

**1. Applicant's Name:**

- a. Application Date:** 26 April 2021
- b. Date Received:** 26 April 2021
- c. Counsel:** Yes

**2. REQUEST, ISSUES, BOARD TYPE, AND DECISION:**

**a. Applicant's Requests and Issues:** The current characterization of service for the period under review is general (under honorable conditions). The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable.

The applicant seeks relief contending, in effect, being discharged for charges which the applicant was found innocent by the State of Alabama. The applicant contends having a Medical Evaluation Board (MEB) and retirement being taken from the applicant. The applicant was doing the best to be the best Soldier the applicant could be, attaining the rank of sergeant in just over two years. After returning from deployment, the nightmares started, and the applicant was suffering from PTSD. The applicant was diagnosed with sleepwalking disorder as well as other issues. An upgrade and restoration of rank and retirement would help the family obtain a house.

**b. Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 1 August 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:** Misconduct (Serious Offense) / AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12c / JKQ / RE-3 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

**b. Date of Discharge:** 7 November 2012

**c. Separation Facts:**

**(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** 15 May 2012

**(2) Basis for Separation:** The applicant was informed of the following reasons:

On or about 10 March 2012, the applicant crossed over into the oncoming lane of traffic and forced CPT D. M. and family (who were driving South in the other lane) to swerve almost off the road to avoid being hit. CPT D. M. then turned around and pursued the applicant as the applicant ran through a ditch trying to get the applicant to pull over and eventually discovered the applicant had been drinking;

The applicant was already enrolled in ASAP for alcohol abuse; however, had a BAC of .12 at the time of the incident; and,

prior to the incident the applicant had received a Field Article 15 for misconduct with a suspended demotion to SPC/E-4, which was vacated on 28 March 2012.

**(3) Recommended Characterization:** General (Under Honorable Conditions)

**(4) Legal Consultation Date:** 22 May 2012

**(5) Administrative Separation Board:** NA

**(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization:** 15 October 2012 / General (Under Honorable Conditions) / The separation authority stated in considering whether to process the applicant through the physical disability system in lieu of separation under the provisions of AR 635-200, the separation authority found the applicant's medical condition was not a direct or substantial cause of the misconduct as outlined in the separation packet; and, other circumstances in the applicant's case do not warrant disability processing instead of further processing for administrative separation.

#### 4. SERVICE DETAILS:

**a. Date / Period of Enlistment:** 5 October 2010 / 6 years

**b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score:** 37 / Associates Degree / 126

**c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service:** E-5 / 19K20, M1 Armor Crewman / 5 years, 1 month, 18 days

**d. Prior Service / Characterizations:** RA, 20 September 2007 – 27 January 2010 / HD  
RA, 28 January 2010 – 4 October 2010 / HD

**e. Overseas Service / Combat Service:** SWA / Iraq (18 December 2009 – 4 December 2010)

**f. Awards and Decorations:** ICM-2CS, AAM-2, AGCM, NDSM, GWOTSM, ASR, OSR

**g. Performance Ratings:** 1 October 2010 – 28 February 2011 / Fully Capable  
1 March 2011 – 29 February 2012 / Marginal

**h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:** FG Article 15, dated 6 March 2012, for a married person, wrongfully having sexual intercourse with S. D., a married person not the spouse on or about 1 September 2011 and 8 February 2012. The punishment consisted of a reduction to E-4, suspended; forfeiture of \$200 pay per month for two months; and extra duty for 30 days.

Alabama Uniform Arrest Report, dated 19 March 2012, reflects the applicant was arrested and charged with DUI.

Military Police Report, dated 19 March 2012, reflects the applicant was arrested and charged with Civil Arrest: Driving Under the Influence (Alcohol) OCAL Code 32-5A-191 [9] [2] (Off Post). RCSO reported the applicant was apprehended for driving under the influence. The applicant was transported to the county jail and released on 19 March 2012.

Record Of Supplementary Action Under Article 15, UCMJ, dated 28 March 2012, reflects the suspended portion of the punishment imposed on 6 March 2012, was vacated for: Article 111, the applicant operated a vehicle while the alcohol concentration on the breath, as shown by chemical analysis, equal to or exceeded (0.08) grams of alcohol per 210 liters of breath which is the limit under Alabama statute 32-5a-191 in a reckless manner by running CPT D. M. and family off of the road and running through a ditch.

Medical Evaluation Board Proceedings, dated 27 June 2012, reflect the following diagnosis: Plantar Fasciitis, Bilateral, Recalcitrant; Post Traumatic Stress Disorder; and Sleepwalking Disorder.

