

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 the under review is general (under honorable conditions). The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable.

The applicant seeks relief contending, in effect, never being in any trouble during the applicant's three years as an Apache Crew Chief. During a brief month as the unit was gearing up to conduct operations in Afghanistan, a new first sergeant (1SG) pushed the applicant physically and morally into the ground because of the applicant's weight issue. The applicant was slightly overweight, but never failed an Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT). The first sergeant humiliated the applicant in front of the applicant's peers and pilots and made the applicant's life unbearable. When it was time for the applicant to take leave to see the applicant's spouse and two kids before deployment, the 1SG ordered the applicant to stay behind, denied the applicant leave, and ordered the applicant to conduct extra duty during the time the applicant's peers went on leave to see their loved ones. The applicant went into severe depression, which caused the applicant to have a verbal outburst. The applicant was then taken to a mental institution for a week. Afterwards, the applicant was held in jail illegally under pre-trial confinement. The 1SG tried to cover up the abuse by sending the applicant away for nearly two weeks. The applicant was scared into believing the applicant would be tried by court martial, with the possibility of imprisonment.

Because the applicant was young and scared, the applicant signed the career away, along with the applicant's pride and the applicant has regretted it to this day. The applicant maintained employment at Boeing for the past three years, building Apache helicopters for the U.S. government and the applicant wanted to stay in the fight for freedom, because the applicant believes in the mission. The applicant wanted to serve the country. Recently, the applicant was laid off and returned to school to finish a bachelor's degree. The applicant is a full-time student and wants to further the applicant's career and believes the discharge will prevent the applicant from obtaining a reasonable job soon. The applicant requests the evidence be considered and the applicant's status be returned to honorable, as the applicant was before the incident.

b. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 12 September 2023, 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: 29 November 2011

c. Separation Facts:

(1) Date and Charges Preferred (DD Form 458, Charge Sheet): On 14 October 2011, the applicant was charged with The Charge, Violating Article 134, UCMJ, The Specification: On 19 September 2011, wrongfully communicate a threat to Corporal T. R., a threat, by saying, "come in here and shoot up the place."

(2) Legal Consultation Date: 21 October 2011

(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: 15 November 2011 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 19 August 2008 / 6 years

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 23 / HS Graduate / 102

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-4 / 15R10, Y1 AH-64 Attack Helicopter Repairer / 3 years, 3 months, 3 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: None

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: None

f. Awards and Decorations: NDSM, GWOTSM, ASR

g. Performance Ratings: NA

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record: Charge Sheet as described in previous paragraph 3c.

Military Police Report, 21 September 2011, reflects the applicant was apprehended for: communications – communicating a threat (other than telephone), under Article 134, UCMJ (on post). Investigation revealed the applicant, Sergeant M., and Corporal R. were involved in a verbal altercation. The applicant threatened to harm 1SG H. along with other people. The applicant was transported to the hospital emergency room for a psychological evaluation. The applicant was treated and released to the Military Police and further released to the unit. The unit transferred the applicant to a mental health facility.

Agent' Investigative Report, 23 September 2011, revealed the 1SG reported the applicant's personal firearm was removed from the applicant's residence and secured in the unit Arms Room. The applicant's live in friend, S. F., reported the applicant was tired of being belittled for being fat and mentioned killing Soldiers in the unit and taking the applicant's own life. The applicant requested mental help which was met with negative results.

Receipt for Inmate or Detained Person, 21 September 2011, reflects the applicant was detained for communicating a threat.

Confinement Order, 28 September 2011, reflects the applicant was placed in pretrial confinement, pending court-martial for Article 134, UCMJ, Threat Communicating.

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

From "Present for Duty (PDY)," to "Confined by Military Authorities (CMA)," effective 29 September 2011; and
From "CMA" to "PDY," effective 6 October 2011.

Military Protective Order, 7 October 2011, reflects the applicant was issued an order not to contact or communicate with the protected person, S. F. because of allegations of an inappropriate and/or adulterous relationship in violation of Article 134, UCMJ.

Numerous Developmental Counseling Forms, for:

Possibility of leaving pretrial confinement for barracks restriction;
Disrespecting a noncommissioned officer (NCO);
Outstanding warrants;
Complete disrespect for authority;
Not having a clean uniform;
Unsatisfactory Progress on the Weight Control Program;
Not being recommended for promotion because of being over the Army height and weight standards;
Information regarding block leave dates;
Failure to be at the appointed place of duty; and
Lack of motivation and having a bad attitude.

The applicant received several positive counseling for duty performance.

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: 8 days (CMA, 29 September 2011 – 6 October 2011) / Released from Confinement

j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):

(1) Applicant provided: None

(2) AMHRR Listed: Report of Mental Status Evaluation, 21 September 2011, reflects the applicant could understand and participate in administrative proceedings. The applicant was diagnosed with: Depression.

Report of Mental Status Evaluation, 7 October 2011, reflects the applicant could understand and participate in administrative proceedings and could appreciate the difference between right and wrong. The applicant could not work on an aircraft until evaluated by psychologist. The applicant was diagnosed with: Adjustment disorder with anxiety.

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: DD Form 293.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: The applicant maintained employment at Boeing for the three years, building Apache helicopters, and is attending college to pursue a bachelor's degree.

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 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.)

(6) Paragraph 10b stipulates Soldiers who have completed entry-level status, characterization of service as honorable is not authorized unless the Soldier's record is otherwise so meritorious that any other characterization clearly would be improper.

