

1. Applicant's Name:

- a. **Application Date:** 18 August 2020
- b. **Date Received:** 22 September 2020
- c. **Counsel:** None

2. REQUEST, ISSUES, BOARD TYPE, AND DECISION:**a. Applicant's Requests and Issues:**

(1) The current characterization of service for the period under review is Under Other Than Honorable Conditions. The applicant requests a change to honorable or a general (under honorable conditions).

(2) The applicant seeks relief stating their discharge seems unjust and improper. They feel throughout their service as a U.S. Soldier has been nothing less than outstanding. Their separation from the U.S. Army was on the grounds of a domestic assault allegation from their spouse at the time. They had an argument which turned physical after they were struck several times in the face by their spouse. The authorities were called, and their spouse wrote a statement implicating they were struck in the fact, thrown down two flights of stairs, and kicked in the stomach. Although their spouse's story was fabricated, they were taken into custody and ultimately separated from the U.S. Army within a few months.

(3) Their life outside the military is an adjustment and their discharge has hinders a few job opportunities that cater to military veterans. They would like to have an opportunity to pursue those positions. They are taking steps to regain control of their life and are applying to further their education. They are not saying they are the victim nor are they saying they didn't have a hand in it as well, they are sure there are plenty of things they could have done differently or handled better. They have to live with what happened every day of their life, but this one mistake doesn't define their career as a U.S. Soldier.

b. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 26 April 2024, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board denied the request upon finding the separation was both proper and equitable.

3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:

a. Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization: Misconduct, (Serious Offense) / Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12C / JKQ / RE-3 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

b. Date of Discharge: 25 May 2018

c. Separation Facts:

(1) **Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** 9 January 2018

(2) Basis for Separation:

- on 13 March 2017, committed an assault consummated by battery on their spouse
- on 25 July 2017, committed an assault consummated by battery on their spouse

- on 5 August 2017, committed an assault consummated by battery on their spouse

(3) Recommended Characterization: Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

(4) Legal Consultation Date: 23 January 2018

(5) Administrative Elimination Board:

- on 5 March 2018, the applicant was notified to appear before an administrative separation board and advised of rights
- on 20 March 2018, the administrative separation board convened, the applicant appeared with counsel, and the board recommended the applicant's discharge with characterization of service of under other than honorable conditions
- On 25 April 2018, the separation authority approved the findings and recommendations of the administrative separation board

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: 25 April 2018 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 10 December 2015 / 3 years

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 26 / HS Graduate / 100

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-5 / 25U2P, Signal Support System Specialist / 6 years, 2 months, 28 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: None

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: SWA / Afghanistan (4 September 2013 – 19 November 2013) and Iraq (30 June 2015 – 29 September 2015 and 2 May 2017 – 8 July 2017)

f. Awards and Decorations: ARCOM, AAM, AGCM, NDSM, GWTEM, GWTSM, ACM-CS, NCOPDR, ASR, IRCM-CS

g. Performance Ratings: NA

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:

(1) A memorandum, Installation Provost Marshal Office, Fort Campbell, KY, subject: Law Enforcement Report, dated 14 April 2017, reflects the applicant as the named subject in violation of Aggravated Assault (Off Post), Vandalism (Off Post), and Interference with Emergency Calls (Off Post). The applicant's spouse is named as the subject in violation of Aggravated Assault (Off Post) and Vandalism (Off Post). The Report Summary states, investigation revealed the applicant, and their spouse, were both arrested for the above offenses by the Clarksville Police Department. A Military Protective Order was issued 15 March 2017, directing the applicant to remain no less than 500 feet away from their spouse.

(2) A Clarksville Police Department Incident Report, dated 26 July 2017, reflects the applicant as the named subject in violation of Domestic Violence with Simple Assault against their spouse. The Report Narrative states the altercation between the applicant and their spouse. The applicant left the scene prior to the police's arrival. Warrant were secured for the applicant and the military police were notified.