Administrative Memorandum of Reprimand, dated 13 September 2012, reflects the applicant was reprimanded for misconduct on 19 March 2012 when the applicant was apprehended for operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol.

Four Developmental Counseling Forms, for alcohol purchase and consumption, recommendation of separation from service x 2, and extra marital affair.

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

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

**(1) Applicant provided:** None

**(2) AMHRR Listed:** Report of Mental Status Evaluation, dated 23 March 2012, 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; and requires further examination to finalize diagnosis and recommendations. The applicant had been screened for PTSD and mTBI with negative results. The conditions were either not present or did not meet AR 40-501 criteria for a medical evaluation board. The applicant was diagnosed with Axis I: Alcohol dependence, Substance-induced anxiety and Axis II: cluster B traits. It was noted: A change in the Soldier's work environment will likely improve the chance of success. Soldier has a significant substance abuse/dependent history. Recommend chapter separation. Currently the coping mechanisms are overwhelmed and Soldier should engage in ongoing talk therapy, med management, and continued substance dependence treatment during transition out of the military.

Medical Record, Chronological Record of Medical Care, dated 27 March 2012, reflects the applicant was being referred to ASAP for alcohol and was currently being seen by mental health.

Report of Medical Examination, dated 4 May 2012, the examining medical physician noted in the comments section: Anxiety/depression/PTSD; alcohol abuse in remission; and, sleepwalking.

Health Record, Chronological Record of Medical Care, dated 7 May 2012, reflects the applicant was diagnosed with Axis I: Alcohol Dependence, In Early Full Remission; Posttraumatic Stress Disorder; Sleepwalking Disorder; and Adjustment Disorder with Depressed Mood.

Medical Evaluation Board Proceedings, dated 27 June 2012, reflect the following diagnosis: Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and Sleepwalking Disorder. The board recommended a referral to the Physical Evaluation Board.

**5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE:** DD Form 149; self-authored statement; attorney letter; Alabama Uniform Traffic Ticket and Complaint; four third-party letters.

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

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

a. Section 1553, Title 10, United States Code (Review of Discharge or Dismissal) provides for the creation, composition, and scope of review conducted by a Discharge Review Board(s) within established governing standards. As amended by Sections 521 and 525 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020, 10 USC 1553 provides specific guidance to the Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records and Discharge Review Boards when considering discharge upgrade requests by Veterans claiming Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), sexual trauma, intimate partner violence (IPV), or spousal abuse, as a basis for discharge review. The amended guidance provides that Boards will include, as a voting board member, a physician trained in mental health disorders, a clinical psychologist, or a psychiatrist when the discharge upgrade claim asserts a mental health condition, including PTSD, TBI, sexual trauma, IPV, or spousal abuse, as a basis for the discharge. Further, the guidance provides that Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records and Discharge Review Boards will develop and provide specialized training specific to sexual trauma, IPV, spousal abuse, as well as the various responses of individuals to trauma.

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

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

(2) Conditions documented in the service record that can reasonably be determined to have existed at the time of discharge will be considered to have existed at the time of discharge. In cases in which a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment may be reasonably determined to have existed at the time of discharge, those conditions will be considered potential mitigating factors in the misconduct that caused the characterization of service in question. All Boards will exercise caution in weighing evidence of mitigation in cases in which serious misconduct precipitated a discharge with a less than Honorable characterization of service. Potentially mitigating evidence of the existence of undiagnosed

combat related PTSD, PTSD-related conditions due to TBI or sexual assault/harassment as causative factors in the misconduct resulting in discharge will be carefully weighed against the severity of the misconduct. PTSD is not a likely cause of premeditated misconduct. Caution shall be exercised in weighing evidence of mitigation in all cases of misconduct by carefully considering the likely causal relationship of symptoms to the misconduct.

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

**d.** Army Regulation 635-200 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 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.

**(5)** 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.

**(6)** Paragraph 14-12c prescribes a Soldier is subject to action per this section for commission of a serious military or civilian offense, if the specific circumstances of the offense warrant separation and a punitive discharge is, or would be, authorized for the same or a closely related offense under the Manual for Courts-Martial.

**e.** Army Regulation 635-5-1, Separation Program Designator (SPD) Codes, provides the specific authorities (regulatory or directive), reasons for separating Soldiers from active duty, and the SPD codes to be entered on the DD Form 214. It identifies the SPD code of "JKQ" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, paragraph 12c, misconduct (serious offense).

