

**1. Applicant's Name:** [REDACTED]**a. Application Date:** 5 May 2021**b. Date Received:** 10 May 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 a medical discharge.

(2) The applicant seeks relief contending, they are 100-percent disabled by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) for suicidal depression and severe bipolar schizophrenia. Their condition is what caused their behavioral health problems and they have over 1,000 pages of VA medical mental health records on file currently. They are currently staying in a VA treatment facility. They served honorably before their mental health breakdown.

**b. Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 22 January 2025, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the circumstances surrounding the discharge (psychosis and mania, Schizoaffective Disorder, Schizophrenia, and PTSD). Accordingly, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade of the characterization of service to honorable and changed the separation authority to AR 635-200, Chapter 15, and the narrative reason for separation to Secretarial Authority, with a corresponding separation code to JFF. The Board determined the reentry code is proper and equitable and voted not to change it.

**3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:**

**a. Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization:** Unsatisfactory Performance / Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 13 (Separation for Unsatisfactory Performance) / JHJ / RE-3 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

**b. Date of Discharge:** 1 December 2017**c. Separation Facts:**

(1) **Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** 29 November 2017

(2) **Basis for Separation:** The applicant was informed of the following reasons:

- failed to develop sufficiently to participate satisfactorily in further training and to become a satisfactory Soldier
- on 21 September 2017, recycled in the 25U10 (Signal Support System Specialist) course due to excessive absences
- on 12 September 2017, removed from class due to disruptive behavior
- on 18 October 2017, dismissed from the 25U10 course for failure to maintain academic standards
- on 27 October 2017, physically assaulted Private (PVT) M\_\_\_\_ T\_\_\_\_ by pushing them into a wall when they failed to turn down their music

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

**AR20210013102**

- on 1 November 2017, threatened to kill Staff Sergeant (SSG) B\_\_\_\_ D\_\_\_\_ after they gave instructions to get ready for bed check
- on 7 November 2017, failed to follow a lawful order given by Sergeant First Class (SFC) C\_\_\_\_ D\_\_\_\_, when they told you to get back into Physical Fitness Training formation
- on 7 November 2017, disrespected First Sergeant A\_\_\_\_ H\_\_\_\_ and communicated a threat to fight them
- on 18 November 2017, disrespected SFC A\_\_\_\_ A\_\_\_\_, an amputee, by stating "you need to leave me the f\_\_\_\_ alone, or I will break your other leg," when they made an on the spot correction
- on 18 November 2017, Fort Gordon Military Police were forced to taser them when they became combative during their arrest

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

**(4) Legal Consultation Date:** 30 November 2017

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

**(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization:** 30 November 2017 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

**4. SERVICE DETAILS:**

- a. **Date / Period of Enlistment:** 2 May 2017 / 4 years
- b. **Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score:** 18 / HS Graduate / 108
- c. **Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service:** E-2 / NA / 7 months
- d. **Prior Service / Characterizations:** None
- e. **Overseas Service / Combat Service:** None
- f. **Awards and Decorations:** NDSM
- g. **Performance Ratings:** NA
- h. **Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:**

**(1)** A memorandum, U.S. Army Signal School, subject: Student Academic Deficiencies Decision Request, dated 21 September 2017, reflect the Assistant Commandant directed the applicant will be recycled and continue the Military Occupational Specialty (MOS) training in the 25U1O Course.

**(2)** A memorandum, U.S. Army Signal School, subject: Student Academic Deficiencies Decision Request, dated 18 October 2017, reflect the Assistant Commandant directed the applicant is dismissed from the 25U1O Course for failure to maintain academic standards.

**(3)** A DA Form 4856 (Developmental Counseling Form) dated 31 October 2017, reflects the applicant received event-oriented counseling notifying the applicant of a no contact order. The Key Points of Discussion reflects due to an ongoing investigation into an incident between

the applicant and Private T \_\_\_\_ on 27 October 2017, the applicant was issued a No Contact Order.

(4) A memorandum, Office of the Provost Marshal, Fort Gordon, GA, subject: Law Enforcement Report, dated 9 November 2017, reflects the applicant as the named subject in violation of Article 128 (Assault), Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), and Article 134 (Communicating a Threat), UCMJ; with a date of occurrence of 27 October 2017. The Report Summary states, on 27 October 2017, investigation revealed that the applicant and PVT T \_\_\_\_ were involved in a verbal altercation, which turned physical when the applicant grabbed PVT T \_\_\_\_ by both arms pinning them on the wall and threatening to kill them. The applicant was apprehended and transported to the Law Enforcement Center where it was attempted to advise them of their legal rights; however, they refused to comply with instructions, or acknowledge any of the attempts to advise. Due to their agitated state and issues brought up by the unit, they were transported by the unit to the Army Medical Center where there were admitted to the Behavioral Health unit for evaluation.

