

1. Applicant's Name:

- a. **Application Date:** 26 April 2021
- b. **Date Received:** 26 April 2021
- c. **Counsel:** None

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

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

The applicant seeks relief contending, in effect, they knew they would not receive a fair trial and requested a Chapter 10 discharge. The applicant's investigation began in November 2004, but the investigating officer (IO) did not call or contact any of the applicant's witnesses. Private (PVT) G. changed their story about a sexual relationship on three occasions before the investigation began. The applicant was comfortable with the assigned attorney but was assigned another attorney once in Iraq. One of the witnesses for the court-martial proceedings was a Soldier who was a deserter and who had been separated from the Army. The applicant was unable to contact the witness, Private First Class (PFC) C., when the applicant returned to out-process. The rear detachment forwarded an unsigned statement from PFC C. to the forward command, but the applicant did not realize the statement was unsigned until the applicant signed the Chapter 10. The applicant requested a new attorney because their attorney indicated they did not believe two persons would make up the same story of adultery. The statements were identical. The applicant knew it was a forged story between the rear and forward commands. The applicant requested a civilian attorney and the court-martial be returned to the U.S. because it was where the alleged affairs took place. The new commander denied the requests and indicated the applicant would have to pay for a civilian attorney to travel to Iraq and for their expenses. The applicant's first sergeant (1SG), who had worked with the applicant's spouse before, called the applicant's spouse, informed their spouse of the investigation, and requested the applicant's spouse go on a date and for sex because the applicant would be out of the picture soon. After the applicant was able to contact PFC C., PFC C. stated they were offered an honorable or a general (under honorable conditions) discharge if PFC C. signed the statement. The applicant served the Army well in their career, which was cut short. The applicant always accepted leadership positions and instructor jobs and rated among the best on their Noncommissioned Officer Evaluation Reports (NCOERs). As a civilian, the applicant has always worked, voted, volunteered, and coached little league teams, and is a single parent to two children. The applicant would love to be able to join veteran organizations and be treated by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) for their combat-related post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) diagnosis, but their discharge prevents these benefits. The applicant defended the country in combat and led Soldiers on numerous missions as a convoy commander, with no deaths of U.S. Soldiers, supported by the applicant's NCOERs. The applicant desires the same rights and benefits as every Soldier who came before the applicant. The applicant had never been in any trouble or received negative counseling in their career. The applicant panicked when the applicant was denied a trial in the U.S., and the request to change their attorney, as well as an Article 32 investigation, which was scheduled to begin three days after the applicant was charged. The applicant was offered a Chapter 10 and spoke with their spouse. The applicant accepted a Chapter 10 because the applicant did not want to risk confinement for adultery, especially knowing they did not do it. The applicant would stand behind anything they have done, but they were being railroaded.

b. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 28 January 2025, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board denied the request upon finding the separation was both proper and equitable.

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: In Lieu of Trial by Court-Martial / AR 635-200, Chapter 10 / KFS / RE-4 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

b. Date of Discharge: 16 August 2005

c. Separation Facts:

(1) Date and Charges Preferred (DD Form 458, Charge Sheet): On 22 July 2005, the applicant was charged with:

Charge I: Violating Article 92, UCMJ:

Specification 1: From 27 October through 10 November 2004, did violate a lawful general regulation by having an inappropriate relationship with Private E-2, K. G., a Soldier of a different rank.

Specification 2: From 19 May through 5 July 2005, did violate a lawful general regulation by having an inappropriate relationship with Private First Class D. C., a Soldier of a different rank.

Charge II: Violating Article 93, UCMJ:

Specification 1: On 27 October 2004, was cruel towards PV2 K. G. a person subject to their orders, by exposing their penis to PV2 K. G. and asking PV2 K. G. for oral sex during a TA-50 layout.

Specification 2: On 10 November 2004, was cruel towards PFC K. G., a person subject to orders, by having PV2 K. G. watch a pornographic video.

Charge III: Violating Article 125, UCMJ:

Specification 1: On 27 October 2004, commit sodomy with PV2 K. G.

Specification 2: On 10 November 2004, commit sodomy with PV2 K. G.

Charge IV: Violating Article 134, UCMJ:

Specification 1: On 27 October 2004, being a married person, did wrongfully have sexual intercourse with PV2 K. S. a person, not their spouse.

Specification 2: On 10 November 2004, being a married person, wrongfully have sexual intercourse with PV2 K. S. a person, not their spouse.

Specification 3: On divers occasions from 19 May 2005 through 5 July 2005, wrongfully have sexual intercourse with PFC M. C., a person, not their spouse.

Specification 4: On 27 October 2005, commit an indecent assault upon PV2 K.G., by grabbing PV2 K.G.'s hands and pulling them up to a standing position next to the applicant's exposed genitals with intent to gratify applicant's sexual desires.

Specification 5: On 10 November 2004, commit an indecent assault upon PV2 K. G., by grabbing PV2 K. G.'s head and pulling it towards their penis with intent to gratify their sexual desires.

