

**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, based on mental health evaluations and tests by medical professionals such as psychologists, psychiatrists, and behavioral health therapists, the applicant's conduct was a direct result of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). The applicant was diagnosed and treated for anxiety, depression, and schizophrenia (PTSD) while on active duty. The applicant's mental injuries were not considered during the separation. The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) granted the applicant a 50 percent service-connected disability for PTSD. The condition has become worse and the applicant is filing for an increase. The applicant requests a change in separation code and to be medically retired from active duty, rightfully, to allow the applicant to start a healthy path to recovery.

The applicant's medical condition was not considered when the applicant was punished under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). The applicant's military records reflect stellar performance and character until the applicant began having behavioral health issues because of the applicant's recent deployment in Iraq. The applicant believes the chain of command was not educated enough about PTSD to properly get the applicant the help the applicant needed rather than punishing the applicant for having mental health and family issues. Commanding General [M.] G.'s command philosophy also influenced the separation determination between medical separation or administrative action. The facts show the applicant's mental health directly affected the behavior while on active duty, and the applicant believes the mental health condition was and is bad enough to warrant a medical separation.

**b. Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 12 September 2023, and by a 3-2 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:** Unacceptable Conduct / AR 600-8-24, Paragraph 4-2b / JNC / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

**b. Date of Discharge:** 4 September 2013**c. Separation Facts:**

**(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** 19 March 2013

**(2) Basis for Separation:** The applicant was informed to show cause for retention on active duty under the provisions of AR 600-8-24, paragraph 4-20 (Rules for processing an elimination of a probationary officer) for misconduct, because of the following reasons: The applicant between 25 June and 14 November 2012:

Made a false official statement;  
Failed to report to the appointed place of duty;  
Violated a lawful general regulation by misusing the government travel card;  
Had an inappropriate relationship with an enlisted member; and  
Violated a general regulation by wrongfully storing an unregistered weapon within the government quarters.

**(3) Legal Consultation Date:** 16 April 2013

**(4) Board of Inquiry (BOI):** On 16 April 2013, the applicant submitted a Discharge in Lieu of Elimination Proceedings, conditionally waiving consideration of the case before a board of inquiry, contingent upon receiving a characterization of service no less favorable than general (under honorable conditions) discharge.

**(5) GOSCA Recommendation Date / Characterization:** On 14 March 2013, the GOSCA recommended an under other than honorable conditions characterization of service. On 2 May 2013, the GOSCA recommended approval of the applicant's request for Discharge in Lieu of Elimination. / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

**(6) DA Board of Review for Eliminations:** On 20 August 2013, the Ad Hoc Review Board considered the applicant's request for Discharge in Lieu of Elimination.

**(7) Separation Decision Date / Characterization:** 20 August 2013 / General (Under Honorable Conditions) / The separation authority approved the separation under AR 600-8-24, paragraph 4-2b, Misconduct and Moral or Professional Dereliction and the Discharge in Lieu of Elimination.

#### 4. SERVICE DETAILS:

**a. Date / Period of Appointment:** 22 June 2011 / Indefinite

**b. Age at Appointment: / Education:** 33 / Bachelor's Degree

**c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service:** WO1 / 920A0, Property Accounting Technician / 13 years, 6 months, 1 day

**d. Prior Service / Characterizations:** RA, 6 March 2000 – 7 May 2002 / HD  
RA, 8 May 2002 – 19 January 2005 / HD  
RA, 20 January 2005 – 2 November 2007 / HD  
RA, 3 November 2007 – 21 June 2011 / HD

**e. Overseas Service / Combat Service:** Alaska, SWA / Afghanistan (26 August 2003 – 30 July 2004); Iraq (26 September 2006 – 2 December 2007)

**f. Awards and Decorations:** ACM-CS, ICM-2CS, ARCOM-5, AAM, VUA, AGCM-3, NDSM, GWOTSM, NCOPDR-2, OSR-3

**g. Performance Ratings:** 22 June 2011 – 1 June 2012 / Best Qualified

**h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:** Municipality of Anchorage Police Department Arrest Report, 18 September 2012, reflects the applicant's spouse was arrested for Assault 4, cause fear or imminent injury; Assault 3, cause fear of injury with weapon; Criminal Mischief 4, property damage \$50 to \$499. Investigation revealed the police were dispatched on report of an assault involving domestic violence. According to the applicant's spouse, the applicant's spouse believed the applicant was cheating with Sergeant (SGT) S. D. The spouse located the applicant at SGT S. D. residence and admitted to slapping the applicant. The spouse and applicant returned to the spouse and applicant's residence and the spouse attacked the applicant with a knife and an unloaded firearm. The report further details the circumstances surrounding the domestic violence.

