

1. Applicant's Name:

- a. **Application Date:** 14 January 2021
- b. **Date Received:** 14 January 2021
- 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 first joined the Baumholder Dental Clinic in May 2013 and was at a rapid pace from PVT (E-1) to SPC (E-4), occasionally in team leader positions. They received many awards from Certificates of Appreciations (COAs) to an Army Achievement Medal (AAM), German proficiency badges, hazmat drivers, training, small arms maintenance, combatives, and more. The applicant continued to self-progress over time as they were becoming more acclimated, since their first duty station. They have and will always continue to capitalize on every opportunity that is presented to them, while motivating others to do the same. As a young private, the applicant recognized they did have a few minimal issues adapting to the Army lifestyle, but then shortly after the applicant realized they were dedicated, motivated, and committed to being someone grander for themselves, their family, and the Army. They have held themselves to that standard ever since.

(1) Since this incident began, the applicant has realized that their image as a leader and their character as a person has been tainted and their career was jeopardized, then ultimately destroyed. As a young private in November 2013, the applicant married someone who they considered the person of their dreams. The relationship was steady at first, then rocky due to the applicant being in Germany and the spouse having remained in Texas for personal goals. When the couple realized their marriage was becoming harder to sustain everyday after the previous one. After a while, from all of the tension their marriage was causing for each other, the couple decided to file for divorce and made an oral agreement to see other people, due to being in separate locations.

(2) In October 2014, the applicant had orders to go to Fort Hood and the couple decided to meet with one another occasionally to find out if a divorce was necessary before a decision was finalized. They both had "casually" met with other people, but nothing serious because of the impending divorce. One of the main reasons why the divorce was not finalized was due to the applicant having been stationed in Germany, while the spouse was in Texas, which caused scheduling complications to handle the matter promptly. After some time had passed at Fort Hood, the spouse asked if they could come stay with them to see if the couple's relationship could flourish from there. The applicant was reluctant to agree based on "character flaws" the spouse had displayed in the past (not to say that we all do not have flaws), due to the spouse not always having the applicant's interest in mind when the spouse acts with negative intent. The applicant agreed anyway.

(3) Unfortunately, the relationship did not work out how it was supposed to and they separated. After the spouse returned to Texas, the spouse wanted to come back to Fort Hood with the same proposal as before (wanting to make things better). This time, the applicant said no because the relationship had become too toxic and they did not think the spouse could see it. The applicant had a career to focus on and so did the spouse. It was difficult to make that

decision, but the applicant knew it had to be done. After they had denied the spouse's "request" to come back a second time to Fort Hood, the spouse told the applicant personally that they were going to get the applicant "kicked out of the Army." The applicant was frightened because they knew the spouse was capable of doing such things but the applicant was in denial because they felt as being a reasonable person trying to make the relationship work, the spouse could understand their perspective of the situation also.

(4) The spouse did exactly what they had expressed. Never in the applicant's wildest thoughts, could they have imagined the detriment this person could have caused to their career from a single act. From what was relayed to the applicant from their command team, the spouse emailed the post commander of Fort Hood and stated the applicant had basically "put [the spouse] and the kids out on the street and was not providing assistance for them," when majority of what their kids had, was coming out of their leave, and earning statement (LES). The applicant could not believe that the spouse would fabricate such a story, as in the summer of 2015, after returning from work, the spouse and children were gone. Once the applicant was finally able to contact the spouse, the spouse told the applicant they had returned back to Texas.

(5) The applicant knew afterwards, the spouse had one motive after they left, which was to end the applicant's career in the military. After their chain of command was notified of the email, they immediately started a Chapter 14 packet for them to be separated from the military. They were dumbfounded for why so much effort was being put into having them separated from an email that was not even determined if it was true or not "beyond a reasonable doubt." At the same time, the applicant was being told to pay the spouse \$85.00 when the applicant was barely making \$1,400.00 as an E-4 living on base with a meal allowance being taken out of their check. After the applicant told the command they were wary of this demand, as they could not afford that much to be taken out of their check. Their command team told the applicant, they "could survive off noodles."

(6) They were such in a state of shock and disparity, the applicant was begging to be retained as a Soldier because the situation did not seem fair, as far as them receiving the maximum punitive measure that could be imposed from one e-mail no one cared to seek clarification from the military. They were suffering from the effects one email could have, to a post commander, and no one cared if it was true or not. There were people who saw it was wrong, however, the applicant stopped being naïve, thinking someone was going to stop them from being separated.

(7) Although the applicant has not compared their situations to others, as every situation is tailored to the individuals in the situation. The applicant knows the punishment of every case is set by the precedence of a similar case in the past. They witnessed an SPC (E-4), forge their spouse's signature on documents in favor of a divorce and that Soldier's punishment was only a reduction of one rank and 14 days of extra duty. Further, they witnessed multiple officers get caught up in extramarital affairs, only to be relocated to a nearby post.

