

1. Applicant's Name:

- a. **Application Date:** 21 October 2020
- b. **Date Received:** 05 November 2020
- c. **Counsel:** None

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

a. **Applicant's Requests and Issues:** The current characterization of service for period under review is General (Under Honorable Conditions). The applicant requests an upgrade to Honorable.

b. The applicant seeks relief contending, they were found not guilty but still discharged for what they were found not guilty for.

c. **Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 10 May 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-3 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

b. **Date of Discharge:** 27 December 2019

c. **Separation Facts:**

(1) **Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** 3 August 2019

(2) **Basis for Separation:** threw their spouse into a wall and violated a general regulation, by wrongfully having their spouse cohabitating with them in the barracks

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

(4) **Legal Consultation Date:** 13 August 2019

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

(6) **Separation Decision Date / Characterization:** 26 November 2019 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. **Date / Period of Enlistment:** 23 February 2016 / 5 years

b. **Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score:** 19 / High School Diploma / 105

c. **Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service:** E-4 / 12N1P Horizontal Construction / 3 years, 10 months, 5 days

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

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: None

f. Awards and Decorations: NDSM, GWOTSM, ASR, PB

g. Performance Ratings: NA

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:

(1) On 23 February 2016, the applicant enlisted in the Regular Army for 5 years as a PVT. The Enlisted Record Brief provides they promoted up to SPC (23 February 2018). On 19 July 2019, they were flagged, Suspend Favorable Personnel Actions (FLAG), for field-initiated involuntary separation (BA).

(2) On 16 July 2019, the applicant completed their medical history for their separation physical, at Womack Army Medical Center (WAMC), Fort Bragg, NC, provides the following:

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

- 12a: [They] have a recurrent pain in their lower back that bothers [them]
- 12d: When a lot of weight is on it, it has the numbness and tingling
- 12h: When [they] walk or stand for too long, their right knee swells up
- 12i: It still has the locking and popping affect it had before surgery
- 12j: Arthroscopy surgery on right knee
- 12k: Knee brace for stability
- 12c: [They] have memory loss after one jump they had but did not get seen for it
- 17c: Smacked [their] head on jump
- 17d: [Their spouse] told [them they] stopped breathing during [their] sleep a lot and [they] been having trouble since then
- 20: For knee surgery
- 21: Womack Hospital April 26, 2019, knee surgery
- 22: Arthroscopy surgery for right knee

(b) On their history, block 30a provides the examiner’s notes:

- Medications: See attached D Form 2766.
- Allergies: NKDA
- Surgeries: Right knee arthroscopic surgery (illegible) April 2019; wisdom teeth
- Hospitalizations: for above
- Fractures/dislocations: None
- Concussions: Abn Opns x2 – 2018
- Chronic conditions: See attached DD Form 2766.

(c) The applicant was seen for their medical examination and determined to be qualified for service, with the provider referencing the above information and recommending the applicant to follow up with their primary care manager (PCM) and Veterans Affairs (VA).

(3) On 3 August 2019, 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 having thrown their spouse into a wall on 6 June 2019 and for having violated a general regulation by wrongfully having their spouse cohabitating with them in the barracks. They recommended a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of

service.

(4) On 6 August 2019, the applicant accepted nonjudicial punishment for violating a lawful general regulation by wrongfully having their spouse cohabitating with them in the barracks, in violation of article 92, UCMJ. They did not appeal. The punishment imposed consisted of reduction to PFC, suspended, to be automatically remitted if not vacated on or before 2 February 2020; forfeiture of \$1,116.00 pay per month for two months, suspended, to be automatically remitted if not vacated on or before 2 February 2020; extra duty for 30 days; restriction to the limits of company area, dining/medical facility, and place of worship for 15 days.

(5) On 13 August 2019, the applicant acknowledged receipt of their separation notice, elected to consult with defense counsel, and elected to submit a self-statement on their behalf. Defense counsel acknowledged their having consulted the applicant on their separation, the rights available to them, and the effects of a General (Under Honorable Conditions).