(3) A Clarksville Police Department Incident Report, dated 5 August 2017, reflects the applicant as the named subject in violation of Domestic Violence with Simple Assault against their spouse. The Report Narrative states both parties have previously been arrested for assaulting each other. The applicant had a previous unserved Domestic Assault warrant on file. The applicant was determined to be the primary aggressor of this domestic incident and charged with Aggravated Domestic Assault. The applicant was transported to the county jail where both warrants were served on them.

(4) A DA Form 3822 (Report of Mental Status Evaluation), 15 September 2017, reflects the applicant has no duty limitations due to behavioral health reasons, currently meets medical retention standards, and is cleared for administrative action. The behavior health provider noted a behavioral health diagnosis of "Problem with spouse;" however, they state the applicant has not mental health condition that contributed to their actions in the marriage. The applicant is cleared for administrative action as deemed necessary.

(5) A memorandum, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment (Airborne), subject: Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14-12c, Commission of a Serious Offense [Applicant], dated 9 January 2018, notified the applicant of initiating actions to separate them for Commission of a Serious Offense, three occurrences of committing assault consummated by battery on their spouse. On the same day the applicant acknowledged receipt of notification for separation.

(6) A memorandum, Headquarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment (Airborne), subject: Commander's Report – Proposed Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14-12c, Commission of a Serious Offense, [Applicant], dated 23 January 2018, the applicant's company commander submitted the request to separate the applicant prior to their expiration term of service. The company commander states the applicant's actions warrants an Other Than Honorable Conditions discharge and immediate discharge from the Army.

(7) On 23 January 2018, the applicant completed their election of rights, signing they had been advised by consulting counsel of the basis for contemplated action to separate them for commission of a serious offense, and it effect; of the rights available to them; and of the effect of any action taken by them in waiving their rights.

(a) They understood they have been notified that they are subject to a characterization of service under Other Than Honorable Conditions and that they are entitled to have their case considered by an administrative separation board. They requested to have their case heard by an administrative separation board.

(b) They understood if they are subject to the issuance of a discharge Under Other Than Honorable Conditions, they may be ineligible for many or all benefits as a veteran under both Federal and State laws and they may expect to encounter substantial prejudice in civilian life. They do not believe that they suffer from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder or Traumatic Brain Injury as a result of deployment overseas in support of a contingency operation in the past 24 months.

(c) The applicant elected to submit matters on their behalf. In the Defense Counsel memorandum, subject: Matters in Support of Retaining [Applicant], they state the allegations against the applicant by their spouse is false. The State of Tennessee decided not to take any action against the applicant, dropped all charges, and ordered their record expunged for the assault charges from 13 March 2017. Trial is currently pending for the charges from 25 July 2017 and 5 August 2017, and they expect they will again be exonerated.

(8) A memorandum, Headquarters, 1st Battalion, 187th Infantry Regiment, subject: Notification of Administrative Separation Board, dated 5 March 2018, reflects the applicant was notified of an Administrative Separation Board to investigate the facts and circumstances concerning their discharge from the service.

(9) On 20 March 2018 the Administrative Elimination Board convened to determine whether the applicant should be separated from the Army prior to the expiration of their current term of service, for assaulting their spouse on 13 March 2017, 25 July 2017, and 5 August 2017. The board made the following findings and recommendations.

(a) The board finds the allegations of assault consummated by battery on their spouse on 13 March 2017 and 5 August 2017, are supported by a preponderance of the evidence. The findings do warrant their separation. The allegation of assault consummated by battery on their spouse on 25 July 2017, is not supported by a preponderance of the evidence. In consideration of all substantiated findings, these findings do warrant their separation.

(b) In view of the above findings the board recommended the applicant be separated from the U.S. Army with a characterization of Other Than Honorable Conditions.

