

1. Applicant's Name: [REDACTED]

a. **Application Date:** 16 November 2022

b. **Date Received:** 22 November 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 general (under honorable conditions). The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable.

b. **Applicant Contention(s) / Issue(s):** The applicant requests relief contending, they were discharged due to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Mandate. They have served the country honorably and respectfully request for their discharge be upgraded to honorable.

c. **Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 25 February 2026, and by a 3-0 vote, the Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on changes in policy since discharge. The sole misconduct on file being a refusal to accept the COVID-19 vaccine. Therefore, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of a change to the characterization to Honorable, to the separation authority to AR 15-180, the narrative reason for separation to Secretarial Authority, with a corresponding separation code to KFF. 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 / Army Regulation 600-8-24 / DFS / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

b. **Date of Discharge:** 27 April 2022

c. **Separation Facts:**

(1) **Date Charges Preferred / DD Form 458 (Charge Sheet):** 14 January 2022 / charges were preferred against the applicant –

- Charge I, violation of Article 89 (Disrespect toward superior commissioned officer), Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), with two Specifications
- Charge II, violation of Article 90 (Willfully disobeying superior commissioned officer), UCMJ, with two Specifications
- Charge III, violation of Article 91 (Insubordinate conduct toward noncommissioned officer (NCO)), UCMJ, with two Specifications
- Charge IV, violation of Article 133 (Conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman), UCMJ, with two Specifications

(2) **Legal Consultation Date:** 17 January 2022

(3) **Basis for Separation:** Pursuant to the applicant's voluntary request for resignation under the provisions of Army Regulation 600-8-24, paragraph 3-9 (Resignation for the Good of the Service in Lieu of Trial by Court-Martial).

(4) GOSCA Recommendation Date / Characterization: 16 February 2022 / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

(5) DA Ad Hoc Review Board: The Army Ad Hoc Review Board reviewed the Resignation for the Good of the Service in Lieu of General Court-Martial tendered by the applicant, under Army Regulation 600-8-24, paragraph 3-9.

(6) DASA Review Board Decision Date / Characterization: 12 April 2022 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Appointment: 26 June 2018 / 7 years

b. Age at Appointment / Education: 22 / Bachelor's Degree

c. Highest Grade Achieved / AOC / Total Service: O-2 / 11A, Infantry / 6 years, 5 months, 29 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: U.S. Army Reserve, 29 October 2015 – 25 June 2018 / NIF

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: None

f. Awards and Decorations: NDSM, ASR

g. Performance Ratings:

- 5 September 2018 – 3 October 2020 / Qualified
- 4 October 2020 – 29 July 2021 / Highly Qualified
- 30 July 2021 – 10 November 2021 / Qualified

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:

(1) A memorandum, Easy Troop, 2nd Squadron, 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment, subject: Request Remove [Applicant] from Leadership Position, dated 27 October 2021, reflects the company commander's request for the applicant to be removed from leadership position. The reasons for their request is –

(a) The applicant has routinely failed to follow all required safeguards and precautions as mandated by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and by the National Training Center (NTC) COVID-19 Policy. Leaders have observed the applicant not wearing a mask indoors and tried to correct them. The applicant usually does not respond in a professional manner.

(b) On 26 October 2021, the applicant was counseled in regards of the NTC COVID-19 policy and the requirements of being administered the COVID-19 Testing for all unvaccinated and not fully vaccinated Troopers on a monthly basis. The applicant refused to take the COVID-19 Test. After arguing for 15 minutes, the applicant decided to take the test but then stated they will not take it next month.

(c) The applicant frequently demonstrates a lack of military bearing towards their peers, subordinates and superiors. On 26 October 2021, the applicant sent a reply through the Troop

Leaders chat, containing 19 leaders, to the company first sergeant saying, “[First Sergeant] I only understand that you’re a sneaky f_____.” The applicant was counseled verbally and in writing. Despite efforts to have the applicant comply with Army Values, they disregarded all and refused to sign the counselings.