Charge V: Violating Article 115, UCMJ: Specification 1 [sic]: On 17 July 2005, in a hostile fire pay zone for the purpose of avoiding the service as an enlisted person feign a drug overdose.

(2) Legal Consultation Date: 23 July 2005

(3) Basis for Separation: Pursuant to the applicant's request for discharge under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 10, in lieu of trial by court-martial.

(4) Recommended Characterization: Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

(5) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: 24 July 2005 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 1 September 1999 / 3 years / The AMHRR is void of any enlistment contract retaining the applicant on active duty after the most recent enlistment period. The Charge Sheet reflects current service: 15 February 2002, 4 years.

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 26 / 1 Year College / 107

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-6 / 88M30, Motor Transport Operator / 12 years, 11 months, 7 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: RA, 10 September 1992 – 3 April 1995 / HD
RA, 4 April 1995 – 1 July 1997 / HD
RA, 2 July 1997 – 31 August 1997 / HD

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: Germany, SWA / Iraq-Kuwait (14 February 2003 – 29 February 2004, 7 July 2005 – 8 August 2005); SWA (17 May 1995 – 3 October 1995)

f. Awards and Decorations: ARCOM, AAM-7, PUC, AGCM-4, NDSM-2, GWOTEM, ICM, SWASM-BSS, GWOTSM, HSM, NCOPDR-2, ASR, OSR

g. Performance Ratings: February 1999 – January 2002 / Among the Best
February 2002 – May 2004 / Among the Best

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record: Informal AR 15-6 Investigation Findings and Recommendations, 17 December 2004, reflect the investigation officer found the applicant:

The allegation of fraternization made by Private E-2 (PV2) G. was credible;

The allegation of fraternization made by Specialist (SPC) H. was plausible;

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20210000720

The applicant's defense PV2 G. was trying to discredit the applicant to stop the applicant from having PV2 G. enrolled in a drug and alcohol program, were unsupported;

The defense PV2 G. had detailed knowledge of the applicant's house because PV2 G., babysat for the applicant was unsupported; and

SPC H.'s credibility was suspect in the case because of multiple statements made by interviewees.

The IO recommended the applicant receive nonjudicial punishment with a reduction from Staff Sergeant (SSG), and PV2 G., offered counseling for the incident.

Memorandum, subject: Legal Review AR 15-6 Investigation, Allegations of Fraternization, 20 December 2004, reflects the Chief, Administrative Law, found the investigation met the legal requirements, but noted the IO did not take sworn statements for all witnesses, and relied primarily on the statements of the alleged victim and the applicant.

The applicant's Enlisted Record Brief (ERB), 9 August 2005, reflects the applicant was flagged for Adverse Action (AA), effective 10 December 2004, and Involuntary Separation or Discharge (Field Initiated) (BA), effective 13 March 2005; and was ineligible for reenlistment because of Other; prohibitions not otherwise identified (9X). The applicant's expiration term of service reflects 30 April 2006.

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: None

j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):

(1) Applicant provided: None

(2) AMHRR Listed: None

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; two Applications for the Review of Discharge; U.S. Army Court of Military Review Electronic Mail message; and five third-party statements.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: The applicant maintained employment, voted, volunteered in the community, coached little league, and is a single parent to two children.

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 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations), 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.

(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) Chapter 10 provides, in pertinent part, that a member who has committed an offense or offenses for which the authorized punishment includes a punitive discharge may submit a request for a discharge for the good of the Service in lieu of trial by court-martial. The request may be submitted at any time after charges have been preferred and must include the individual's admission of guilt.

(6) Paragraph 10-6 stipulates medical and mental examinations are not required but may be requested by the Soldier under AR 40-501, chapter 8.

(7) Paragraph 10-8a stipulates a discharge under other than honorable conditions normally is appropriate for a Soldier who is discharged in lieu of trial by court-martial. However, the separation authority may direct a general discharge if such is merited by the Soldier's overall record during the current enlistment. (See chap 3, sec II.)

(8) Paragraph 10b stipulates Soldiers who have completed entry-level status, characterization of service as honorable is not authorized unless the Soldier's record is otherwise so meritorious that any other characterization clearly would be improper.

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 "KFS" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 10, In Lieu of Trial by Court-Martial.

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-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 evidence in the applicant's Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR) confirms the applicant was charged with the commission of an offense punishable under the UCMJ with a punitive discharge. The applicant, in consultation with legal counsel, voluntarily requested, in writing, a discharge under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 10, in lieu of trial by court-martial. In this request, the applicant admitted guilt to the offense, or a lesser included offense, and indicated an understanding an under other than honorable conditions discharge could be received, and the discharge would have a significant effect on eligibility for veterans' benefits. The under other than honorable conditions discharge received by the applicant was normal and appropriate under the regulatory guidance.

The applicant contends being diagnosed with PTSD. The applicant did not submit any evidence, other than the applicant's statement, the applicant was diagnosed with PTSD. The applicant's AMHRR is void of a mental status evaluation.

The applicant contends good service, including three combat tours. The Board considered the applicant's service accomplishments and the quality of service according to the DODI 1332.28.

