

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 under other than honorable conditions. The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable.

The applicant seeks relief contending, in effect, serving honorably and diligently for four and a half years and requests their rank be restored to Sergeant. After returning from the applicant's second deployment, the applicant began therapy and anger management. The applicant was seen for migraines and behavioral health and states being very lost and confused while coping with PTSD. The applicant believes the medications they were using caused them to reflect on the things they experienced during combat and may have influenced them to make poor decisions. The applicant drank to hide the pain of losing friends in combat and was in the process of going through a Medical Evaluation Board (MEB) process when the rest of the unit returned from deployment. The chain of command was not happy with the applicant for seeking treatment. The brigade chain of command ordered the battalion chain of command to do anything to stop the MEB process and chapter the applicant out. The applicant describes how members of the chain of command would try to break the applicant, which caused the applicant more stress. The applicant did what they could to maintain their military bearing and discipline while coping with PTSD. Since the discharge, the applicant has continued to help young Soldiers by teaching them the knowledge and skills they learned. The applicant wants to receive medical benefits for their service.

b. **Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 11 January 2024, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board denied the request upon finding the separation was both proper and equitable.

Please see Section 9 of this document for more detail regarding the Board's decision.

(Board member names available upon request)

3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:

a. **Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization:** Misconduct (Serious Offense) / AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12c / JKQ / RE-4 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

b. **Date of Discharge:** 2 May 2012

c. **Separation Facts:**

(1) **Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** NIF

(2) **Basis for Separation:** The applicant was informed of the following reasons: marijuana distribution under 5 pounds, a class five Felony.

Disorderly conduct- fighting in public, a class three misdemeanor.

Assault three- know/reckless injury, a class one misdemeanor; simple assault.

Destruction of government property, of a value of approximately \$200.

Disrespect toward a commission officer.

(3) Recommended Characterization: Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

(4) Legal Consultation Date: undated

(5) Administrative Separation Board: In an undated memorandum, the applicant conditionally waived consideration of the case before an administrative separation board, contingent upon receiving a characterization of service no less favorable than general (under honorable conditions) discharge.

On 20 March 2012, the administrative separation board convened, and the applicant appeared with counsel. The Board determined six of the six reasons 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 20 April 2012, the separation authority approved the findings and recommendations of the administrative separation board. The separation authority finds the applicant's medical condition is not a direct or substantial contributing cause of their misconduct.

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: 20 April 2012 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 16 November 2008 / 4 years

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 21 / GED / 103

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-5 / 19D20, B9 Calvary Scout / 6 years, 5 months, 12 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: RA, 8 November 2005 – 15 November 2008 / HD

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: SWA / Iraq (13 January 2007 – 26 March 2008; 22 March 2010 – 24 July 2010)

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

g. Performance Ratings: 1 January 2009 – 31 December 2009 / Fully Capable
1 January 2010 – 15 July 2010 / Fully Capable
16 July 2010 – 15 July 2011 / Marginal
16 July 2011 – 5 January 2012 / Marginal

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record: The applicant's DD Form 214, reflects the applicant had completed the first full term of service. The applicant was discharged under the authority of AR 635-200, paragraph 14-12c, with a narrative reason of Misconduct (Serious

Offense). The DD Form 214 was authenticated with the applicant's electronic signature. The applicant had lost time for the period 2 December 2010 to 14 December 2010. The applicant was reduced from E-5 to E-1 effective 20 April 2012.

i. **Lost Time / Mode of Return:** 12 days (NIF, 2 December 2010 – 14 December 2010) / NIF

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

(1) **Applicant provided:** Headquarters U.S. Army Medical Department Activity Behavioral Health Diagnosis letter, 9 February 2012, reflects Major L., reviewed the applicant's medical records and in their opinion the applicant's behavioral health diagnosis and symptoms are a significant contributing cause of their misconduct which may result in the applicant's discharge through their pending administrative separation action.