(5) A DA Form 4856 dated 17 November 2017, reflects the applicant received counseling informing them that they are being considered for separation from the Army under Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 13 (Failure to Adapt).

(6) A DD Form 2807-1 (Report of Medical History) dated 21 November 2017, the applicant marked "No" to all items to the question "Have you ever had or do you now have." In item 30 (Examiner's Summary and Elaboration on all Pertinent Data) the examiner commented the applicant had no chronic conditions, was on no medications, and was hospitalized for behavioral health in November 2017.

(7) A DD form 2808 (Report of Medical Examination) dated 21 November 2017, reflects that examiner marked "Normal" to all items examined. The examiner marked the applicant is qualified for service, Chapter 14 and has no physical profile restrictions. In item 77 (Summary of Defects and Diagnoses) the examiner commented "Patterns of Misconduct."

(8) A memorandum, Office of the Provost Marshal, Fort Gordon, GA, subject: Law Enforcement Report, dated 25 November 2017, reflects the applicant as the named subject in violation of Article 134 (Communicating a Threat), UCMJ, with date of occurrence of 24 November 2017. The Report Summary states, on 24 November 2017, investigation revealed the applicant and SSG D \_\_\_\_ were involved in a verbal altercation, when SSG D \_\_\_\_ stated the applicant was threatening to kill them. The applicant was apprehended and transported to the Law Enforcement Center where they were advised of their legal rights with they waived verbally denying the offense.

(9) A memorandum, Office of the Provost Marshal, Fort Gordon, GA, subject: Law Enforcement Report, undated, reflects the applicant as the named subject in violation of Article 92 (Failure to Obey General Order), UCMJ; Article 95 (Resisting Apprehension – Military), UCMJ; Article 128 (Assault on a Law Enforcement Officer), UCMJ; and Article 134 (Communicating a Threat), UCMJ; with a date of occurrence of 18 November 2017. The Report Summary states on 18 November 2017, SFC A \_\_\_\_ positively identified the applicant who assaulted them. The Military Police attempted to take the applicant into custody, but the applicant refused to comply with instructions. They cursed and used racial epithets towards the officers. The applicant resisted and a taser was used to deployed to bring them into compliance. They were advised of their legal rights, which they waived and denied all offenses.

(10) A DA Form 3822 (Report of Mental Status Evaluation), dated 28 November 2017, reflects the applicant shows no evidence of an impairing behavioral health disorder, is cleared

for advance military training, has no duty limitations due to behavioral health reasons, currently meets medical retention standards, and is cleared for administrative action. Section IV (Diagnoses) reflects "Encounter for other military examinations, Other problems related to employment." Section V (Follow-Up Recommendations) reflects the applicant already has a follow up scheduled with Community Behavioral Health Services. [Note: only page 1 is in evidence for review.]

**(11)** A memorandum, Alpha Company, 369th Signal Battalion, 15th Signal Brigade, subject: Separate Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 13, Unsatisfactory Performance, [Applicant], dated 29 November 2017, the applicant's company commander notified the applicant that under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, chapter 13, they are initiating action to separate them for Unsatisfactory Performance. The reason for the proposed action is described above in paragraph 3c(2). The company commander recommended the applicant's service be characterized as General (Under Honorable Conditions). On that same day, the applicant acknowledged the basis for the separation and of the right available to them.

**(12)** On 30 November 2017, the applicant completed their election of rights signing they had been advised by counsel of the basis for their separation and its effects and of the rights available to them. They understood they many expect to encounter substantial prejudice in civilian life if a general (under honorable conditions) discharge is issued to them. They further understood that as the result of issuance of a discharge that is less than honorable, they may be ineligible for many or all benefits as a veteran under both Federal and State laws They elected to waive consulting counsel and elected to submit statements in their behalf. In their statement they apologized for their previous actions and stated certain situations they were stressed out and others, their temper got the best of them. They should have thought about the consequences of their decisions but they were careless.

