

1. Applicant's Name: [REDACTED]

- a. **Application Date:** 6 January 2022
- b. **Date Received:** 18 January 2022
- c. **Counsel:** None

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

a. **Applicant Requests:** The current characterization of service for the period under review is under other than honorable conditions. The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable, a narrative reason change, SPD code change, and RE code change.

b. **Applicant Contention(s)/Issue(s):** The applicant requests relief contending, in effect, suffering from mental health issues and is service connected for bipolar disorder. Also, the applicant's reenlistment was not honored, and did not receive \$8,000 reenlistment bonus a did not receive an honorable discharge certificate. The applicant would also like their rank restored to E-5, good conduct medal issued and any other awards.

c. **Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 16 October 2025, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board determined that the characterization of service was inequitable based on the applicant's length and prior Honorable characterization of service, and the circumstances surrounding the discharge (Depression, Bipolar Disorder diagnoses). Accordingly, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade to the characterization of service to General Under Honorable Conditions. The Board determined the narrative reason/SPD code and RE code were proper and equitable and voted not to change them. Please see **Board Discussion and Determination** section for more detail regarding the Board's decision. Board member names are available upon request.

3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:

a. **Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization:** Pattern of Misconduct / AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12b / JKA / RE-3 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

b. **Date of Discharge:** 17 October 2011

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:

- On 18 August 2011, the applicant received notification to appear before an administrative separation board and was advised of rights.

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20220003802

- On 9 September 2011, the administrative separation board convened, and the applicant appeared with counsel. The administrative separation board determined a preponderance of the evidence did support the allegations and recommended the applicant's discharge with a characterization of service as under other than honorable condition:
- The applicant did commit misconduct by failing to go to the appointed place of duty 24 November 2010, to wit: 0630 hours, Lake Rim Park.
- The applicant did commit misconduct by failing to go to the appointed place of duty on 27 November 2010, to wit: the Defense Drivers Course.
- The applicant did commit misconduct by failing to go to the appointed place of duty on 11 December 2010, to wit: 0730 hours, at the Driver's Improvement Training (DIT) Course.
- The applicant did commit misconduct on 11 December 2010 by failing to obey a lawful order issued by First Sergeant B. J. M. to attend the DIT course, an order which it was the duty to obey by not attending the course.
- The applicant did commit misconduct by failing to go to the appointed place of duty on 13 December 2010, to wit: 0630 hours, Accountability formation located at Bldg E-2535.
- The applicant did commit misconduct by failing to go at the appointed place of duty on 13 December 2010, to wit: 112th Signal Battalion Motor pool.
- The applicant did commit misconduct by failing to go to the appointed place of duty on 14 January 2011, to wit: 0630 hours work call at 112th Signal Battalion motor pool.
- The applicant did commit misconduct by failing to go to the appointed place of duty on 14 January 2011, to wit: 0800 hrs, 112th Signal Battalion Staff duty desk.
- The applicant did commit misconduct on 13 January 2011 and 14 January 2011, when the applicant, who was restricted to the limits of the place of duty, company area, dining facility, and medical facility, by person authored to do so, did at Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, break said restriction.
- The applicant did commit misconduct on 14 January 2011, when the applicant, who was restricted to the limits of the place of duty, company area, dining facility, and medical facility, by a person authorized to do so, did, at or near Fayetteville, North Carolina, break said restriction.
- The applicant did commit misconduct in the applicant was wrongfully absent from the unit on 14 February 2011 and did remain so absent until 10 March 2011.
- The applicant did commit misconduct in the applicant was charged by the North Carolina State Highway Patrol for Driving While Intoxicated on 8 May 2011, at or near Murchison Road, Spring Lake, North Carolina.
- The applicant did commit misconduct in the applicant was charged by the North Carolina State Highway Patrol for Driving While License Revoked on 8 May 2011, at or near Spring Lake, North Carolina.
- The applicant did commit misconduct by failing to go to the appointed place of duty on 24 May 2011, to wit: 0630 hours, Accountability Formation at Bldg E-2535.

