

**1. Applicant's Name:** [REDACTED]

- a. **Application Date:** 21 June 2021
- b. **Date Received:** 12 July 2021
- c. **Counsel:** NA

**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 they felt their punishment altogether with their actions and for what they take full responsibility for was unfair. Their unit neglected the fact that although they were an excellent performer, their depression had taken a toll on them which ultimately caused them to lose their career. They started to resort to alcohol to ease their mind and combat the negative images that were taking them over. Within a six-month period they lost two friends to suicide which they still blame themselves for to this day for not being able to see the signs. On 15 April 2016 there were pulled over by a civilian police officer and charged with driving under the influence and convicted of negligent driving. They take full responsibility for their actions and as a result they were separated from the U.S. Army with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) character of service.

(3) Since leaving the military they were determined to overcome all their obstacles. They were able to secure a job as a Correctional Officer and have just bought a house last year. Separating from the military was the biggest failure and they have learned from it. Due to their character of service they do not qualify for military education benefits like the GI Bill. They want to use the GI Bill to further themselves and their education to prove their success as a prior Soldier and a successful veteran.

**b. Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 15 August 2025, and by a 5-0 vote. The Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the applicant's in-service factors. The applicant possesses length and quality of service, to include post-service accomplishments, that outweigh the applicant's one-time driving while intoxicated basis for separation. Therefore, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade to the characterization of service to Honorable and directed the issue of a new DD Form 214 changing the separation authority to AR 635-200, paragraph 14-12a, the narrative reason for separation to Misconduct (Minor Infractions), and the separation code to JKN. The Board determined the RE Code was proper and equitable and voted not to change it.

**3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:**

**a. Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization:** Misconduct (Serious Offense) / Army Regulations 635-200, Paragraph 14-12C / JKQ / RE-3 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

**b. Date of Discharge:** 9 December 2016

**c. Separation Facts:**

(1) **Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** 2 November 2016

**(2) Basis for Separation:** on 15 April 2016, wrongfully operated a motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol with a blood alcohol content of 0.152.

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

**(4) Legal Consultation Date:** 7 November 2016

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

**(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization:** 18 November 2016 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

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

**a. Date / Period of Reenlistment:** 18 August 2014 / 3 years, 19 weeks

**b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score:** 24/ HS Graduate / 97

**c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service:** E-4 / 88M10, Motor Transport Operator / 2 years, 3 months, 22 days

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

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

**f. Awards and Decorations:** AAM-2, NDSM, ASR

**g. Performance Ratings:** NA

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

**(1)** A DA Form 2627 (Record of Proceedings under Article 15, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)) dated 23 September 2015 reflects the applicant received nonjudicial punishment, in that, at or near Joint Base Lewis-McChord, WA, on or about 5 August 2015, drunk and disorderly such conduct being prejudicial to good order and discipline in the Armed Forces, in violation of Article 134 (Drunk and disorderly), UCMJ. Their punishment consisted of extra duty for seven days. They elected not to appeal.

**(2)** A DA Form 4856 (Developmental Counseling Form) dated 15 April 2016 reflects the applicant received event oriented counsel from their platoon sergeant for failure to report and driving under the influence. The Key Points of Discussion states the platoon sergeant was notified at 0315 hours that the applicant had been arrested for speeding over 80 miles per hour and driving under the influence. They also failed to report to accountability formation that day. The applicant's charges stated driving under the influence with a blood alcohol content of 0.159-percent. Due to these actions the applicant will be Command Referred into the Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP). The platoon sergeant is recommending UCMJ action, a general officer memorandum of reprimand (GOMOR), and be separated from the service.

**(3)** A memorandum, Headquarters, 7th Infantry Division, subject: GOMOR, dated 10 May 2016, reflects the applicant was reprimanded in writing for driving while under the influence of alcohol. The commanding general states, on 15 April 2016, civilian police officer pulled them over for speeding. The officer suspected the applicant of being under the influence

of alcohol and arrested them. Their breath alcohol content was 0.152, nearly double the legal limit. These actions are not in keeping with the Army Values.