The applicant contends being innocent of the charges preferred against the applicant, having a toxic leadership, and requesting Chapter 10 because they would not have received a fair trial. The applicant submitted third party statements to support the contentions regarding the 1SG's actions and the unsigned witness statement. The AMHRR does not include any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command.

The applicant contends an upgrade of the discharge would allow veterans benefits. Eligibility for veteran's benefits does not fall within the purview of the Army Discharge Review Board. Accordingly, the applicant should contact a local office of the Department of Veterans Affairs for further assistance.

The applicant contends maintaining employment, volunteering in the community, coaching little league, and being a single parent to two children. The Army Discharge Review Board is authorized to consider post-service factors in the recharacterization of a discharge. No law or regulation provides for the upgrade of an unfavorable discharge based solely on the passage of time or good conduct in civilian life after leaving the service. The Board reviews each discharge on a case-by-case basis to determine if post-service accomplishments help demonstrate previous in-service misconduct was an aberration and not indicative of the member's overall character.

The third party statements provided with the application speak highly of the applicant. They all recognize the applicant's good military service and/or 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/experiences: PTSD and Major Depressive Disorder (MDD).

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor found the applicant is 50 percent service connected (SC) for PTSD.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Partially.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that a review of the available information reflects the applicant has BH conditions that partially mitigate applicant's misconduct. The applicant is 50 percent SC for PTSD and is also diagnosed with MDD. Given the nexus between PTSD and avoidance, the applicant's misconduct characterized by feigning suicide is mitigated as the misconduct appears related to a desire to avoid continued service in a hostile/traumatizing environment. However, the applicant's misconduct characterized by engaging in an inappropriate relation with a junior Soldier, sodomy, adultery, and indecent assault is not mitigated as it is not natural sequela of either BH condition, as neither rendered applicant unable to differentiate between right and wrong and adhere to the right.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **No.** After applying liberal consideration to the evidence, including the Board Medical Advisor's opine, the Board determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's PTSD or MDD outweighed the medically unmitigated portions of the basis of separation – engaging in an inappropriate relation with a junior Soldier, sodomy, adultery, and indecent assault.

b. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends being diagnosed with PTSD. The Board considered this contention and determined the applicant is SC for PTSD by the VA. However, the applicant's PTSD does not mitigate or outweigh the applicant's misconduct of engaging in an inappropriate relation with a junior Soldier, sodomy, adultery, and indecent assault.

(2) The applicant contends good service, including three combat tours. The Board considered the applicant's 12 years of service, including three combat tours and the numerous awards received by the applicant but determined that these factors did not outweigh the applicant's engaging in an inappropriate relation with a junior Soldier, sodomy, adultery, and indecent assault basis for separation.

(3) The applicant contends being innocent of the charges preferred against the applicant, having a toxic leadership, and requesting Chapter 10 because they would not have received a fair trial. The Board liberally considered this contention and determined there is insufficient evidence in the applicant's file to support this contention. 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. In light of the current evidence of record, the Board determined the applicant's discharge was appropriate.

(4) The applicant contends an upgrade of the discharge would allow veterans benefits. The Board considered this contention and determined that eligibility for Veteran's benefits, to include educational benefits under the Post-9/11 or Montgomery GI Bill, healthcare or VA loans,

do not fall within the purview of the Army Discharge Review Board. Accordingly, the applicant should contact a local office of the Department of Veterans Affairs for further assistance.

(5) The applicant contends maintaining employment, volunteering in the community, coaching little league, and being a single parent to two children. The Board considered this contention and determined that the applicant's maintaining employment, volunteering in the community, coaching little league, and being a single parent to two children does not outweigh the misconduct based on the seriousness of the applicant's engaging in an inappropriate relation with a junior Soldier, sodomy, adultery, and indecent assault basis for separation.

c. The Board determined that the discharge is, at this time, proper and equitable, in light of the current evidence of record. 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 not to change the applicant's characterization of service because, despite applying liberal consideration of all the evidence before the Board, the applicant's PTSD and MDD did not excuse or mitigate the engaging in an inappropriate relation with a junior Soldier, sodomy, adultery, and indecent assault basis for separation. The Board also considered the applicant's contention being innocent of the charges preferred against the applicant, having a toxic leadership, and requesting Chapter 10 because they would not have received a fair trial and found that the totality of the applicant's record does not warrant a discharge upgrade. The discharge was consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the regulation, was within the discretion of the separation authority, and the applicant was provided full administrative due process. Therefore, the applicant's Under Other Than Honorable Conditions discharge was proper and equitable as the applicant's conduct fell below that level of satisfactory service warranting a General discharge or meritorious service warranted for an upgrade to Honorable discharge.

(2) The Board voted not to change the applicant's reason for discharge or accompanying SPD code under the same pretexts, as 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:** No
- b. **Change Characterization to:** No Change
- c. **Change Reason / SPD Code to:** No Change
- d. **Change RE Code to:** No Change
- e. **Change Authority to:** No Change

Authenticating Official:

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20210000720

2/5/2025

X

Presiding Officer, COL, U.S. ARMY

Army Discharge Review Board

Legend:

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