- The applicant did commit misconduct in an Order for Arrest was put out by the Cumberland County Superior Court after the applicant failed to appear for court on 7 June 2011, which conduct was of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces.

- On 28 September 2011, the separation authority approved the administrative separation Board's findings and recommendations

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: 28 September 2011 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment Under Review: 19 September 2007 / 7 years

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 23 / High School Graduate / 111

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-5 / 25N2O, Nodal Network Systems / 4 years, 10 months, 8 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: RA, 13 May 2003 – 20 May 2004 / HD
(Break in Service)

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: None

f. Awards and Decorations: NDSM, GWOTSM, ASR

g. Performance Ratings: None

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:

(1) Memorandum for Record, 2 February 2011, indicates the applicant was not recommended for the Army Good Conduct Medal due to being Suspended of Favorable Personnel Actions FLAGGED in accordance with AR 600-8-2 and pending punishment under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) Article 86 (Failure to Report).

(2) FG Record of Proceedings under Article 15, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 4 February 2011, on or about 13 and 14 January 2011, without authority, fail to go at the time prescribed to the place of duty; on or about 13 and 14 January 2011, having been restricted to the limits of the place of duty, company area, dining facility, and medical facility, by a person authorized to do so, did at Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, break said restriction; and, on or about 14 January 2011, having been restricted to the limits of the place of duty, company area, dining facility, and medical facility, by a person authorized to do so, did, at or near Fayetteville, North Carolina, on or about 14 January 2011, break said restriction. without authority fail to go at the time prescribed to the appointed place of duty. The imposed punishment included a reduction to E-4, forfeiture of \$1,115 pay per month for two months (suspended), along with 45 days of extra duty and restriction.

(3) Four Personnel Action forms indicate the applicant's duty status changed as follows

(a) From Present for Duty (PDY) to Absent Without Leave (AWOL), effective 14 February 2011.

- (b) From AWOL to PDY, effective 10 March 2011;
- (c) From PDY to Confined by Civil Authorities (CCA), effective 15 June 2011; and,
- (d) From CCA to PDY, effective 18 August 2011.

(4) Driving While Impaired Report (DWIR), 8 May 2011, indicates the officer was following behind the applicant's vehicle when the applicant swerved in the lane and touched the white line twice while traveling in the center lane. The applicant switched lanes and touched the white line again. The applicant pulled into DVA and slowly stopped. The applicant had a blank stare when the officer asked how much the applicant had drunk. The applicant stated a couple. The applicant had a strong odor of alcohol on the breath and refused the breathalyzer. The applicant had a suspended license in North Carolina; however, a valid license in Pennsylvania and prior DWI using a Virginia license in North Carolina.

(5) State of North Carolina Impaired Driving – Judgment Suspending Sentence, 19 July 2011 indicates the applicant was found guilty by the court and given a minimum term of nine months for a maximum term of 17 months 25 days in the custody of the N.C. Department of Correction. The applicant was given credit for 34 days spent in confinement prior to the date of the judgment. The applicant received supervised probation for 48 months. As a condition of special probation, the applicant shall serve an active term of 30 days in the custody of Sheriff of this County and pay a total amount of \$2,112 in fines.

(6) General Officer Administrative Reprimand, 28 July 2011, indicates the applicant was reprimanded for refusing to take a lawfully requested breathalyzer after being suspected of operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated. On the early morning of 8 May 2011, at 0112 hours, a State Trooper stopped the applicant for failing to maintain their lane. The officer noticed the applicant's eyes were red and speech was slurred. After refusing to take any field sobriety test the applicant was transported to the Cumberland County Detention Center for a breathalyzer; however, the applicant refused to cooperate.

(7) Several Developmental Counseling Forms for failure to report; failure to obey a lawful order; concern of prescribed medications; and financial indebtedness.

(8) Report of Proceedings by Investigating Officer/Board of Officers, as previously described in paragraph 3c(1).