(6) On 14 August 2019, the Family Advocacy Program (FAP) Incident Determination Committee (IDC) identified the applicant as the offender and the incident "Met Criteria" for physical assault. The severity level was moderate and the FAP Clinical (FAP-C) recommended command concurrence for the following treatment:

(a) Individual counseling for the applicant (start date: within 30 days, length of treatment to be determined (TBD) by provider based on progress) – Goal: Increase positive coping skills

(b) Substance Use Disorder Clinical Care (SUDCC) evaluation/treatment for the applicant (start date: TBD, length of treatment TBD by SUDCC) – Goal: Evaluate/stop substance abuse

(c) Evaluation for Treatment for the spouse (start date: TBD, length of treatment TBD by provider) – Goal: Evaluation/stop substance abuse – the spouse did not respond to FAP attempts to contact them

(d) County Department of Human Services (DHS) Involvement (start: 10 June 2019, TBD by County DHS) Goal: Monitor safety of the children – closed 5 July 2019

(e) Command to counsel the applicant on IDC Treatment Recommendations (start date: 14 August 2019) Goal: Engage the applicant in treatment, support the Case Review Committee (CRC) treatment plan

(7) On 26 August 2019, the paralegal specialist provides the applicant did not submit a statement as elected. The same day, the battalion commander concurred with the recommendation to separate the applicant, with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service.

(a) On 17 September 2019, the Parachute Infantry Regiment commander provided their recommendation to approve the applicant's administrative separation for misconduct rather than their discharge through medical disability channels. The applicant assaulted their spouse, which is a serious misconduct and warrants a separation, with a characterization of service that reflects their actions. The applicant chose to grab their spouse by the neck, cut off their airflow, and slam them into three different surfaces. This occurred while they had their spouse illegally living in the barracks with them and after the spouse confronted them about their adultery. Seven days before the IDES evaluation, physical therapy noted "questionable compliance" but

expected "return to duty with limitations." Five days before, orthopedics said to "follow-up in three months for reassessment. Anticipate full recovery at this time." Yet the IDES provider began the MEB because the applicant reported pain and did "not feel [they are] capable of performing [their]...duties." The MEB mentioned Tendonitis (which is not a disqualifying condition) but disqualified them per a reference to "miscellaneous conditions and defects." The applicant's subjective claim of service limiting knee pain lacks objective evidence or support from a specialist. Finally, the medical evaluation board considered the applicant's lengthy history of profiles, but not their poor compliance with rehabilitation, as noted by both their medical records and their company commander. The Soldier could and should have recovered from their injury. Instead, [they] failed to comply with their medical plan for recovery. They now seek to avoid the consequences of their misconduct by claiming injuries-unsubstantiated conditions-that would only have resulted from their own lack of effort.

(b) On 20 September 2019, the brigade commander concurred with the recommendation to separate the applicant, with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service.

(c) Medical Evaluation Board Proceedings, dated 16 October 2019, provides the board diagnosed their right knee Tendonitis/Tendinosis status post their arthroscopic surgical procedure, with residual chronic pain, did not meet retention standards and did not exist prior to service; the board recommended for the applicant to be referred to a Physical Evaluation Board. At the time, they had been on a temporary profile for this condition for 404 days. The onset of their diagnosis begin on 21 June 2018, when they presented to the clinic after having fell into a fox hole approximately five feet deep and twisted their knee, upon an airborne operation landing.

(d) On 23 October 2019, Health Service Support-Physical Evaluation Board Liaison Officer (HSS-PEBLO), IDES, provides a copy of the applicant's Medical Evaluation Board (MEB) findings, providing since the applicant has a pending chapter action, which may result in an Other than Honorable discharge, the case should be referred to the General Court-Martial Convening Authority (GCMA) for determining if the applicant is administratively separated or referred through the disability system. If referred through the disability system in lieu of administrative separation, the entire package should be returned, along with the GCMA's decision to the HSS PEBLO.

(e) On 26 November 2019, the separation approval authority approved the discharge, with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service. Their FLAGS (BA, AA) were removed.