Military Police Desk Blotter, 18 September 2012, reflects the applicant was apprehended and cited for Fail to Obey General Order – Weapons, Article 92, UCMJ. The applicant's spouse was apprehended by Anchorage Police Department for Assault in the Fourth Degree and the victim was the applicant.

Sworn Statement from S. L. D., 2 October 2012, reflects the applicant's spouse recanted the statement regarding the applicant having an inappropriate relationship, stating the spouse falsely accused the applicant because of the issues the applicant and spouse were having at home.

Memorandum, subject: AR 15-6 Investigation Findings and Recommendations, 9 October 2012, reflects the investigating officer (IO) found:

The applicant possessed unregistered firearms in violation of Article 92, UCMJ, failure to obey a general order;

The applicant did not assault the applicant's spouse, in violation of Article 128, UCMJ; and

The applicant was involved in an inappropriate relationship with SGT S. D., violating Article 92, UCMJ, by having an inappropriate relationship with a noncommissioned officer (NCO), in violation of a lawful regulation.

The IO recommended the applicant receive a General Officer Memorandum of Reprimand (GOMOR) and the case be forwarded to SGT S. D.'s chain of command. On 12 November 2012, the appointing authority approved the IO's findings and recommendations.

General Officer Memorandum Of Reprimand, 13 December 2012, reflects the applicant possessed two unregistered firearms and had an inappropriate relationship with an NCO.

General Officer Article 15, 12 March 2013, for failing to go at the time prescribed to the appointed place of duty (8 November 2012) and on divers occasions, violated a lawful general regulation by wrongfully using the government travel charge card (between 8 and 14 November 2012). The punishment consisted of a forfeiture of \$2,102 pay per month for two months (suspended).

**i. Lost Time / Mode of Return:** None

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

**(1) Applicant provided:** The VA Rating Decision, 14 April 2014, reflecting the VA rated the applicant 50 percent service-connected disabled for anxiety disorder, not otherwise specified (NOS) (claimed as stress disorder, insomnia, and PTSD).

Initial Post Traumatic Stress (PTSD) Disability Benefits Questionnaire, 15 October 2015, reflecting the applicant was diagnosed with PTSD and schizoaffective disorder. Parts of the diagnoses were illegible.

**(2) AMHRR Listed:** Report of Medical History, 6 June 2013, the applicant, among other entries, reported using Spice, self-referred to Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP). The examining medical physician noted in the comments section: Psychiatric record for PTSD; seeking treatment for insomnia; ASAP record.

Report of Medical Examination, 6 June 2013, the examining medical physician noted in the summary of defects and diagnoses section: PTSD; cannabis addiction; and insomnia.

**5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE:** DD Form 149; two DD Forms 214; four third party character references; Initial PTSD Disability Benefits Questionnaire; VA Rating Decision; Social Security Administration Retirement, Survivors, and Disability Insurance letter.

**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 600-8-24, Officer Transfers and Discharges, sets forth the basic authority for the separation of commissioned and warrant officers.

(1) Paragraph 1-23, provides the authorized types of characterization of service or description of separation.

(2) Paragraph 1-23a, states an officer will normally receive an honorable characterization of service when the quality of the officer's service has met the standards of acceptable conduct and performance of duty, or the final revocation of a security clearance under DODI 5200.02 and AR 380-67 for reasons that do not involve acts of misconduct for an officer.

(3) Paragraph 1-23b, states an officer will normally receive a general (under honorable conditions) characterization of service when the officer's military record is satisfactory but not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge. A separation under general (under honorable conditions) normally appropriate when an officer: Submits an unqualified resignation; Separated based on misconduct; discharged for physical disability resulting from intentional misconduct or neglect; and, for final revocation of a security clearance.

