

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 requests an upgrade to Honorable.

The applicant seeks relief contending, in effect, the discharge was a miscarriage of justice, in which none of the disciplinary or administrative proceedings took into consideration the combat-related medical conditions. The behavior incidents leading to the discipline and discharge were a direct result of service-connected, combat-related medical conditions. The applicant was coerced by JAG staff during discipline proceedings into accepting an Under Other Than Honorable conditions discharge, through induced fear of harsh prison sentence should the applicant request a special court-martial to have the case fairly adjudicated. The chain of command acted with impropriety to rid themselves of an injured and perceived troublesome Soldier by the most expeditious manner available. The command used a law enforcement incident on post to railroad the applicant out on an early and unfavorable discharge, without consideration or regard for significant and known mitigating medical circumstances. The applicant was not aware at the time of the gravity and impact an under other than honorable conditions discharge would have on the life after service. The applicant attempted to file a claim for service-connected disability with the Veteran Benefits Administration (VBA) for combat-related conditions. The VBA summarily administratively denied the claim citing the Under Other Than Honorable conditions discharge. The VBA has refused to decide the case on the merits citing the Under Other Than Honorable condition discharge and related CFR provisions barring benefits. The applicant has also applied for eligibility for Veterans Health Administration (VHA) medical care. VHA has also denied the request, citing VHA policy concerning under other than honorable conditions discharges and the absence of any VBA decision on service-connected conditions.

b. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 28 May 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: In Lieu of Trial by Court-Martial / AR 635-200, Chapter 10 / KFS / RE-4 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

b. Date of Discharge: 15 August 2012

c. Separation Facts:

(1) Date and Charges Preferred (DD Form 458, Charge Sheet): On 1 May and 11 June 2012, the applicant was charged with:

Charge II: Violating Article 92, UCMJ. The Specification: On or about 5 March 2012, the applicant violated a lawful general order, to wit: paragraph 4, Installation Policy Memorandum 10-30, Prohibition of Certain Unregulated Intoxicants, dated 21 April 2010, by wrongfully possessing drug paraphernalia.

Charge III: Violating Article 134, UCMJ:

Specification 1: On or about 5 March 2012, had a duty for the care of C. W., a child under the age of 16 years and did endanger the physical health of said C. W. by allowing for the accumulation of dog feces to fill and remain on the dining room floor, and such conduct constituted culpable negligence and was prejudicial to good order and discipline in the Armed Forces or of a nature to bring discredit upon the Armed Forces.

Specification 2: On or about 5 March 2012, had the duty for the care of H. B., a child under the age of 16 years and did endanger the physical health of said H. b. by allowing for the accumulation of dog feces to fill and remain on the dining room floor, and such conduct constituted culpable negligence and was prejudicial to good order and discipline in the Armed Forces or of a nature to bring discredit upon the Armed Forces.

Specification 3: On about 5 March 2012, had a duty for the care of C. W., a child under the age of 16 years and did endanger the physical health of said child, by allowing two items of drug paraphernalia to remain within C. W's. reach, such conduct constituted culpable negligence and was prejudicial to good order and discipline in the Armed Forces or of a nature to bring discredit upon the Armed Forces.

Specification 4: On or about 5 March 2012, had a duty for the care of H. B., a child under the age of 16 years and did endanger the physical health of said child by allowing two items of drug paraphernalia to remain within the child's reach, and such conduct constituted culpable negligence and was prejudicial to good order and discipline in the Armed Forces or of a nature to bring discredit upon the Armed Forces.

Specification 5: On or about 5 March 2012, disorderly, to wit: the neighbor L. L. Y., who was disorderly, to wit the neighbor, L. L. Y., who was disrupted by the applicant's screams which were audible from inside the apartment, felt it was necessary to call law enforcement officials, which conduct was prejudicial to good order and discipline in the Armed Forces or of a nature to bring discredit upon the Armed Forces.

Specification 6: On or about 5 March 2012, orally communicated to C. W., a child under the age of 16 years, certain indecent language, to wit: "quit lying to your fucking child", or words to the effect, such conduct was prejudicial to good order and discipline in the Armed Forces or of a nature to bring discredit upon the Armed Forces.

Specification 7: On or about 5 March 2012, orally communicated to H. B., a child under the age of 16 years, certain indecent language, to wit: "quit lying to your fucking child or words", to the effect, such conduct was prejudicial to good order and discipline in the Armed Forces or of a nature to bring discredit upon the Armed Forces.

Charge IV: Violating Article 86, UCMJ:

Specification 1: On or about 19 January 2012, without authority, fail to go at the time prescribed to the appointed place of duty, to wit: 0700 accountability formation located on the corner of Restore Hope Ave and 8th Street West.

