

**1. Applicant's Name:** [REDACTED]

**a. Application Date:** 12 January 2021

**b. Date Received:** 10 February 2021

**c. Counsel:** None

**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 Honorable.

**b. Applicant's Contention(s)/Issue(s):** The applicant seeks relief contending, the US Army failed to recognize the applicant's suicidal tendencies, anxiety, and depression cause by their spouse having had an affair with their senior noncommissioned officer (NCO) and the financial burdens unfairly placed on the applicant which caused a nervous breakdown and their involuntary discharge.

**c. Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 18 June 2025, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board denied the request upon finding the separation was both proper and equitable. Please see the Board Discussion and Determination section 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-4 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

**b. Date of Discharge:** 30 May 2018

**c. Separation Facts:**

**(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** 2 May 2018

**(2) Basis for Separation:** On 27 December 2017 and 11 March 2018, the applicant committed assault consummated by battery towards their spouse.

**(3) Recommended Characterization:** 2 May 2018

**(4) Legal Consultation Date:** 7 May 2018

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

**(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization:** 11 May 2018 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

**4. SERVICE DETAILS:**

**a. Date / Period of Enlistment:** 23 February 2015 / 3 years, 22 weeks

**b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score:** 20 / High School Diploma / 88

**c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service:** E-4 / 92R1P Parachute Rigger / 3 years, 4 months, and 1 day

**d. Prior Service / Characterizations:** None

**e. Overseas Service / Combat Service:** None

**f. Awards and Decorations:** AGCM, NDSM, GWOTSM, ASR, PB, PRB

**g. Performance Ratings:** NA

**h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:** An informal AR 15-6 Investigation Findings and Recommendations memorandum, dated 6 March 2018, provides the investigating officer (IO) was appointed to determine the facts and circumstances surrounding the incident on 27 December 2017, involving the applicant and their spouse to determine if the applicant assaulted their spouse. It was determined the applicant forcibly took their phone away from their spouse. The following delays occurred throughout the interview process which were approved by the appointing authority: (1) The spouse failed to show on all three interviews in which they agreed to attend; (2) An administrative error occurred with the Police Department report which made it severely difficult to locate the incident report; and (3) The Police Department's open record division's failed to advise of their legal inability to provide pictures from a police report filed under family violence. After carefully considering the evidence, the IO found the following: (1) The applicant admitted to slamming the spouse against a wall, holding them down, and slapping the spouse in their sworn statement; (2) The spouse's parent (SFC) provided two pictures of the spouse following the incident; and (3) The police report provided the applicant initiated the incident by forcibly taking the spouse's phone away from them and the spouse had abrasions on the left side of their face. In view of the above findings, the IO recommended the applicant receive a Field grade Article 15 in violation of Article 128, UCMJ (assault).

**(1)** A Criminal Investigation Division (CID) Final Report, dated 16 March 2018, provides the spouse's parent reported a domestic assault to Military Police (MP). Upon arrival MPs made contact with the spouse, who stated the applicant arrived at the residence and engaged in a verbal argument over a cell phone. The altercation became physical when the applicant grabbed the spouse by the arm, pulled them outside, and took the phone from their back pocket. The applicant left in their vehicle, which was later found in a parking lot with an expired registration. The applicant was apprehended, searched, and transported to the station, when they waived their rights and provided a written sworn statement admitting to the offense. They were processed and released to their unit. No injuries were reported, and no further investigation was needed. The record includes five sworn statements from MPs, the parent, the spouse, and the applicant. The applicant stated that the spouse attacked them while trying to retrieve their phone, leading to the assault.

**(2)** On 13 March 2018, they were flagged (Suspend Favorable Personnel Actions (FLAG)) for field-initiated involuntary separation (BA). On 20 March, the applicant received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for being found drunk while on duty as a Parachute Packer which is in violation of Article 112, UCMJ (drunk on duty). Their punishment consisted of a reduction to PFC (E-3); forfeiture of \$1,088.00 pay per month for two months; \$1,088.00 pay for one month, suspended, to be automatically remitted if not vacated on or before 16 September 2018; extra duty for 45 days; and restriction for 45 days, suspended, to be automatically remitted if not vacated on or before 16 September 2018.

