

**1. Applicant's Name:**

- a. **Application Date:** 6 May 2021
- b. **Date Received:** 24 May 2021
- c. **Counsel:** Yes

**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 general (under honorable conditions). The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable, change of their separation code, reentry code and a change of their narrative reason for separation.

(2) The applicant, through counsel, seeks relief stating they wish this petition to be reviewed and in the interest of Equity, Fairness, and Justice. The request is based on three errors, the underlying basis of their separation was procedurally defective at the time of the discharge; the adverse action, to include the administrative discharge, was unfair at the time; and the General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization is inequitable now. Their command used a single incident which did not rise to the level of discharge.

(3) There is a procedural defect in this case, consideration should be given to their potential for rehabilitation, and their entire record should be review before acting. They were never offered or provided with rehabilitation and the results of their investigation were never reviewed prior to their discharge. Their Command in this case did not have the proper authority to administratively separate them. Their General (Under Honorable Conditions) discharge does not serve a further purpose. The events that took place are no longer relevant to their life and they have lived since in a responsible manner as they could. There is no valid equitable purpose in leaving the discharge in place.

(4) This request should consider the entirety of their military career is reflected in their service record, medical records, and their affidavit. Reviewing their military record, they gave as much as they could to the U.S. Army. They have sought to fix their life since being involuntary separated. They have received statements from supervisors and friends attesting positively to their character and work ethic since their separation from the U.S. Army. Their compelling affidavit should also be considered.

**b. Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 11 September 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 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

**b. Date of Discharge:** 30 November 2017

**c. Separation Facts:**

**(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** 1 November 2017

**(2) Basis for Separation:** violated lawful orders on divers occasions and made a false official statement.

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

**(4) Legal Consultation Date:** 3 November 2017

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

**(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization:** 17 November 2017 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

#### **4. SERVICE DETAILS:**

**a. Date / Period of Enlistment:** 19 November 2012/ 6 years

**b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score:** 26 / Baccalaureate Degree / 128

**c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service:** E-4 / 68P1O, Radiology Specialist / 5 years, 12 days

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

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

**f. Awards and Decorations:** AAM, AGCM, NDSM, GWTSM, NCOPDR, ASR

**g. Performance Ratings:** NA

**h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:**

**(1)** A DA Form 4856 (Developmental Counseling Form) dated 22 February 2017, reflects the applicant received event oriented counseling from their company commander notifying the applicant of a suspension of favorable personnel actions (Flag) for violations of Article 92 (Violate a Lawful General Order), Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) and Article 107 (False Official Statement), UCMJ. The Key Points reflects this is strictly a notification counseling.

**(2)** A memorandum, William Beaumont Army Medical Center, subject: Army Regulation 15-6 (Procedures for Investigating Officers and Boards of Officers) Investigation, Failure to Obey Lawful Order and False Official Statement, dated 10 March 2017, reflects based on a preponderance of the investigation, the applicant did travel to Juarez Mexico which is in violation of Fort Bliss Policy 09-001 "Signature Authority for Emergency or Family Travel to Restricted Areas in Mexico." The Investigating Officer recommended appropriate punitive action be taken.

**(3)** A memorandum, William Beaumont Army Medical Center, subject: Legal Review Army Regulation 15-6, Report of Investigation, dated 27 March 2017, reflects the Deputy Center Counsel finds there is no legal objection for the approval of the findings and the recommendation should be taken under advisement. Counsel states the preponderance of the

evidence shows the applicant traveled to Juarez Mexico on or about January 2017 in violation of Fort Bliss Policy 09-001. This is evidenced by their Facebook posts that are timed stamped and geographically tagged. Furthermore, the comments on the post are not consistent with the applicant's claim that the pictures were from trips that they took in the past. Lastly, the keycard access log to their room showed a gap of 6 days in which they did not access their room is contrary to a statement made by them that they remained in their barracks on Fort Bliss the entire time of their leave.