(4) A DA Form 2627 (Record of Proceedings under Article 15, UCMJ) dated 29 June 2016 reflects the applicant received nonjudicial punishment, in that, at or near Joint Base Lewis-McChord, WA, on or about 15 April 2016, without authority, failed to go at the time prescribed to their appointed place of duty, to wit: 0630 formation, in violation of Article 86 (Failure to go, going from place of duty), UCMJ. Their punishment consisted of a reduction in rank/grade from specialist/E-4 to private first class/E-3 and extra duty for 14 days. They elected not to appeal.

(5) A DA Form 3822 (Report of Mental Status Evaluation) dated 10 August 2016, reflects the applicant is fit for full duty, including deployment. Section V (Diagnoses) reflects no Axis I (Psychiatric Conditions) diagnoses. The Clinical Psychologist states the applicant screened negative for symptoms of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and Traumatic Brain Injury (TB). From a behavioral health perspective, the applicant meets the medical fitness standards for retention as there is no indication of a boardable health disorder at this time.

(6) A memorandum, Alpha Company, 296th Brigade Support Battalion, 1st Stryker Brigade Combat Team, 2nd Infantry Division, subject: Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12c, Commission of a Serious Offense, [Applicant], dated 2 November 2016, the applicant's company commander notified the applicant of their intent to separate them under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, paragraph 14-12c, for Commission of a Serious Offense, as described above in paragraph 3c(2). The company commander recommended the applicant's characterization of service as General (Under Honorable Conditions). On the same day, the applicant acknowledged the basis for the separation and of the right available to them.

(7) On 7 November 2016, the applicant completed their Election of Rights Regarding Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12c, Commission of a Serious Offense, acknowledging they have been advised by their consulting counsel of the basis for the contemplated action to separate them for Commission of a Serious Offense, and its effects; of the rights available to them, and of the effect of any action taken by them in waiving their rights. They elected to submit statements in their behalf. [Note: statements in the applicant's behalf are not in evidence in their AMHRR for review.] They requested consulting counsel. They understood they may expect to encounter substantial prejudice in civilian life if a General discharge under honorable conditions is issued to them. They further understand 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.

(8) A memorandum, Alpha Company, 296th Brigade Support Battalion, 1st Stryker Brigade Combat Team, 2nd Infantry Division, subject: Commander's Report – Proposed Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12c, Commission of a Serious Offense, [Applicant], dated 15 November 2016, 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 has not demonstrated sufficient desire to overcome their shortcomings and be a quality member of the unit. Continued presence in the unit will reduce morale, readiness, and effectiveness.

(9) A memorandum, Headquarters, 296th Brigade Support Battalion, 1st Stryker Brigade Combat Team, 2nd Infantry Division, subject: Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12c, Commission of a Serious Offense, [Applicant], dated 16 November 2016, the applicant's battalion commander recommended the applicant be separate prior to their expiration term of service. They recommended the applicant's service be characterized as

General (Under Honorable Conditions). The commander states the applicant has failed to live up to the standards within this battalion and no longer require their service.

(10) A memorandum, Headquarters, 1st Stryker Brigade Combat Team, 2nd Infantry Division, 7th Infantry Division, subject: Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12c, Commission of a Serious Offense, dated 18 November 2016, the separation authority reviewed the separation packet of the applicant. After careful consideration of all matters, they directed the applicant be separated from the Army prior to the expiration of their current term of service and directed their service be characterized as General (Under Honorable Conditions). The separation authority states the rehabilitative transfer requirements do not apply to this action.