**(13)** A memorandum, Alpha Company, 369th Signal Battalion, 15th Signal Brigade, subject: Commander's Report – Proposed Separate Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 13, Unsatisfactory Performance, [Applicant], dated 30 November 2017, the applicant's company commander submitted a request to separate them prior to their expiration term of service. The company commander states they do not consider it feasible or appropriate to accomplish other disposition as the applicant show a general disrespect for authority and fails to comply with military regulations and the Army Values. The applicant has been given ample opportunity to comply within Army standards and is unwilling or unable to meet them. The separation is in the best interest of both the Army and the applicant.

**(14)** A memorandum, Headquarters, 369th Signal Battalion, 15th Signal Brigade, subject: Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 13, Unsatisfactory Performance [Applicant], dated 1 December 2017, the separation authority, having reviewed the separation packet of the applicant, directed the applicant be separated from the Army prior to the expiration of current term of service and their service be characterized as general (under honorable conditions). The separation authority directed the requirement for a rehabilitative transfer be waived.

**(15)** A DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty), for the period ending 1 December 2017, shows in:

- item 12c (Net Active Service This Period) – 7 months
- item 18 (Remarks) – in part, 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, Chapter 13
- item 26 (Separation Code) – JHJ [Unsatisfactory Performance]

- item 27 (Reentry Code) – 3
- item 28 (Narrative Reason for Separation) – Unsatisfactory Performance

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

j. **Behavioral Health Condition(s):**

(1) **Applicant provided:**

- VA General Discharge Summary dated 30 September 2020, reflecting primary discharge diagnoses of schizoaffective disorder, depressed, cannabis use disorder, homelessness and history of antisocial personality disorder
- VA Rating Decision reflecting service connection for schizoaffective disorder, bipolar type (also claimed as acquired psychiatric disorder, to include psychosis and mental disorder) granted with an evaluation of 100-percent effective 17 July 2019

(2) **AMHRR Listed:** DA Form 3822 (Report of Mental Status Evaluation) as described above in paragraph 4h(10).

**5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE:**

- DD Form 293 (Application for the Review of Discharge from the Armed Forces of the United States), with statement
- VA General Discharge Summary
- VA Rating Decision, page 1

**6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS:** None submitted with the application.

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

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

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

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

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

c. Army Regulation 15-180 (Army Discharge Review Board) sets forth the policies and procedures under which the Army Discharge Review Board is authorized to review the character, reason, and authority of any Servicemember discharged from active military service within 15 years of the Servicemember's date of discharge. Additionally, it prescribes actions and composition of the Army Discharge Review Board under Public Law 95-126; Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1553; and DoD Directive 1332.41 and Instruction 1332.28.

d. Army Regulation 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations), dated 19 December 2016, set policies, standards, and procedures to ensure the readiness and competency of the force while providing for the orderly administrative separation of Soldiers for a variety of reasons. Readiness is promoted by maintaining high standards of conduct and performance.

(1) An Honorable discharge is a separation with honor and is appropriate when the quality of the Soldier's service generally has met the standards of acceptable conduct and performance of duty for Army personnel or is otherwise so meritorious that any other characterization would be clearly inappropriate.

(2) A General discharge is a separation from the Army under honorable conditions and is issued to a Soldier whose military record is satisfactory but not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge.

**(3)** A Under Other Than Honorable Conditions Discharge is an administrative separation from the Service under conditions other than honorable. It may be issued for misconduct, fraudulent entry, security reasons, or in lieu of trial by court-martial.

**(4)** Chapter 13 (Separation for Unsatisfactory Performance) contains the policy and outlines the procedures for separating individuals for unsatisfactory performance, and provides, in pertinent part, commanders will separate a member under this Chapter when, in the commander's judgment, the member will not develop sufficiently to participate satisfactorily in further training and/or become a satisfactory Soldier. The service of Soldiers separated because of unsatisfactory performance will be characterized as honorable or general (under honorable conditions) as warranted by their military records.

**(5)** 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 "JHJ" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 13, separation for unsatisfactory performance.

**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 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** Title 38, U.S. Code, Sections 1110 and 1131, permits the VA to award compensation for a medical condition which was incurred in or aggravated by active military service. The VA, however, is not required by law to determine medical unfitness for further military service. The VA, in accordance with its own policies and regulations, awards compensation solely on the basis that a medical condition exists and that said medical condition reduces or impairs the social or industrial adaptability of the individual concerned. Consequently, due to the two

concepts involved, an individual's medical condition, although not considered medically unfitting for military service at the time of processing for separation, discharge, or retirement, may be sufficient to qualify the individual for VA benefits based on an evaluation by the agency.

