

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 honorable. The applicant requests a narrative reason change.

The applicant seeks relief contending, in effect, being diagnosed with generalized anxiety disorder and not obtaining adequate treatment to alleviate this issue. The applicant's government record lacks certain documentation. The applicant's unit commander did not fill out DA Form 3349 as required. Contrary to CPT B's assertion, the applicant was not separated under Chapter 5 prior to the incident. The applicant's appointed attorney from Trial Defense Services (TDS) declined to comply with AR 27-26 and furnish witnesses as requested. The government obtained private medical information without consent from medical authorities, and the unit violated standards by sending the applicant to rehabilitation 13 days late. The applicant was separated despite the Alcohol Substance Abuse Program's (ASAP) recommendation for retention. The applicant contends the ASAP director found evidence of mitigating circumstances and the evidence was ignored. No governmental body in the process made note of the medical aspects of the applicant's specific situation despite requirements under AR 635-200 and AR 600-85. The applicant failed to receive a fair, impartial, and proper hearing before an administrative separation board; the applicant failed to receive notice of administrative separation board convening and was not advised of rights regarding the board.

b. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 22 October 2024, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board, based on the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighing the applicant's illegal substance abuse offense, determined the narrative reason for the applicant's separation is now inequitable. Therefore, the Board directed the issue of a new DD Form 214 changing the separation authority to AR 635-200, paragraph 14-12a, the narrative reason for separation to Misconduct (Minor Infractions), the separation code to JKN, and the reentry eligibility code to RE-3. The Board determined the characterization of service was proper and equitable and voted not to change it.

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: Misconduct / AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12c (2) / JKK / RE-4 / Honorable

b. Date of Discharge: 17 April 2005

c. Separation Facts:

(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate: 23 July 2004

(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: Between 1 May and 1 June 2004, the applicant wrongfully used cocaine, a controlled substance.

(3) Recommended Characterization: General (Under Honorable Conditions)

(4) Legal Consultation Date: 26 July 2004

(5) Administrative Separation Board: The applicant's notification memorandum was not in the file.

On 26 July 2004, the applicant conditionally waived consideration of the case before an administrative separation board, contingent upon receiving a characterization of service no less favorable than an honorable discharge.

On 24 September 2004, the applicant's conditional waiver was denied.

On 8 November 2004, the administrative separation board convened, and the applicant appeared with counsel. The Board determined by a preponderance of the evidence the applicant did commit a serious offense under AR 635-200, chapter 14-12c by using cocaine, an illegal drug, and subsequent admission of abusing the prescription drug, percocet. The board recommended the applicant's discharge with characterization of service of general (under honorable conditions).

On 7 January 2005, the separation authority approved the findings and recommendations of the administrative separation board.

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: On 7 January 2005, the separation authority approved the applicant's separation under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12c, Commission of a Serious Offense. / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 29 January 2003 / Indefinite

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 32 / some college / 120

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-6 / 15T3P, UH-60 Helicopter Repairer / 15 years, 8 months, 17 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: RA, 1 August 1989 – 30 March 1994 / HD
RA, 1 April 1994 – 10 February 1997 / HD
RA, 11 February 1997 – 16 April 1998 / HD
RA, 17 April 1998 – 23 June 1999 / HD
RA, 24 June 1999 – 3 May 2000 / HD
RA, 4 May 2000 – 28 January 2003 / HD

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: Germany, Korea, Puerto Rico, SWA / Saudi Arabia (8 September 1990 – 5 April 1991)

f. Awards and Decorations: ARCOM-3, AAM-11, AGCM-4, NDSM-2, AFEM-2, GWOTSM, KDMS, SWASM, HSM-2, NCOPDR-2, ASR, OSR-3, UNM, NATOMDL, KLMSA, KLMK

g. Performance Ratings: January 2003 – April 2003 / Among the Best
May 2003 – April 2004 / Among the Best
May 2004 – February 2005 / Marginal

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record: Electronic Copy of DD Form 2624, undated, reflects the applicant tested positive for benzoylecgonine (cocaine) 656, during an Inspection Unit (IU) urinalysis testing, conducted on 1 June 2004.

FG Article 15, 22 June 2004, for wrongfully using cocaine (between 1 May and 1 June 2004). The punishment consisted of a reduction to E-5; forfeiture of \$1184 pay per month for two months; and extra duty for 45 days.

The applicant provided a memorandum for proposed witness list, 26 October 2004.

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: None

j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):

(1) Applicant provided: Memorandum for a Psychological Evaluation; 1 March 2004, reflects a medical diagnosis.

Physical Profile, 24 March 2004, reflects a medical diagnosis.

Memorandum for Defense Counsel, 2 November 2004, reflects a medical diagnosis.

(2) AMHRR Listed: Report of Medical History, 21 July 2004, the examining medical physician noted the applicant's medical conditions in the comments section. The evaluation included a medical diagnosis.

