

1. Applicant's Name: [REDACTED]**a. Application Date:** 23 May 2022**b. Date Received:** 23 July 2022**c. Counsel:** [REDACTED]**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 (UOTHC). The applicant and counsel, request an upgrade to honorable or in the alternative a general discharge under honorable conditions, and a change of the narrative reason for separation to Secretarial Authority.

b. Applicant Contention(s) / Issue(s): The applicant requests relief contending, in effect, the applicant's Army career was successful until the applicant's combat tour in Iraq from 2008 to 2009. Undiagnosed, untreated post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) contributed to the misconduct that led to the applicant's discharge and is an extenuating factor required by law.

(1) The applicant seeks an upgrade and a change of the narrative reason for separation. The applicant provides, in effect, a detailed description of military service, service in Iraq between 2008 and 2009, and personal issues. The applicant describes suffering from considerable stress and problems sleeping, this included a 3-day period during which the applicant was unable to sleep. Despite the considerable stress, the applicant flew more than 740 hours providing reconnaissance and security in Mosul, Iraq and served as the Squadron Troop Armament Officer in Iraq. The applicant describes suffering from increasingly severe mental health issues, depression, nightmares, lack of sleep, anxiety and social withdrawal. The applicant struggled to communicate with family and to manage personal affairs. The applicant's marriage struggled and failed. In August 2010, the applicant received redeployment orders to Iraq, but the order was revoked. Uncertainty about whether or when the applicant would deploy eased the applicant's stress and anxiety. The applicant states a request to attend the Wounded Warrior Program was denied. In July 2010, the applicant sought Behavioral Health treatment, and the applicant was command referred to ASAP for drinking. The applicant states in May 2011, while awaiting court-martial, for DUI's and related offenses, the applicant met with an Army appointed lawyer who recommended the applicant seek separation in lieu of court-martial. The lawyer did not advise the applicant a medical examination was required. Between 2012 and 2017 the applicant participated in the Grand Island VA Residential Substance Use Disorder Program, Hot Springs, SD. The applicant continues to receive treatment for PTSD, and related issues. The applicant has committed to helping other veterans. In 2019, the applicant committed to community gardening and the applicant formed a non-profit called Therapeutic Gardens of Nebraska Veterans Gardens. The applicant regrets the mistakes made. The applicant also states the Army failed to properly diagnose and treat the applicant for PTSD.

(2) Counsel's Brief states, in effect, upon the applicant's return from Iraq in 2009, the applicant was suffering from undiagnosed and untreated PTSD, which compounded family issues, that led to increased drinking. The applicant repeatedly sought mental health assistance and counseling, but the military providers failed to provide a diagnosis of PTSD, and the applicant was referred to the Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP). The applicant's problems came to a head after being involved in [two] driving under the influence (DUI) [offenses]. The applicant requested an administrative discharge in lieu of court martial, but the

applicant was never afforded a medical examination. The applicant was diagnosed with PTSD in May 2012 after discharge. Title 10, United States Code (USC), section 1177 requires that a service member alleging PTSD receive a medical examination prior to an administrative separation with an UOTHC discharge. The applicant was discharged approximately 24 months after deployment to Iraq. The applicant repeatedly sought treatment for psychological issues, the chain of command should have known the applicant was likely suffering from PTSD. Liberal consideration should be considered in the applicants request for an upgrade of the discharge and PTSD should be considered a mitigating factor. The applicant's discharge should be upgraded to honorable or in the alternative a general discharge under honorable conditions should be issued and change the narrative reason for separation to Secretarial Authority.

c. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 11 February 2026, and by a 3-0 vote, the Board determined that the characterization of service was inequitable based on the applicant's PTSD mitigating the DUI, but the litany of misconduct which remained warranting no further relief. 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 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: In Lieu of Trial by Court-Martial / AR 600-8-24, Paragraph 3-13 / DFS / NA / UOTHC

b. Date of Discharge: 26 January 2012

c. Separation Facts:

(1) Date Charges Preferred / DD Form 458 (Charge Sheet): Both are NIF

(2) Legal Consultation Date: NIF

(3) Basis for Separation: A Record of Trial and discharge orders confirm the applicant pled guilty before a General Court-Martial and was found guilty of driving under the influence on two occasions, 8 February 2011 and 13 March 2011. On 8 September 2011 the sentence was adjudged, and the applicant was sentenced to forfeit \$700 pay for 7 months and serve in confinement 7 months. The findings were approved. On 29 June 2011, the applicants request for resignation in lieu of court-martial with an UOTHC discharge was accepted. On 26 January 2012, the applicant was discharged under the provisions of AR 600-8-24, paragraph 3-13, in lieu of trial by court-martial with an UOTHC discharge.