Specification 2: On or about 23 January 2012, without authority, fail to go at the time prescribed to the appointed place of duty, to wit: 0700 accountability formation located on the corner of Restore Hope Ave and 8th Street West.

Specification 3: On or about 24 January 2012, without authority, fail to go at the time prescribed to the appointed place of duty, to wit: 0700 accountability formation located on the corner of Restore Hope Ave and 8th Street West.

Specification 4: On or about 27 January 2012, without authority, the applicant failed to go at the time prescribed to the appointed place of duty, to wit: 0700 accountability formation located on the corner of Restore Hope Ave and 8th Street West.

Specification 5: On or about 8 February 2012, without authority, fail to go at the time prescribed to the appointed place of duty, to wit: 0700 accountability formation located on the corner of Restore Hope Ave and 8th Street West.

Specification 6: On or about 10 February 2012, without authority, fail to go at the time prescribed to the appointed place of duty to wit: 0930 work call formation located at Company Command Hallway.

Additional Charge I: Violating Article 128, UCMJ:

Specification 1: On or about 5 March 2012, assault Officer S. C. F., who then was and was then known by the applicant to be a person then having and in the execution of civilian law enforcement duties, by pushing the said Officer F's. body with the hands.

Specification 2: On or about 5 March 2012, assault Office S. C. F, who then was and was then known by the applicant to be a person then having and in the execution of civilian law enforcement duties, by attempting to punch the said Officer F. with the right hand.

Additional Charge II: Violating Article 86, UCMJ:

Specification 1: On or about 12 March 2012, without authority fail to go at the time prescribed to the appointed place of duty, to wit: 0700 accountability formation located on the corner of Restore Hope Avenue and 8th Street West, Fort Drum, New York.

Specification 2: On or about 13 March 2012, without authority, fail to go at the time prescribed to the appointed place of duty, to wit 0700 accountability formation located on the corner of Restore Hope Avenue and 8th Street West, Fort Drum, New York.

(2) Legal Consultation Date: 16 May 2012

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

(4) Recommended Characterization: Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

(5) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: 24 July 2012 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

- a. Date / Period of Enlistment:** 25 February 2010 / 6 years
- b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score:** 20 / GED / 92
- c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service:** E-4 / 91H10, Track Vehicle Repairer / 4 years, 2 months, 25 days
- d. Prior Service / Characterizations:** RA, 21 May 2008 – 24 February 2010 / HD
- e. Overseas Service / Combat Service:** SWA / Iraq (17 December 2009 – 3 December 2010)
- f. Awards and Decorations:** ICM-2CS, ARCOM, AAM, AGCM, NDSM, GWOTSM, ASR, OSR, CAB
- g. Performance Ratings:** NA
- h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:** Two charge sheets as described in previous paragraph 3c(1).
- i. Lost Time / Mode of Return:** None
- j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):**

(1) Applicant provided: Winn Army Community Hospital Emergency Nursing Record Psychiatric Complaints / Suicide Attempt, 2 November 2009, reflects a diagnosis.

3rd Infantry Division Pre-Deployment Behavioral Health Screening, 18 November 2009, reflects a diagnosis.

(2) AMHRR Listed: None

The ARBA's medical advisor reviewed DoD and VA medical records and not solely those documents listed in 4j(1) and (2) above.

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: DD Form 293; DD Form 214; self-authored statement; Memorandum for Secretaries of the Military Departments; medical documents.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: None submitted with the application.

7. STATUTORY, REGULATORY AND POLICY REFERENCE(S):

a. Section 1553, Title 10, United States Code (Review of Discharge or Dismissal) provides for the creation, composition, and scope of review conducted by a Discharge Review Board(s) within established governing standards. As amended by Sections 521 and 525 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020, 10 USC 1553 provides specific guidance to the Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records and Discharge Review Boards when considering discharge upgrade requests by Veterans claiming Post Traumatic Stress Disorder

(PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), sexual trauma, intimate partner violence (IPV), or spousal abuse, as a basis for discharge review. The amended guidance provides that Boards will include, as a voting board member, a physician trained in mental health disorders, a clinical psychologist, or a psychiatrist when the discharge upgrade claim asserts a mental health condition, including PTSD, TBI, sexual trauma, IPV, or spousal abuse, as a basis for the discharge. Further, the guidance provides that Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records and Discharge Review Boards will develop and provide specialized training specific to sexual trauma, IPV, spousal abuse, as well as the various responses of individuals to trauma.

b. Multiple Department of Defense Policy Guidance Memoranda published between 2014 and 2018. The documents are commonly referred to by the signatory authorities' last names (2014 Secretary of Defense Guidance [Hagel memo], 2016 Acting Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Carson memo], 2017 Official Performing the Duties of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Kurta memo], and 2018 Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Wilkie memo].