(11) A DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) reflects the applicant was discharged on 9 December 2016, with 2 years, 3 months, and 22 days of net active service this period. The DD Form 214 shows in:

- item 24 (Character of Service) – General (Under Honorable Conditions)
- item 26 (Separation Code) – JKQ
- item 27 (Reentry Code) – 3
- item 28 (Narrative Reason for Separation) – Misconduct, (Serious Offense)

**i. Lost Time / Mode of Return:** NA

**j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):** None

**5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE:**

- DD Form 293 (Application for the Review of Discharge from the Armed Forces of the United States), with letter
- DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Records under the Provisions of Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1552)
- Excerpts of their AMHRR
- six 3rd Party Statements [Note: these were not in evidence in their Case Files for Approved Separations in their AMHRR]

**6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS:** None submitted with 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 VA determinations that document a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment potentially contributed to the circumstances resulting in a less than honorable discharge characterization. Special consideration will also be given in cases where a civilian provider confers diagnoses of a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment if the case records contain narratives supporting symptomatology at the time of service or when any other evidence which may reasonably indicate that a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment existed at the time of discharge might have mitigated the misconduct that caused a discharge of lesser characterization.

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

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

**d.** Army Regulation 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations) effective 6 September 2011, 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. It prescribes the policies, procedures, and the general provisions governing the separation of Soldiers before expiration term of service or fulfillment of active duty obligation to meet the needs of the Army and its Soldiers.

(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) Paragraph 1-16 (Counseling and Rehabilitative Requirements) stated 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. The rehabilitative transfer requirements in chapter 14 (Separation for Misconduct) may be waived by the separation authority in circumstances where common sense and sound judgment indicate that such transfer will serve no useful purpose or produce a quality, Soldier.

(5) Chapter 14 (Separation for Misconduct) establishes policy and prescribes procedures for separating personnel for misconduct because of minor disciplinary infractions, a pattern of misconduct, commission of a serious offense, conviction by civil authorities, desertion, and absence 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. Paragraph 14-12c (Commission of a Service Offense), stated a Soldier is subject to action per this section for commission of a serious military or civilian offense, if the specific circumstances of the offense warrant separation and a punitive discharge is, or would be, authorized for the same or a closely related offense under the Manual for Courts-Martial.

(6) 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 "JKQ" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, paragraph 14-12c, misconduct (serious offense).

f. Army Regulation 601-210 (Regular Army and Reserve Components Enlistment Program) governs eligibility criteria, policies, and procedures for enlistment and processing of persons into the Regular Army, the U.S. Army Reserve, and Army National Guard for enlistment per DoD 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. Army Regulation 600-85 (Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP)) governs the program and identifies Army policy on alcohol and other drug abuse, and responsibilities. The ASAP is a command program that emphasizes readiness and personal responsibility. The ultimate decision regarding separation or retention of abusers is the responsibility of the Soldier's chain of command. Abuse of alcohol or the use of illicit drugs by military personnel is inconsistent with Army values and the standards of performance, discipline, and readiness necessary to accomplish the Army's mission. Unit commanders must intervene early and refer all Soldiers suspected or identified as alcohol and/or drug abusers to the ASAP. The unit commander should recommend enrollment based on the Soldier's potential for continued military service in terms of professional skills, behavior, and potential for advancement.

h. Manual for Courts-Martial, United States (2016 Edition) stated, military law consists of the statutes governing the military establishment and regulations issued thereunder, the constitutional powers of the President and regulations issued thereunder, and the inherent authority of military commanders. Military law includes jurisdiction exercised by courts-martial and the jurisdiction exercised by commanders with respect to nonjudicial punishment. The purpose of military law is to promote justice, to assist in maintaining good order and discipline in the Armed Forces. Appendix 12 (Maximum Punishment Chart) Manual for Courts-Martial shows the maximum punishments include punitive discharge for violating Article 111 (Drunk or reckless operation of vehicle).

