

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 general (under honorable conditions). The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable and a narrative reason change.

The applicant seeks relief contending, in effect, using poor judgment, but their entire service should not be judged on one occurrence. When the applicant was informed of being deployed for the third time, added to an already stressful set of circumstances. The applicant's child and spouse forgave the applicant, and the applicant believes society had also. Everyone who hears what happened says, "that can happen to anybody." The applicant's actions were not dishonest or of "immortal turpitude." They were simply errors in judgment which caused the applicant years of anguish and regret. It has never occurred again. The applicant and the child are closer than they have ever been. The applicant had a second child and another child on the way. The discharge affects the applicant's ability to provide for their family. This was an isolated incident. The applicant had seven years of service, two deployments, two Army Commendation Medals. The applicant completed their first term of service. For the applicant's entire military career to be based on this one incident that could have been handled while still on active duty is more than the situation called for. At the time, the applicant was very disappointed, and in grief the applicant believed they deserved everything they received. The applicant regrets what happened and desires a better life for their family, but any background check destroys the possibility and brings what happened back into light. The applicant and the applicant's family need to be able to heal. The applicant further details the contentions including suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), in a self-authored statement submitted with the application.

b. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 3 October 2024, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board denied the request upon finding the separation was both proper and equitable.

Please see Board Discussion and Determination 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, Paragraph 14-12c / JKQ / RE-3 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

b. Date of Discharge: 26 November 2008

c. Separation Facts:

(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate: 24 October 2008

(2) Basis for Separation: The applicant was informed of the following reasons: On two occasions on or about 13 February 2008, the applicant unlawfully struck D. S., a child under the age of 16, on the right and left side of the child's face with the hand. The conduct was not tolerated by the unit or the Army.

(3) Recommended Characterization: Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

(4) Legal Consultation Date: 28 October 2008

(5) Administrative Separation Board: On 28 October 2008, the applicant unconditionally waived consideration of the case before an administrative separation board, pursuant to an offer to plead guilty by summary court-martial.

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: 14 November 2008 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 15 February 2006 / 6 years

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 23 / HS Graduate / 123

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-4 / 92A10, Automated Logistical Specialist / 7 years, 5 months, 9 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: RA, 4 June 2001 – 11 August 2004 / HD
RA, 12 August 2004 – 14 February 2006 / HD

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: SWA / Iraq (7 April 2003 – 23 March 2004, 17 January 2006 – 3 December 2006)

f. Awards and Decorations: ARCOM-2, AAM, AGCM-2, NDSM, GWOTEM, GWOTSM, ICM-3BSS, NCOPDR, ASR, OSR

g. Performance Ratings: NA

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record: Carthage Area Hospital Emergency Department Report, 13 February 2008, reveals D. S., the applicant's child was treated by medical personnel for a chief complaint of being assaulted by the applicant. Investigation revealed the applicant slapped the child on both sides of the face and over the left renal area. The child did not sustain any injury to the bones of the nose but did have microscopic hematuria which may have indicated mild bruising of the kidney.

Criminal Investigation Division (CID) Report of Investigation - Initial Final, 28 February 2008, reflects an investigation established probable cause to believe the applicant committed the offense of Assault Upon a Child, under the age of 16, when the applicant struck S. with an open hand on the face and across the back. The applicant was interviewed and admitted to striking S.

Memorandum for Record, subject: 30 July Telephone Conversation with L. S., 30 July 2008, reflects the trial counsel contacted the applicant's spouse and their spouse believed the incident with their child stemmed from the applicant having PTSD and the applicant would have been transferred to the Warrior Transition Unit in March if the applicant had not been flagged for UCMJ action. The applicant had shown symptoms of anxiety, aversion to loud noises, a short

temper, and was often nervous and edgy following the deployment in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF). The applicant was genuinely sorry for the actions and was actively taking steps to become better.

Charge Sheet, 18 August 2008, reflects the applicant was charged with violation of the UCMJ, Article 28, Specifications 1 and 2: On 13 February 2008, the applicant unlawfully strike D. S., a child under the age of 16, on the right side of the face with their hand, and on the left side of the face with their hand.