(4) CDR / Intermediate CDR Recommended Characterization: All three recommended a general discharge (GD).

(5) Separation Approval Decision Date / Characterization: NIF / UOTHC

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Appointment under review: 3 February 2005 / Indefinite Term

b. Age at Appointment / Education / 30 / NIF

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20220010156

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: CW2 / 152DO, OH-58D, Scout Pilot / 10 years / 7 months / 2 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: RA, 3 March 1994-10 May 1997, HD
RA/USAR, 10 February 2003-29 May 2003, HD
RA, 26 August 2004-2 February 2005, HD
RA, 3 February 2005-26 January 2012, UOTHC

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: None / SWA, Iraq (6 July 2008-1 July 2009)

f. Awards and Decorations: ICM-CS-2, AM, AAM, NDSM-2, GWOTSM, NCOPD, ASR, OSR, Army Lapel Button-2, AFRM-"M," EIB, Ranger TAB, CAB, BAB, Parachutist Badge

g. Performance Ratings: 7 August 2006-6 August 2007, Best Qualified
7 August 2007-6 August 2008, Best Qualified
6 August 2008-5 August 2009, Best Qualified
5 August 2009-4 August 2010, Fully Qualified
5 August 2010-13 May 2011, Do Not Promote, Referred OER

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:

(1) A General Officer Memorandum of Reprimand (GOMOR) reflects the applicant was administered an administrative reprimand for driving under the influence of alcohol on 28 February 2011. The applicant was stopped by civilian police for speeding and the applicant was administered a breath test using the Intoxilyzer 8000. The applicant's blood alcohol content registered .238, which was three times the legal limit. The GOMOR is contained in the Official Military Personnel File (OMPF).

(2) A Court-Martial Order confirms the applicant was arraigned at Fort Riley, KS. The applicant pled guilty and was found guilty of driving a passenger car on or about:

- 28 February 2011 with an alcohol concentration that exceeded .08 grams of alcohol per 210 liters of breath, which is the limit in Kansas
- 13 March 2011, while drunk
- The sentence was adjudged on 8 September 2011, and included \$700 pay for 7 months and to be confined for 7 months
- the findings of guilty was disapproved and the charges and specifications were dismissed
- the applicant's request for resignation in lieu of a general court-martial was accepted by the Secretary of the Army on 29 December 2011 with an UOTHC discharge

(3) Prior to the above approval, the request for resignation was denied on 7 September 2011.

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: 23 April 2011-24 April 2011, NIF
25 April 2011-7 September 2011, NIF
9 October 2011-20 November 2011, NIF

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 and Counsel provided: The following documents.

- Parallels Substance Abuse Evaluation showing the applicant was evaluated on 16 February 2010, due to a charge of assault and failure to comply on 22 November 2009; his BAC level was .169 at that time; PTSD was not diagnosed at that time
- Sanity Board Evaluation confirming on 25 August 2011, the applicant was evaluated and determined not have a severe mental disease or defect; the applicant was diagnosed to suffer from alcohol dependence and adjustment disorder with anxiety
- Two Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Compensation and Pension (C&P) Evaluations confirming the applicant was diagnosed with PTSD as early as 24 May 2012
- C&P Review, confirming a PTSD diagnosis on 9 March 2016
- Disability Benefits Questionnaire (DBQ), confirming a PTSD diagnosis on 9 March 2016
- Medical Progress Notes confirming a mental health diagnosis and relevant medical conditions that include alcohol dependence and severe PTSD
- Statement from Doctor J Parker, indicating while working as clinical psychologist at the VA Hospital in 2013, the applicant was a patient who sought Doctor Parkers help; Doctor Parker concludes the applicant meets the criteria of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-5) for PTSD and this may have contributed to the applicant's problems with alcohol
- VA Rating decision confirming on 15 January 2025, the applicant had a combined disability of 80 percent (%), which included a PTSD rating of 50%