Doctor C., Soldier Life Center, 19 March 2012, the applicant has been receiving therapy for Anger-Management since October of 2010. The applicant participated in the Anger-management therapy group on Wednesdays and Fridays. In addition, the doctor had been seeing the applicant on an individual basis to treat their post-traumatic stress symptoms. The applicant had two deployments and had been involved in significant combat. The impression of the assessment was the applicant's mental health was unstable, and therefore their ability to function in the military had significantly been impacted by the condition. It had caused significant distress in both the applicant's occupational and social level of functioning. It was important the applicant continue to be provided with the necessary support to treat their condition. It was imperative the applicant continue receiving therapy to work on their treatment issues and to stabilize their PTSD symptoms while increasing their ability to function daily.

(2) **AMHRR Listed:** The Medical Evaluation Board Narrative Summary, 22 November 2011, reflects the applicant had been diagnosed with PTSD and did not meet retention standards.

Report of Medical Examination, 8 December 2011, the examining medical physician noted in the comments section: Being treated for PTSD and TBI.

Report of Mental Status Evaluation, 16 December 2011, reflects the applicant was cleared for any administrative actions deemed appropriate by the command. The applicant could understand and participate in administrative proceedings; could appreciate the difference between right and wrong. The applicant had been screened for PTSD and mTBI with positive results. It was the professional opinion of the provider the applicant would not respond to command efforts at rehabilitation (such as transfer, disciplinary action, or reclassification), or to any behavioral health treatment methods currently available in the military. The applicant was diagnosed with: Chronic Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. The applicant had been evaluated and the psychiatric and medical history reviewed. The Soldier had no diagnoses of a major mental illness which accounted for all the misconduct leading to the command's first recommendation for administrative chapter. The applicant had PTSD and a history of Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI). The applicant fell below medical retention standards IAW AR 40-501 for symptoms related to PTSD and had been referred to DES. As a result, of the applicant being referred to DES for their PTSD symptoms the applicant could not be cleared for administrative actions. The applicant was not psychologically cleared for administrative separation.

5. **APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE:** DD Form 214; two DD Forms 293; self-authored letter; two DA Forms 2823; seven letters of support.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: The applicant teaches the knowledge and skills they learned to help young Soldiers.

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) 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.

(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-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 applicant's Army Military Human Resources Record (AMHRR) includes partial facts and circumstances concerning the events which led to the discharge from the Army. The applicant's AMHRR does contain a properly constituted DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty), which was authenticated by the applicant's electronic signature. The applicant's DD Form 214 indicates the applicant was discharged under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 14, paragraph 14-12c, by reason of Misconduct (Serious Offense), with a characterization of service of under other than honorable conditions.

The applicant contends struggling with PTSD. The applicant provided a Headquarters U.S. Army Medical Department Activity Behavioral Health Diagnosis letter, 9 February 2012, reflecting Major L., reviewed the applicant's medical records and in their opinion the applicant's behavioral health diagnosis and symptoms were a significant contributing cause of their misconduct which may result in the applicant's discharge through their pending administrative separation action. Also, a letter from Doctor C., Soldier Life Center, 19 March 2012, reflects the applicant had been receiving therapy for Anger-Management since October of 2010. The applicant participated in the Anger-management therapy group on Wednesdays and Fridays. In addition, the doctor had been seeing the applicant on an individual basis to treat their post-traumatic stress symptoms. The applicant had two deployments and had been involved in significant combat. The impression of the assessment was the applicant's mental health was unstable, and therefore their ability to function in the military had significantly been impacted by this condition. It had caused significant distress in both the applicant's occupational and social level of functioning. It was important the applicant continue to be provided with the necessary support to treat their condition. It was imperative the applicant continue receiving therapy to work on their treatment issues and to stabilize their PTSD symptoms while increasing their ability to function daily. The AMHRR includes a Medical Evaluation Board Narrative Summary, 22 November 2011, reflecting the applicant had been diagnosed with PTSD and did not meet retention standards. A Report of Medical Examination, 8 December 2011, the examining medical physician noted in the comments section: Being treated for PTSD and TBI. A Report of Mental Status Evaluation 16 December 2011 reflects the applicant was cleared for any administrative actions deemed appropriate by the command. The applicant could understand and participate in administrative proceedings; could appreciate the difference between right and wrong. The applicant had been screened for PTSD and mTBI with positive results. It was the professional opinion of the provider the applicant would not respond to command efforts at

