

1. Applicant's Name: [REDACTED]**a. Application Date:** 26 April 2021**b. Date Received:** 26 April 2021**c. Counsel:** [REDACTED]**2. REQUEST, ISSUES, BOARD TYPE, AND DECISION:**

a. Applicant's Requests and Issues: The current characterization of service for the period under review is under other than honorable conditions. The applicant, through counsel, requests an upgrade to honorable.

The applicant seeks relief, contending, in effect, being a stellar and highly decorated Soldier and noncommissioned officer for many years before developing an addiction to marijuana. The applicant continues to suffer from the long-term effects of chronic PTSD and seizure disorder. Still their future has been marred by a psychological problem never comprehensively reviewed by a clinical psychologist or similar to determine whether their misconduct originated from their medical/mental condition or the converse. The commanders and board members had to make determinations significantly impacting the applicant's life without the aid of this much-needed medical testimony. This error was compounded by the many procedural defects in the board notification process, including errors committed by the board and respondent's counsel. As a result, the Department of Veterans Affairs denied the applicant compensation. Counsel and the applicant further detail the contentions in the legal brief and the applicant's affidavit.

b. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 8 April 2025, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighing the applicant's medically mitigated illegal substance abuse offenses. Therefore, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade of the characterization of service to Honorable and changed the separation authority to AR 635-200, paragraph 14-12a. Accordingly, the narrative reason for separation was changed to Misconduct (Minor Infractions) with a corresponding separation code of JKN and reentry code of RE-3.

*Please see **Board Discussion and Determination** section for more details regarding the Board's decision. Board member names are available upon request.*

3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:

a. Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization: Misconduct (Drug Abuse) / AR 635-200, Paragraph 14-12c (2) / JKK / RE-4 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

b. Date of Discharge: 24 August 2011**c. Separation Facts:**

(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate: 5 April 2011

(2) Basis for Separation: Under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12c, Commission of a Serious Offense, the applicant was informed of the following reasons: The applicant received two Field Grade Article 15s for testing positive for marijuana. The applicant

tested positive twice for marijuana and it was expected they would continue to test positive. It was obvious to the command the applicant had no intention of abating their use of illegal drugs. The conduct was direct evidence the applicant was no longer suitable for continuance in the Army Wounded Warrior program or for continued military service.

(3) Recommended Characterization: Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

(4) Legal Consultation Date: 6 April 2011

(5) Administrative Separation Board: On 6 April 2011, the applicant requested consideration of the case before an administrative separation board.

On 12 May 2011, the applicant was notified to appear before an administrative separation board and advised of rights

On 25 May 2011, the applicant conditionally waived consideration of the case before an administrative separation board, contingent upon receiving a characterization of service no less favorable than general (under honorable conditions) discharge.

On 20 June 2011, the separation authority disapproved the conditional waiver.

On 22 June 2011, the administrative separation board convened, and the applicant appeared with counsel. The Board determined each allegation in the proposed separation was supported by a preponderance of the evidence. The board, comprised of three board members, recommended the applicant's discharge with characterization of service of under other than honorable conditions; however, one board member recommended general (under honorable conditions).

On 9 July 2011, the separation authority approved the findings and recommendations of the administrative separation board.

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: 9 July 2011 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions / The separation authority approved the applicant's separation under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12c, Commission of a Serious Offense. The separation authority disapproved the recommendation of the medical evaluation board to have the applicant's case referred to a physical evaluation board.

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 28 February 2008 / 4 years

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 23 / HS Graduate / 124

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-5 / 15U2O, CH-47 Helicopter Repairman / 8 years, 2 months, 21 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: RA, 4 June 2003 – 27 February 2008 / HD

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: Germany, SWA / Afghanistan (11 March 2005 – 11 March 2006); Iraq (1 July 2007 – 19 July 2008)

f. Awards and Decorations: ACM-CS, NATOMDL, ARCOM-2, MUC-2, AGCM-2, NDSM, GWOTSM, HSM, ICM-CS, ASR, OSR-3, CAB

g. Performance Ratings: 1 July 2007 – 31 December 2008 / Fully Capable
25 January 2009 – 1 May 2010 / Fully Capable

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record: Electronic Copy of Specimen Custody Document – Drug Testing, 23 November 2010, reflects the applicant tested positive for THC 222 (marijuana), during an Inspection Unit (IU) urinalysis testing, conducted on 15 November 2010.

