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 honorable. The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable.

The applicant did not present any issues of propriety or equity for the Board's consideration.

b. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 26 September 2024, 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 details regarding the Board's decision. Board member names available upon request.

3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:

a. Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization: Physical Standards / AR 635-200, Chapter 13-2E / JFT / RE-3 / Honorable

- **b.** Date of Discharge: 13 March 2014
- c. Separation Facts:
 - (1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate: 4 February 2014

(2) Basis for Separation: Under the provisions of Chapter 13, for Unsatisfactory Performance the applicant was informed of the following reasons: The applicant failed two consecutive APFTs on 14 November 2013 and 8 January 2014. The applicant was also not in compliance with the Army Weight Control Standards from 2 August 2013 to 8 January 2014.

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

- (4) Legal Consultation Date: On 5 February 2014, the applicant waived legal counsel.
- (5) Administrative Separation Board: NA

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: On 5 February 2014, the separation authority directed the discharge under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 13, Unsatisfactory Performance. / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

- 4. SERVICE DETAILS:
 - a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 27 March 2012 / 3 years, 23 weeks
 - **b.** Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 18 / High School Graduate / 90

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-3 / 92F10, Petroleum Supply Specialist / 1 year, 11 months, 17 days / There appears to be an error on the applicant's DD Form 214, block 12e, and should read 0 months 0 days.

- d. Prior Service / Characterizations: None
- e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: Japan / None
- f. Awards and Decorations: NDSM, ASR
- g. Performance Ratings: NA

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record: Two Developmental Counseling Forms, for APFT Failure and second consecutive record APFT failure.

- i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: None
- j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):
 - (1) Applicant provided: None

(2) AMHRR Listed: Report of Medical History, 21 November 2013, the examining medical physician noted the applicant's medical conditions in the comments section.

Report of Mental Status Evaluation (MSE), 25 November 2013, reflects the applicant was cleared for any administrative actions deemed appropriate by the command. The applicant could understand and participate in administrative proceedings; could appreciate the difference between right and wrong; and met medical retention requirements. The applicant had been screened for PTSD and mTBI. The conditions were either not present or did not meet AR 40-501 criteria for a medical evaluation board. The evaluation contains a 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: Application for the Review of Discharge and Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty.

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 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) Chapter 13 contains the policy and outlines the procedures for separating individuals for unsatisfactory performance, and provides, in pertinent part, commanders will separate a member under this Chapter when, in the commander's judgment, the member will not develop sufficiently to participate satisfactorily in further training and/or become a satisfactory Soldier.

(4) Paragraph 13-2c (previously paragraph 13-2e) states in pertinent part, separation proceedings will be initiated for Soldiers without medical limitations that have two consecutive failures of the Army Physical Fitness Test. The reason for discharge will be shown as physical standards.

(5) Paragraph 13-8, stipulates the service of Soldiers separated because of unsatisfactory performance will be characterized as honorable or under honorable conditions as warranted by their military records.

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 "JFT" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, in effect at the time, Chapter 13-2e, Physical standards.

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-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.

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 did not present any issues of propriety or equity for the Board's consideration.

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: Depressive Disorder NOS/Major Depressive Disorder, Anxiety Disorder NOS, and Social Anxiety Disorder.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? Yes. The Board's Medical Advisor found evidence of BH conditions to include in service diagnoses of Depression and Anxiety Disorder NOS, and the applicant is service connected by the VA for Unspecified Depressive Disorder and Social Anxiety Disorder.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **No.** The Board determined, based on the BMA's opine, that applicant's behavioral health conditions do not mitigate the discharge. Given the nexus between Depression, low energy, decreased motivation, and loss of interest in pleasurable activities, the applicant's Depression likely contributed to the failed APFTs and noncompliance with weight control standards. The applicant has been upgraded to an HD suggesting that the proper mitigation has already been applied.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **No.** After applying liberal consideration to the evidence, including the Board Medical Advisor opine, the Board determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's Major Depressive Disorder and Anxiety Disorder outweighed the applicant's medically unmitigated discharge as the applicant already holds an honorable characterization of service.

b. Response to Contention(s): The applicant did not present any issues of propriety or equity for the Board's consideration. The Board considered the totality of the applicant's service record, including liberally considering the applicant's behavioral health conditions, but found insufficient mitigating factors to warrant discharge upgrade.

c. The Board determined that the discharge is, at this time, proper and equitable, considering the current evidence of record. However, the applicant may request a personal appearance hearing to address the issues before a Board. 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 as the applicant already holds an honorable characterization and further upgrade is not available.

(2) The Board voted not to change the applicant's reason for discharge or accompanying SPD code, as the reason the applicant was discharged was both proper, equitable, and in accordance with regulations.

(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:

9/27/2024



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