

1. Applicant's Name:

- a. **Application Date:** 10 October 2020
- b. **Date Received:** 29 October 2020
- 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, a narrative reason change, and a change to both their separation and reenlistment codes.

b. Counsel states. The applicant's appeal is based on three errors: (1) the underlying basis of their separation was procedurally defective at the time of the discharge; (2) the adverse action, to include the administrative discharge, was unfair at the time; and (3) the General (Under Honorable Conditions, is inequitable now. The applicant contends they were in a relationship with [redacted] for seven months; [redacted] served prior but had left during that time. After [redacted] got out of the Army, they would find time to meet each other in Atlanta, which was the halfway point between the two places. On one occasion, the applicant went to meet [redacted], and they were staying the weekend in Atlanta but they were arguing, so [redacted] left to go smoke and did not come back. [Redacted] left the applicant without any money or a car, as the applicant's car was in the parking garage. The applicant was angry as they left with their friend and knew the hotel was in their partner's name, so they messed the hotel room up, so [redacted] would have to pay. The police called the applicant once, but the applicant assumed the police left it to the military to charge, as they never heard from them again. The applicant later reconciled with [redacted] and they told the applicant they had paid for the damage, and there was no further investigation.

(1) The unit conducted an investigation related to the incident. After the investigation, they made a finding of misconduct. The applicant later received an Article 15 and afterwards, they was told by their first sergeant (1SG) if they wanted to remain in the Army they could, as it was their first time getting in trouble. The applicant told 1SG they did not want to stay in, but they did not understand that this would affect their discharge. The 1SG used this information against the applicant and hastily proceeded to start administrative separation proceedings. This was in retaliation for the applicant not committing to staying in the Army.

(2) The applicant now works as a contractor at a military base and has gone to a little bit of school that they have paid for out of pocket. This discharge is holding the applicant back from pursuing school, as they wish to earn their degree and work as a dental hygienist but is unable to go without their veteran benefits. The General discharge does not serve a further purpose. The events that took place are no longer relevant to the applicant's life and they have lived since in as responsible a manner as they could. There is no valid equitable purpose in leaving the discharge in place.

c. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 17 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) / AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12C / JKQ / RE-4 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

b. Date of Discharge: 14 August 2018

c. Separation Facts:

(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate: Undated

(2) Basis for Separation: willfully and wrongfully damaged a hotel room, bed, artwork, and mirror, totaling approximately \$5,000.00 and wrongfully committed indecent conduct by sending sexually explicit videos and pictures to [redacted]

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

(4) Legal Consultation Date: Waived defense counsel on 11 July 2018

(5) Administrative Separation Board: NA

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: 25 July 2018 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 27 October 2014 / 4 years, 24 weeks

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 19 / High School Diploma / 94

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-4 / 42A10 F5 Human Resources Specialist / 3 years, 9 months, 18 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: None

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: None

f. Awards and Decorations: ARCOM, AGCM, NDSM, GWOTSM, ASR, COA, DMB-DWV

g. Performance Ratings: NA

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:

(1) On 27 October 2014, the applicant enlisted in the Regular Army for 4 years and 24 weeks as a PVT. They last promoted to SPC on 1 August 2016; however, was demoted to PFC on 30 April 2018; they have been awarded an Army Commendation Medal and an Army Good Conduct Medal. On 10 January 2018, they were flagged, Suspend Favorable Personnel Actions (FLAG), for commander's investigation (LA) and

on 23 April 2018, for field-initiated involuntary separation (BA).

(2) On 22 February 2018, the investigating officer provides their findings and recommendation for AR 15-6, which indicates the applicant was responsible for damages caused in a hotel room at the Hyatt Regency, inflicted after a verbal disagreement between [redacted] and the applicant, regarding [redacted] leaving the applicant there to go home.

(a) [Redacted] and the applicant checked in the hotel, had sexual relations, and [redacted] left the hotel in the afternoon to tend to a personal emergency in Alabama. Security footage confirms their leaving before the applicant and by themselves. [Redacted] states they got into a disagreement with the applicant over a text about them leaving the hotel, and the text messages suggest that the applicant vandalized the room (which was under [redacted] name) in retaliation. The texts included messages from the applicant such as “you gone [sic] pay for this that was your room” and “If I see you my n**** Uma [sic] do you worse than I did that cheap a** room.”