Field Grade Article 15, 14 December 2010, for wrongfully using marijuana (between 15 October and 15 November 2010). The punishment consisted of a reduction to E-4; forfeiture of \$1146 pay per month for two months (suspended), extra duty for 45 days, and restriction for 45 days (suspended).

Electronic Copy of Specimen Custody Document – Drug Testing, 8 February 2011, reflects the applicant tested positive for THC>LOL (marijuana), during an Inspection Unit (IU) urinalysis testing, conducted on 31 January 2011.

Two Developmental Counseling Forms, 3 December 2010, and 15 February 2011, for testing positive for THC on multiple occasions, during urinalysis testing; self-enrolling in the Army Substance Abuse Program; and receiving an Article 15.

Record Of Supplementary Action Under Article 15, UCMJ, 17 February 2011, reflects the suspended portion of the punishment imposed on 14 December 2010, was vacated for: Article 112a, wrongful use of marijuana.

Electronic Copy of Specimen Custody Document – Drug Testing, 17 February 2011, reflects the applicant tested positive for THC 222 (marijuana), during an Inspection Random (IR) urinalysis testing, conducted on 19 February 2011.

Field Grade Article 15, 8 March 2011, for, on two occasions, wrongfully using marijuana (between 31 December 2010 and 31 January 2011 and between 10 January 2011 and 10 February 2011). The punishment consisted of a reduction to E-1, forfeiture of \$733 pay per month for two months, extra duty for 60 days.

Formal AR 15-6 Investigation Findings and Recommendations, 22 June 2011, reflects the administrative separation board found each allegation in the notice of proposed separation was supported by the preponderance of the evidence, and two of the three board members recommended separation with an under other than honorable conditions. One of the administrative separation board members recommended a general (under honorable conditions).

Administrative Law Attorney legal review, 8 July 2011, reflects the Government did not appear to have provided written notice to the applicant regarding Government witnesses as required by AR 635-200, paragraph 2-10b; however, the defense counsel did not object to the lack of notification during the proceedings and cross-examined the witnesses. The attorney found the proceedings complied with the legal requirements of AR 15-6 and AR 635-200.

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: None

j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):

(1) Applicant provided: Report of Mental Status Evaluation, 14 March 2011, reflects the applicant was not psychiatrically cleared for Chapter 14 administrative action. The applicant had been referred to the PEB, and the ultimate disposition was referred to the general court-martial convening authority. The applicant could understand and participate in administrative proceedings and could appreciate the difference between right and wrong. On 24 August 2010, the applicant was diagnosed with a PTSD, chronic. The applicant had been screened for mild traumatic brain injury (mTBI). The condition was not evident.

(2) AMHRR Listed: MSE as described in previous paragraph 4j(1).

Physical Profile (permanent), 1 October 2009, reflects the applicant had seizure disorder well controlled with medication, which limited their duties.

Physical Profile (temporary), 26 March 2010, reflects the applicant had PTSD, which limited their duties.

Medical Evaluation Board Proceedings, 26 August 2010, reflects the applicant did not meet medical retention standards for a PTSD, chronic, and major depressive disorder, recurrent, in partial remission. The applicant met medical retention standards for medical conditions epilepsy with complex focal seizures; dyslipidemia; and proteinuria. The medical evaluation board (MEB) referred the case to a physical evaluation board (PEB). The approving authority approved the board's findings and recommendations. The applicant did not concur with the findings and recommendations and appealed the decision.

Physical Profile (permanent), 18 October 2010, reflects the applicant had PTSD; depression; and seizure disorder under medication adjustment, which limited their duties:

Physical Profile (permanent), 29 October 2010, reflects the applicant had PTSD, chronic; and major depressive disorder recurrent, which limited their duties:

Medical Evaluation Board Proceedings, 20 December 2010, reflects the applicant did not meet medical retention standards because of PTSD, chronic, and major depressive disorder, recurrent, in partial remission. The applicant met medical retention standards for medical conditions epilepsy with complex focal seizures; dyslipidemia; and proteinuria. The MEB referred the case to a PEB. The approving authority approved the board's findings and recommendations. The applicant concurred with the findings and recommendations.