## 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 a nonjudicial punishment under the provisions of Article 15, UCMJ in violation of Article 134 (Drunk and Disorderly); received a GOMOR for driving while under the influence of alcohol; received a nonjudicial punishment under the provisions of Article 15, UCMJ in violation of Article 86 (Failure to go place of duty); and was involuntarily discharged from the U.S. Army. The DD Form 214, signed by the applicant, provides the applicant was discharged with a character of service of General (Under Honorable Conditions) for misconduct (serious offense) rather than a discharge Under Other Than Honorable Conditions, which is normally considered appropriate. They completed 2 years, 3 months, and 22 days of net active service this period and did not complete their first full term of service: their 3-year, 19-week enlistment obligation.

c. Chapter 14 establishes policy and prescribes procedures for separation members for misconduct. Specific categories include minor disciplinary infractions, a pattern of misconduct, commission of a serious offense; to include abuse of illegal drugs; 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 does not reflect documentation of a diagnosis of PTSD; however, their DA Form 3822 reflects an Axis I (Psychiatric Conditions) diagnoses of "Other Problem Related to Employment, Alcohol Use Disorder and the behavioral health provider stated the applicant meets medical retention standards from a behavioral health perspective. The applicant provided a VA entitlement letter reflecting a 50-percent evaluation for Major Depression Disorder with anxiety distress.

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 which were void. However, the applicant asserts OBH which may be sufficient evidence to establish the existence of a condition that could mitigate or excuse the discharge.

(2) Did the condition exist, or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** Applicant asserts OBH in-service.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **No.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that there were no conditions identified or provided for mitigation.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **No.** Based on liberally considering all the evidence before the Board, the ADRB determined that the condition or experience did not outweigh the basis of separation. However, the applicant's in-service factors of length and quality of service, to include post-service accomplishments outweighed the basis for separation, DUI.

b. Prior Decisions Cited: None

c. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends they felt their punishment for their actions and for what they take full responsibility, for was unfair. Their unit neglected the fact that, although they were an

excellent performer, depression had taken a toll on them which ultimately caused them to lose their career. They resorted to alcohol to ease their mind and combat the negative images that were taking over. Within a six-month period, they lost two friends to suicide which they still blame themselves for, to this day, not being able to see the signs.

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 in-service factors of length and quality of service, to include post-service accomplishments outweighed the basis for separation, DUI.

(3) The applicant contends since leaving the military they were determined to overcome all their obstacles. They were able to secure a job as a Correctional Officer and have just bought a house last year. Separating from the military was the biggest failure and they have learned from it.

The ADRB is authorized to consider post-service factors in the recharacterization of a discharge. In this case the applicant's in-service factors of length and quality of service, to include post-service accomplishments outweighed the basis for separation, DUI.

(4) The applicant contends due to their character of service they do not qualify for military education benefits like the GI Bill. They want to use the GI Bill to further themselves and their education to prove their success as a prior Soldier and a successful veteran.

The Board considered this contention and determined that eligibility for Veteran's benefits, to include educational benefits under the Post-9/11 or Montgomery GI Bill, healthcare or VA loans, do not fall within the purview of the Army Discharge Review Board. Accordingly, the applicant should contact a local office of the Department of Veterans Affairs for further assistance

d. The Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the applicant's in-service factors of length and quality of service, to include post-service accomplishments outweighed the applicant's one-time driving while intoxicated basis for separation. Therefore, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade to the characterization of service to Honorable and directed the issue of a new DD Form 214 changing the separation authority to AR 635-200, paragraph 14-12a, the narrative reason for separation to Misconduct (Minor Infractions), and the separation code to JKN. The Board determined the RE Code was proper and equitable and voted not to change it.

e. Rationale for Decision:

(1) The Board voted the discharge is inequitable based on the applicant's in-service factors of length and quality of service, to include post-service accomplishments outweighed the applicant's one-time driving while intoxicated basis for separation. Therefore, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade to the characterization of service to Honorable.

(2) The Board voted to change the reason for discharge to Misconduct (Minor Infractions) under the same rationale, 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.

**10. BOARD ACTION DIRECTED:**

- a. Issue a New DD-214 / Separation Order: Yes
- b. Change Characterization to: Honorable
- c. Change Reason / SPD code to: Misconduct (Minor Infractions)/JKN
- d. Change RE Code to: No Change
- e. Change Authority to: No Change

**Authenticating Official:**

8/23/2025



**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