

**1. Applicant's Name:**

- a. **Application Date:** 26 April 2021
- b. **Date Received:** 26 April 2021
- c. **Counsel:** Yes

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

**a. Applicant's Requests and Issues:** The current characterization of service for the period under review is general (under honorable conditions). The applicant, through counsel, requests an upgrade to honorable and a change to the narrative reason for separation.

The applicant seeks relief contending, in effect, the discharge and characterization is in error. The applicant should have been placed on inactive status until they retired because the applicant engaged in a form of minor misconduct for adultery while suffering from PTSD. This minor form of misconduct should not outweigh nineteen years of honorable service including multiple personal awards. This Board should liberally consider the applicant's application and find the PTSD contributed to and mitigates the minor misconduct. The misconduct was non-violent, and not life-threatening. After applying its precedent, the Board should consider uniformity. In past cases involving mental health conditions, this honorable Board granted relief. The applicant suffered from PTSD due to multiple combat deployments; therefore, this Board should grant the relief herein. The applicant should be given constructive service credit for the duration of time necessary to permit lawful retirement from the active duty component. The separation was egregiously unfair and disproportionate to the alleged misconduct.

**b. Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 15 October 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 detail regarding the Board's decision.*

*(Board member names available upon request)*

**3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:**

**a. Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization:** Misconduct (Serious Offense) / AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12c / JKQ / RE-3 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

**b. Date of Discharge:** 7 February 2013

**c. Separation Facts:**

**(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** 26 October 2011

**(2) Basis for Separation:** The applicant was informed of the following reasons: The applicant violated Army Regulation 600-20, 18 March 2008, paragraph 4-14b, having sexual relations with PFC A. E. J., a person not the spouse, and committed fraud and abuse of FOO Funds.

**(3) Recommended Characterization:** Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

**(4) Legal Consultation Date:** 22 November 2011

**(5) Administrative Separation Board:** On 9 March 2012, the applicant was notified to appear before an administrative separation board and advised of rights.

On 26 March 2012, the administrative separation board convened, and the applicant appeared with counsel. The Board determined the allegation against the applicant of having an adulterous and inappropriate relationship with PFC A. J. was supported by a preponderance of the evidence; however, the allegation of committing fraud and abuse of FOO Funds was not supported by a preponderance of the evidence. The board recommended the applicant's discharge with characterization of service of general (under honorable conditions).

On 1 May 2012, the separation authority adopted the findings and recommendations of the administrative separation board and recommended to HQDA the applicant be separated with a general (under honorable conditions).

**(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization:** On 9 December 2012, the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, directed the applicant be separated from the service. / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

**4. SERVICE DETAILS:**

**a. Date / Period of Enlistment:** 28 February 2007 / Indefinite

**b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score:** 31 / some college / 113

**c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service:** E-7 / 92Y4V 5W, Unit Supply Specialist / 19 years, 7 days

**d. Prior Service / Characterizations:** 1 February 1994 – 3 September 1996 / HD  
4 September 1996 – 7 December 1998 / HD  
8 December 1998 – 21 February 2002 / HD  
22 February 2002 – 27 February 2007 / HD

**e. Overseas Service / Combat Service:** Cuba, Italy, SWA / Afghanistan (1 August 2002 – 21 January 2003); Iraq (1 August 2003 – 1 March 2004; 27 September 2008 – 29 September 2009; 15 November 2010 – 29 August 2011)

**f. Awards and Decorations:** ARCOM-7, AAM, 2, JMUA, MUC, USCG MUC, AGCM-5, NDSM, ACM-A, GWOTEM, GWOTSM, KCM, HSM, ICM-2CS, NCOPDR-3, ASR, OSR-2, USCG SOSR, NATOMDL, CAB

**g. Performance Ratings:** 1 August 2006 – 15 April 2009 / Among the Best  
16 April 2009 – 18 September 2009 / Among the Best  
19 September 2009 – 18 September 2010 / Among the Best  
1 October 2010 – 1 August 2011 / Marginal  
15 August 2011 – 14 August 2012 / Marginal

**h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:** Report of Proceedings by Investigating Officer/Board of Officers, 17 June 2011, reflects the investigating officer found: Based on the evidence provided during the investigation, the applicant and PFC J. were engaged in a sexual relationship. This relationship was contrary to the good order and discipline of the unit and must

be terminated immediately; the emails discovered in PFC J.'s Yahoo email account alluding to a sexual relationship between PFC J. and the applicant, further supports this finding; PFC J. violated the no contact order issued by CPT H. when PFC J. engaged in email communications with the applicant and CPT R. This is in violation of Article 90, UCMJ; and based on the information provided by the applicant on the recording about the sexual relationship with PFC J., and the email messages discovered in PFC J.'s Yahoo email account, PFC J. made a false official statement regarding the sexual relationship with the applicant. This is in violation of Article 107, UCMJ. The investigating officer recommended: The applicant be considered for administrative action and/or nonjudicial punishment for having committed acts in violation of Article 134 (Adultery), UCMJ, and paragraph 4-14 of AR 600-20 (Army Command Policy); PFC J. be considered for administrative action and/or nonjudicial punishment for having committed acts in violation of Article 134 (Adultery), UCMJ, paragraph 4-14 of AR 600-20 (Army Command Policy), Article 90 (Disobeying a Superior Commissioned Officer), UCMJ, and Article 107 (False Official Statement), UCMJ; and mandatory training regarding relationships between Soldiers of different rank be implemented to increase awareness and deter future incidents from taking place.