**f.** Army Regulation 601-210, Regular Army and Reserve Components Enlistment Program, governs eligibility criteria, policies, and procedures for enlistment and processing of persons into the Regular Army, the U.S. Army Reserve, and Army National Guard for enlistment per DODI

1304.26. It also prescribes the appointment, reassignment, management, and mobilization of Reserve Officers' Training Corps cadets under the Simultaneous Membership Program. Chapter 4 provides the criteria and procedures for waiverable and nonwaiverable separations. Table 3-1, defines reentry eligibility (RE) codes: RE-3 Applies to: Person who is not considered fully qualified for reentry or continuous service at time of separation, but disqualification is waiverable. Eligibility: Ineligible unless a waiver is granted.

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

The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable.

The applicant contends the narrative reason for the discharge needs changed. The applicant was separated under the provisions of Chapter 14, paragraph 14-12c, AR 635-200 with a general (under honorable conditions) discharge. The narrative reason specified by Army Regulations for a discharge under this paragraph is "Misconduct (Serious Offense)," and the separation code is "JKQ." Army Regulation 635-8, Separation Processing and Documents, governs the preparation of the DD Form 214, and dictates the entry of the narrative reason for separation, entered in block 28 and separation code, entered in block 26 of the form, will be as listed in tables 2-2 or 2-3 of AR 635-5-1, Separation Program Designator (SPD) Codes. The regulation stipulates no deviation is authorized. There is no provision for any other reason to be entered under this regulation.

The applicant contends good service, including a combat tour and obtaining the rank of E-5 in just over two years.

The applicant contends being discharged for charges which the applicant was found innocent by the State of Alabama. The applicant provided a copy of an attorney letter which references enclosures and that the applicant's court record states that the applicant was found "not guilty" and that the "adjudication dismissed." It also states the applicant was among the first to be referred to "Veterans Court" in Russell County Alabama and the applicant's dedication to completing the requirements imposed by the judge led the way in allowing many more Veterans to be referred to Russell County Veterans Court for help and treatment rather than serve time in jail.

The applicant contends having a Medical Evaluation Board (MEB) and retirement taken away from the applicant. AR 635-200, paragraph 1-34 states that processing under the Disability Evaluation System (DES) takes precedence over administrative separation except for cases involving misconduct. Soldiers subject to administrative separation for misconduct are eligible for medical evaluation board (MEB) processing of DES but requires the Separation Authority's approval to refer to the Soldier to physical evaluation board (PEB) after the completion of the MEB if the Separation Authority determines a Soldier's medical condition is the direct or substantial contributing cause of the misconduct or if other circumstances warrant DES processing. The Separation Authority determined that the applicant's medication condition was not the direct or substantial cause of the applicant's misconduct and did not find other circumstances warranted disability processing. The AMHRR shows the separation authority stated in considering whether to process the applicant through the physical disability system in lieu of separation under the provisions of AR 635-200, the separation authority found the applicant's medical condition was not a direct or substantial cause of the misconduct as outlined in the separation packet; and, other circumstances in the applicant's case do not warrant disability processing instead of further processing for administrative separation. The applicant's AMHRR does not contain any indication or evidence of arbitrary or capricious actions by the command.

The applicant contends after returning from deployment, the nightmares started, and the applicant was suffering from PTSD. The applicant was diagnosed with sleepwalking disorder as well as other issues. The applicant's AMHRR contains documentation which supports a diagnosis of in-service Anxiety/depression/PTSD; alcohol abuse in remission; and, sleepwalking. The record shows the applicant underwent a Mental Status Evaluation (MSE), dated 23 March 2012, which 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; and requires further examination to finalize diagnosis and recommendations. The applicant had been screened for PTSD and mTBI with negative results. The conditions were either not present or did not meet AR 40-501 criteria for a medical evaluation board. The applicant was diagnosed with Axis I: Alcohol dependence, Substance-induced anxiety and Axis II: cluster B traits. Medical Record, Chronological Record of Medical Care, dated 27 March 2012, reflects the applicant was being referred to ASAP for alcohol and was currently being seen by mental health. Report of Medical Examination, dated 4 May 2012, the examining medical physician noted in the comments section: Anxiety/depression/PTSD; alcohol abuse in remission; and, sleepwalking. Health Record, Chronological Record of Medical Care, dated 7 May 2012, reflects the applicant was diagnosed with Axis I: Alcohol Dependence, In Early Full Remission; Posttraumatic Stress Disorder; Sleepwalking Disorder; and Adjustment Disorder with Depressed Mood. Medical Evaluation Board Proceedings, dated 27 June 2012, reflect the following diagnosis: Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and Sleepwalking Disorder. The board recommended a referral to the Physical Evaluation Board. The MSE and allied medical records/proceedings were considered by the separation authority.