**(4)** A DA Form 2627 (Record of Proceedings under Article 15, UCMJ) dated 15 September 2017 reflects the applicant received nonjudicial punishment for, on divers occasions between on or about 2 February 2016 and on or about 17 May 2016 violated a lawful general order by wrongfully traveling in a prohibited Mexican State along the United States – Mexican border, in violation of Article 92, UCMJ; and for, on divers occasions between on or about 17 December 2016 and on or about 3 January 2017, violated a lawful general order by wrongfully traveling in a prohibited Mexican State in Mexico without the Commanding General's approval, in violation of Article 92, UCMJ.

**(a)** The applicant elected to appeal, through counsel, stating, both specifications alleging violations of Article 92, UCMJ failed to state an offense, as they failed to inform the applicant of the locations where they allegedly violated the purported general orders. The specifications failed to state which Mexican state they allegedly travelled in, thus depriving them of sufficient notice such that they could defend themselves against these allegations. The subject orders are not general orders. The imposing commander's findings are unreasonable and a "clear injustice" necessitating the punishment be wholly set aside, as no reasonable person could have found the applicant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt based on either of these specifications. The applicant requests that all punishment be set aside and that all records of this action be destroyed.

**(b)** The applicant's punishment consisted of reduction in rank/grade of special/E-4 to private two/E-2, forfeiture of \$896.00 pay for 2 months, and extra duty and restriction for 45 days.

**(c)** On 25 September 2017, the Reviewing Judge Advocate, considered the appeal and determined the proceedings were conducted in accordance with law and regulation and the punishments imposed were not unjust nor disproportionate to the offense committed. After consideration of all matters presented in the appeal, the Commander, William Beaumont Army Medical Center denied the applicant's appeal.

**(5)** A DA Form 3822 (Report of Mental Status Evaluation) dated 24 October 2017, reflects the applicant has no duty limitations due to behavioral health reasons and currently meets behavioral health medical retention standards. Section IV (Diagnoses) reflects the applicant has behavioral health diagnosis as "Occupational Problem (does not warrant disposition through medical channels). [Note: only page 1 is in evidence for review.]

**(6)** A memorandum, Bravo Company, Troop Command, William Beaumont Army Medical Center, subject: Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12c, Commission of a Serious Offense, [Applicant], dated 1 November 2017, notified the applicant of initiating actions to separate them for Commission of a Serious Offense, for misconduct as described above in paragraph 3c(2). On the same day, the applicant acknowledged receipt of notification for separation and of the rights available to them.

**(7)** On 3 November 2017, the applicant completed their election of rights signing they had been advised by counsel of the basis for the contemplated action to separate them, and its

effects and of the rights available to them. They elected not to submit statements in their behalf and requested consulting counsel. They understood they may expect to encounter substantial prejudicial in civilian life if a general (under honorable conditions) discharge is issued to them and further understood they may be ineligible for many or all benefits as a veteran under both Federal and State laws.

(8) A memorandum, Bravo Company, Troop Command, William Beaumont Army Medical Center, subject: Commander's Report – Proposed Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12c, Commission of a Serious Offense, [Applicant], dated 6 November 2017, the applicant's company commander submitted the request to separate the applicant prior to their expiration term of service. The company commander states they do not consider it feasible or appropriate to accomplish other disposition as the applicant does not understand the wrongdoing of their action. They lied during the investigation because they thought they could get away with it just as they did the six times he went to Juarez Mexico before they were caught.

(9) A memorandum, William Beaumont Army Medical Center, subject: Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12c, Commission of a Serious Offense, [Applicant], dated 17 November 2017, the separation authority, after careful consideration of all matters, directed the applicant be separated from the Army prior to their expiration of current term of service, their service be characterized as General (Under Honorable Conditions). After reviewing the rehabilitative transfer requirements the commander determined the requirements do not apply to this action.

(10) On 30 November 2017, the applicant was discharged accordingly, the DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) provides they completed 5 years and 12 days of net active service this period and did not complete their first full term of service obligation. Their DD Form 214 shows in –

- item 4a (Grade, Rate or Rank) – Private Two
- item 4b (Pay Grade) – E-2
- item 12i (Effective Date of Pay Grade) – 26 July 2017
- item 24 (Character of Service) – General (Under Honorable Conditions)
- item 26 (Separation Code) – JKQ
- 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):** None

#### 5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE:

- two DA Forms 293 (Application for the Review of Discharge from the Armed Forces of the United States)
- DD Form 214
- Counsel's Legal Brief in Support of Discharge Upgrade
- Narrative Summarized Transcript
- three 3rd Party Character Statements
- six Military Award Certificates

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.