(2) AMHRR provided: None

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: DD Form 293; 2 sets of documents, Attorneys Brief and Exhibits; Applicant's Declaration Statement; various orders; five DD Forms 214; GOMOR; Report of Result of Trial; Appeal of the GOMOR; Memorandum, subject: Resignation for the Good of the Service-In Lieu of General Court-Martial; GOMOR Filing Instructions; Separation Processing Documenta; Sanity Board Evaluation; General Court-Martial Order; C&P Documents; Progress Notes; Statement from Doctor Parker Clinical Psychologist, VA Raring Decision; 90 Service Records; Appointment Documents; four Service School Academic Reports; five Officer Evaluation Reports; Parallels Substance Abuse Evaluation Records; Chronological Records of Medical Care; Training Certificates/Training Diplomas, Award Certificates; and Award Orders.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: Applicant states Between 2012 and 2017 the applicant participated in the Grand Island VA Residential Substance Use Disorder Program, Hot Springs, SD. The applicant continues to receive treatment for PTSD, and related issues. In 2019, the formed a non-profit called Therapeutic Gardens of Nebraska Veterans Gardens.

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 PTSD), 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), dated 25 September 2019, sets forth the policies and procedures under which the Army Discharge Review Board is authorized to review the character, reason, and authority of any Servicemember discharged from active military service within 15 years of the Servicemember's date of discharge. Additionally, it prescribes actions and composition of the Army Discharge Review Board under Public Law 95-126; Section 1553, Title 10 United States Code; and Department of Defense Directive 1332.41 and Instruction 1332.28.

f. Army Regulation 600-8-24 (Officer Transfers and Discharges) sets forth the basic authority for the separation of commissioned and warrant officers.

(1) Paragraph 1-23 provides the authorized types of characterization of service or description of separation.

(2) Paragraph 1-23a, states an officer will normally receive an honorable characterization of service when the quality of the officer's service has met the standards of acceptable conduct and performance of duty, or the final revocation of a security clearance under DODI 5200.02 and AR 380-67 for reasons that do not involve acts of misconduct for an officer.

(3) Paragraph 1-23b, states an officer will normally receive a general (under honorable conditions) characterization of service when the officer's military record is satisfactory but not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge.

(4) Paragraph 1-23c, states a discharge under other than honorable conditions is an administrative separation from the service. A discharge certificate will not be issued. An officer will normally receive an under other than honorable conditions when he or she: Resigns for the good of the Service; is dropped from the rolls (DFR) of the Army in accordance with paragraph 5-9; (3) is involuntarily separated due to misconduct, moral or professional dereliction, or for the final revocation of a security clearance under DODI 5200.02 and AR 380-67 as a result of an act or acts of misconduct, including misconduct for which punishment was imposed; and, is discharged following conviction by civilian authorities.

(5) Chapter 3 prescribes the rules for processing voluntary resignations. Except as provided in paragraph 3-1b, any officer of the RA or USAR may tender a resignation under the provisions of this chapter. SECARMY (or designee) may accept resignations and orders will be issued by direction of the CG, HRC. An officer whose resignation has been accepted will be separated on the date specified in DA's orders or as otherwise directed by the DA. An appropriate discharge certificate as specified by the CG, HRC, will be furnished by the appropriate commander at the time the officer is separated. The date of separation, as specified or directed, will not be changed without prior approval of HQDA nor can valid separation orders be revoked subsequent to the specified or directed date of separation.

(6) Paragraph 3-9 (previously 3-13) outlines the rules for processing requests for resignation for the good of the Service in lieu of trial by a general court-martial.

(7) Paragraph 3-9i, states an officer separated under this paragraph normally receives characterization of service of under other than honorable conditions.

g. 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. This regulation identifies the SPD code of "DFS" as the appropriate code to assign Officers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 600-8-24, Chapter 3-13, in lieu of trial by court-martial.

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 or in the alternative a general discharge under honorable conditions and change the narrative reason for separation to Secretarial Authority. The applicant's Army Military Human Resources Record (AMHRR), the issues, and documents submitted with the application were carefully reviewed.

(1) The applicant contends suffering from PTSD. The applicant's AMHRR does not contain a Mental Status Evaluation, however, the applicant provided a Sanity Board Evaluation confirming on 25 August 2011, the applicant was evaluated and determined not have a severe mental disease or defect; the applicant was diagnosed to suffer from alcohol dependence and adjustment disorder with anxiety.