(b) The applicant declined to comment. On 18 January 2018, [Redacted] texted the investigating officer the following, “Soldier [sic] sent me a video of [them] performing a sexual act on [themselves], [sic] can someone put a stop to this please before I file a complaint on [them].” [Redacted] believed the applicant was using fake phone numbers to get around having been blocked from their phone. The investigating officer notified the applicant’s command about this incident. Based on both that text and [redacted] frustration on the phone, the officer does not believe that the sexual messages received from the applicant in the weeks after the hotel room was vandalized, were invited, or wanted. Appropriate action under the UCMJ should be considered for bot the alleged sexual harassment and hotel vandalism.

(3) On 7 March 2018, the applicant attempted to drive on-post and was selected for a RAM inspection. During the inspection the Military Police discovered the vehicle’s insurance had expired on 1 March 2018. Subsequently, the applicant was arrested, taken to the MP station, was charged for driving without insurance. They was released to their unit.

(4) On 22 May 2018, the applicant completed their medical assessment and history for their separation. On their assessment, the applicant provides in block 12, they have been seen for pregnancy and wellness checkups. In block 13, they indicated their knee injury, which they had not been seen for.

(a) On their history, block 29 lists the following explanations of “yes” answers:

- 10f: had it when they were 16
- 11a: the spaces in their teeth make their gums hurt extremely
- 11f: they wear both contact s and glasses
- 12d: they get numbness and tingling in their foot often
- 12f: they had corns and bunions before from the Army boots, they were issued
- 12i: they had a knee injury in 2016
- 13g: they have acne
- 13l: they have had chlamydia and have herpes
- 15b: they have frequent headaches and was on medication for it at one point
- 17a: they get panic attacks at time

- 17d: its an issue for them to fall asleep and if they do, they do not stay sleep for long
- 17e: they have received counseling in 2016 or 2017
- 17f: they have excessive worrying
- 18a: yeast infection and bacterial vaginosis
- 20: they cut their finger before and had strep throat
- 21: in September 2017, gave birth at WACH
- 26: N/A

(b) On their history, block 30a lists the examiner's notes:

- 10f: no recurrent episodes of bronchitis
- 11a: SM is under the care of dentist
- 11f: SM wears glasses and contacts and is nearsighted.
- 12d: SM has intermittent right foot numbness and tingling increased at night.
- 12f: SM has a corn on their right 5th toe.
- 12i: SM injured their right knee in basic. SM now has intermittent patellar tendinitis and takes prn Tylenol or prn Motrin.
- 13g: SM has facial acne.
- 13l: Acknowledged.
- 15b: SM has tension headaches and was taking prn Fioricet with good relief. They are not able to take it at this time due to their pregnancy.
- 17a: SM has seen Behavioral Health once and receives counseling. They have intermittent anxiety due to work stress. They denied any SI/HI.
- 17d: SM has difficulty asleep and sleeps about three hours per night. SM has not been seen for it in the past.
- 17e: Acknowledged.
- 17f: Acknowledged.
- 18a: Treated and resolved.
- 20: Acknowledged.
- 21: Acknowledged.
- 26: Acknowledged.

(c) Although missing from the record, on 30 April 2018, the applicant accepted nonjudicial punishment and as a result, was demoted to PFC.

(d) On 22 May 2018, the applicant was seen for their medical examination at the WACH, Fort Stewart, GA and was qualified for service. At the time, the applicant was referred to the doctor for lower back evaluation. The applicant was nine weeks pregnant.

(5) Although undated, the company commander notified the applicant of their intent to initiate separation proceedings under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12c, Misconduct (Serious Offense), for willfully and wrongfully damaged a hotel room, bed, artwork, and mirror, totaling approximately \$5,000.00 and wrongfully committed indecent conduct by sending sexually explicit videos and pictures to [redacted]; they recommended a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service.

(a) On 11 July 2018, the applicant acknowledged receipt of the separation notice, elected not waive their rights to legal consultation, and elected not to submit a

statement on their behalf.

(b) Although undated, the battalion commander concurred with the recommendation to separate the applicant, with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service.

(c) On 25 July 2018, the separation approval authority approved the discharge, with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service.

(6) On 31 July 2018, their separation orders were issued and later amended. A DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) reflects the applicant was discharged accordingly 14 August 2018, with 4 years and 1 day of total service. The applicant has not completed their first full term of service.

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

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

(1) **Applicant provided:** None

(2) **AMHRR Listed:** On 16 May 2018, the applicant was seen by Behavioral Health at Winn Army Community Hospital (WACH), and completed their mental status examination, which indicates the applicant showed no evidence of an impairing behavioral health disorder and they are cleared for advance military training. Their cognition, perceptions, behavior, and impulsivity were all normal, with no elevated risk of harm to themselves or others. There was no diagnoses or any follow ups recommended. Page 2 of 2 is missing from the record.