The applicant contends the rank of E-5 should be restored. The applicant's requested change to the DD Form 214 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 an upgrade and restored retirement would help the applicant and family obtain a house. 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 third-party statements provided with the application speak highly of the applicant and recognize the applicant's good conduct while serving in the Army and one letter is from the parent which speaks about the applicant always being a caring and giving person.

#### **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: Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, depressive disorder not otherwise specified, anxiety disorder not otherwise specified, adjustment disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, mTBI.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor found applicant's PTSD (Depressive disorder not otherwise specified, anxiety disorder not otherwise specified, adjustment disorder and generalized anxiety disorder are

subsumed under PTSD), and mTBI existed during the applicant's service. Sleepwalking disorder was diagnosed while on active duty.

(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 applicant PTSD partially mitigates the applicant's DUI as simple DUI is associated with alcohol misuse to self-medicate symptoms of PTSD. However, the applicant's PTSD does not fully mitigate the applicant's DUI because of the aggravating circumstances associated with the applicant's recklessness endangering the well-being of others. Further, the applicant's PTSD and mTBI do not mitigate the applicant's inappropriate relationship offense as there is no nexus between these conditions and the applicant's offense as PTSD/mTBI do not impair one's ability to differentiate right from wrong and adhere to the right. Finally, the applicant's records do not reflect that the applicant's mTBI was of the severity to that would impair judgment, cognition, or behavior to a degree that would mitigate any of the behaviors associated with discharge.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **No.** After applying liberal consideration to the evidence, including the Board Medical Advisor opine, the Board determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's PTSD/mTBI outweighed the applicant's partially medically mitigated DUI due to the aggravating circumstance (running a family off the road) and medically unmitigated inappropriate relationship offense.

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

(1) The applicant contends after returning from deployment, the nightmares started, and was suffering from PTSD. The applicant was diagnosed with sleepwalking disorder as well as other issues. The Board liberally considered this contention and determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's PTSD/mTBI outweighed the applicant's partially medically mitigated DUI due to the aggravating circumstance (running a family off the road) and medically unmitigated inappropriate relationship offense. Therefore, a discharge upgrade is not warranted.

(2) The applicant contends being discharged for charges which the applicant was found innocent by the State of Alabama. The Board considered this contention but found that the available evidence shows the applicant's civilian criminal charges were dismissed after the applicant completed requirements imposed by a Veteran's Court. This alternative process is not tantamount to innocence. Therefore, a discharge upgrade is not warranted.

(3) The applicant contends good service, including a combat tour and obtaining the rank of E-5 in just over two years. The Board considered this contention but determined that the applicant's service accomplishments do not outweigh the applicant's medically unmitigated offenses of running a family off the road while driving under the influence and participating in an inappropriate relationship.

(4) The applicant contends having a Medical Evaluation Board (MEB) and retirement taken away from the applicant. The Board considered this contention and determined that the Separation Authority acted within the Separation Authorities discretion in accordance with AR 635-200, paragraph 1-34d..

(5) The applicant contends the narrative reason for the discharge needs changed. The Board considered this contention but determined that the Serious Offense narrative reason is proper and equitable.



**(6)** The applicant contends the rank of E-5 should be restored. The Board determined that the applicant's requested reinstatement 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.

**(7)** The applicant contends an upgrade and restored retirement would help the applicant and family obtain a house. The Board considered this contention but does not grant relief to gain employment or enhance employment opportunities.

**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, the Board determined that the applicant's partially medically mitigated DUI does not outweigh the applicant's partially mitigated DUI due to the aggravating circumstance (running a family off the road) and medically unmitigated inappropriate relationship. The Board also considered the applicant's contentions regarding good service and dismissal of the underlying criminal charges and found that the totality of the applicant's record does not warrant a discharge upgrade. The discharge was consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the regulation, was within the discretion of the separation authority, and the applicant was provided full administrative due process. Therefore, the applicant's General discharge was proper and equitable as the applicant's misconduct fell below that level of meritorious service warranted for an upgrade to Honorable discharge.

**(2)** The Board voted not to change the applicant's reason for discharge or accompanying SPD code under the same pretexts, and the reason the applicant was discharged was both proper and equitable.

**(3)** The RE code will not change, as the current code is consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the regulation.

**ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE**

**AR20210001855**

**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:**

1/5/2024

**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