(8) On 12 December 2019, their amended separation orders were issued. A DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) reflects the applicant was discharge accordingly on 27 December 2019, with 3 years, 11 months, and 21 days 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 19 July 2019, the applicant completed a mental status evaluation at Robinson Embedded Behavioral Health (EBH), Fort Bragg, NC, which provides the applicant was diagnosed with Alcohol Use Disorder (severe). Further comments states the

applicant does not currently have a behavioral health (BH) condition that causes [them] to fail medical retention standards IAW AR 40-501. The medical record does not contain substantial evidence that [the applicant] currently meets criteria for a condition requiring referral to the Integrated Disability Evaluation System (IDES) but has not yet received a diagnosis. [The applicant] is cleared for administrative action from a behavioral health perspective.

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: DD Form 293 (Application for the Review of Discharge)

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

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

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

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

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

(2) Conditions documented in the service record that can reasonably be determined to have existed at the time of discharge will be considered to have existed at the time of discharge. In cases in which a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment

may be reasonably determined to have existed at the time of discharge, those conditions will be considered potential mitigating factors in the misconduct that caused the characterization of service in question. All Boards will exercise caution in weighing evidence of mitigation in cases in which serious misconduct precipitated a discharge with a less than Honorable characterization of service. Potentially mitigating evidence of the existence of undiagnosed combat related PTSD, PTSD-related conditions due to TBI or sexual assault/harassment as causative factors in the misconduct resulting in discharge will be carefully weighed against the severity of the misconduct. PTSD is not a likely cause of premeditated misconduct. Caution shall be exercised in weighing evidence of mitigation in all cases of misconduct by carefully considering the likely causal relationship of symptoms to the misconduct.

c. Army Regulation 15-180 (Army Discharge Review Board), 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.

g. 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.

(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.

(2) 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.

(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.

h. Manual for Courts-Martial (2019 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.

(1) Article 92 (violation of or failure to obey other lawful order) states in the subparagraph, the maximum punishment consists of a bad conduct discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for six months.

(2) Article 128 (assault consummated by a battery upon a spouse) states in the subparagraph, the maximum punishment consists of dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for five years.

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) A review of the available evidence provides the applicant enlisted in the RA as a PVT, promoted up to SPC, and served 3 years, 4 months, and 26 days without indiscipline. The applicant was flagged for field-initiated separation. The applicant accepted nonjudicial punishment in violation of a lawful general regulation, by wrongfully having their spouse living with them in the barracks. They were processed for separation IAW AR 635-200 for the above and for throwing their spouse into a wall. The FAP IDC determined the physical assault "Met Criteria" for partner abuse and provided recommendations to the command for counseling and treatment for both the spouse and the applicant.

(2) The applicant completed a mental status evaluation providing the applicant was diagnosed with Alcohol Use Disorder (severe); they also completed their medical examination which the provider recommended the applicant follow up with their PCM and the VA; they were otherwise qualified for service. MEB recommended the applicant's case be sent to IDES and IDES's recommendation was to send the case to the General Court Martial Authority to determine whether the applicant should be administratively separated for misconduct or referred through the disability system. Their chain of command all recommended the administrative separation over the MEB. The separation authority approved the applicant's discharge with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service.

(3) They served 3 years, 10 months, and 5 days of their 5 year contractual obligation.

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 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: The applicant was the offender of IPV. Post-service, the applicant was initially service connected for Adjustment Disorder but recently changed to PTSD. While the applicant was service connected for TBI based on subjective symptoms, the VA has had a neuropsychological evaluation completed since the last C&P which determined he did not have a current TBI or residuals of asserted concussions/mTBI.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The applicant was the offender of IPV. Post-service, he was initially service connected for Adjustment Disorder but recently changed to PTSD. While he was service connected for TBI based on subjective symptoms, the VA has had a neuropsychological evaluation completed since the last C&P which determined he did not have a current TBI or residuals of asserted concussions/mTBI.

(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 applicant admitted to his role in the IPV and could clearly lay out the events which occurred over time and with awareness of what he was doing and why. This does not align with a trauma reaction or cognitive impairment.

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

b. Response to Contention(s): The applicant seeks relief contending, they were found not guilty but still discharged for what they were found not guilty for.

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 PTSD and TBI did not outweigh the medically unmitigated offenses of assault. 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 of abuse. 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.

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:

12/9/2024

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 –
Noncommissione
d 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