

**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 under General (Under Honorable Conditions). The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable and a change to the narrative reason.

The applicant seeks relief contending, in effect, the disability evaluation system was not allowed to take precedence over the administrative separation required by regulation. The applicant requests their discharge be upgraded to honorable and be allowed to retire in accordance with Chapter 12, Army Regulation 635-200, Retirement for Length of Service, in the grade held, E-7. In the alternative the applicant requests they be afforded a Medical Evaluation Board (MEB) and ultimately a Physical Evaluation Board (PEB). The applicant desires access to veterans benefits. Counsel further details the contentions in an allied legal brief provided with the application.

b. **Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 10 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 (Civil Conviction) / AR 635-200, Chapter 14, Sec II / JKB / RE-3 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

b. **Date of Discharge:** 27 August 2013

c. **Separation Facts:**

(1) **Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** 26 April 2010

(2) **Basis for Separation:** The applicant was informed of the following reasons: A federal conviction from the United States District Court Northern District of Georgia, on 31 March 2010, for theft of government property in violation of 18 United States Code Section 641.

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

(4) **Legal Consultation Date:** 27 April 2010

(5) **Administrative Separation Board:** On 13 August 2010, the applicant was notified to appear before an administrative separation board and advised of rights.

**ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE**

**AR20210000760**

On 17 September 2010, the administrative separation board convened, and the applicant appeared with counsel. The Board determined the reason listed in the notification memorandum were supported by a preponderance of the evidence. The board recommended the applicant's discharge with characterization of service of under other than honorable conditions.

On 27 September 2011, reflects, the request for involuntary separation of the applicant was returned for clarification of the findings by the administrative separation board and returned to the Chief Army Reserve (CAR) for a new recommendation.

On 2 June 2012, in Decision Memorandum, Involuntary Separation for the applicant to correct their recommendation regarding the involuntary separation and to provide a corrected separation packet to the Department of the Army's Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff G-1, Enlisted Careers Division.

On 4 June 2012, in Memorandum, for HQDA (DAPE-MPE-IP), 300 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310-0300, the Involuntary Separation Board results recommended a under other than honorable discharge.

On 9 May 2013, the separation authority approved the findings and recommendations of the administrative separation board.

**(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization:** 9 May 2013 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

**4. SERVICE DETAILS:**

**a. Date / Period of Enlistment:** 18 March 2005 / Indefinite

**b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score:** 33 / some college / 110

**c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service:** E-7 / 22 years, 11 months, 2 days

**d. Prior Service / Characterizations:** RA, 31 August 1989 – 27 May 1992 / HD  
RA, 28 May 1992 – 13 February 1994 / HD  
RA, 14 February 1994 – 6 May 1997 / HD  
RA, 7 May 1997 – 28 May 2002 / HD  
USAR, 29 May 2002 – 17 March 2005 / NA

**e. Overseas Service / Combat Service:** Germany, Kosovo, SWA / Saudi Arabia  
(16 October 1990 – 2 May 1991)

**f. Awards and Decorations:** ARCOM-5, AAM-5, AGCM-6, NDSM, SASM-2BS, GWOTSM, HSM, NCOPDR, ASR, OSR-2, KLM

**g. Performance Ratings:** August 2001 – July 2004 / Among the Best  
August 2004 – May 2006 / Among the Best  
1 June 2006 – 31 May 2007 / Among the Best  
1 June 2007 – 10 April 2008 / Marginal  
11 April 2008 – 10 April 2009 / Fully Capable

**h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:** United States District Court Northern District of Georgia Atlanta Division, 31 March 2010, reflects the applicant plead guilty for theft of

government property. The applicant was ordered to pay a fee of 100 dollars for the special assessment; served 18 months in prison and make restitution in the total amount of \$163,330.

Orders 327-01, 21 April 2009, reflect the applicant was reduced from Sergeant First Class to Private with a date of rank of 31 August 1989, effective 26 April 2010.

Two Personnel Action forms, reflect the applicant's duty status changed as follows:

From Present for Duty (PDY) to Confined by Civil Authorities (CCA) effective 14 May 2010; and

From CCA to PDY, effective 8 June 2011.

**i. Lost Time / Mode of Return:** 1 year, 25 days (CCA, 14 May 2010 – 8 June 2011) / Released from confinement

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

**(1) Applicant provided:** Sweetwater Psychological Associates letter, D.S. Ph. D., 13 June 2013, reflects a medical diagnosis.

Chronological Record of Medical Care, 15 July 2013, reflects a medical diagnosis.

Department of Veterans Affairs Benefits letter, effective 7 August 2013, reflects a rating of 70 percent and a medical diagnosis.

