

1. Applicant's Name: [REDACTED]

- a. Application Date: 8 April 2021
- b. Date Received: 9 April 2021
- c. Counsel: None

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

a. Applicant's Requests and Issues:

(1) The current characterization of service for the period under review is general (under honorable conditions). The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable.

(2) The applicant seeks relief contending their alcoholism was their way of helping them with their anger towards members of their unit. During their deployment their unit received a mortar attack in which their first sergeant killed. After their deployment their use of alcohol greatly increased. They received extra duty on many occasions because of their alcohol use. They were so tired of their depression, anger, and horrific nightmares; alcohol was the only way they could numb themselves. They never asked for help from anyone because they thought most people hated them. At that time, they really stopped caring about themselves and everyone else was done with them. They served on a deployment and did their part to the best of their abilities, and they deserve an honorable discharge.

b. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 1 November 2024, the majority of board members, in a 3-2 vote, determined that the applicant's discharge was inequitable. This decision was based on the applicant's in-service factors, such as length, quality, and combat service, as well as the mitigating (length, quality, combat) and behavioral health condition (PTSD) mitigated the two alcohol-related offenses and a positive test for marijuana. Therefore, the board voted to recommend relief with issuance of a new DD214, with an upgrade of the characterization of service to Honorable, the separation authority to AR 635-200, paragraph 14-12a, the narrative reason for separation to Misconduct (Minor Infractions). However, the board concluded that the reentry eligibility (RE) code was both proper and equitable, opting not to change it.

3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:

a. Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization: Pattern of Misconduct / Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12b / JKA / RE-3 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

b. Date of Discharge: 24 October 2007

c. Separation Facts:

(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate: 4 September 2007

(2) Basis for Separation: two alcohol related offenses on 8 June 2007 and 9 July 2007; and tested positive for marijuana on 7 August 2007.

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

(4) Legal Consultation Date: 5 September 2007

(5) Administrative Separation Board: NIF

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: 3 October 2007 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

- a. Date / Period of Enlistment:** 17 February 2005 / 3 Years, 25 weeks
- b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score:** 20 / HS Graduate / 100
- c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service:** E-4 / 92F1O, Petroleum Supply Specialist / 2 years, 8 months, 8 days
- d. Prior Service / Characterizations:** None
- e. Overseas Service / Combat Service:** SWA / Afghanistan (11 March 2006 – 10 March 2007)
- f. Awards and Decorations:** ARCOM, NDSM, ACM, GWTSM, ASR, OSR, NATOMDL
- g. Performance Ratings:** NA
- h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:**

(1) A DA Form 4856 (Developmental Counseling Form) dated 3 December 2006 reflects the applicant received event oriented counseling for violation of Article 86 (Absence Without Leave) for failure to be at appointed place of duty. The Key Points of Discussion states on 2 December 2006, [while deployed to Afghanistan] the applicant was awakened at 2330 hours because the generator that supplies power to most of the base camp ran out of fuel. They were supposed to fill the generator at 1930 hours, this is the third time they were late in completing their fueling missions. As a direct result of their incompetence the base camp was without power for at least 30 minutes. This type of behavior will not be tolerated, and the applicant is being recommended to receive nonjudicial punishment under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). The applicant agree with the information and signed the form.

(2) A DA Form 2627 (Record of Proceedings under Article 15, UCMJ) dated 17 December 2006, reflects the applicant received nonjudicial punishment for, in that they knew of their duties at or near Forward Operating Base, on or about 2 December 2006, were derelict in the performance of those duties in that they, by culpable inefficiency, failed to fill the generator which supplies power to the base camp, in violation of Article 92 (Dereliction in Performance of Duties). Their punishment consisted of a reduction in rank/grade from specialist/E-4 to private first class/E-3, forfeiture of \$380.00 pay and extra duty for 14 days. The applicant elected not to appeal.

(3) A DA Form 2627-2 (Record of Supplementary Action under Article 15, UCMJ) dated 29 December 2006 reflects the suspension of the punishment of reduction to the rank private first class/E-3; forfeiture of \$350.00 pay for one month imposed on 21 December 2006 are vacated. The unexecuted portions of the punishment will be duly executed. Vacation is based on the following offense, in that the applicant, while deployed to Afghanistan, on or about 23 December 2006, without authority, failed to go at the time prescribed to their appointed place of duty, to wit: Tower 2 guard tower at 2200 hours, in violation of Article 86 (Absence from Guard or Watch), UCMJ.

(4) A DA Form 4856 dated 5 March 2007 reflects the applicant received event oriented for violation of Article 92 (Failure to Obey Order), in that on 4 March 2007, failed to properly carry their night vision googles as prescribed. The applicant disagreed with the information and signed the form.