Offer to Plead Guilty, 17 September 2008, reflects the applicant offering to plead guilty to the one charge and two specifications, and in pertinent part, to waive the rights to an administrative separation board with the understanding of being discharged with the conditions of a UOTH, and in exchange, to have the charges referred to a Summary Court-Martial, and understanding the rights, agreed to move forward with the Summary Court-Martial. The Offer was accepted on 18 September 2008.

Memorandum for Record, 17 September 2008, reflects the applicant waived the right to an administrative separation board contingent upon the convening authority accepting the Offer to Plead Guilty.

Report of Result of Trial reflects the applicant was tried in a Summary Court-Martial on 19 September 2008. The applicant was charged with two specifications. The summary of offenses, plea, and finding: in violation of Article 86 [sic], Assault: On two occasions the applicant committed assault consummated by a battery upon a child under 16 years. Plea: Guilty. Finding: Guilty. The sentence consisted of reduction to E-3; forfeiture of \$596 pay; and confinement for 14 days. The applicant's AMHRR reflects the charge was under Article 128, UCMJ.

Report of Medical History, 8 October 2008, reflects the applicant reported medical conditions: Head injury or concussion, memory loss, August 2008; PTSD, 2004; anxiety, panic attacks; anger management since August 2008; thoughts of suicide, attempted May 2004; and anxiety, VA Hospital, Syracuse. The examining medical physician noted in the comments section, "as stated by the [applicant]."

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: 14 days (Confined by Military Authorities, 26 September 2008 – 9 October 2008) / Released from Confinement

j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):

(1) Applicant provided: Four letters from B. G., licensed independent social worker, 3 January, 3 June, and 8 September 2012, and 25 November 2014, reflecting the applicant was diagnosed with PTSD; adjustment disorder with feelings of both depression and anxiety; problems with primary support system; and global assessment of functioning of 65, GAF last year of 70.

Cross Therapy Center, PLLC, 5 December 2014, reflecting a licensed mental health counselor provided therapy to the applicant since 12 April 2013.

(2) AMHRR Listed: Report of Mental Status Evaluation, 23 October 2008, reflects the applicant was cleared for any administrative actions deemed appropriate by the command. The applicant could understand and participate in administrative proceedings; was mentally responsible; and met medical retention requirements. The applicant was diagnosed with PTSD per medical record and gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD).

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; self-authored statement; third party character reference; Family Advocacy Program Certificate of Completion; medical documents; trial counsel's memorandum.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: The applicant was attending college and participating in parenting skills and marriage counseling.

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 3-5c, provides the reasons for separation, including the specific circumstances that form the basis for the separation, will be considered on the issue of characterization. As a general matter, characterization will be based upon a pattern of behavior other than an isolated incident. There are circumstances, however, in which the conduct or performance of duty reflected by a single incident provides the basis for characterization.

(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 14-3 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.

(7) 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 suffering from PTSD, and the condition along with family issues affected behavior, which led to the discharge. The applicant provided medical documents reflecting the applicant was diagnosed with PTSD and adjustment disorder, with feelings of both depression and anxiety. The applicant's AMHRR reflects the applicant reported a history of concussion during the separation medical examination. The applicant underwent a mental status evaluation (MSE) on 23 October 2008, which indicates the applicant was mentally responsible. The applicant was diagnosed with PTSD per medical record. The documents in the AMHRR were considered by the separation authority.

The applicant contends the event which led to the discharge from the Army was an isolated incident. Army Regulation 635-200, paragraph 3-5, in pertinent part, stipulates there are circumstances in which the conduct or performance of duty reflected by a single incident provides the basis for a characterization.

The applicant contends other Soldiers with similar offenses were allowed to remain in the Army. The DODI 1332.28 provides each case must be decided on the individual merits, and a case-

by-case basis, considering the unique facts and circumstances of the case. Additionally, when an applicant cites a prior decision of the ADRB, another agency, or a court, the applicant shall describe the specific principles and facts contained in the prior decision and explain the relevance of the cited matter to the applicant's case. The Board is an independent body, not bound by prior decisions in its review of subsequent cases because no two cases present the same issues. The applicant's AMHRR does not contain any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command.

The applicant contends good service, including two combat tours.

The applicant contends a medical evaluation board was under process at the time of the separation proceedings. 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.