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: 86 days:

AWOL, 14 February 2011 – 10 March 2011 / NIF
CCA, 15 June 2011 – 18 August 2011 / Released from Confinement

j. Behavioral Health Condition(s): The following documents have been provided to the ARBA Medical Advisor, if applicable. See "**Board Discussion and Determination**" for Medical Advisor Details.

(1) Applicant provided:

(a) Progress Notes, 27 February 2015, indicate the applicant was diagnosed with: Bipolar I (provisional).

(b) VA Summary of Benefits Letter, 14 January 2022, indicates the applicant was granted 70 percent combined service-connected disability; however, is being paid at the

100 percent rate because the applicant is unemployable due to the service-connected disabilities. The letter does not state the nature of the disability.

(2) AMHRR Listed: None

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: Application for the Review of Discharge; ARBA Letter; Progress Notes; college transcripts; VA Summary of Benefits Letter.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: None submitted with the 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. Office, Secretary of Defense memorandum (Supplemental Guidance to Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records Considering Discharge Upgrade Requests by Veterans Claiming Post Traumatic Stress Disorder), 3 September 2014, directed the Service Discharge Review Boards (DRBs) and Service Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records (BCM/NRs) to carefully consider the revised PTSD criteria, detailed medical considerations and mitigating factors when taking action on applications from former service members administratively discharged UOTHC and who have been diagnosed with PTSD by a competent mental health professional representing a civilian healthcare provider in order to determine if it would be appropriate to upgrade the characterization of the applicant's service.

c. Office, Under Secretary of Defense memorandum (Clarifying Guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records Considering Requests by Veterans for Modification of their Discharge Due to Mental Health Conditions, Sexual Assault, or Sexual Harassment), 25 August 2017 issued clarifying guidance for the Secretary of Defense Directive to DRBs and BCM/NRs when considering requests by Veterans for modification of their discharges due in whole or in part to mental health conditions, including PTSD; Traumatic Brain Injury; sexual assault; or sexual harassment. Boards are to give liberal consideration to Veterans petitioning for discharge relief when the application for relief is based in whole or in part to those conditions or experiences. The guidance further describes evidence sources and criteria and requires Boards to consider the conditions or experiences presented in evidence as potential mitigation for misconduct that led to the discharge.

d. Office, Under Secretary of Defense memorandum (Guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records Regarding Equity, Injustice, or Clemency Determinations), 25 July 2018 issued guidance to Military DRBs and BCM/NRs regarding equity, injustice, or clemency determinations. Clemency generally refers to relief

specifically granted from a criminal sentence. However, the guidance applies to more than clemency from a sentencing in a court-martial; it also applies to other corrections, including changes in a discharge, which may be warranted based on equity or relief from injustice.

(1) This guidance does not mandate relief but rather provides standards and principles to guide Boards in application of their equitable relief authority. In determining whether to grant relief on the basis of equity, injustice, or clemency grounds, DRBs shall consider the prospect for rehabilitation, external evidence, sworn testimony, policy changes, relative severity of misconduct, mental and behavioral health conditions, official governmental acknowledgement that a relevant error or injustice was committed, and uniformity of punishment.

(2) Changes to the narrative reason for discharge and/or an upgraded character of service granted solely on equity, injustice, or clemency grounds normally should not result in separation pay, retroactive promotions, and payment of past medical expenses or similar benefits that might have been received if the original discharge had been for the revised reason or had the upgraded service characterization.

e. 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; Section 1553, Title 10 United States Code; and Department of Defense Directive 1332.41 and Instruction 1332.28.

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:

- 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.

- 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.

- 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 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations) provides the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel.

(1) Chapter 3, Section II provides the authorized types of characterization of service or description of separation.

(a) Paragraph 3-7a states 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.

(b) Paragraph 3-7b states 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.

(c) 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.

(2) 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) Paragraph 14-3, prescribes 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.

