **Yes.** After applying liberal consideration to the evidence, including the Board Medical Advisor opine, the Board determined that the applicant's in-service diagnosis of Adjustment Disorder and post-service, the applicant is connected for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, Major Depressive Disorder, Generalized Anxiety Disorder partially mitigated the applicant's misconduct - FTR, Disrespect, wrongfully use 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDA), wrongfully use marijuana (THC), and going AWOL. Pulling of a fire alarm and possession of firecrackers is not mitigated.

b. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant requests an upgrade to Honorable. The Board considered this contention and determined that the applicant's service, given the overall nature of the misconducts - FTR, Disrespect, wrongfully use 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDA), wrongfully use marijuana (THC), and going AWOL was not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge. However, the board determined the current discharge is inequitable and the board voted to upgrade to General, Under Honorable Conditions because of the partial mitigation as detailed in paragraphs 9a (3-4). Thus, the prior characterization is no longer appropriate.

(2) The applicant contends, in effect, to have post-deployment undiagnosed mental deficiencies that the applicant was unable to address on the applicant's own. The Board considered this contention during proceedings but ultimately did not address the contention due to an upgrade being granted as outlined above in paragraph 9a (3-4) and 9b (1).

(3) The applicant contends, in effect, the applicant developed a drinking and drug abuse dependency that the applicant took to members of the enlisted command and did not receive the help needed to address the applicant's issues. The Board considered this contention along with the totality of the applicant's military records and found no evidence of the command acting in an arbitrary or capricious manner. The applicant's AMHRR reflects the applicant tested positive for D-AMP, D-METH, MDMA, and THC after providing a urine sample during a unit

urinalysis inspection. Nevertheless, the board voted that relief was warranted based on other circumstances as outlined above in paragraph 9a (3-4) and 9b (1).

(4) The applicant contends, in effect, while deployed to Iraq their camp was frequently attacked with indirect fire, resulting in the applicant being awarded a combat action badge. The Board considered this contention but ultimately did not address the contention due to an upgrade being granted as outlined above in paragraph 9a (3-4) and 9b (1).

c. The Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the applicant's in-service diagnosis of Adjustment Disorder and post-service, the applicant is connected for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, Major Depressive Disorder, Generalized Anxiety Disorder outweighed the applicant's misconduct - FTR, Disrespect, wrongfully use 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDA), wrongfully use marijuana (THC), and going AWOL. Therefore, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade of the characterization of service to General (Under Honorable Conditions). Thus, warranting relief. The applicant has exhausted their appeal options available with ADRB. However, the applicant may still apply to the Army Board for Correction of Military Records. The applicant is responsible for satisfying the burden of proof and providing documents or other evidence sufficient to support the applicant's contention(s) that the discharge was improper or inequitable.

d. Rationale for Decision:

(1) The Board voted to change the applicant's characterization of service to General, Under Honorable Conditions because of the partial mitigation as detailed in paragraphs 9a (3-4) and 9b (1). Thus, the prior characterization is no longer appropriate.

(2) The Board voted not to change the applicant's reason for discharge or accompanying SPD code under the same pretexts, and the reason the applicant was discharged was both proper and equitable.

(3) The RE code will not change, as the current code is consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the regulation.

10. BOARD ACTION DIRECTED:

a. Issue a New DD-214 / Separation Order: Yes

b. Change Characterization to: General, Under Honorable Conditions

c. Change Reason / SPD code to: No Change

d. Change RE Code to: No Change

e. Change Authority to: No Change

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20200009841

Authenticating Official:

1/31/2024



AWOL – Absent Without Leave
AMHRR – Army Military Human
Resource Record
BCD – Bad Conduct Discharge
BH – Behavioral Health
CG – Company Grade Article 15
CID – Criminal Investigation
Division
ELS – Entry Level Status
FG – Field Grade Article 15

GD – General Discharge
HS – High School
HD – Honorable Discharge
IADT – Initial Active Duty Training
MP – Military Police
MST – Military Sexual Trauma
N/A – Not applicable
NCO – Noncommissioned Officer
NIF – Not in File
NOS – Not Otherwise Specified

OAD – Ordered to Active Duty
OBH (I) – Other Behavioral
Health (Issues)
OMPF – Official Military
Personnel File
PTSD – Post-Traumatic Stress
Disorder
RE – Re-entry
SCM – Summary Court Martial
SPCM – Special Court Martial

SPD – Separation Program
Designator
TBI – Traumatic Brain Injury
UNC – Uncharacterized
Discharge
UOTHC – Under Other Than
Honorable Conditions
VA – Department of Veterans
Affairs