(2) A DA Form 67-10-1 (Company Grade Plate Officer Evaluation Report), covering the period 30 July 2021 through 10 November 2021, reflects in –

- Part I(i) (Reason for Submission) – Relief for Cause
- Part II(d) (This is a Referred Report, Do you wish to make comments?) – “Referred” is marked
- Part II(e)(1) (Rated Officer Signature) – No Entry
- Part IV(b) (This Officer’s overall Performance is Rated as) – Unsatisfactory, with comments –
 - I directed the relief of [Applicant]
 - [Applicant] is number 5 out of 5 Lieutenants that I rate
 - [Applicant’s] performance during this rating period is not commensurate with [Applicant’s] position and assigned duties and responsibilities
 - [Applicant] failed to comply with instructions and required multiple reminders to complete assigned tasks
 - Set a poor example for [Applicant’s] troops
 - [Applicant] lacks leadership and critical thinking, especially during stressful situations
- Part IV(c)(1) (Character), Part IV(c)(2) (Presence), Part IV(c)(3) (Intellect), Part IV(c)(4) (Leads), Part IV(c)(5) (Develops), Part IV(c)(6) (Achieves) – multiple derogatory statements
- Part VI (Senior Rater)(a) (Potential Compared with Officers Senior Rated in Same Grade) - QUALIFIED
- Part VI(b) (Comments) –
 - Rated Soldier refuses to sign
 - Performed during this rating period but demonstrated a lack of judgement and interpersonal skills
 - Exercised poor judgement and failed to uphold Army Values in [Applicant’s] interactions with commanders, peers, and Senior NCOs
 - I do not recommend [Applicant] for promotion or Professional Military Education at this time

(3) A memorandum, Headquarters, NTC and Fort Irwin, subject: General Officer Memorandum of Reprimand (GOMOR), dated 7 December 2021, reflects the applicant was reprimanded in writing for disobeying a lawful order. The commanding general states, on 29 October 2021, the applicant was ordered to receive the COVID-19 vaccine. Prior to their refusals, they were provided with materials explaining the benefits of vaccination and the opportunity to speak with a medical professional regarding concerns. Despite these efforts, they continued their refusal to comply with the order.

(4) A DA Form 4856 (Developmental Counseling Form) dated 11 January 2022 reflects the applicant received event-oriented counseling from their company commander for Failure to Report and refusal to take COVID-19 Test. The applicant refused to sign the counseling form.

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20220011578

(5) A DD Form 458 (Charge Sheet) dated 14 January 2022 reflects charges were preferred against the applicant, as shown above in paragraph 3c(1).

(6) In the applicant's memorandum, subject: Resignation for the Good of the Service (in Lieu of General Court-Martial) dated 17 January 2021 [sic], the applicant voluntarily tendered their resignation from the Army for the good of the service under the provisions of Army Regulation 600-8-24, paragraph 3-9. They do not desire to appear before a court-martial. They have not been subject to coercion with respect to this resignation and have been advised of and fully understand the implications of this action. They have been afforded an opportunity to present matter in explanation, mitigation, or defense of their case and they elect to remain silent. They understand if their resignation is accepted, it may be considered as being Under Other Than Honorable Conditions. They also understand, regardless of the type of discharge certificate furnished, they will not receive separation pay and will be barred from all rights, based on the period of service from which they will be separated, under any laws administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA).

(7) A memorandum, Headquarters, NTC and Fort Irwin, subject: Recommendation – Resignation for the Good of the Service in Lieu of General Court-Martial – [Applicant], dated 16 February 2022, the commanding general notified the Commanding General, U.S. Army Human Resources Command (HRC), stating, they have carefully considered the referral packet, the chain of command recommendations and the applicant's request for resignation for the good of the service in accordance with Army Regulation 600-8-24 (Officer Transfers and Discharges). Based upon the foregoing, they recommend the applicant's request to resign in lieu of General Court-Martial be approved and they be discharged from the U.S. Army with an Under Other Than Honorable Conditions characterization of service.

(8) A DA Form 5315E (U.S. Army Advanced Education Financial Assistance Record) dated 22 February 2022 reflects the applicant's total amount of education assistance as \$80,477.50.

(9) A memorandum, Department of the Army, Army Review Boards Agency, subject: Resignation for the Good of the Service in Lieu of General Court-Martial, [Applicant], dated 12 April 2022, reflects the Department of the Army Ad Hoc Review Board reviewed the Resignation for the Good of the Service in Lieu of General Court-Martial tendered by the applicant. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Review Boards) accepted the applicant's resignation and directed they will be discharged from the U.S. Army with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service. They also directed recoupment action be conducted in accordance with Army Regulation 600-8-24, paragraph 1-16 and Title 10, U.S Code, Section 2005.