Sweetwater Psychological Associates letter, D.M. Ph. D., Consultation Summary, 28 June 2015, reflects a medical diagnosis.

Sweetwater Psychological Associates letter, D.M. Ph. D., 18 April 2016. Reflects a medical diagnosis.

Medical Evaluation Board Proceedings, 23 August 2016, reflects the received one unfitting diagnosis and referred to a Physical Evaluation Board.

Psychology Progress Notes, 27 July 2018, reflects a medical diagnosis.

Department of Veterans Affairs letter, L,A, Ph, D., 2 September 2021, reflects a medical diagnosis.

**(2) AMHRR Listed:** Physical Profile, 10 June 2013, reflects the applicant had medical conditions and a diagnosis limiting their duties.

Report of Mental Status Evaluation, 19 June 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. The evaluation included 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; two Certificates of Release or Discharge from Active Duty; lawyers brief and enclosures 1 through 15; ARBA letter; lawyers brief; letter from the Commander in Chief; five letters of support; Newspaper articles;

Eyewitness statement for award recommendation; two statements of support for Bronze Star Medal; four letters of support; Certificate of Recognition; two Department of Veterans Affairs Benefits letters; Chronological Record of Medical Care, three Sweetwater Psychological Associates memorandums; Psychiatric progress note; Psychology Progress Notes; Medical Evaluation Board Proceedings; DA Form 1506; Legal opine; Case Report and Directive AR20130002385.

**6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS:** The applicant sought treatment for their mental health from the VA.

**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 1-33, Disposition through medical channels when the medical treatment facility (MTF) commander or attending medical officer determines that a Soldier being processed for administrative separation under chapters 7 (see sec IV), or 14, does not meet the medical fitness standards for retention (see AR 40-501, chap 3), he/she will refer the Soldier to a Medical Evaluation Board (MEB) in accordance with AR 40-400. The administrative separation proceedings will continue, but final action by the separation authority will not be taken, pending the results of MEB. If the MEB findings indicate that referral of the case to a physical evaluation board (PEB) is warranted for disability processing under the provisions of AR 635-40, the MTF commander will furnish copies of the approved MEB proceedings to the Soldier's GCMCA and unit commander. The GCMCA may direct, in writing, that the Soldier be processed through the physical disability system when action under the UCMJ has not been initiated.

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

**(3)** Paragraph 3-7a states an Honorable discharge is a separation with honor and is appropriate when the quality of the Soldier's service generally has met the standards of acceptable conduct and performance of duty for Army personnel or is otherwise so meritorious that any other characterization would be clearly inappropriate.

**(4)** Paragraph 3-7b states a General discharge is a separation from the Army under honorable conditions and is issued to a Soldier whose military record is satisfactory but not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge.

**(5)** Paragraph 3-7c states Under Other Than Honorable Conditions discharge is an administrative separation from the Service under conditions other than honorable and it may be issued for misconduct, fraudulent entry, security reasons, or in lieu of trial by court martial based on certain circumstances or patterns of behavior or acts or omissions that constitute a significant departure from the conduct expected of Soldiers in the Army.

(6) 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.

(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) Section II, Paragraph 14-5, prescribes conditions which subject a Soldier to discharge and reduction in grade. A Soldier may be considered for discharge when initially convicted by civil authorities, or when action is taken that is tantamount to a finding of guilty, if one of the following conditions is present. This includes similar adjudication in juvenile proceedings: 1) A punitive discharge authorized for the same or a closely related offense under the MCM 2002, as amended; 2) The sentence by civil authorities includes confinement for 6 months or more, without regard to suspension or probation. Adjudication in juvenile proceedings includes adjudication as a juvenile delinquent, wayward minor, or youthful offender; Initiation of separation action is not mandatory. Although the conditions established in a (1) or (2), above, are present, the immediate commander must also consider whether the specific circumstances of the offense warrant separation. If the immediate commander initiates separation action, the case will be processed through the chain of command to the separation authority for appropriate action. A Soldier convicted by a civil court or adjudged a juvenile offender by a civil court will be reduced or considered for reduction.

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 "JKB" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, section II, misconduct (civil conviction).

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.

Army Regulation 635-200, in pertinent part, stipulates a Soldier may be separated when initially convicted by civil authorities, or when action is taken tantamount to a finding of guilty, if a punitive discharge authorized for the same or a closely related offense under the Manual for Courts Martial or the sentence by civil authorities includes confinement for six months or more, without regard to suspension or probation. At the time of the applicant's discharge, the applicant had been confined by civilian authorities for 1 year and 25 days and was convicted for theft of

government property and was sentenced to 1 year and 6 months of civilian confinement; a fine of \$163,330; and three-years' probation.