(10) A memorandum, Headquarters, Fort Campbell, subject: Administrative Separation Pertaining to [Applicant], dated 25 April 2018, the separation authority reviewed the separation packet, the Defense matters, to include all enclosures, and the findings and recommendations of the Administrative Separation Board. Having carefully considered the applicant's service record, their acts of misconduct, all matters submitted by the applicant's Defense Counsel, and the findings and recommendations of the Administrative Separation Board, direct the applicant be discharged from the U.S. Army and their service be characterized as Under Other Than Honorable Conditions.

(11) On 25 May 2018, the applicant was discharged accordingly, the DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) provides the applicant completed 6 years, 2 months, and 28 days of net active service this period and completed their first full term of service obligation; however, they did not complete their reenlistment service obligation of 3 years. Their DD Form 214 shows in –

- item 4a (Grade, Rate or Rank) – Private
- item 4b (Pay Grade) – E-1
- item 12c (Net Active Service This Period) – 6 years 2 months, 28 days
- item 12i (Effective Date of Pay Grade) – 25 April 2018
- item 18 (Remarks) – in part,
 - CONTINUOUS HONORABLE ACTIVE SERVICE – 20120228 - 20151209
 - MEMBER HAS COMPLETED FIRST FULL TERM OF SERVICE
- item 24 (Character of Service) – Under Other Than Honorable Conditions
- item 25 (Separation Authority) – Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12c
- item 26 (Separation Code) – JKQ [Misconduct (Serious Offense)]

- item 27 (Reentry Code) – 3
- item 28 (Narrative Reason for Separation) – Misconduct, (Serious Offense)

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: None

j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):

(1) Applicant provided: None

(2) AMHRR Listed: MSE/BHE as described in previous paragraph 4h(4).

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE:

- DD Form 293 (Application for the Review of Discharge from the Armed Forces of the United States), with letter
- DA Form 2166-9-1 (NCO Evaluation Report)
- DD Form 214
- eight 3rd Party Character Statements
- Memorandum, Headquarters, U.S. Army Medical Department, subject: Anger Management Group
- Memorandum, Headquarters, U.S. Army Medical Department, subject: Domestic Abuse Group

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

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

a. Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1553, (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, Title 10 U.S. Code, Section 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 (DoD) 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; Title 10 U.S. Code; Section 1553 and DoD Directive 1332.41 and DoD Instruction 1332.28.

d. Army Regulation 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations), dated 19 December 2016, set policies, standards, and procedures to ensure the readiness and competency of the force while providing for the orderly administrative separation of Soldiers for a variety of reasons. Readiness is promoted by maintaining high standards of conduct and performance.

(1) 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.

(2) 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.

(3) A Under Other Than Honorable Conditions Discharge is an administrative separation from the Service under conditions other than honorable. It may be issued for misconduct, fraudulent entry, security reasons, or in lieu of trial by court-martial.

(4) Chapter 14 (Separation for Misconduct) established policy and prescribed procedures for separating members for misconduct. Action will be taken to separate a member for misconduct when it is clearly established that rehabilitation is impractical or unlikely to succeed. 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. Paragraph 14-12c (Commission of a Service Offense), stated 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.

(5) Chapter 15 (Secretarial Plenary Authority), currently in effect, provides explicitly for separation under the prerogative of the Secretary of the Army. Secretarial plenary separation authority is exercised sparingly and seldom delegated. Ordinarily, it is used when no other provision of this regulation applies, and early separation is clearly in the Army's best interest. Separations under this paragraph are effective only if approved in writing by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary's approved designee as announced in updated memoranda. Secretarial separation authority is normally exercised on a case-by-case basis.

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 14-12c, 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 DoD Instruction 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:

(1) RE-1 Applies to: Person completing his or her term of active service who is considered qualified to reenter the U.S. Army. Eligibility: Qualified for enlistment if all other criteria are met.

(2) 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.

(3) 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.

g. Manual for Courts-Martial, United States, (2016 Edition) states military law consists of the statutes governing the military establishment and regulations issued thereunder, the constitutional powers of the President and regulations issued thereunder, and the inherent authority of military commanders. Military law includes jurisdiction exercised by courts-martial and the jurisdiction exercised by commanders with respect to nonjudicial punishment. The purpose of military law is to promote justice, to assist in maintaining good order and discipline in

the Armed Forces. Appendix 12 (Maximum Punishment Chart) Manual for Courts-Martial shows the maximum punishments include punitive discharge for violating the Article 128 (Assault).