(4) Chapter 4 outlines the policy and procedure for the elimination of officers from the active Army for substandard performance of duty.

(5) Paragraph 4-2b, prescribes for the elimination of an officer for misconduct, moral or professional dereliction, or in the interests of national security.

(6) Paragraph 4-20a (previously 4-24a), states an officer identified for elimination may, at any time during or prior to the final action in the elimination case elect one of the following options: (1) Submit a resignation in lieu of elimination; (2) request a discharge in lieu of elimination; and (3) Apply for retirement in lieu of elimination if otherwise eligible.

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 "JNC" as the appropriate code to assign commissioned officers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 600-8-24, Chapter 4-2b, unacceptable conduct.

**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.

Based on the applicant's AMHRR, someone in the discharge process erroneously entered on the applicant's DD Form 214, block 25, "AR 600-8-24, Para 4-2B" and block 26, "JNC." The discharge packet confirms the separation authority approved the applicant's discharge under the provisions AR 600-8-24, Paragraphs 4-2b, Misconduct and Moral or Professional Dereliction and 4-24a(2), Request for Discharge in Lieu of Elimination. Army Regulations state a Soldier separated under these provisions will receive a narrative reason of Unacceptable Conduct, and a Separation Code of "KNC."

The applicant contends the narrative reason for the discharge needs changed. The applicant was separated under the provisions of Chapter 4, paragraph 4-2b, AR 600-8-24 with a general (under honorable conditions) discharge. The narrative reason specified by Army Regulations for a discharge under this paragraph is "Unacceptable Conduct," and the separation code is "JNC." Army Regulation 635-8, Separation Processing and Documents, governs 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 exactly as listed in tables 2-2 or 2-3 of AR 635-5-1, Separation Program Designator (SPD) Codes. The regulation further stipulates no deviation is authorized. There is no provision for any other reason to be entered under this regulation.

The applicant contends the SPD code should be changed. The SPD codes are three-character alphabetic combinations that identify reasons for, and types of, separation from active duty. The primary purpose of SPD codes is to provide statistical accounting of reasons for separation. They are intended exclusively for the internal use of DoD and the Military Services to assist in the collection and analysis of separation data. The SPD Codes are controlled by OSD and then implemented in Army policy AR 635-5-1 to track types of separations. The SPD code specified by Army Regulations for a discharge under Chapter 4, paragraph 4-2b, is "JNC."

The applicant contends PTSD affected behavior, which led to the discharge; being treated for anxiety, depression, and schizophrenia; and the VA rated the applicant 50 percent service-connected disabled for PTSD. The applicant provided medical documents reflecting the applicant was diagnosed with PTSD and schizoaffective disorder. The VA rated the applicant 50 percent service-connected disabled for anxiety disorder, NOS, (claimed as stress disorder,

insomnia, and PTSD). The applicant's AMHRR shows the applicant underwent a medical examination on 6 June 2013, which indicates the examining medical physician noted: Psychiatric record for PTSD; insomnia; cannabis addiction; and an Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP) record. The medical examination was considered by the separation authority. The AMHRR is void of a mental status evaluation.

The applicant contends the applicant's medical condition was not considered during UCMJ proceedings and the separation was influenced by the commanding general's command philosophy. The applicant's AMHRR does not contain any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command.

The applicant contends good service, including two combat tours. The Board will consider the applicant's service accomplishments and the quality of service according to the DODI 1332.28.

The applicant contends the discharge should have been for medical reasons. Army Regulation 600-8-24 provides specific processing procedures for Soldiers pending elimination who have been found to have a medical impairment which does not meet medical retention standards according to applicable laws and regulations. The applicant did not provide any evidence to show the applicant had a medical impairment, which did not meet medical retention standards, or evidence to show the applicant was referred to a medical evaluation board.

The applicant contends the applicant should be medically retired. 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 third party statements provided with the application speak highly of the applicant. They all recognize the applicant's good military service.