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

**j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):** The following documents have been provided to the ARBA Medical Advisor, if applicable. See “**Board Discussion and Determination**” for Medical Advisor Details.

**(1) Applicant provided:** None

**(2) AMHRR Listed:** The applicant completed their separation examinations between 21 March – 10 April 2018 and although the mental status evaluation refers to their AHLTA medical records, the applicant was already scheduled and enrolled in the Substance Use Disorder Clinical Care (SUDCC) and found to be psychiatrically cleared for administrative proceedings.

**5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE:** Application for Correction of Military Record

**6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS:** None was provided with this application.

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

**a.** Office, Secretary of Defense memorandum (Supplemental Guidance to Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records Considering Discharge Upgrade Requests by Veterans Claiming Post Traumatic Stress Disorder), 3 September 2014, directed the Service Discharge Review Boards (DRBs) and Service Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records (BCM/NRs) to carefully consider the revised PTSD criteria, detailed medical considerations and mitigating factors when taking action on applications from former service members administratively discharged UOTHC and who have been diagnosed with PTSD by a competent mental health professional representing a civilian healthcare provider in order to determine if it would be appropriate to upgrade the characterization of the applicant's service.

**b.** Office, Under Secretary of Defense memorandum (Clarifying Guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records Considering Requests by Veterans for Modification of their Discharge Due to Mental Health Conditions, Sexual Assault, or Sexual Harassment), 25 August 2017 issued clarifying guidance for the Secretary of Defense Directive to DRBs and BCM/NRs when considering requests by Veterans for modification of their discharges due in whole or in part to mental health conditions, including PTSD; Traumatic Brain Injury; sexual assault; or sexual harassment. Boards are to give liberal consideration to Veterans petitioning for discharge relief when the application for relief is based in whole or in part to those conditions or experiences. The guidance further describes evidence sources and criteria and requires Boards to consider the conditions or experiences presented in evidence as potential mitigation for misconduct that led to the discharge.

**c.** Office, Under Secretary of Defense memorandum (Guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records Regarding Equity, Injustice, or Clemency Determinations), 25 July 2018 issued guidance to Military DRBs and BCM/NRs regarding equity, injustice, or clemency determinations. Clemency generally refers to relief specifically granted from a criminal sentence. However, the guidance applies to more than clemency from a sentencing in a court-martial; it also applies to other corrections, including changes in a discharge, which may be warranted based on equity or relief from injustice.

**(1)** This guidance does not mandate relief but rather provides standards and principles to guide Boards in application of their equitable relief authority. In determining whether to grant relief on the basis of equity, injustice, or clemency grounds, DRBs shall consider the prospect for rehabilitation, external evidence, sworn testimony, policy changes, relative severity of misconduct, mental and behavioral health conditions, official governmental acknowledgement that a relevant error or injustice was committed, and uniformity of punishment.

**(2)** Changes to the narrative reason for discharge and/or an upgraded character of service granted solely on equity, injustice, or clemency grounds normally should not result in separation pay, retroactive promotions, and payment of past medical expenses or similar benefits that might have been received if the original discharge had been for the revised reason or had the upgraded service characterization.

**d.** 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.

**e.** Army Regulation 600-85 (Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP)) provided a comprehensive alcohol and drug abuse prevention and control policies, procedures, and responsibilities for Soldiers for ASAP services. The ASAP is a command program that emphasizes readiness and personal responsibility. The ultimate decision regarding separation or retention of abusers is the responsibility of the Soldier's chain of command. Abuse of alcohol or the use of illicit drugs by military personnel is inconsistent with Army values and the standards of performance, discipline, and readiness necessary to accomplish the Army's mission. All Soldiers who are identified as drug abusers, without exception, will be referred to the ASAP counseling center for screening; be considered for disciplinary action under the UCMJ, as appropriate; and be processed for administrative separation in accordance with Army Regulation 635-200.