The ARBA's medical advisor reviewed DoD and VA medical records and not solely those 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; two Physical Profiles; Memorandum for a Psychological Evaluation; Memorandum for proposed witness list; DA Form 4254; two Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Program (ADAPCP); DD Form 2870; two Legal Assistance of Western New York ING letters; Report of Proceeding by Investigating Officer; Army Discharge Review Board Data Sheet; Memorandum for Commander, 23 July 2004; Memorandum Request for immediate entry in to ASAP; Memorandum for Record, 4 November 2004; Memorandum for medical statement, 2 November 2004; three emails 7 May and 20 November 2014 and 18 March 2015.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: None were 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 40-501 (Standards of Medical Fitness), This regulation provides information on medical fitness standards for induction, enlistment, appointment, retention, and related policies and procedures. Chapter 7-12, provides the unit commanders and personnel officers are responsible for necessary personnel actions, including appropriate entries on personnel management records and the assignment of the individual to military duties commensurate with the individual's physical profile and recorded assignment limitations. If the soldier's commander believes the soldier cannot perform with the permanent profile, the commander will make appropriate comments on the profile form in the section entitled "Action by Unit Commander" and request reconsideration of the profile by the profiling physician. Reconsideration must be accomplished by the physician who will either amend the profile or revalidate the profile as appropriate. Commanders may also request a review of temporary profiles.

e. Army Regulation 600-85, (The Army Substance Abuse Program), paragraph 3-5 (b) a soldier's alcohol or other drug abuse may be identified through military or civilian law enforcement investigation and/or apprehension. The unit commander will refer the individual to the ASAP counseling center for an initial screening interview within 72 hours of notification of apprehension of a Soldier for apparent alcohol or other drug abuse. Referral for screening or enrollment does not interfere with or preclude pending legal or administrative actions in any way.

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

(1) Chapter 2-10 Board procedures, the Soldier will be notified of names and addresses of witnesses expected to be called at the board hearing. The Soldier will also be notified the recorder of the board will, upon request of the Soldier, try to arrange for the presence of any available witness they desire. 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) 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.

(5) 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.

(6) 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.

g. 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).

h. 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 being diagnosed with generalized anxiety disorder and did not obtain adequate treatment to alleviate this issue. The applicant provided a Memorandum for a Psychological Evaluation; 1 March 2004, reflecting a medical diagnosis. A Physical Profile, 24 March 2004, reflecting a medical diagnosis. Also, a Memorandum for Defense Counsel, 2 November 2004, reflecting a medical diagnosis. The AMHRR includes a Report of Medical History, 21 July 2004, reflecting the examining medical physician noted the applicant's medical conditions in the comments section. The evaluation included a medical diagnosis.

The applicant contends their government record lacks certain documentation. The applicant did not submit any evidence, other than the applicant's statement, to support the contention. The applicant's AMHRR does not contain any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command.

The applicant contends the applicant's unit commander did not fill out Physical Profile as required. Army Regulation 40-501 Chapter 7-12, provides unit commanders and personnel officers are responsible for necessary personnel actions, including appropriate entries on personnel management records and the assignment of the individual to military duties commensurate with the individual's physical profile and recorded assignment limitations. If the Soldier's commander believes the Soldier cannot perform with the permanent profile, the commander will make appropriate comments on the profile form in the section entitled "Action by Unit Commander" and request reconsideration of the profile by the profiling physician. Reconsideration must be accomplished by the physician who will either amend the profile or

revalidate the profile as appropriate. Commanders may also request a review of temporary profiles. Completion of a Physical Profile form does not fall within this board's purview. The applicant may apply to the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR), using the enclosed DD Form 149 regarding this matter. A DD Form 149 may also be obtained from a Veterans' Service Organization. The applicant's AMHRR does not contain any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command.

The applicant contends not being separated under Chapter 5 prior to incident despite the statement from CPT B. The applicant provided a Memorandum for a Psychological Evaluation; 1 March 2004, reflecting a medical diagnosis. Army Regulation 635-200, in pertinent part, stipulates commanders will not separate Soldiers for a medical condition solely to spare a Soldier who may have committed serious acts of misconduct.

The applicant contends their appointed attorney from Trial Defense Services (TDS) declined to comply with AR 27-26 and furnish witnesses as requested. The applicant provided a proposed witness list, 26 October 2004. Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 2-10, Board procedures, the Soldier will be notified of names and addresses of witnesses expected to be called at the board hearing. The Soldier will also be notified the recorder of the board will, upon request of the Soldier, try to arrange for the presence of any available witness they desire. 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 a board will hear the case.

The applicant contends the government obtained private medical information without consent from medical authorities. The applicant did not submit any evidence, other than the applicant's statement, to support the contention. The applicant's AMHRR does not contain any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command.

The applicant contends their unit violated standards by sending the applicant to rehabilitation 13 days late. The applicant did not submit any evidence, other than the applicant's statement, to support the contention. Army Regulation 600-85, The Army Substance Abuse Program, paragraph 3-5 (b) a Soldier's alcohol or other drug abuse may be identified through military or civilian law enforcement investigation or apprehension. The unit commander will refer the individual to the ASAP counseling center for an initial screening interview within 72 hours of notification of apprehension of a Soldier for apparent alcohol or other drug abuse. Referral for screening or enrollment does not interfere with or preclude pending legal or administrative actions in any way.