General Officer Memorandum of Reprimand, 18 August 2011, reflects the applicant was reprimanded for an inappropriate relationship with PFC A. J., a junior Soldier in the applicant's charge. A 15-6 investigation revealed between June 2010 and June 2011, the applicant maintained an inappropriate senior-subordinate relationship with PFC J. in violation of AR 600-20, paragraph 4-14. The investigation further revealed the inappropriate relation was sexual in nature and therefore adulterous.

CID Report of Investigation – Final/SSI – 0117-2011-CID899-35588-6C6 / 6F2B / 5Y2E / 6H1, 24 October 2011, investigation established probable cause to believe the applicant committed the offenses of Forced Sodomy and Cruelty of Subordinates, when they forced SGT C. to perform fellatio on them while at the Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC), Fort Riley. Investigation established probable cause to believe the applicant committed the offenses of Wrongful Sexual Contact and Cruelty of Subordinates, when the applicant touched the breasts of SPC S. without permission. Investigation established probable cause to believe the applicant committed the offense of Indecent Exposure when the applicant exposed oneself to SPC S., while in the parking lot of Envisions, Fort Riley.

Report of Proceedings by Investigating Officer/Board of Officers, 26 March 2012, reflects the Board determined the allegation against the applicant of having an adulterous and inappropriate relationship with PFC A. J. was supported by a preponderance of the evidence; however, the allegation of committing fraud and abuse of FOO Funds was not supported by a preponderance of the evidence. The board recommended the applicant's discharge with characterization of service of general (under honorable conditions).

**i. Lost Time / Mode of Return:** None

**j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):**

**(1) Applicant provided:** Department of Veterans Affairs letter, 9 December 2021, reflects the applicant was granted 100 percent service-connected disability. The letter does not reflect the nature of the applicant's disability.

**(2) AMHRR Listed:** Report of Medical Examination, 12 September 2011, the examining medical physician noted the applicant's medical conditions in the comments section.

Report of Mental Status Evaluation (MSE), 5 October 2011, 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 MSE contains a diagnosis.

Report of Medical History, 6 October 2011, the examining medical physician noted the applicant's medical conditions in the comments section.

*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:** Online Application; Application for Correction of Military Record; attorney brief with listed enclosures 1 through 7.

**6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS:** The applicant has worked hard to repair their reputation and has raised their children to be wonderful citizens. The applicant is a proud business owner and lives life according to Army Core Values.

**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) Paragraph 1-14b states if the separation authority recommends involuntary separation of a Soldier with 18 or more years of active Federal service, the proceedings, with complete documentation and the recommendation of the separation authority, will be sent to HQDA for final determination.

(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) 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.

(6) Paragraph 14-2c, prescribes Commanders will not take action prescribed in this chapter instead of disciplinary action solely to spare an individual who may have committed serious misconduct from the harsher penalties that may be imposed under the UCMJ.

(7) 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.

(8) Paragraph 14-12c prescribes a Soldier is subject to action per this section for commission of a serious military or civilian offense, if the specific circumstances of the offense warrant separation and a punitive discharge is, or would be, authorized for the same or a closely related offense under the Manual for Courts-Martial.

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 "JKQ" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, paragraph 12c, misconduct (serious offense).

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 contends the narrative reason for the discharge needs changed. The applicant was separated under the provisions of Chapter 14, paragraph 14-12c, AR 635-200 with a general (under honorable conditions) discharge. The narrative reason specified by Army Regulations for a discharge under this paragraph is "Misconduct (Serious Offense)," and the separation code is "JKQ." Army Regulation 635-8 (Separation Processing and Documents), governs the preparation of the DD Form 214, and dictates the entry of the narrative reason for separation, entered in block 28 and separation code, entered in block 26 of the form, will be as listed in tables 2-2 or 2-3 of AR 635-5-1 (Separation Program Designator (SPD) Codes). The regulation stipulates no deviation is authorized. There is no provision for any other reason to be entered under this regulation.

The applicant contends good service, including four combat tours and receiving numerous awards.

The applicant contends suffering from PTSD due to multiple combat deployments. The applicant engaged in a form of minor misconduct for adultery while suffering from PTSD. The minor form

of misconduct should not outweigh nineteen years of honorable service. The applicant provided Department of Veterans Affairs letter, 9 December 2021, which reflects the applicant was granted 100 percent service-connected disability. The letter does not reflect the nature of the applicant's disability. The applicant's AMHRR contains no documentation of PTSD diagnosis. The AMHRR shows Report of Medical Examination, 12 September 2011, the examining medical physician noted the applicant's medical conditions in the comments section. A Report of Mental Status Evaluation (MSE), 5 October 2011, 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 MSE contains a diagnosis. A Report of Medical History, 6 October 2011, the examining medical physician noted the applicant's medical conditions in the comments section. All the medical documents included in the AMHRR were considered by the separation authority.