(5) A DA Form 2627 dated 20 June 2007, reflects the applicant received nonjudicial punishment for, on or about 8 June 2007, as a result of wrongful previous overindulgence in intoxicating liquor incapacitated for the proper performance of their duties, in violation of Article 134 (Drunkenness – incapacitating oneself for performance of duties through prior indulgence in intoxicating liquor or drugs), UCMJ. Their punishment consisted of a reduction in rank/grade from private first class/E-3 to private two/E-2, forfeiture of \$340.00 pay, and extra duty for 14 days. The applicant elected not to appeal.

(6) A DA Form 2627 dated 17 July 2007, reflects the applicant received nonjudicial punishment for, on or about 9 July 2007, as a result of wrongful previous overindulgence in intoxicating liquor incapacitated for the proper performance of their duties, in violation of Article 134, UMCJ. Their punishment consisted of a reduction in rank/grade from private two/E-2 to private/E-1, forfeiture of \$650.00 pay for 2 months, and extra duty for 45 days. The applicant elected not to appeal.

(7) A DD Form 2808 (Report of Medical Examination) dated 25 July 2007 reflects the applicant is qualified for service and chapter 14-12b (Pattern of Misconduct) separation. The examining physician record no physical limitations and no defects or diagnoses.

(8) A Report of Mental Status Evaluation dated 26 July 2007 reflects the applicant has the mental capacity to understand and participate in the proceedings, was mentally responsible, and meets retention requirement. The applicant has a diagnosis of Alcohol Abuse. The psychologist commented suicidality and or homicidally was denied, and the current potential for absence without leave, harm themselves, or harm others is thought to be minimal.

(9) A memorandum, Charlie Company, 37th Engineer Battalion (Combat) (Airborne), subject: Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, dated 4 September 2007, reflects the applicant's company commander notifying the applicant of initiating action to separate them for A Pattern of Misconduct consisting of two alcohol related offenses on 8 June 2007 and 9 July 2007; and testing positive for marijuana on 7 August 2007. The company commander recommends their service be characterized as general (under honorable conditions). On that same date, the applicant acknowledged receipt of their separation notice and of the rights available to them.

(10) A memorandum, Charlie Company, 37th Engineer Battalion (Combat) (Airborne), subject: Separation under Army Regulation 636-200, Paragraph 14, dated 4 September 2007, reflects the applicant's company commander recommending the applicant be separated from the U.S. Army prior to expiration of their term of service. The company commander states they do not consider it feasible or appropriate to accomplish other disposition as the applicant has demonstrated through repeated conduct, after formal counseling, that other disposition would be inappropriate. The applicant clearly has no potential for useful service under conditions of full mobilization.

(11) On 5 September 2007 the applicant's completed their Election of Rights acknowledged they have been advised by their consulting counsel of the basis for the contemplated action to separate them due to pattern of misconduct, and its effects; of the rights available to them; and of the effects of any action taken by them in waiving their rights. They elected not to submit statement on their own behalf. They understand they may expect to

encounter substantial prejudice in civilian life if a general (under honorable conditions) discharge is issued to them.

(12) A memorandum, Headquarters, 18th Fires Brigade (Airborne), subject: Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, Section III, Paragraph 14-12b, A Pattern of Misconduct, dated 3 October 2007, the separation authority reviewed the separation proceedings pertaining to applicant, directed the applicant be separated from the service and be issued a General (Under Honorable Conditions) discharge.

(13) On 24 October 2007 the applicant was discharged accordingly. Their DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) provides completed 2 years, 8 months, and 8 days of net active service this period. Their DD Form 214 shows in:

- item 18 (Remarks) – MEMBER HAS NOT COMPLETED FIRST FULL TERM OF SERVICE
- item 24 (Character of Service) – General (Under Honorable Conditions)
- item 25 (Separation Authority) – Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12b
- item 26 (Separation Code) – JKA
- item 27 (Reentry Code) – 3
- item 28 (Narrative Reason for Separation) – Pattern of Misconduct

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: None

j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):

(1) Applicant provided: Psychological Evaluation Report dated 29 September 2021 reports a mental health diagnosis of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and Alcohol Use Disorder.

(2) AMHRR Listed: Report of Mental Status Evaluation as described in previous paragraph 4h (8).

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE:

- DD Form 293 (Application for the Review of Discharge from the Armed Forces of the United States), with personal statement
- three 3rd Party Statements
- Counsel Letter, reflecting their assistance to the applicant and not representation

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 [Kurtz 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 Instruction 1332.28.

d. Army Regulation 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations), dated 6 June 2005, 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 1 (General Provisions) sets policies, standards, and procedures to ensure readiness and competency of the force while providing for the orderly administrative separation of Soldiers, it provides in pertinent part:

(a) When a separation is ordered, the approved proceedings will be sent to the commander who has the Soldier's records for separation processing. The original copy of the proceedings will be filed in the permanent part of the Soldiers official personnel record.

(b) Army leaders at all levels must be continually aware of their obligation to provide purpose, direction, and motivation to Soldiers. It is essential that Soldiers who falter, but have the potential to serve honorably and well, be given every opportunity to succeed. Except as otherwise indicated, commanders must make maximum use of counseling and rehabilitation before determining that a Soldier has no potential for further useful service and ensure it occurs prior to initiating separation proceedings for reason to include Minor Disciplinary Infractions (14-12a) or a Pattern of Misconduct (14-12b).