## 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: anxiety disorder, PTSD, depressive disorder, adjustment disorder (multiple), schizoaffective disorder, TBI. Additionally, the applicant asserts schizophrenia.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor found applicant is service connected for anxiety disorder, with evidence of PTSD, depression, and multiple adjustment disorders diagnosed on active duty. For the purposes of this advisory, each of these conditions can be subsumed under PTSD with depression reasonably present at the time of service. There is also evidence of possible TBI at the time of service.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Partially.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that the presence of PTSD with associated depression mitigates some of the misconduct leading to discharge; specifically, under liberal consideration guidelines, FTR can be considered an avoidance behavior associated with the natural history of PTSD. There is evidence of possible

mild TBI noted in applicant's records, but there is no compelling data that it was of such severity as to impair judgment, cognition, or behavior to the extent to provide any mitigation for the misconduct for which applicant was separated. The advisor also appreciates the applicant appears to have been the victim of IPV while in the military, but ultimately there is no nexus between this circumstance and the various charges for which applicant was separated (at least some of which appears to predate the IPV documented in record). Evidence suggests applicant was eventually diagnosed with schizoaffective disorder and potentially bipolar disorder, in addition to applicant's assertion of schizophrenia; however, there is no evidence applicant was disorganized or had impaired reality testing to the extent that applicant was unable to differentiate right from wrong and adhere to the right at the time of service and was not diagnosed with psychosis on active duty. Furthermore, the potentially mitigating PTSD and associated depression present at the time of service do not result in the inability to differentiate right from wrong and adhere to the right. Therefore, there is no support for any psychiatric mitigation for making a false official statement, misuse of a government travel card, inappropriate relationship with an enlisted service member, and wrongful storage of an unregistered weapon in government quarters.

**(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 anxiety disorder, PTSD, depressive disorder, adjustment disorder (multiple), schizoaffective disorder, TBI outweighed the basis for applicant's separation – making a false official statement, misuse of a government travel card, inappropriate relationship with an enlisted service member, and wrongful storage of an unregistered weapon in government quarters – for the aforementioned reason(s).

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

**(1)** The applicant contends the narrative reason for the discharge and the SPD code should be changed. The Board considered this contention and determined the discharge is proper and equitable based on the significance of the unmitigated misconduct. Therefore, no change to narrative reason or SPD code is warranted.

**(2)** The applicant contends PTSD affected behavior, which led to the discharge; being treated for anxiety, depression, and schizophrenia; and the VA rated the applicant 50 percent service-connected disabled for PTSD. The Board liberally considered this contention and determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's anxiety disorder, PTSD, depressive disorder, adjustment disorder (multiple), schizoaffective disorder, TBI outweighed the basis for applicant's separation – making a false official statement, misuse of a government travel card, inappropriate relationship with an enlisted service member, and wrongful storage of an unregistered weapon in government quarters. The Board also considered the totality of the applicant's record, including the applicant's BH condition and determined that a discharge upgrade is not warranted based on the significance of the applicant's misconduct.

**(3)** The applicant contends the applicant's medical condition was not considered during UCMJ proceedings and the separation was influenced by the commanding general's command philosophy. The Board considered this contention and determined it had no weight or bearing to the applicant's discharge. The severity of the applicant's misconduct is not outweighed by the applicant's medical conditions and there is no evidence to support capricious acts by the chain of command.



(4) The applicant contends good service, including two combat tours. The Board considered the applicant's 13 years of service, including 2 combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan and the numerous awards received by the applicant but determined that these factors did not outweigh the applicant's misconduct of making a false official statement, misuse of a government travel card, inappropriate relationship with an enlisted service member, and wrongful storage of an unregistered weapon in government quarters.

(5) The applicant contends the discharge should have been for medical reasons and applicant should be medically retired. The Board determined that the applicant's requested change to the DD Form 214 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.

c. The Board determined 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 anxiety disorder, PTSD, depressive disorder, adjustment disorder (multiple), schizoaffective disorder, TBI did not excuse or mitigate the offenses of making a false official statement, misuse of a government travel card, inappropriate relationship with an enlisted service member, and wrongful storage of an unregistered weapon in government quarters. 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) As the applicant was an Officer, there is no reentry code supplied upon discharge, honorable or otherwise.

**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