(1) Individually and collectively, these documents provide further clarification to the Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records when considering requests by Veterans for modification of their discharge due to mental health conditions, including PTSD; TBI; sexual assault; or sexual harassment. Liberal consideration will be given to Veterans petitioning for discharge relief when the application for relief is based in whole or in part on matters relating to mental health conditions, including PTSD; TBI; sexual assault; or sexual harassment. Special consideration will be given to Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) determinations that document a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment potentially contributed to the circumstances resulting in a less than honorable discharge characterization. Special consideration will also be given in cases where a civilian provider confers diagnoses of a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment if the case records contain narratives supporting symptomatology at the time of service or when any other evidence which may reasonably indicate that a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment existed at the time of discharge might have mitigated the misconduct that caused a discharge of lesser characterization.

(2) Conditions documented in the service record that can reasonably be determined to have existed at the time of discharge will be considered to have existed at the time of discharge. In cases in which a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment may be reasonably determined to have existed at the time of discharge, those conditions will be considered potential mitigating factors in the misconduct that caused the characterization of service in question. All Boards will exercise caution in weighing evidence of mitigation in cases in which serious misconduct precipitated a discharge with a less than Honorable characterization of service. Potentially mitigating evidence of the existence of undiagnosed combat related PTSD, PTSD-related conditions due to TBI or sexual assault/harassment as causative factors in the misconduct resulting in discharge will be carefully weighed against the severity of the misconduct. PTSD is not a likely cause of premeditated misconduct. Caution shall be exercised in weighing evidence of mitigation in all cases of misconduct by carefully considering the likely causal relationship of symptoms to the misconduct.

c. Army Regulation 15-180 (Army Discharge Review Board), sets forth the policies and procedures under which the Army Discharge Review Board is authorized to review the character, reason, and authority of any Servicemember discharged from active military service within 15 years of the Servicemember's date of discharge. Additionally, it prescribes actions and composition of the Army Discharge Review Board under Public Law 95-126; Section 1553, Title 10 United States Code; and Department of Defense Directive 1332.41 and Instruction 1332.28.

d. Army Regulation 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations), provides the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel.

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

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

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

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

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

e. Army Regulation 635-5-1 (Separation Program Designator (SPD) Codes), provides the specific authorities (regulatory or directive), reasons for separating Soldiers from active duty, and the SPD codes to be entered on the DD Form 214. It identifies the SPD code of "KFS" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 10, In Lieu of Trial by Court-Martial.

f. Army Regulation 601-210, (Regular Army and Reserve Components Enlistment Program), governs eligibility criteria, policies, and procedures for enlistment and processing of persons into the Regular Army, the U.S. Army Reserve, and Army National Guard for enlistment per DODI 1304.26. It also prescribes the appointment, reassignment, management, and mobilization of Reserve Officers' Training Corps cadets under the Simultaneous Membership Program. Chapter 4 provides the criteria and procedures for waiverable and nonwaiverable separations. Table 3-1, defines reentry eligibility (RE) codes: RE-4 Applies to: Person separated from last period of service with a nonwaiverable disqualification. This includes anyone with a DA imposed bar to reenlistment in effect at time of separation or separated for any reason (except length of service retirement) with 18 or more years active Federal service. Eligibility: Ineligible for enlistment.

8. SUMMARY OF FACT(S): The Army Discharge Review Board considers applications for upgrade as instructed by Department of Defense Instruction 1332.28.

The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable. The applicant's Army Military Human Resources Record (AMHRR), the issues, and documents submitted with the application were carefully reviewed.

The evidence in the applicant's Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR) confirms the applicant was charged with the commission of an offense punishable under the UCMJ with a

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

The applicant contends the narrative reason for the discharge needs changed. The applicant was separated under the provisions of Chapter 10, AR 635-200, with a general (under honorable conditions). The narrative reason specified by Army Regulations for a discharge under this paragraph is "In Lieu of Trial by Court-Martial," and the separation code is "KFS." 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 a combat tour. The Board considered the applicant's service accomplishments and the quality of service according to the DODI 1332.28.

The applicant contends none of the disciplinary or administrative proceedings considered the applicant's combat related medical conditions. The chain of command acted with impropriety to rid themselves of an injured and perceived troublesome Soldier by the most expeditious manner available. The applicant provided Winn Army Community Hospital Emergency Nursing Record Psychiatric Complaints / Suicide Attempt, 2 November 2009, which reflects a diagnosis; and a 3rd Infantry Division Pre-Deployment Behavioral Health Screening, 18 November 2009, which also reflects a diagnosis. The AMHRR does not contain a mental status evaluation (MSE). The applicant's AMHRR does not contain any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command.