(8) On 22 March 2015, they received their DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty), with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service. The applicant was confused as their paperwork said they were in receipt of an "Honorable Discharge" up until the day they were to leave. The applicant asked why their characterization was changed because it was wrong; Mr. S. (GS-7 then) from the out-processing center, informed the applicant that SFC P. provided the office a subsequent separation package, stating their was a mistake on the previously submitted documents. This happened one day before the applicant was prepared to get on a plane and fly back to their home of residence.

c. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 23 August 2024, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board denied the request upon finding the separation was both proper and equitable.

Please see Section 9 of this document for more detail regarding the Board's decision.

(Board member names available upon request)

3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:

a. Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization: Misconduct (Serious Offense) / AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12C / JKA / RE-3 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

b. Date of Discharge: 22 March 2016

c. Separation Facts:

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

(2) Basis for Separation: NIF

(3) Recommended Characterization: NIF

(4) Legal Consultation Date: NIF

(5) Administrative Separation Board: NA

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: Undated / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 26 March 2012 / 6 years

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 20 / High School Diploma / 96

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-4 (SPC) / 68E10 Dental Specialist / 3 years, 9 months, 27 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: None

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: 2 years; Germany / None (27 August 2012 – 26 August 2014)

f. Awards and Decorations: AAM, AGCM, NDSM, GWOTSM, ASR, OSR

g. Performance Ratings: NA

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:

(1) On 26 March 2012, the applicant enlisted in the Regular Army (RA) for six years as a PVT (E-1). The Enlisted Record Brief provides they last promoted on 1 October 2013, to SPC (E-4). The applicant received an Army Achievement Medal for their service in Germany from 27

August 2012 – 26 August 2014.

(2) On 29 October 2015, the investigating officer provided two memorandums for record, indicating their attempts to contact the individual as pertaining to the investigation. The applicant was not willing to give out contact information or any details regarding this person. However, G-1 was able to provide information on the individual's current unit and duty station. Four numbers were called at various times on different days, in an attempt to contact the individual, the commander, 1SG, and Operations noncommissioned officer (NCO), to no avail.

(3) The same day, an attempt was made to reach another individual by telephone in order to discuss with them the email that was sent to COL M. regarding their spouse, the applicant. The spouse did not answer and a voicemail was left stating the caller identification, the reason for the call, and return contact information. The phone call was not returned. Another attempt was made to contact the spouse, in which they answered, but then hung up immediately after being informed of the reason for the phone call. No further contact was attempted in lieu of the fact that it was deemed the spouse did not want to be a part of the investigation.

(4) On 10 November 2015, they were flagged, Suspend Favorable Personnel Actions (FLAG), for field-initiated involuntary separation (BA).

(5) Notwithstanding the missing separation documents, although undated, the separation approval authority approved the discharge, with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service.

(6) On 15 March 2016, their separation orders were issued. A DD Form 214 reflects the applicant was discharged accordingly on 22 March 2016, with 4 years, 5 months, and 2 days of total service. The applicant provided their electronic signature and 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:** None

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: Application for the Review of Discharge; Two Application for Correction of Military Records; Self-Authored Statement

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 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations), set policies, standards, and procedures to ensure the readiness and competency of the force while providing for the orderly administrative separation of Soldiers for a variety of reasons. Readiness is promoted by maintaining high standards of conduct and performance.

(1) 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 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.

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

a. The applicant requests an upgrade to Honorable. A review of the records provides there was an administrative irregularity in the proper retention of official military records, specifically, a charge sheet and or investigation report(s), the majority of the separation package, and their medical/mental separation examinations. Based on this, the specific facts and circumstances surrounding their separation, are unknown.

b. The available evidence provides the applicant enlisted in the RA, promoted to SPC, and served for 2 years, 9 months, and 14 days prior to the misconduct which led to their discharge. The applicant specifies they were separated for "adultery." Two memorandums for record, from the commander's investigation, indicated the individual from the alleged affair and the spouse (at the time), were contacted on multiple occasions to discuss the details pertaining to the investigation, however, both were not responsive. Notwithstanding the missing records, the separation authority approved separation under the provision of AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12C, Misconduct (Serious Offense), with a General (Under Honorable Conditions).

(1) There is no evidence of a medical examination and/or mental status evaluation in their record, which is required under this chapter of separation.

(2) They served 3 year, 11 months, and 27 days of their 6 year contractual obligation.

c. Chapter 14 establishes policy and prescribes procedures for separation members for misconduct. Specific categories include minor disciplinary infractions, a pattern of misconduct, commission of a serious offense and convictions by civil authorities. Action will be taken to separate a member for misconduct when it is clearly established that rehabilitation is impracticable or is unlikely to succeed. A discharge under other than honorable conditions is normally appropriate for a Soldier discharged under this chapter. However, the separation authority may direct a general discharge if such is merited by the Soldier's overall record.

d. Published Department of Defense guidance indicates that the guidance is not intended to interfere or impede on the Board's statutory independence. The Board will determine the relative weight of the action that led to the discharge and whether it supports relief or not. In reaching its determination, the Board shall consider the applicant's petition, available records and/or submitted documents in support of the petition.