(10) On 27 April 2022, the applicant was discharged accordingly, their DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) provides they completed 3 years, 10 months, and 2 days of active service this period and has not completed their first full term of service. Their DD Form 214 reflects in –

- item 24 (Character of Service) – General (Under Honorable Conditions)
- item 25 (Separation Authority) – Army Regulation 600-8-24
- item 26 (Separation Code) – DFS
- item 28 (Narrative Reason for Separation) – In Lieu of Trial by Court-Martial

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: None

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: None

(2) AMHRR provided: None

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: None submitted with application.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: None submitted with 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, 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. 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), 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. Office, Secretary of Defense memorandum (Rescission of August 24, 2021 and November 30, 2021 Coronavirus Disease 2019 Vaccination Requirements for Member of the Armed Forces) 10 January 2023, implemented 23 December 2022, James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2023 which rescinded the mandate for members of the Armed Forces to be vaccinated against Corona Virus 2019 (COVID-19), as issued on 24 August 2021 in the now-rescinded Secretary of Defense Guidance for Mandatory COVID-19 Vaccination for Department of Defense Service Members issued on 30 November 2021. For Service members administratively discharged on the sole bases of failure to obey a lawful order to receive vaccine for COVID-19, the Department precluded by law from awarding any characterization less than a general (under honorable conditions) discharge. Former service members may petition the Military Departments DRBs and BCM/NRs to individually request correction to their personnel records, including records regarding the characterization of their discharge.

g. Office, Secretary of the Army memorandum (Army Policy Implementing the Secretary of Defense Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) Vaccination Mandate Recission), 24 February 2023 implemented policy to rescind the COVID-19 vaccination mandate, applicable to Soldiers servicing in the Regular Army (RA), Army National Guard (ARNG)/Army National Guard of the United States (ARNGUS), and the U.S. Army Reserve (USAR), cadets of the US. Military Academy (USMA), cadet candidates at the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School (USAMPS), and cadets in the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps (SROTC). It provides that Soldiers currently serving shall not be separated solely on their refusal to receive the COVID-19 vaccine if they sought an exemption on religious, administrative, or medical grounds. Furthermore, the guidance provides details for updating records of current Soldiers, however,

former Soldiers may petition the Army Discharge Review Board or the Army Board for Correction of Military Records to request corrections to their personnel records regarding the characterization of their discharge.

h. Office, Assistant Secretary of the Army, Manpower and Reserve Affairs (SAMR) memorandum (Correction of Military Records for Former Members of the Army Following Recission of August 24, 2001 and November 30, 2021, Coronavirus Disease 2019 Vaccination Requirements for Former Soldiers), 6 September 2023, provided supplemental guidance to the Army Discharge Review Board (ADRB) and the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR) when considering requests for discharge upgrade requests involving former service members who did not meet the COVID-19 vaccination mandate. If the Board determines relief is warranted, this does not imply the vaccination mandate or involuntary separation itself constituted an “injustice” or “inequity” as the vaccination mandate was a valid lawful policy at the time. Consistent with previous published Under Secretary of Defense, Personnel and Readiness Guidance and Board processes regarding changes to policy and/or standards, the COVID-19 vaccination requirement rescission is a relevant factor in evaluating an application for upgrade of the characterization of service. Reinstatement is not under the purview of the Military Review Board. Former Soldier would need to submit their requests for reinstatement to the Army Board for Correction of Military Records. Additionally, the Board should:

(1) It further states to apply existing policy that requires the former Soldier to establish evidence of an error, impropriety, inequity, or injustice in support of their petition in cases with multiple reasons for separation.

i. 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 1-17 (Recoupment) states, individuals who participated in certain advanced education programs and fail to complete their incurred Active-Duty Service Obligation are subject to the recoupment provision of Army Regulation. Recoupment action by the servicing Finance Office/Defense Military Pay Office must be accomplished prior to separation of an individual who has not fulfilled the Active-Duty Service Obligation incurred as a result of participation in that advanced education program in accordance with applicable law and regulation.

(3) 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.