Chronological Record of Medical Care, from 16 September 2010 to 7 March 2011, reflects the applicant chronic medical problems were listed as: Cannabis dependence; phase of life circumstances; major depression, recurrent; military services MEB; PTSD; adjustment disorder with depressed mood; severe recurrent major depression without psychotic features; depression; anxiety disorder, not otherwise specified (NOS); seizure disorder; nightmare disorder; insomnia; and adjustment disorder with anxiety.

Physical Profile (temporary), 14 January 2011, reflects the applicant had seizure disorder, major depression, improving, which limited their duties. The form indicated an MEB was underway.

The ARBA's medical advisor reviewed DoD and VA medical records, including documents listed in 4j(1) and (2) above.

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty; Application for the Review of Discharge; Legal Brief; applicant's Affidavit; and various separation documents.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: None submitted with the application.

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) 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 600-85, (The Army Substance Abuse Program) paragraph 10-12a defines the Limited Use Policy and states unless waived under the circumstances listed in paragraph 10-13d, Limited Use Policy prohibits the use by the government of protected evidence against a Soldier in actions under the UCMJ or on the issue of characterization of service in administrative proceedings. Additionally, the policy limits the characterization of discharge to "Honorable" if protected evidence is used. Protected evidence under this policy includes a Soldier's self-referral to BH for SUD treatment.

e. Army Regulation 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations) provides the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel.

(1) Paragraph 2-9b (previously 2-10b), states the Soldier will be notified of names and addresses of witnesses expected to be called at the board hearing. A copy of the case file, including all affidavits and depositions of witnesses unable to appear in person at the board hearing will be furnished to the Soldier or the counsel as soon as possible after it is determined that a board will hear the case.

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

(3) 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.

(4) 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.

(5) 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.

(6) Paragraph 3-8a states a Soldier is entitled to an honorable characterization of service if limited-use evidence (see AR 600-85) is initially introduced by the Government in the discharge proceedings, and the discharge is based upon those proceedings. The separation authority will consult with the servicing Judge Advocate in cases involving limited use evidence.

(7) Chapter 14 establishes policy and prescribes procedures for separating members for misconduct. Specific categories include minor disciplinary infractions, a pattern of

misconduct, and commission of a serious offense, to include abuse of illegal drugs, convictions by civil authorities and desertion or being absent without leave. Action will be taken to separate a member for misconduct when it is clearly established that rehabilitation is impractical or unlikely to succeed.

(8) Paragraph 14-3 prescribes a discharge under other than honorable conditions is normally appropriate for a Soldier discharged under this chapter. However, the separation authority may direct a general discharge if such is merited by the Soldier's overall record.

(9) Paragraph 14-12c(2) terms abuse of illegal drugs as serious misconduct. It continues; however, by recognizing relevant facts may mitigate the nature of the offense. Therefore, a single drug abuse offense may be combined with one or more minor disciplinary infractions or incidents of other misconduct and processed for separation under paragraph 14-12a or 14-12b as appropriate.

f. 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 "JKK" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, misconduct (drug abuse).

g. 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-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 Army Military Human Resources Record (AMHRR), the issues, and documents submitted with the application were carefully reviewed.

The applicant contends mental health issues affected their behavior, leading to their discharge, and were not properly evaluated regarding PTSD-related misconduct. The applicant provided evidence of undergoing a mental status evaluation (MSE) on 14 March 2011, indicating the applicant was mentally responsible and could recognize right from wrong. On 24 August 2010, the applicant was diagnosed with chronic PTSD. The applicant's AMHRR contains the mental status evaluation and medical documents reflecting the applicant underwent an MEB, which determined the applicant did not meet medical retention standards for PTSD, chronic, and major depressive disorder, recurrent, in partial remission. The applicant met medical retention standards for epilepsy with complex focal seizures, dyslipidemia, and proteinuria. The MEB referred the applicant's case to a PEB. The applicant's medical records listed several other medical conditions as chronic problems. The separation authority considered the documents in the applicant's AMHRR.

The applicant contends good service, including two combat tours.