#### **8. SUMMARY OF FACT(S):**

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

b. The applicant's AMHRR reflects they were recycled for their MOS training, were dismissed from their MOS training for failure to maintain academic standards, and they were the named subject in three Law Enforcement Reports in violation of Article 92 (Failure to Obey General Order, Article 95 (Resisting Apprehension – Military), two violations of Article 128 (Assault), and three violation of Article 134 (Communicating a Threat). The applicant's DD Form 214 indicates their discharge under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, chapter 13, separation for unsatisfactory performance, with a characterization of service of general (under honorable conditions). The applicant completed 7 months of net active service; however, the applicant did not complete their first full term of service obligation of 4 years.

c. Chapter 13 contains the policy and outlines the procedures for separating individuals for unsatisfactory performance, and provides, in pertinent part, commanders will separate a member under this Chapter when, in the commander's judgment, the member will not develop sufficiently to participate satisfactory in further training and/or become a satisfactory Soldier. The service of Soldiers separated because of unsatisfactory performance will be characterized as honorable or general (under honorable conditions) as warranted by their military records.

d. The applicant's Army Military Human Resource Record provides documentation of a mental health diagnosis of "Encounter for other military examinations; Other problems related to employment." The applicant provided VA documentation of diagnosis of schizoaffective disorder, depressed, cannabis use disorder, homelessness and history of antisocial personality disorder and a VA Rating Decision reflecting service connection for schizoaffective disorder, bipolar type (also claimed as acquired psychiatric disorder, to include psychosis and mental disorder) granted with an evaluation of 100-percent effective 17 July 2019.

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: Adjustment Disorder with Mixed Disturbance of Emotions and Conduct, documented and objective testing affirmed psychosis and mania, Schizoaffective Disorder, Schizophrenia, and PTSD.



(2) Did the condition exist, or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** Adjustment Disorder with Mixed Disturbance of Emotions and Conduct, but documented and objective testing affirmed psychosis and mania supporting active Schizoaffective Disorder/Schizophrenia while serving.

(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 had a serious mental illness in-service with documented symptoms and objective evidence overlooked by behavioral health but diagnosed and service connected shortly after discharge. Given the symptoms associated with psychosis and mania, it is more likely than not his misconduct was secondary to a serious mental health condition. While this advisor acknowledges some of the misconduct is serious, documentation supports active psychosis which more likely than not underlies even those more serious behaviors.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **Yes.** After applying liberal consideration to the evidence, including the Board Medical Advisor's opine, the Board determined that the applicant's condition outweighed the basis for separation for the aforementioned reason(s).

b. Prior Decisions Cited: None

c. Response to Contentions:

(1) The applicant contends they are 100-percent disabled by the VA for suicidal depression and severe bipolar schizophrenia. Their condition is what caused their behavioral health problems and they have over 1,000 pages of VA medical mental health records on file currently.

The Board determined that this contention was valid and voted to upgrade the characterization of service due to PTSD mitigating the applicant's AWOL charges.

(2) The applicant contends they are currently staying in a VA treatment facility. The Board acknowledged this contention during proceedings.

(3) The applicant contends they served honorably before their mental health breakdown. The Board acknowledged this contention during proceedings.

d. The Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the circumstances surrounding the discharge (psychosis and mania, Schizoaffective Disorder, Schizophrenia, and PTSD). Accordingly, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade of the characterization of service to honorable and changed the separation authority to AR 635-200, Chapter 15, and the narrative reason for separation to Secretarial Authority, with a corresponding separation code to JFF. The Board determined the reentry code is proper and equitable and voted not to change it.

e. Rationale for Decision:

(1) The Board voted to change the applicant's characterization of service to Honorable based on a serious mental illness, active psychosis and mania and the egregious mismanagement of the serious health condition. The panel members voted not to change the RE-3 based on the medical diagnoses.

(2) The Board voted to change the applicant's reason for discharge to Secretarial Authority with accompanying SPD code of JFF.

(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:** Yes
- b. **Change Characterization to:** Honorable
- c. **Change Reason / SPD Code to:** Secretarial Authority / JFF
- d. **Change RE Code to:** No change
- e. **Change Authority to:** AR 635-200

**Authenticating Official:**

1/24/2025