The applicant contends having 19 years of service prior the separation and based on 10 USC 1176 they should have allowed the applicant to remain in the Army until they had 20 years of service and allowed to retire. Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 1-14b states if the separation authority recommends involuntary separation of a Soldier with 18 or more years of active Federal service, the proceedings, with complete documentation and the recommendation of the separation authority, will be sent to HQDA for final determination. On 9 December 2012, the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Manpower and Reserve Affairs directed the applicant's discharge with a general (under honorable conditions).

The applicant requests retroactive military retirement effective 1 February 2014 at the rank of E-8 and award of the Purple Heart for injuries sustained. The applicant's request do 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 has worked hard to repair their reputation and has raised their children to be wonderful citizens. The applicant is a proud business owner and lives life according to Army Core Values. 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.

#### **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 in part on the Board's Medical Advisor's opine, as well as 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, Acute Reaction to Stress Adjustment Disorder, Adjustment Disorder w/Anxiety and Depressed Mood, Anxiety Disorder, Depression w/Anxiety, mTBI.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board found that, based in part on 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? **No.** The Board determined, based on the BMA's opine, that the applicant's behavioral health conditions do not mitigate the discharge. The applicant's misconduct of adultery is not mitigated as the misconduct is not natural sequela of any diagnosed condition and the applicant did not have a condition that rendered the 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 opine, the Board determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Acute Reaction to Stress Adjustment Disorder, Adjustment Disorder w/Anxiety and Depressed Mood, Anxiety Disorder, Depression w/Anxiety, or Traumatic Brain Injury outweighed the applicant's medically unmitigated Adultery, which was the basis for the separation and characterization of service.

**b. Response to Contention(s):**

(1) The applicant contends suffering from PTSD due to multiple combat deployments. The applicant engaged in a form of minor misconduct for adultery while suffering from PTSD. The minor form of misconduct should not outweigh nineteen years of honorable service. The Board liberally considered this contention but determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Acute Reaction to Stress Adjustment Disorder, Adjustment Disorder w/Anxiety and Depressed Mood, Anxiety Disorder, Depression w/Anxiety, Traumatic Brain Injury outweighed the applicant's medically unmitigated Adultery.

(2) The applicant contends the narrative reason for the discharge needs changed. The Board considered this contention but found that the applicant's narrative reason was proper and equitable given the applicant's medically unmitigated Adultery.

(3) The applicant contends good service, including four combat tours and receiving numerous awards. The Board considered the applicant's 19 years of service, including a combat tours in Iraq and the numerous awards received by the applicant but determined that these factors did not outweigh the applicant's offenses of Adultery, as articulated in the General Officer Letter of Reprimand, permanently filed in the applicant's records.

(4) The applicant contends having 19 years of service prior the separation and based on 10 USC 1176 they should have allowed the applicant to remain in the Army until they had 20 years of service and allowed to retire. The Board determined that the applicant's request for a 20 year retirement does not fall within the purview of the ADRB. The applicant may apply to the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR), using a DD Form 293 regarding this matter. A DD Form 293 may be obtained online at <https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/forms/dd/dd0293.pdf> or from a Veterans' Service Organization.

(5) The applicant requests retroactive military retirement effective 1 February 2014 at the rank of E-8 and award of the Purple Heart for injuries sustained. The Board determined that the applicant's request for an award and restoration of rank does not fall within the purview of the ADRB. The applicant may apply to the Army Board for Correction of Military Records

(ABCMR), using a DD Form 293 regarding this matter. A DD Form 293 may be obtained online at <https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/forms/dd/dd0293.pdf> or from a Veterans' Service Organization.

**(6)** The applicant has worked hard to repair their reputation and has raised their children to be wonderful citizens. The applicant is a proud business owner and lives life according to Army Core Values. The Board considered the applicant's post-service accomplishments but determined that they do not outweigh the applicant's misconduct.

**c.** The Board determined that the discharge is, at this time, proper and equitable, in light of the current evidence of record. However, the applicant may request a personal appearance hearing to address the issues before the 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 because, despite applying liberal consideration to all evidence before the Board, the applicant's Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Acute Reaction to Stress Adjustment Disorder, Adjustment Disorder w/Anxiety and Depressed Mood, Anxiety Disorder, Depression w/Anxiety, Traumatic Brain Injury did not outweigh the medically unmitigated offenses of Adultery. The Board also considered the applicant's contentions regarding good service and post-service accomplishments but found that the totality of the applicant's record does not warrant a discharge upgrade. The applicant did not present any issues of impropriety for the Board's consideration. 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 General discharge was proper and equitable as the applicant's misconduct fell below that level of 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, and the reason the applicant was discharged was both proper and equitable.

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

# ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20210000738

## 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:

12/16/2024

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  
UOTHHC – Under Other Than  
Honorable Conditions  
VA – Department of Veterans  
Affairs