(4) 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. A separation under general (under honorable conditions) normally appropriate when an officer: Submits an unqualified resignation; Separated based on misconduct; discharged for physical disability resulting from intentional misconduct or neglect; and, for final revocation of a security clearance.

(5) Paragraph 3-9 (Resignation for the good of the Service in lieu of general court-martial) states an officer may submit a Resignation for the Good of the Service in lieu of general

court-martial under the following circumstances; to include, court-martial charges have been preferred against the officer with a view toward trial by general court-martial and until action by the convening authority on the findings and sentence in a case where the officer has been convicted. An officer separated under this paragraph normally receives characterization of service of under other than honorable conditions. An officer who resigns for the good of the Service (regardless of the character of service received) is barred from right under laws administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs based on the period of service from which the officer resigned.

(6) 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 "DFS" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 600-8-24, In Lieu 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. The applicant's Army Military Human Resources Record (AMHRR), the issues, and documents submitted with the application were carefully reviewed.

b. A review of the applicant's AMHRR reflects the applicant received a Referred Officer Evaluation Report for poor performance and received a GOMOR for disobeying a lawful order to receive the COVID-19 vaccine. Charges were preferred against the applicant for violation of Article 89, Article 90, Article 91, and Article 133, UCMJ and the applicant voluntarily tendered their resignation from the Army for the Good of the Service in Lieu of General Court-Martial. Their DD Form 214 provides they were discharged with a character of service of General (Under Honorable Conditions), with a narrative reason for separation as In Lieu of Trial by Court-Martial. They completed 3 years, 10 months and 2 days of net active service this period and did not complete their first full term of service.

c. Army Regulation 600-8-24, paragraph 3-9 (Resignation for the good of the Service in lieu of general court-martial) states an officer may submit a Resignation for the Good of the Service in lieu of general court-martial under the following circumstances; to include, court-martial charges have been preferred against the officer with a view toward trial by general court-martial and until action by the convening authority on the findings and sentence in a case where the officer has been convicted. An officer separated under this paragraph normally receives characterization of service of under other than honorable conditions.

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? **No.** The Board's Medical Advisor reviewed DoD and VA medical records and found no mitigating BH diagnoses on the applicant. The applicant provided no documents or testimony of a condition or experience, that, when applying liberal consideration, could have excused or mitigated a discharge.

(2) Did the condition exist, or experience occur during military service? **N/A**

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **N/A**

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

b. Prior Decisions Cited: N/A

c. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends they were discharged due to the COVID-19 Mandate. The applicant contends they have served the country honorably and respectfully requests their discharge be upgraded to honorable. The Board considered this contention valid, and due to changes in DoD policy an upgrade is warranted.

d. The Board determined: The Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the 7 May 2025 Undersecretary of Defense Memo, "Supplemental Guidance to the Military Department Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military / Navy Records Considering Requests from Service Members Adversely Impacted by Coronavirus Disease 2019 Vaccination Requirements" and the 22 May 2025, Assistant Secretary of the Army Manpower and Reserve Affairs Memo, "Supplemental Guidance to the Army Discharge Review Board and Army Board for Correction of Military Records when Considering Requests for Service Member Adversely Impacted by Coronavirus Disease 2019 Vaccination Requirements." The Board discussed the applicant's file, the length and quality of service, no prior misconduct, and COVID-19 vaccination refusal as the sole reason for separation. Based on a preponderance of evidence, the Board found the current discharge inequitable and warranted an upgrade. The Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade of the characterization of service to Honorable and changed the separation authority to AR 15-180, and the narrative reason for separation to Secretarial Authority, with a corresponding separation code of KFF.

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 Honorable based on the new policy and the only misconduct on file being a refusal to accept the COVID-19 vaccine. Thus, the prior characterization is no longer appropriate.

(3) The Board voted to change the reason for discharge to Secretarial Authority under the same pretexts, thus the reason for discharge is no longer appropriate. The SPD code associated with the new reason for discharge is KFF.

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20220011578

10. BOARD ACTION DIRECTED:

- a. Issue a New DD-214 / Separation Order: Yes
- b. Change Characterization to: Honorable
- c. Change Reason / SPD code to: Secretarial Authority / KFF
- d. Change Authority to: AR 15-180

Authenticating Official:

2/27/2026



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 Veterans
Affairs