(b) Paragraph 14-12b, addresses a pattern of misconduct consisting of either discreditable involvement with civilian or military authorities or discreditable conduct and conduct prejudicial to good order and discipline including conduct violating the accepted standards of personal conduct found in the Uniform Code of Military Justice, Army Regulations, the civilian law and time-honored customs and traditions of the Army.

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

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

a. The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable. The applicant's Army Military Human Resources Record (AMHRR), the issues, and documents submitted with the application were carefully reviewed.

b. The available evidence reflects the applicant received notification to appear before an administrative separation board and was advised of rights. On 9 September 2011, the administrative separation board convened, and the applicant appeared with counsel. The administrative separation board determined a preponderance of the evidence did support the allegations. The Board recommended the applicant be discharged with a characterization of service as under other than honorable condition. The separation authority approved the Board's findings and recommendations, and the applicant was involuntarily discharged from the U.S. Army. The DD Form 214 provides the applicant was discharged with a character of service of Under Other Than Honorable Conditions for a pattern of misconduct.

c. The applicant contends the Army should change the narrative reason for the discharge. Under Chapter 14, paragraph 14-12b of AR 635-200, the Army separated the applicant with an under other than honorable conditions discharge. Army Regulations designate "Pattern of Misconduct," as the narrative reason for discharge under this provision and assign the separation code "JKA." Army Regulation 635-8 (Separation Processing and Documents) governs how officials prepare the DD Form 214. This regulation mandates that block 28 must list the narrative reason for separation, and block 26 must show the corresponding separation code, both as specified in tables 2-2 or 2-3 of AR 635-5-1 (Separation Program Designator (SPD) Codes). The regulation prohibits any deviation and does not allow officials to enter any other reason.

d. The applicant contends the Army should change the SPD code. The SPD codes are three-character alphabetic combinations identifying reasons for and types of separation from active duty. The primary purpose of SPD codes is to provide a statistical accounting of reasons for separation. They are intended exclusively for the internal use of DoD and the Military Services to assist in collecting and analyzing separation data. The Office of the Secretary of Defense controls SPD codes and implements them in Army policy AR 635-5-1 to track types of separations. The SPD code specified by Army Regulations for a discharge under Chapter 14, paragraph 14-12b is "JKA."

e. The applicant requests a change to the reentry eligibility (RE) code. Soldiers receive reentry codes during separation based on service records or discharge reasons. Army Regulation 601-210 assigns the applicant an RE code of "4," which is appropriate under the circumstances. An RE code of "4" remains ineligible for waiver, preventing reenlistment.

f. The applicant contends the discharge should have been based on medical reasons. The applicant is service connected for bipolar disorder. The applicant provided Progress Notes, 27 February 2015, which indicates the applicant was diagnosed with: Bipolar I (provisional). A VA Summary of Benefits Letter, 14 January 2022, indicating the applicant was granted 70 percent combined service-connected disability; however, is being paid at the 100 percent rate because the applicant is unemployable due to the service-connected disabilities. The letter does not state the nature of the disability. The applicant's AMHRR includes no documentation of a medical diagnosis.

g. The applicant's reenlistment was not honored and did not receive \$8,000 reenlistment bonus and/or an honorable discharge certificate. The applicant would also like their rank restored to E-5, good conduct medal issued and any other awards. The request falls outside this board's purview. The applicant may submit a request to the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR) using the enclosed DD Form 149 or obtain the form through a Veterans' Service Organization.