rehabilitation (such as transfer, disciplinary action, or reclassification), or to any behavioral health treatment methods currently available in the military. The applicant was diagnosed with: Chronic Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. Unfit for duty due to a serious mental condition which was not likely to resolve within one year. The letter by Major L., The Medical Evaluation Board Narrative Summary; Report of Medical Examination and the Report of Mental Status Evaluation were considered by the separation authority.

The applicant requests their rank be restored. The applicant's request does 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 the chain of command denied the applicant the ability to complete their MEB. The applicant contends the discharge should have been for medical reasons. Army Regulation 635-200, in pertinent part, stipulates commanders will not separate Soldiers for a medical condition solely to spare a Soldier who may have committed serious acts of misconduct. 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 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 good service, including two combat tours. The Board considered the applicant's service accomplishments and the quality of service according to the DODI 1332.28.

The third-party statements provided with the application reflect the applicant's good conduct prior to their last deployment and the abuse the applicant suffered at the hands of the chain of command.

The applicant contends teaching the knowledge and skills they learned to young Soldiers. 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 [REDACTED] 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, PTSD, TBI, Depression, Anxiety Disorder.

(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, PTSD, TBI, Depression, and Anxiety. The VA has also service connected the applicant's PTSD.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Partially.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that there is evidence of multiple BH conditions that provide partial mitigation for the basis of separation. The applicant was diagnosed in service with an Adjustment Disorder, PTSD, TBI, Depression, and Anxiety. The VA has also service connected the applicant's PTSD. Given the nexus between PTSD and difficulty with authority, the disrespect toward a commissioned officer is mitigated. However, there is no natural sequela between any of the applicant's BH conditions and the remaining misconduct of marijuana distribution, disorderly conduct, assault, or destruction of government property. These are acts of misconduct that involve a blatant disregard for social norms and none of the applicant's BH 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 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, Depression, or Anxiety Disorder outweighed the applicant's medically unmitigated offenses of marijuana distribution, disorderly conduct, assault, or destruction of government property.

b. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends struggling with PTSD. The Board liberally considered this contention but determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's Adjustment Disorder, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Traumatic Brain Injury, Depression, or Anxiety Disorder outweighed the applicant's medically unmitigated offenses of marijuana distribution, disorderly conduct, assault, or destruction of government property.

(2) The applicant requests their rank be restored. The Board determined that the applicant's request for restoration of rank does not fall within the purview of the ADRB. The applicant may apply to the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR), using a DD Form 149 regarding this matter. A DD Form 149 may be obtained from a Veterans' Service Organization.

(3) The applicant contends the chain of command denied the applicant the ability to complete their MEB. When 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. In this case, the Board considered the applicant's contention and determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's Adjustment Disorder, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder,

Traumatic Brain Injury, Depression, or Anxiety Disorder outweighed the applicant's medically unmitigated offenses of marijuana distribution, disorderly conduct, assault, or destruction of government property.

(4) 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.

(5) The applicant contends good service, including two combat tours, and teaching the knowledge and skills the applicant learned to young Soldiers. The Board considered the applicant's six years of service, including combat service in Iraq and the numerous awards the applicant received, but determined that the applicant's service record does not outweigh the applicant's medically unmitigated offenses of marijuana distribution, disorderly conduct, assault, or destruction of government property.

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 the evidence before the Board, the applicant's Adjustment Disorder, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, Traumatic Brain Injury, Depression, or Anxiety Disorder did not outweigh the applicant's medically unmitigated offenses of marijuana distribution, disorderly conduct, assault, or destruction of government property. The Board also considered the applicant's contention regarding good service and 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 Under Other Than Honorable Conditions discharge was proper and equitable as the applicant's conduct fell below that level of satisfactory service warranting a General discharge or 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:

2/20/2024

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