8. SUMMARY OF FACT(S):

a. The Army Discharge Review Board considers applications for upgrade as instructed by DoD Instruction 1332.28.

b. A review of the applicant's Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR) reflects the applicant received notification of separation notice and their case was presented to an Administrative Separation which recommended the applicant's separation for two occurrences of the applicant's assault consummated by battery against their spouse. The DD Form 214 provides the applicant was discharged with a character of service of Under Other Than Honorable Conditions, for misconduct, (serious offense). They completed 6 years, 2 months, and 28 days of net active service this period; however, they did not complete their 3 year, contractual reenlistment obligation.

c. Chapter 14 establishes policy and prescribes procedures for separation members for misconduct. Specific categories include minor disciplinary infractions, a pattern of misconduct, commission of a serious offense and convictions by civil authorities. Action will be taken to separate a member for misconduct when it is clearly established that rehabilitation is impracticable or is unlikely to succeed. 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.

d. Published DoD guidance indicates that the guidance is not intended to interfere or impede on the Board's statutory independence. The Board will determine the relative weight of the action that led to the discharge and whether it supports relief or not. In reaching its determination, the Board shall consider the applicant's petition, available records and/or submitted documents in support of the petition.

9. BOARD DISCUSSION AND DETERMINATION:

a. As directed by the 2017 memo signed by A.M. Kurta, the board considered the following factors:

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board'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 experiences: Applicant asserts he was a victim of IPV.

(2) Did the condition exist, or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** Applicant asserts he was a victim of IPV.

(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 abundance of documentation, with police report outlining him as the primary aggressor, supports the applicant as the perpetrator.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **No.** Based on liberally considering all the evidence before the Board, the ADRB determined that the condition or

experience did not outweigh the basis of separation.

b. Prior Decisions Cited:

c. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends their discharge seems unjust and improper. They feel throughout their service as a U.S. Soldier has been nothing less than outstanding. Their separation from the U.S. Army was on the grounds of a domestic assault allegation from their spouse at the time.

The Board considered this contention and determined that the 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 applicant contends their life outside the military is an adjustment and their discharge has hinders a few job opportunities that cater to military veterans. They would like to have an opportunity to pursue those positions. They are taking steps to regain control of their life and are applying to further their education.

The Board considered this contention but does not grant relief to gain employment or enhance employment opportunities. Also, eligibility for Veteran's benefits, to include educational benefits under the Post-9/11 or Montgomery GI Bill, healthcare or VA loans, do not fall within the purview of the Army Discharge Review Board. Accordingly, the applicant should contact a local office of the Department of Veterans Affairs for further assistance.

(3) The applicant contends they have to live with what happened every day of their life, but this one mistake doesn't define their career as a U.S. Soldier.

The Board considered this contention and determined that the discharge was proper and equitable as the applicant's misconduct fell below that level of meritorious service warranted for an upgrade to Honorable discharge.

d. 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.

e. Rationale for Decision:

(1) The Board voted not to change the applicant's characterization of service based on the following reasons. The Board carefully considered the applicant's request, supporting documents, evidence in the records, a medical review, and published Department of Defense guidance for liberal consideration of discharge upgrade requests. The Board considered the applicant's statement, record of service, the frequency and nature of misconduct, and the reason for separation. The Board found insufficient evidence of in-service mitigating factors and concurred with the conclusion of the medical advising official that the applicant does not have a BH condition that mitigates the applicant's misconduct. The applicant had multiple FAP cases all noting he was the offender aligning with police reports noting the applicant as the primary aggressor, therefore, based on a preponderance of evidence, the Board determined that the reason for the applicant's separation and the character of service the applicant received upon separation were proper and equitable.

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20210005265

(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:

7/31/2024

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