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 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) discharge. 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 severe depression affected behavior, which ultimately led to the discharge. The applicant did not provide any evidence to support the contention, other than the applicant's statement. The applicant's AMHRR contains documentation which supports a diagnosis of in-service depression and anxiety disorder with anxiety. The record shows the applicant underwent two mental status evaluation (MSE) on 21 September and 7 October 2011, which indicates the applicant could understand and participate in administrative proceedings and could appreciate the difference between right and wrong. The MSEs 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 good service. The Board will consider the applicant's service accomplishments and the quality of service according to the DODI 1332.28.

The applicant contends harassment by a senior member of the unit. There is no evidence in the AMHRR the applicant sought assistance AM or reported the harassment.

The applicant contends requesting a discharge because the applicant was young and scared. The applicant did not provide any evidence of coercion by the command. The applicant's AMHRR reflects the applicant consulted legal counsel and voluntarily requested discharge.

The applicant contends being held in jail illegally under pretrial confinement. The applicant's AMHRR reflects the applicant was apprehended for communicating a threat and held because of charges preferred with a view towards court-martial. The applicant's AMHRR does not contain any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command.

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 maintaining employment at Boeing for the past three years, building Apache helicopters, and is attending college to pursue a bachelor's degree. 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 (multiple); depressive disorder NOS, mood disorder NOS, dysthymic disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, anxiety disorder NOS, bipolar II disorder, major depressive disorder recurrent, schizoaffective disorder, and psychosis/disorganized schizophrenia (current service connection).

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor found evidence of noteworthy depression and anxiety on active duty as evidenced by multiple adjustment disorder diagnoses, depression, and mood disorder NOS while on active duty. Ultimately, these diagnoses can be subsumed under diagnoses of dysthymic disorder and generalized anxiety disorder noted in his VA compensation record.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **No.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that the applicant is currently service connected for psychosis (schizophrenia), although there is no compelling evidence of psychosis or the inability to differentiate right from wrong during applicant's time of service. Available records from applicant's active duty are suggestive of diagnoses of adjustment disorder, depression, and mood disorder NOS; under liberal consideration guidelines, diagnoses of dysthymic disorder and generalized anxiety disorder noted in applicant's C&P record appear consistent with and can subsume diagnoses made while on active duty. The advisor recognizes the post-service progression of applicant's condition eventually meeting the criteria for psychotic-spectrum disorders, however, these do not appear germane to applicant's active service. Neither depression/dysthymic disorder nor generalized

anxiety disorder results in the inability to differentiate right from wrong and adhere to the right, and as such provide no psychiatric mitigation for the communication of a threat cited in 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 (multiple); depressive disorder NOS, mood disorder NOS, dysthymic disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, anxiety disorder NOS, bipolar II disorder, major depressive disorder recurrent, schizoaffective disorder, and psychosis/disorganized schizophrenia outweighed the basis for applicant's separation – Communicating a Threat to 1SG (8 days pre-trial confinement) and other misconduct of disrespect, outstanding warrants, disrespect, dirty uniform, no progress on WCP, FTR, lack of motivation and poor attitude – for the aforementioned reason(s).

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 discharge was proper and equitable given the severity of the misconduct and no behavioral health mitigating diagnoses.

(2) The applicant contends severe depression affected behavior, which ultimately led to the discharge. The Board considered this contention and determined the applicant's severe depression did not inhibit the applicant from determining right from wrong and therefore did not mitigate the misconduct.

(3) The applicant contends the event which led to the discharge from the Army was an isolated incident. The Board considered this contention and found the discharge proper and equitable given the severity, nature and repletion of misconducts to include; Communicating a Threat to 1SG (8 days pre-trial confinement) and other misconduct of disrespect, outstanding warrants, disrespect, dirty uniform, no progress on WCP, FTR, lack of motivation and poor attitude.

(4) The applicant contends good service. The Board considered the applicant's three years of service but determined that these factors did not outweigh the applicant's misconduct of: communicating a Threat to 1SG (8 days pre-trial confinement) and other misconduct of disrespect, outstanding warrants, disrespect, dirty uniform, no progress on WCP, FTR, lack of motivation and poor attitude.

(5) The applicant contends harassment by a senior member of the unit. The Board considered this contention and found no corroborating evidence to support the applicant's assertion and therefore found the discharge proper and equitable. 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.

(6) The applicant contends requesting a discharge because the applicant was young and scared. The Board considered this contention and determined that the applicant's youth and immaturity did not outweigh the seriousness of the applicant's multiple offenses. Therefore, no change is warranted.

(7) The applicant contends being held in jail illegally under pretrial confinement. The Board considered this contention and found no corroborating evidence to support the applicant's assertion and therefore found the discharge proper and equitable. 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.

(8) 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.

(9) The applicant contends maintaining employment at Boeing for the past three years, building Apache helicopters, and is attending college to pursue a bachelor's degree. The Board considered this contention and determined that the applicant's employment at Boeing and college attendance do not outweigh the misconduct based on the seriousness of the applicant's offenses of communicating a Threat to 1SG (8 days pre-trial confinement) and other misconduct of disrespect, outstanding warrants, disrespect, dirty uniform, no progress on WCP, FTR, lack of motivation and poor attitude.

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 adjustment disorder (multiple); depressive disorder NOS, mood disorder NOS, dysthymic disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, anxiety disorder NOS, bipolar II disorder, major depressive disorder recurrent, schizoaffective disorder, and psychosis/disorganized schizophrenia did not excuse or mitigate the offenses of communicating a Threat to 1SG (8 days pre-trial confinement) and other misconduct of disrespect, outstanding warrants, disrespect, dirty uniform, no progress on WCP, FTR, lack of motivation and poor attitude. The discharge was consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the regulation, was within the discretion of the separation authority, and the applicant was provided full administrative due process. Therefore, the applicant's General discharge was proper and equitable as the applicant's misconduct fell below the level of meritorious service warranted for an upgrade to an 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:

1/16/2024

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