(2) The applicant denies receiving legal counsel. The applicant's request for resignation, 5 July 2011, confirms the stated the applicant had been fully advised by counsel on various occasions since April 2011.

b. The applicant's initial request for resignation was disapproved 7 September 2011. The applicant's second request for resignation was approved on 12 December 2011.

c. A VA Rating decision confirms as of 15 January 2025, the applicant had a combined disability rating of 80 (%), which included a PTSD rating of 50%

d. The applicant and counsel contend, in effect, the narrative reason for the separation should be changed to "Secretarial Authority." The applicant was separated under the provisions of AR 600-8-24, Paragraph 3-13 with an UOTHC discharge. The narrative reason specified by Army Regulations for a discharge under this paragraph is "In Lieu of Court-Martial" and the separation code is "DFS" Army Regulation 635-8, Separation Processing and Documents, governs the preparation of the DD Form 214, and dictates the entry of the narrative reason for separation, entered in block 28 and separation code, entered in block 26 of the form, will be as listed in tables 2-2 or 2-3 of AR 635-5-1, SPD Codes. The regulation stipulates no deviation is authorized. There is no provision for any other reason to be entered under this regulation.

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 Anxiety, Alcohol Dependence, PTSD

(2) Did the condition exist, or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** Adjustment Disorder with Anxiety, Alcohol Dependence, combat trauma

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that although the applicant's alcohol abuse was a chronic maladaptive coping mechanism, it is as possible as not this was combat aggravated further fueling a use of alcohol. Accordingly, given the service-

connected trauma occurred prior to the basis for separation and nexus between trauma and substance use, the basis is mitigated.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **Yes.** The Board concurred with the opinion of the Board's Medical Advisor, a voting member. As a result, the ADRB applied liberal consideration and found that the applicant's PTSD outweighed the DUI basis for separation for the aforementioned reason(s).

b. Prior Decisions Cited: N/A

c. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant requests relief contending, in effect, the applicant's Army career was successful until the applicant's combat tour in Iraq from 2008 to 2009. Undiagnosed, untreated post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) contributed to the misconduct that led to the applicant's discharge and is an extenuating factor required by law. The Board determined that this contention was valid and voted to upgrade the characterization of service due to PTSD mitigating the applicant's DUI charges. But with the lengthy misconduct which remains, IPV perpetration being the most serious offense, the Board determined no further relief was warranted. The applicant diminished the quality of service below that meriting an honorable discharge at the time of separation.

(2) The applicant describes suffering from increasingly severe mental health issues, depression, nightmares, lack of sleep, anxiety and social withdrawal. The applicant struggled to communicate with family and to manage personal affairs. The applicant's marriage struggled and failed. The Board determined that this contention was valid and voted to upgrade the characterization of service due to PTSD mitigating the applicant's DUI charges. But with the lengthy misconduct which remains, IPV perpetration being the most serious offense, the Board determined no further relief was warranted. The applicant diminished the quality of service below that meriting an honorable discharge at the time of separation.

(3) The applicant continues to receive treatment for PTSD, and related issues. The applicant has committed to helping other veterans. In 2019, the applicant committed to community gardening and the applicant formed a non-profit called Therapeutic Gardens of Nebraska Veterans Gardens. The Board determined that this contention was valid and voted to upgrade the characterization of service due to PTSD mitigating the applicant's DUI charges. But with the lengthy misconduct which remains, IPV perpetration being the most serious offense, the Board determined no further relief was warranted. The applicant diminished the quality of service below that meriting an honorable discharge at the time of separation.

(4) The applicant requested an administrative discharge in lieu of court martial, but the applicant was never afforded a medical examination. The Board considered this contention but found contradictory evidence, in that the applicant actually received a lengthy and in-depth sanity exam while in-service.

d. The Board determined that the characterization of service was inequitable based on the applicant's PTSD mitigating the DUI, but the litany of misconduct which remained warranting no further relief. 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

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE**AR20220010156**

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 voted to change the applicant's characterization of service to General, Under Honorable Conditions because the applicant's PTSD mitigated the applicant's DUI. Thus, the prior characterization is no longer appropriate. But with the lengthy misconduct which remains, IPV perpetration being the most serious offense, the Board determined no further relief was warranted. The applicant diminished the quality of service below that meriting an honorable discharge at the time of separation.

(3) The Board voted not to change the applicant's reason for discharge or accompanying SPD code due to the seriousness of the misconduct which included IPV perpetration, as the reason the applicant was discharged was both proper and equitable.

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 Authority to: No Change**

Authenticating Official:

2/18/2026

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

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
UOTHHC – Under Other Than
Honorable Conditions
VA – Department of Veter