The applicant contends the ASAP director found evidence of mitigating circumstances and the evidence was ignored. No governmental body in the process made note of the medical aspects of the applicant's specific situation despite requirements under AR 635-200 and AR 600-85. The applicant provided a Memorandum for Defense Counsel, 2 November 2004, reflecting a medical diagnosis. The applicant's AMHRR does not contain any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command.

The applicant contends they failed to receive a fair, impartial, and proper hearing before an administrative separation board; the applicant failed to receive notice of administrative separation board convening and was not advised of rights regarding the board. The applicant's notification memorandum was not available for review. The AMHRR includes a Legal Review of Administrative Separation Board proceedings, 17 December 2004, reflecting the proceedings comply with legal requirements and were supported by a preponderance of the evidence. The applicant's AMHRR does not contain any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command.

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 found that, based off the Board's Medical Advisor's opine, a review of the applicant's DOD and VA health records, applicant's statement, and/or civilian provider documentation, the applicant has the following potentially-mitigating diagnoses/experiences: PTSD, MDD, GAD, Anxiety Disorder, Mood Disorder NOS

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board found that, based off the Board's Medical Advisor's opine, the applicant is 100 percent SC for PTSD.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board applied liberal consideration and determined, based on the BMA's opine, that the applicant's behavioral health conditions the discharge. Given the nexus between PTSD and the use of substances to self-medicate, the applicant's illegal substance abuse 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 Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighed the applicant's illegal substance abuse offense.

b. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends being diagnosed with generalized anxiety disorder and did not obtain adequate treatment to alleviate this issue. The Board liberally considered this contention and determined that the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighed the applicant's illegal substance abuse offense.

(2) The applicant contends the narrative reason for the discharge needs to be changed. The Board considered this contention and determined that it was valid based on medical mitigation of the applicant's misconduct.

(3) The applicant contends their government record lacks certain documentation. The Board considered this contention during proceedings, but ultimately did not address the contention due to an upgrade being granted based on the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighing the applicant's illegal substance abuse offense.

(4) The applicant contends the applicant unit commander did not fill out DA Form 3349 as required. The Board considered this contention during proceedings, but ultimately did not address the contention due to an upgrade being granted based on the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighing the applicant's illegal substance abuse offense.

(5) The applicant contends not being separated under Chapter 5 prior to incident despite the statement from CPT B. The Board considered this contention during proceedings, but ultimately did not address the contention due to an upgrade being granted based on the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighing the applicant's illegal substance abuse offense.

(6) The applicant contends their appointed attorney from Trial Defense Services (TDS) declined to comply with AR 27-26 and furnish witnesses as asked. The Board considered this contention during proceedings, but ultimately did not address the contention due to an upgrade being granted based on the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighing the applicant's illegal substance abuse offense.

(7) The applicant contends the government obtained private medical information without consent from medical authorities. The Board considered this contention during proceedings, but ultimately did not address the contention due to an upgrade being granted based on the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighing the applicant's illegal substance abuse offense.

(8) The applicant contends their unit violated standards by sending the applicant to rehabilitation 13 days late. The Board considered this contention during proceedings, but ultimately did not address the contention due to an upgrade being granted based on the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighing the applicant's illegal substance abuse offense.

(9) The applicant contends the ASAP director found evidence of mitigating circumstances and the evidence was ignored. No governmental body in the process made note of the medical aspects of the applicant's specific situation despite requirements under AR 635-200 and AR 600-85. The Board considered this contention during proceedings, but ultimately did not address the contention due to an upgrade being granted based on the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighing the applicant's illegal substance abuse offense.

(10) The applicant contends they failed to receive a fair, impartial, and proper hearing before an administrative separation board; the applicant failed to receive notice of administrative separation board convening and was not advised of rights regarding the board. The Board considered this contention during proceedings, but ultimately did not address the contention due to an upgrade being granted based on the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighing the applicant's illegal substance abuse offense.

c. The Board, based on the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighing the applicant's illegal substance abuse offense, determined the narrative reason for the applicant's separation is now inequitable. Therefore, the Board directed the issue of a new DD Form 214 changing the separation authority to AR 635-200, paragraph 14-12a, the narrative reason for separation to Misconduct (Minor Infractions), the separation code to JKN, and the reentry eligibility code to RE-3. The Board determined the characterization of service was proper and equitable and voted not to change it.

d. Rationale for Decision:

(1) The Board voted not to change the applicant's characterization of service as the applicant already holds an honorable characterization and further relief is not available .

(2) The Board voted to change the reason for discharge to Misconduct (Minor Infractions) due to the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder outweighing the applicant's illegal substance abuse offense, 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: No Change
- c. Change Reason / SPD Code to: Misconduct (Minor Infractions)/JKN
- d. Change RE Code to: RE-3
- e. Change Authority to: AR 635-200

Authenticating Official:

11/17/2024



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