**(1)** Unit commanders must intervene early and refer all Soldiers suspected or identified as alcohol and/or drug abusers to the ASAP. The unit commander should recommend enrollment based on the Soldier's potential for continued military service in terms of professional skills, behavior, and potential for advancement. ASAP participation is mandatory for all Soldiers who are command referred. Failure to attend a mandatory counseling session may constitute a violation of Article 86 (Absence Without Leave) of the UCMJ.

**(2)** Alcohol and/or other drug abusers, and in some cases dependent alcohol users, may be enrolled in the ASAP when such enrollment is clinically recommended. Soldiers who fail to participate adequately in, or to respond successfully to, rehabilitation will be processed for administrative separation and not be provided another opportunity for rehabilitation except under the most extraordinary circumstances, as determined by the Clinical Director in

consultation with the unit commander.

**(3)** Alcohol and/or other drug abusers, and in some cases dependent alcohol users, may be enrolled in the ASAP when such enrollment is clinically recommended. Soldiers who fail to participate adequately in, or to respond successfully to, rehabilitation will be processed for administrative separation and not be provided another opportunity for rehabilitation except under the most extraordinary circumstances, as determined by the Clinical Director in consultation with the unit commander.

**(4)** All Soldiers who are identified as drug abusers, without exception, will be referred to the ASAP counseling center for screening; be considered for disciplinary action under the UCMJ, as appropriate; and be processed for administrative separation in accordance with Army Regulation 635-200.

**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 waivable and nonwaivable 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 waivable. Eligibility: Ineligible unless a waiver is granted.

**(3)** RE-4 Applies to: Person separated from last period of service with a nonwaivable 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.** Army Regulation 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations), 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)** Chapter 3, Section II provides the authorized types of characterization of service or description of separation.

**(a)** 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.

**(b)** 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.

**(c)** 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.

(2) 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.

(3) 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.

h. 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).

i. Manual for Courts-Martial (2016 Edition), United States, 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 orders and discipline in the Armed Forces. Article 128 (assault, consummated by battery) states in the subparagraph, the maximum punishment consists of a bad conduct discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for six months.

**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. The applicant's Army Military Human Resources Record (AMHRR), the issues, and documents submitted with the application were carefully reviewed.

(1) The available evidence provides they enlisted in the RA and promoted up to SPC. Near the end of the applicant's service contract, an AR 15-6 investigation (6 March 2018) found by the applicant's own admission of having assaulted their spouse, in which NJP was recommended (Article 128, UCMJ, assault). Days later, MPs responded to another domestic incident where the applicant took their spouse's phone during an argument and left but was later found and apprehended with an expired vehicle registration and admitted to the offense. On 20

March, they received NJP for being drunk on duty (Article 112, UCMJ) and was demoted to PFC. They were discharged under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12C, for misconduct (serious offense) with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service. They were given the opportunity to consult with legal and elected to provide a statement on their behalf.

**(2)** The applicant completed their separation examinations between 21 March – 10 April 2018 and although the mental status evaluation refers to their AHLTA medical records, the applicant was already scheduled and enrolled in the SUDCC and found to be psychiatrically cleared for administrative proceedings.

**b.** 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.

**c.** 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 a 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 diagnoses/experiences: Adjustment Disorders, MDD, and suspected Personality Disorder. Perpetrator for last IPV event and bi-directional on other occasions.

**(2)** Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** Adjustment Disorders, MDD, and suspected Personality Disorder. Perpetrator for last IPV event and bi-directional on other occasions.

**(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 diagnosed conditions do not trigger IPV. Rather, the undiagnosed, but present, Personality Disorder underlie his maladaptive response to relational events. Although a Personality Disorder provides context, it is not mitigating. However, the Board could still consider some of the IPV events were noted to be bi-directional in determining relief.

**(4)** Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **No.** After applying liberal consideration to the evidence, including the Board Medical Advisor's opine, the Board determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's conditions outweighed the medically unmitigated list offenses.

**ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE**  
**AR20210008824**

**b. Prior Decisions Cited: None**

**c. Response to Contention(s): None**

**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 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 domestic abuse. The MA opined that the diagnosed conditions do not trigger IPV. 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:**

7/2/2025



**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

**ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE**  
**AR20210008824**

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