The applicant contends the narrative reason for the discharge needs to be changed. The applicant was separated under the provisions of Chapter 14, Section II, AR 635-200 with an under other than honorable conditions discharge. The narrative reason specified by Army Regulations for a discharge under this paragraph is "Misconduct (Civil Conviction)," and the separation code is "JKB." Army Regulation 635-8 (Separation Processing and Documents), governs preparation of the DD Form 214, and dictates 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 suffering from PTSD. The applicant provided eight medical documents reflecting a medical diagnosis. The AMHRR included a Physical Profile and a Report of Mental Status Evaluation, which includes a medical diagnosis. All medical documents were considered by the separation authority.

The applicant contends the Disability Evaluation System was not allowed to take precedence over the administrative separation of processing. The Department of Defense disability regulations do not preclude a disciplinary separation while undergoing a medical board. Appropriate regulations stipulate separations for misconduct take precedence over potential separations for other reasons. Whenever a member is being processed through the Physical Evaluation Board and is subsequently processed for an involuntary administrative separation or referred to a court-martial for misconduct, the disability evaluation is suspended. The Physical Evaluation Board case remains in suspense pending the outcome of the non-disability proceedings. If the action includes either a punitive or administrative discharge for misconduct, the medical process is stopped, and the board report is filed in the member's medical record. AR 635-200, 1-33 reflects If the MEB findings indicate that referral of the case to a physical evaluation board (PEB) is warranted for disability processing under the provisions of AR 635-40, the MTF commander will furnish copies of the approved MEB proceedings to the Soldier's GCMCA and unit commander. The GCMCA may direct, in writing, that the Soldier be processed through the physical disability system when action under the UCMJ has not been initiated.

The applicant requests retirement in accordance with Chapter 12, AR 635-200, Retirement for Length of Service, and in the grade held, E-7 and be afforded a Medical Evaluation Board (MEB) and ultimately a Physical Evaluation Board (PEB). The applicant's requests 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 contends good service, including a combat tour. The third-party statements provided with the application reflect the applicant's work ethic and willingness to go the extra mile and make a difference in people's lives.

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 seeking treatment for their mental health from the VA. 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 on 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 and found that the applicant has the following potentially-mitigating diagnoses/experiences: Adjustment Disorder, PTSD, TBI, Panic Disorder, Major Depressive Disorder.

**(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 was diagnosed in service with an Adjustment Disorder, PTSD, TBI, and Panic Disorder. The applicant is service connected by the VA for PTSD and Major Depressive Disorder, which establishes that these conditions also existed during military service.

**(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. There is no natural sequela between an Adjustment Disorder, PTSD, TBI, Panic Disorder, or Major Depressive Disorder and theft of government property since none of these conditions interfere with the ability to distinguish between right and wrong and act in accordance with 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 Adjustment Disorder, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Traumatic Brain Injury, Panic Disorder, or Major Depressive Disorder outweighed the applicant's medically unmitigated offenses of theft of government property.

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

**(1)** The applicant contends suffering from PTSD. The Board liberally considered this contention but determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's Adjustment Disorder, PTSD, TBI, Panic Disorder, or Major Depressive Disorder outweighed the applicant's medically unmitigated offense of theft of government property.

**(2)** The applicant contends the narrative reason for the discharge needs to be changed. The Board considered this contention but determined that the applicant's Misconduct (Civil Conviction) narrative reason for separation is proper and equitable given the lack of mitigating factors to warrant a change.

**(3)** The applicant contends the Disability Evaluation System was not allowed to take precedence over the administrative separation of processing. The Board considered this contention but determined that the applicant's medical discharged was paused in favor of



administrative separation and that this is explicitly permitted per the separation regulation, AR 635-200.

(4) The applicant requests retirement in accordance with Chapter 12, AR 635-200, Retirement for Length of Service, and in the grade held, E-7 and be afforded a Medical Evaluation Board and ultimately a Physical Evaluation Board. The Board determined that the applicant's requests for changes to retirement status and restoration of rank do 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 contends good service, including a combat tour. The Board considered the applicant's 22 years of service, including a combat tour in Saudi Arabia, but found that the applicant's record does not outweigh the applicant's medically unmitigated offense of theft of government property.

(6) 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.

(7) The applicant contends seeking treatment for their mental health from the VA. The Board considered this contention but found that the applicant's seeking treatment from the VA does 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 Adjustment Disorder, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Traumatic Brain Injury, Panic Disorder, or Major Depressive Disorder did not outweigh the medically unmitigated offense of theft of government property. The Board also considered the applicant's contentions regarding good service and being in the disability evaluation process 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.

## ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20210000760

(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:

1/21/2025

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