**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 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.

h. Manual for Courts-Martial, United States (2016 Edition) stated, 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 following Article 92 (Violate a Lawful General Order) and Article 107 (False Official Statement).

**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 AMHRR reflects they received nonjudicial punishment for willfully disobeying a lawful order on two occasions by wrongfully traveling in a prohibited Mexican State. The DD Form 214 provides the applicant was discharged with a character of service of General (Under Honorable Conditions), for misconduct, (serious offense). They completed 5 years and 12 days of net active service this period; however, they did not complete their 6-year contractual enlistment 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 diagnoses/experiences: Mild TBI; Chronic Adjustment DO (CAD-30% service connected (SC)).

(2) Did the condition exist, or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor found mTBI was diagnosed in service. VA service connection of 30% for CAD establishes nexus with military service.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **No.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that there are no mitigating BH conditions. While the applicant was diagnosed with Concussion and Adjustment DO with mixed anxiety and depressed mood while on active duty and with Chronic Adjustment DO by the VA, none of these conditions mitigates his offense of going to Mexico multiple times, beginning in 2013, in violation of orders prohibiting travel to Mexico without out command approval as none of these conditions affects one's ability to distinguish right from wrong and act in accordance with the right.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **N/A.**

b. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends their request is based on three errors, the underlying basis of their separation was procedurally defective at the time of the discharge; the adverse action, to include the administrative discharge, was unfair at the time; and the General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization is inequitable now. Their command used a single incident which did not rise to the level of discharge. The Board considered this contention and determined the applicant's discharge is proper and equitable. The applicant violated a General order by travelling to Juarez Mexico on or about January 2017 in violation of Fort Bliss Policy 09-001. The applicant also made false official statements stating the applicant was in the barracks the whole time of the authorized leave. The file shows the applicant was in Mexico during leave and not in the barracks. No upgrade is warranted at this time.

(2) The applicant contends consideration should be given to their potential for rehabilitation, and their entire record should be review before acting. They were never offered or provided with rehabilitation and the results of their investigation were never reviewed prior to their discharge. The Board considered this contention and determined AR 635-200, 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. The applicant's file shows two incidents of travelling to restricted areas for which nonjudicial punishment was received, and subsequent to traveling to restricted areas the applicant made false official statements in order to not get caught traveling in the restricted areas. The separation authority was within the regulation to determine rehabilitation efforts were impractical or unlikely to succeed.

(3) The applicant contents their Command in this case did not have the proper authority to administratively separate them. The Board considered this contention and determined the separation authority acted in accordance with the regulation to determine rehabilitation efforts



were impractical or unlikely to succeed. AR 635-200, 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. The applicant was properly and equitably discharged.

(4) The applicant contends their General (Under Honorable Conditions) discharge does not serve a further purpose. The events that took place are no longer relevant to their life and they have lived since in a responsible manner as they could. There is no valid equitable purpose in leaving the discharge in place. The Board considered this contention and determined that on 3 November 2017, the applicant completed their election of rights signing they had been advised by counsel of the basis for the contemplated action to separate them, and its effects and of the rights available to them. They understood they may expect to encounter substantial prejudicial in civilian life if a general (under honorable conditions) discharge is issued to them and further understood they may be ineligible for many or all benefits as a veteran under both Federal and State laws. The Board voted and determined the totality of the applicant's record does not warrant a discharge upgrade, 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.

(5) The applicant contends the Board should consider that the entirety of their military career is reflected in their service record, medical records, and their affidavit. Reviewing their military record, they gave as much as they could to the U.S. Army. The Board considered the applicant's 5 years of service and the numerous awards received by the applicant but determined that these factors did not outweigh the applicant's violations of a lawful order on diverse occasions and made a false official statement.

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 before the Board, the applicant's mild TBI and chronic Adjustment Disorder did not excuse or mitigate the offenses of violating lawful orders on divers occasions and made a false official statement. The Board also considered the applicant's contention regarding a procedurally defective basis for separation and found that 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, 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.

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

**AR20210009613**

**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:**

9/13/2024

**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