The applicant contends being coerced by JAG staff during discipline proceedings into accepting a under other than honorable conditions discharge, through induced fear of harsh prison sentence should the applicant request a special court-martial. The applicant was not aware at the time of the gravity and impact an under other than honorable conditions discharge would have on their life after service. The applicant did not submit any evidence, other than the applicant's statement, to support the contention. On 7 May 2012, the applicant, in consultation with legal counsel, voluntarily requested, in writing, a discharge under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 10, in lieu of trial by court-martial, in the request the applicant stated they voluntarily requested the discharge and was making the request on their own free will and had not been subjected to any coercion whatsoever by any person. The request also states if the discharge was accepted, the applicant may be discharged under conditions other than honorable conditions. The applicant was advised and understood the possible effects of an under other than honorable conditions discharge, and the discharge would have a significant effect on eligibility for veterans' benefits.

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.

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 off the Board's Medical Advisor's opine, and 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, Anxiety 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 is 70 percent SC for PTSD.

(3) Does the condition or experience excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Partially.** The Board applied liberal consideration, to include consideration of the Board's Medical Advisor's opine, and determined that as there is an association between PTSD and avoidance, comorbid substance abuse, and increased anger and irritability, there is a nexus between the applicant misconduct characterized by failure to report (FTR), possession of drug paraphernalia, and use of indecent language, such that the misconduct is mitigated. However, the misconduct characterized by culpable negligence, child endangerment, and assault of an Officer are not mitigated, as the misconduct is not natural sequela of PTSD or Anxiety Disorder, and the applicant did not have a condition that rendered him 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 PTSD and Anxiety Disorder outweighed the entire basis for applicant's separation – which included endangering the physical health of two children under the age of 16 years, and assault on two occasions.

b. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends the narrative reason for the discharge needs changed. The Board considered this contention and determined the applicant's narrative reason for discharge is appropriate. The Board considered this contention and noted that this action is a procedural step which is part of a normal process, when an alternative forum is chosen. In this case, the charges were dismissed because the applicant requested to be discharged under the provisions of Chapter 10, AR 635-200, in lieu of trial by court-martial and the convening authority approved that request. There was no evidence presented to the Board to convince the Board of any mitigating circumstances.

(2) The applicant contends good service, including a combat tour. The Board considered the applicant's four years of service, including a combat tour in Iraq and the numerous awards received by the applicant but determined that these factors did not outweigh the applicant's misconduct of endangering the physical health of two children under the age of 16 years, and assault on two occasions. The applicant has previously petitioned the board and was afforded relief in the form of an upgrade to General, Under Honorable Conditions, which appears appropriate given the applicant's history.

(3) The applicant contends none of the disciplinary or administrative proceedings took into consideration the applicant's combat related medical conditions. The chain of command acted with impropriety to rid themselves of an injured and perceived troublesome Soldier by the most expeditious manner available. The Board considered this contention and determined the applicant's discharge is appropriate. There is no indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command, the applicant's PTSD and anxiety do not mitigate or excuse the applicant's endangering the physical health of two children under the age of 16 years, and assault on two occasions. The Board considered the applicant's totality of service and determined the discharge is appropriate due the severity of the misconduct. The applicant has previously petitioned the board and was afforded relief in the form of an upgrade to General, Under Honorable Conditions, which appears appropriate given the applicant's history.

(4) The applicant contends being coerced by JAG staff during discipline proceedings into accepting a under other than honorable conditions discharge, through induced fear of harsh prison sentence should the applicant request a special court-martial. The applicant was not aware at the time of the gravity and impact an under other than honorable conditions discharge would have on their life after service. The Board considered this contention and determined the discharge is proper and equitable as there is insufficient evidence in the file to support the applicant was coerced by JAG staff. There is evidence in the file to support on 7 May 2012, the applicant, in consultation with legal counsel, voluntarily requested, in writing, a discharge under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 10, in lieu of trial by court-martial. In the request the applicant stated they voluntarily requested the discharge and was making the request on their own free will and had not been subjected to any coercion whatsoever by any person. Ultimately, a previous ADRB upgraded the applicant's characterization of service to General, Under Honorable Conditions.

(5) 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.

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 of all the evidence before the Board, the applicant's PTSD and anxiety did not excuse or mitigate the offenses of endangering the physical health of two children under the age of 16 years, and assault on two occasions. The Board also considered the applicant's contention regarding being coerced by JAG staff and the applicant's combat related medical conditions and found that totality of the applicant's record does not warrant a discharge upgrade. The discharge was consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the regulation, was within the discretion of the separation authority, and the

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20210001145

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.

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:

10/8/2024

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