The applicant requests a medical discharge and various corrections to the DD Form 214. 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 desires to rejoin the military service. Soldiers processed for separation are assigned reentry codes based on their service records or the reason for discharge. Based on Army Regulation 601-210, the applicant was appropriately assigned an RE code of "3." There is no basis upon which to grant a change to the reason or the RE code. An RE Code of "3" indicates the applicant requires a waiver before being allowed to reenlist. Recruiters can best advise a former service member as to the Army's needs at the time and are required to process waivers of reentry eligibility (RE) codes if appropriate.

The applicant contends an upgrade of the discharge will allow the applicant to obtain better employment. The Board does not grant relief to gain employment or enhance employment opportunities.

The applicant contends attending college and participating in parenting skills and marriage counseling. 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 statement provided with the application speak highly of the applicant. It recognizes the applicant's good military service.

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: Adjustment Disorder, Major Depression, Anxiety Disorder NOS, Panic Disorder, PTSD, Bipolar Disorder, TBI.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor found that the applicant was diagnosed in service with an Adjustment Disorder, Major Depression, Anxiety Disorder NOS, Panic Disorder, and PTSD. The VA has service connected the applicant for PTSD and Bipolar Disorder and documented a history of in service TBIs.

(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, Major Depression, Anxiety Disorder NOS, Panic Disorder, PTSD, Bipolar Disorder, or TBI and perpetrating child physical abuse. The record reveals the applicant's own admission that the physical abuse towards the child was consciously perpetrated out of frustration because the child was crying. Accordingly, none of the applicant's BH conditions provide mitigation for the basis of separation.

(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 Adjustment Disorder, Major Depression, Anxiety Disorder, Panic Disorder, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Bipolar Disorder, and Traumatic Brain Injury outweighed the applicant's medically unmitigated offense of assault against a child under the age of 16.

b. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends suffering from PTSD, and the condition along with family issues affected behavior, which led to the discharge. The Board liberally considered this contention but determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's Adjustment Disorder, Major Depression, Anxiety Disorder, Panic Disorder, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Bipolar Disorder, and Traumatic Brain Injury outweighed the applicant's medically unmitigated offense of assault against a child under the age of 16.

(2) The applicant contends the narrative reason for the discharge needs changed. The Board considered this contention but determined that the applicant's Misconduct (Serious Offense) narrative reason is proper and equitable given the applicant's medically unmitigated offense of assault against a child under the age of 16.

(3) The applicant contends the event which led to the discharge from the Army was an isolated incident. The Board considered this contention but determined that the severity of the offense was such to warrant separation based on a single incident.

(4) The applicant contends other Soldiers with similar offenses were allowed to remain in the Army. The Board considered this contention but found that the applicant's offense was of a nature to warrant separation.

(5) The applicant contends good service, including two combat tours. The Board considered the applicant's seven years of service, with a combat tour in Iraq, but did not find that the applicant's record outweighed the applicant's medically unmitigated offense of assault against a child under the age of 16.

(6) The applicant contends a medical evaluation board was under process at the time of the separation proceedings. The Board considered this contention but determined that the suspension of the applicant's medical discharge process in favor of administrative separation was in accordance with AR 635-200 given the applicant's medically unmitigated offense of assault against a child under the age of 16.

(7) The applicant requests a medical discharge. The Board determined that the applicant's request for a medical discharge 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.

(8) The applicant desires to rejoin the military service. The Board considered this contention and voted to maintain the RE-code at RE-3, which is a waivable code. An RE Code of "3" indicates the applicant requires a waiver before being allowed to reenlist. Recruiters can best advise a former service member as to the Army's needs at the time and are required to process waivers of reentry eligibility (RE) codes, if appropriate.

(9) The applicant contends an upgrade of the discharge will allow the applicant to obtain better employment. The Board considered this contention but does not grant relief to gain employment or enhance employment opportunities.

(10) The applicant contends attending college and participating in parenting skills and marriage counseling. The Board considered the applicant's post-service accomplishments but determined that they do not outweigh the applicant's medically unmitigated offense of assault against a child under the age of 16.

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 all available 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 to all evidence before the Board, the applicant's Adjustment Disorder, Major Depression, Anxiety Disorder, Panic Disorder, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Bipolar Disorder, and Traumatic Brain Injury did not outweigh the medically unmitigated offenses of offense of assault against a child under the age of 16. The Board also considered the applicant's contentions regarding good service and the misconduct being an isolated incident 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

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20210000882

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, 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:

10/16/2024

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