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: DD Form 293 (Application for the Review of Discharge); DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty); Legal Brief; Standard Form 180 (Request Pertaining to Military Records); Army Commendation Medal Award; Postal Operations Course Diploma; Certificate of Achievement; Character Letter

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: The applicant now works as a contractor at a military base and has gone to a little bit of school that they have paid for out of pocket.

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), dated 25 September 2019, 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) 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) An Under other-than-honorable-conditions discharge is an administrative separation from the Service under conditions other than honorable and it may be issued for misconduct, fraudulent entry, security reasons, or in lieu of trial by court martial based on certain circumstances or patterns of behavior or acts or omissions that constitute a significant departure from the conduct expected of Soldiers in the Army.

(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. 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. 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 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 14-12c, 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:

(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.

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

a. The applicant requests an upgrade to Honorable, a narrative reason change, and a change to both their separation and reenlistment codes. The applicant's Army Military Human Resources Record (AMHRR), the issues, and documents submitted with the application were carefully reviewed.

b. A review of the available evidence provides the applicant enlisted in the RA as a PVT, promoted up to SPC and was awarded an Army Commendation Medal and an Army Good Conduct Medal. They served for 3 years, 2 months, and 13 days prior to their misconduct. They were flagged for commander's investigation for having vandalized a hotel room with damages of about \$5,000 and for wrongfully committed indecent conduct by sending explicit videos and pictures to [redacted]. Although not in the record, the applicant accepted nonjudicial punishment and was demoted to PFC. Flagged for involuntary separation, they were processed for separation IAW AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12C, Misconduct (Serious Offense) and discharged with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service. The applicant elected to waive their right to consultation and elected not to submit a statement on their behalf.

(1) The applicant completed a mental status examination for their separation, which indicates no diagnoses or follow up recommendation, qualifying them for service.

(2) They served 3 years, 9 months, and 18 days of their 4 year, 24 week contractual 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 Department of Defense 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 and found no potentially-mitigating diagnoses/experiences. However, the applicant's assertion of OBH, no specific condition noted, may be sufficient evidence to establish the existence of a condition that could mitigate or excuse the discharge.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The applicant marked OBH, but there is no reference to a specific condition, further discussion, or medical records in support of.

(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 OBH marking is insufficient to make a determination.

(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 did not outweigh the basis of separation.

b. Prior Decisions Cited: None

c. Response to Contention(s):

(1) Through counsel, the applicant contends the underlying basis of their separation was procedurally defective at the time of the discharge and the adverse action, to include the administrative discharge, was unfair at the time. The unit conducted an investigation related to the incident. After the investigation, they made a finding of misconduct. The applicant later received an Article 15 and afterwards, they were told by their first sergeant (1SG) if they wanted to remain in the Army they could, as it was their first time getting in trouble. The applicant told 1SG they did not want to stay in, but they did not understand that this would affect their discharge. The 1SG used this information against the applicant and hastily proceeded to start administrative separation proceedings. This was in retaliation for the applicant not committing to staying in the Army. The Board considered this contention and noted that this action is a procedural step which is part of a normal regulatory process.

(2) The applicant, through counsel contends the General discharge does not serve a further purpose. The events that took place are no longer relevant to the applicant's life and they have lived since in as responsible a manner as they could. There is no valid equitable purpose in leaving the discharge in place. The Board considered this contention, but determined that these factors did not outweigh the applicant's misconduct; willfully and wrongfully damaged a hotel room, bed, artwork,

and mirror, totaling approximately \$5,000.00 and wrongfully committed indecent conduct by sending sexually explicit videos and pictures to [redacted]

(3) Through counsel, the applicant contends they were in a relationship with [redacted] for seven months; [redacted] served prior but had left during that time. After [redacted] got out of the Army, they would find time to meet each other in Atlanta, which was the halfway point between the two places. On one occasion, the applicant went to meet [redacted], and they were staying the weekend in Atlanta but they were arguing, so [redacted] left to go smoke and did not come back. [Redacted] left the applicant without any money or a car, as the applicant's car was in the parking garage. The applicant was angry as they left with their friend and knew the hotel was in their partner's name, so they messed the hotel room up, so [redacted] would have to pay. The police called the applicant once, but the applicant assumed the police left it to the military to charge, as they never heard from them again. The applicant later reconciled with [redacted] and they told the applicant they had paid for the damage, and there was no further investigation.

The Board considered this contention non-persuasive during its deliberations.

(4) The applicant, through counsel contends this discharge is holding the applicant back from pursuing school, as they wish to earn their degree and work as a dental hygienist but is unable to go without their veteran benefits.

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

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) While liberal consideration was applied, there is no mitigation as the marking of OBH is insufficient. 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 (damage). 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.

(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:

5/3/2024

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