9. BOARD DISCUSSION AND DETERMINATION:

a. As directed by the 2017 memo signed by A.M. Kurta, the board considered the following factors:

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor, a voting member, reviewed the applicant's DOD and VA health records, applicant's statement, and/or civilian provider documentation and found that the applicant has the following potentially-mitigating diagnoses/experiences: Major Depressive Disorder (MDD-70%SC).

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor found VA service connection establishes condition began during military service.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **No.** The Board's Medical Advisor opined that if the basis for separation involved sexual misconduct or adultery, this type of misconduct would not be mitigated by the applicant's MDD diagnosis.

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

b. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends adultery, as a military offense, is difficult to prosecute (legally) for several reasons, in which there was no proof of 1) "That the accused wrongfully had sexual intercourse with a certain person"; 2) "That, at the time, the accused or the other person was married to someone else"; 3) "That, under the circumstances, the conduct of the accused was to the prejudice of good order and discipline in the armed forces or was of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces." The applicant is responsible for satisfying the burden of proof and providing documents or other evidence sufficient to support the applicant's contentions that the discharge was improper or inequitable. In light of the current evidence of record, the Board determined the applicant's discharge was appropriate. The applicant did not provide information to disprove allegations of an inappropriate relationship. The applicant provided in his statement that he made an oral agreement with his spouse to see other people outside of their marriage due to being in separate locations. The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence that he did not engage in an inappropriate relationship in Germany.

(2) The applicant is contending, it is difficult to fathom how any of the previous provisions apply to their situation if they were supposed to be punished for alleged "adultery" because of an e-mail sent to the post commander. The reason the applicant knows they were wrongfully punished is because during their counseling, the applicant was not provided a copy of the email. The only basis of authentication the applicant was referred to was, the "supposed" email was in quotations in the counseling; but when the applicant asked them to provide them an authentic copy of the email that was sent to the post commander with a timestamp of the email address it was sent from, no one wanted to understand why the applicant was asking for it, because it was quoted in their counseling documentation. The Board considered this contention but found insufficient evidence that the command acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner other than the applicant's contention. There is insufficient evidence to support the applicant's contention. Therefore, a discharge upgrade is not warranted.

(3) They contend, regardless of the "quoted remarks" in the counseling document is accurate or not, enclosed with this packet is a Memorandum For Record, which clearly states there were multiple failed attempts to contact the alleged mistress for any confirmation. If they

were to be hassled for information for their separation, the applicant knew there were ways to contact the involved parties as well. The main reason why the applicant did not provide any contact information is because if their ex-spouse “allegedly” sent an email to the post commander, the applicant saw no reason why they were unable to contact the ex-spouse through email. The applicant was fearful of giving out any information that could be potentially used against them based on “new information,” and the investigating authorities could not even provide the applicant an authentic copy of the email sent. Furthermore, during the investigation, their Enlisted Record Brief stated that the applicant was a single Soldier with dependents, but the investigation authority did not seem to care to seek clarification of how the applicant was being punished for adultery when their status was listed as “single.” The Board considered this contention during deliberations and found the applicant failed to provide documents or other evidence to support the applicant’s contention that the discharge was improper or inequitable.

(4) The applicant contends, they were found guilty of having committed adultery due to one allegation from an email they were not afforded the chance to view. They were separated from the Army based on their ex-spouse’s scorn, when the couple had previously agreed to see other people because the marriage was not working out, a divorce was filed, and needed to be finalized. The Board considered this contention but found insufficient evidence that the command acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner other than the applicant’s contention. There is insufficient evidence to support the applicant’s contention. Therefore, a discharge upgrade is not warranted.

(5) The applicant contends, they had no records of any past “patterns of misconduct” and request their DD Form 214 accurately reflects the character of their service and not the intent of biased repercussions. The board considered this contention during deliberations, but found the applicant failed to provide documents or other evidence to support they did not engage in an inappropriate relationship and adultery.

b. 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 contentions that the discharge was improper or inequitable.

c. 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 MDD diagnosis does not affect one’s ability to tell right from wrong and act in accordance with the right. Any sexually based misconduct is not part of the natural history or sequelae of MDD, therefore there is no medical mitigation for the misconduct of inappropriate relationship and adultery. Additionally, the applicant is responsible for satisfying the burden of proof and providing documents or other evidence sufficient to support the applicant’s contentions. The applicant provided in his statement that he made an oral agreement with his spouse to see other people outside of their marriage due to being in separate locations, and the applicant did not provide sufficient evidence to the two Investigating Officers to disprove he engaged in an inappropriate relationship and adultery in Germany. The Board determined 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 (Under Honorable Conditions) discharge was proper and equitable as the applicant’s misconduct fell below that level of meritorious service warranted for an upgrade to Honorable discharge.

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20210011538

(2) The Board voted not to change the applicant's reason for discharge or accompanying SPD code under the same rationale, 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.

9. 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:

9/12/2024

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