(5) 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. Paragraph 14-12b (Pattern of Misconduct), stated, a pattern of misconduct consisting of one of the following – discreditable involvement with civil or military authorities, or discreditable conduct and conduct prejudicial to good order and discipline including conduct violating the accepted standards of personal conduct found in the UCMJ, Army regulations, the civil law, and time-honored customs and traditions of the Army.

(6) Paragraph 14-3 (Characterization of Service or Description of Separation) prescribed 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.

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

e. Army Regulation 635-5-1 (Separation Program Designator (SPD) Codes) provides the specific authorities (regulatory or directive), reasons for separating Soldiers from active duty, and the SPD codes to be entered on the DD Form 214. It identifies the SPD code of "JKA" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, paragraph 12b, (Pattern of Misconduct).

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 Instructions 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. Manual for Courts-Martial, United States (2019 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 86 (Absence Without Leave), Article 86 (Absence from Guard or Watch), Article 92 (Dereliction in Performance of Duties) and Article 134 (Drunkenness – incapacitating oneself for performance of duties through prior indulgence in intoxicating liquor or drugs).

8. SUMMARY OF FACT(S):

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

b. A review of the available evidence provides the applicant received nonjudicial punishment for multiple instances of misconduct in violations of Article 86, Article 92, and Article 134, UCMJ, and was involuntarily separation for a pattern of misconduct. Their DD Form 214 provides they were discharged with a character of service of General (Under Honorable Conditions) for pattern of misconduct. They completed 2 years, 8 months, and 8 days of net active service this period; however, the applicant did not complete their contractual enlistment obligation of 3 years and 25 weeks.

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. The applicant's AMHRR reflects documentation of a diagnosis of Alcohol Abuse and the applicant provided a Psychological Evaluation Report dated 29 September 2021 reflecting diagnosis of PTSD and Alcohol Use Disorder.

e. 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: PTSD (70%SC).

(2) Did the condition exist, or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor found VA service connection for PTSD establishes nexus with active service.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that the applicant has a mitigating BH condition, PTSD. As PTSD is associated with self-medication with alcohol and illicit drugs, there is a nexus between the diagnosis of PTSD, the applicant's alcohol-related incidents, and positive UA for marijuana.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **Yes.** The board determined the mitigation from service-connected PTSD and the applicant in-service factors outweighed the serious misconducts of two alcohol related offenses and a positive UA for marijuana infraction.

b. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends their alcoholism was their way of helping them with their anger towards members of their unit. The contention was considered and found valid leading to an upgrade in characterization of service and narrative reason.

(2) The applicant contends during their deployment their received a mortar attack in which their first sergeant killed. After their deployment their use of alcohol greatly increased. They were so tired of their depression, anger, and horrific nightmares; alcohol was the only way

they could numb themselves. The board considered this contention during proceedings, but ultimately did not address the contention due to an upgrade being granted based on the applicant's PTSD and in-service factors (length, quality, combat) outweighing the applicant's misconduct (alcohol-related incidents and positive UA for marijuana) the basis for separation.

(3) The applicant contends they never asked for help from anyone because they thought most people hated them. They really stopped caring about themselves and everyone else was done with them. The board considered this contention, and ultimately did not address it due to an upgrade being granted.

(4) The applicant contends they served on a deployment and did their part to the best of their abilities, and they deserve an honorable discharge. The board considered the applicant's good service and ultimately relief was granted for another reason.

c. The board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the in-service factors of (length, quality combat) and PTSD outweighing the applicant's misconduct (alcohol-related incidents and positive UA for marijuana). Therefore, the board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade of the characterization of service to Honorable and changed to the separation authority to AR 635-200, paragraph 14-12a. the narrative reason to misconduct (Minor Infractions), with a corresponding separation code of JKN, with no change to the reentry code.

d. Rationale for Decision:

(1) The board voted to change the applicant's characterization of service because based on the available information it is the opinion of the Agency BH Advisor that the applicant's mitigating BH condition (PTSD) mitigated the alcohol-related offenses and positive UA for marijuana. Also, the applicant's overall in-service factor was sufficiently meritorious to be characterized as Honorable. Thus, the prior characterization is no longer appropriate.

(2) The board voted to change the reason for discharge to Misconduct (Minor Infractions) under the same pretexts, thus the reason for discharge is no longer appropriate. The SPD code associated with the new reason for discharge is JKN.

(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
AR20210010897

10. BOARD ACTION DIRECTED:

- a. Issue a New DD-214: Yes
- b. Change Characterization to: Honorable
- c. Change Reason / SPD code to: Misconduct (Minor Infraction)/JKN.
- d. Change RE Code to: No Change
- e. Change Authority to: AR 635-200 14-12a

Authenticating Official:

6/24/2025

X [REDACTED]

Presiding [REDACTED]

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