The applicant contends coercion by command members in Article 15 proceedings and the legal review of the administrative separation board was evidence of procedural errors. The applicant's AMHRR reflects an administrative attorney indicated in a legal review, the Government did not appear to have provided the applicant with written notice of Government witnesses as required by AR 635-200; however, the defense counsel did not object to the lack of notification during the proceedings and cross-examined the witnesses. Army Regulation 635-200, paragraph 2-9b (previously 2-10b), states the Soldier will be notified of names and addresses of witnesses expected to be called at the board hearing. A copy of the case file, including all affidavits and depositions of witnesses unable to appear in person at the board hearing, will be furnished to the Soldier or the counsel as soon as possible after it is determined that a board will hear the case. The applicant's AMHRR does not include any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command.

The applicant contends a medical evaluation board was in process during the separation proceedings. The applicant's AMHRR reflects the applicant underwent an MEB, and their case was referred to a PEB. The Department of Defense disability regulations do not preclude a disciplinary separation while undergoing a medical board. Appropriate regulations stipulate separations for misconduct take precedence over potential separations for other reasons. Whenever a member is being processed through the Physical Evaluation Board and is subsequently processed for an involuntary administrative separation or referred to a court-martial for misconduct, the disability evaluation is suspended. The Physical Evaluation Board case remains in suspense pending the outcome of the non-disability proceedings. If the action includes either a punitive or administrative discharge for misconduct, the medical process is stopped, and the board report is filed in the member's medical record.

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 reviewed the applicant's DOD and VA health records, the applicant's statement, and/or civilian provider documentation and found that the applicant has the following potentially mitigating diagnoses/experiences: PTSD, MDD, and Anxiety Disorder.

(2) Did the condition exist, or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board found the applicant was diagnosed with PTSD, MDD, and Anxiety Disorder while in the military and is 10 percent service connected for PTSD by the VA.

(3) Does the condition or experience excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board determined, based on the Board Medical Advisor opine, that the applicant's PTSD mitigates the discharge. Given the nexus between PTSD and the use of substances to self-medicate, the applicant's wrongful use of marijuana is 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 PTSD outweighed the applicant's wrongful use of marijuana offenses.

b. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends mental health issues affected their behavior, leading to the discharge, and not properly evaluated regarding PTSD-related misconduct. The Board liberally considered this contention and determined that the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighed the separating illegal substance abuse offenses.

(2) The applicant contends good service, including two combat tours. The Board considered this contention, but ultimately did not make a determination because the Board granted the applicant's requested relief based on the applicant's PTSD outweighing the applicant's medically mitigated illegal substance abuse offenses.

(3) The applicant contends coercion by command members in Article 15 proceedings and the legal review of the administrative separation board was evidence of procedural errors. The Board considered this contention, but ultimately did not make a determination because the Board granted the applicant's requested relief based on the applicant's PTSD outweighing the applicant's medically mitigated illegal substance abuse offenses.

(4) The applicant contends a medical evaluation board was in process during the separation proceedings. The Board considered this contention but found that the pausing of a medical evaluation board in favor of administrative separation for misconduct is proper and IAW AR 635-200.

c. The Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the applicant's PTSD outweighing the applicant's medically mitigated illegal substance abuse offenses. Therefore, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade of the characterization of service to Honorable and changed the separation authority to AR 635-200, paragraph 14-12a. Accordingly, the narrative reason for separation was changed to Misconduct (Minor Infractions) with a corresponding separation code of JKN and reentry code of RE-3.

d. Rationale for Decision:

(1) The Board voted to change the applicant's characterization of service to Honorable because the applicant's PTSD outweighed the separating illegal substance abuse offenses. Thus, the prior characterization is no longer appropriate.

(2) The Board voted to change the reason for discharge to Misconduct (Minor Infractions) under the same pretexts. Thus, the reason for discharge is no longer appropriate. The SPD code associated with the new reason for discharge is JKN.

(3) The RE code will change to RE-3.

10. BOARD ACTION DIRECTED:

- a. **Issue a New DD-214:** Yes
- b. **Change Characterization to:** Honorable
- c. **Change Reason / SPD Code to:** Misconduct (Minor Infractions)/JKN
- d. **Change RE Code to:** RE-3
- e. **Change Authority to:** AR 635-200

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20210000351

Authenticating Official:

6/25/2025



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