9. BOARD DISCUSSION AND DETERMINATION:

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

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor, a voting member, reviewed the applicant's DOD and VA health records, applicant's statement, and/or civilian provider documentation and found that the applicant has the following potentially-mitigating diagnoses/experiences: The applicant was diagnosed in service with Depression and various Adjustment Disorder. After his discharge, he was diagnosed by the VA with service-connected Bipolar Disorder.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor found the applicant was diagnosed in service with Depression and various Adjustment Disorder. After his discharge, he was diagnosed by the VA with service-connected Bipolar Disorder.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Partial.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that there is evidence of mental health conditions that provide partial mitigation. The applicant was diagnosed in service with various Adjustment Disorders and Depression, and the applicant is service connected by the VA for Bipolar Disorder. Given the nexus between Bipolar Disorder and erratic and avoidant behavior the applicant's misconduct of repeatedly not following orders, not being at his place of duty, not staying within his restricted place of duty, driving while intoxicated, and going AWOL is mitigated. However, there is insufficient evidence the applicant did not understand the difference between right and wrong, and he was unable to understand the consequences of not failing to appear for court and refusing a breathalyzer as a result of his later diagnosis of VA diagnosis of Bipolar Disorder or his in-service diagnosis of Adjustment Disorder. Therefore, this misconduct is not mitigated.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **No.** After applying liberal consideration to the evidence, including the Board Medical Advisor's opine, the Board determined that the applicant's condition outweighed the listed basis for separation for the aforementioned reasons.

b. Prior Decisions Cited: None

c. Response to Contentions:

(1) The applicant contends the Army should change the narrative reason and accompanying SPD code for the discharge.

The Board considered this contention and determined that the narrative reason and accompanying SPD code for the discharge are proper and equitable.

(2) The applicant requests a change to the reentry eligibility (RE) code. The Board considered this contention and determined that the reentry eligibility (RE) code is proper and equitable.

(3) The applicant contends the discharge should have been based on medical reasons. The applicant is service connected for bipolar disorder. The Board acknowledged and considered the applicant's service connection and the totality of the applicant's records.

(4) The applicant's reenlistment was not honored, did not receive \$8,000 reenlistment bonus and the applicant did not receive an honorable discharge certificate. The applicant would also like their rank restored to E-5, good conduct medal issued and any other awards. The Board acknowledged and considered the applicant's contention and determined that corrections of the applicant's awards and rank/grade on their DD Form 214 are not within the purview of this Board. These issues should be addressed by the Army Board of Correction of Military Records (ABCMR). A DD Form 149 is enclosed for the applicant's use.

d. The Board determined that the characterization of service was inequitable based on the applicant's length and prior Honorable characterization of service, and the circumstances surrounding the discharge (Depression, Bipolar Disorder diagnoses). Accordingly, the Board

voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade to the characterization of service to General (Under Honorable Conditions). The Board determined the narrative reason/SPD code and RE code were proper and equitable and voted not to change them. However, the applicant may request a personal appearance hearing to address further issues before the Board. The applicant is responsible for satisfying the burden of proof and providing documents or other evidence sufficient to support the applicant's contention(s) that the discharge was improper or inequitable.

e. Rationale for Decision:

(1) Published Department of Defense guidance indicates the guidance is not intended to interfere or impede on the Board's statutory independence. The Board determines the relative weight of the action that was the basis for the discharge and whether it supports relief or not. In reaching its determination, the Board considers the application, available records and any supporting documents included with the application.

(2) The Board carefully considered the applicant's request, supporting documents, evidence in the records, a medical review, and published Department of Defense guidance for liberal consideration of discharge upgrade requests. The Board considered the applicant's statement, record of service, the frequency and nature of misconduct, and the reason for separation. The Board concurred with the medical advising official that the applicant's Bi-Polar Disorder partially mitigates the AWOL and DUI. The Board found sufficient evidence of in-service factors (Length, and prior HD) that mitigate the remaining misconduct. Based on a preponderance of evidence, the Board determined that the reason for the applicant's separation and the character of service the applicant received upon separation were inequitable. Therefore, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of a change in character to General (Under Honorable Conditions) and directed the issue of a new DD Form 214. The Board determined the Authority, Separation and Narrative Reason & RE Code was proper and equitable and voted not to change them.

(3) The Board voted not to change the applicant's reason for discharge or accompanying SPD code and the reason the applicant was discharged was both proper and equitable.

(4) 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: General, Under Honorable Conditions
- c. Change Reason / SPD Code to: No Change
- d. Change RE Code to: No Change
- e. Change Authority to: No Change

Authenticating Official:

10/23/2025



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
FTR – Failure to Report

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