

1. Applicant's Name:

- a. **Application Date:** 25 August 2022
- b. **Date Received:** 6 September 2022
- c. **Counsel:** None

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

a. **Applicant's Requests and Issues:** The current characterization of service for period under review is general (under honorable conditions). The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable and a narrative reason change.

b. The applicant seeks relief contending, in effect, in 2019, the applicant was issued a General Officer Memorandum of Reprimand (GOMOR) for "failure to disclose a preexisting and potentially disqualifying medical condition during the applicant's entry examination and during the applicant's re-commissioning examination." The applicant was issued an initiation of elimination memorandum for having a previous medical history of suicidal behavior which "if known prior to appointment, would preclude appointment," and for having a GOMOR based on said medical history. However, the entirety of the basis for the separation and the GOMOR is that the applicant had previous medical history of suicidal behavior/mental health prior to appointment. The applicant has no such civilian records prior to appointment that shows the applicant lied during the applicant's examinations. The applicant only obtained a mental health diagnosis during the applicant's time in service. This is corroborated by the applicant's VA Rating, which lists the applicant's diagnosis as occurring while in service, and directly service connected with a 100 percent disability rating. The basis of both the GOMOR and separation is incorrect, and the applicant was diagnosed with behavior health issues during their time in service and not before. There is no diagnosis for suicidal ideation or any mental health issues that exist prior to the applicant entering military service. The applicant's personal belief is that the applicant was persecuted for having valid mental health concerns prior to deployment, and the applicant's command team and command climate sought reprisals through initiating a AR 15-6 Investigation and subsequent GOMOR and separation. The applicant now knows that the Department of Defense's (DOD) updated stance on Mental Health and Suicide Prevention does not condone this behavior and support its service members. The applicant aims to have this request in discharge status to validate the efforts by the DOD to normalize behavioral health concerns, instead of what the applicant went through in their service separation.

c. **Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 16 August 2024, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board denied the request upon finding the separation was both proper and equitable.

Please see Paragraph 9 of this document for more detail regarding the Board's decision.

(Board member names available upon request)

3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:

a. **Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization:** Substandard Performance / AR 600-8-24, Chapter 4-2A / JHK / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

b. **Date of Discharge:** 20 March 2020

c. Separation Facts: The applicant's AMHRR contains the case separation file. However, the applicant provided documents which are described below in 3c (1) through (6).

(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate: 18 September 2019

(2) Basis for Separation: The applicant was informed to show cause for retention on active duty under the provisions of AR 600-8-24, paragraphs 4-2a (13) for substandard performance and 4-2c(5) for derogatory information.

(3) Board of Inquiry (BOI) Date: NA

(4) GOSCA Recommendation Date / Characterization: NIF

(5) DA Board of Review for Eliminations: On an unknown date, the Army Board of Review for Eliminations considered the GOSCA's request to involuntarily separate the applicant for substandard performance in accordance with AR 600-8-24, Chapter 4-2a.

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: 13 February 2020 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Appointment: 23 June 2018 / NIF

b. Age at Appointment: / Education: 22 / bachelor's degree

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: O-1 / 42B, Human Resources Officer / 1 year, 8 months, and 28 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: USAR, 19 September 2014 - 22 June 2018 / HD
 AD, 30 May 2016 - 29 June 2016 / HD
 AD, 26 April 2017 - 30 June 2017 / HD
 (Concurrent Service)

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: None

f. Awards and Decorations: NDSM, GWOTSM, ASR

g. Performance Ratings: 20 May 2018 - 10 January 2020 / Highly Qualified

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record: The applicant provided:

(1) DOD Medical Examination Review Board Report of Medical History, 19 December 2013, shows the applicant marked "No" for items 21 and 22: Depression, anxiety, excessive worry, or nervousness, and any mental condition or illness.

(2) Report of Medical History, 2 February 2017, shows the applicant marked "No" for item 17h, attempted suicide.

(3) Sworn Statement by Captain (CPT) P__ L. M__, Brigade Behavioral Health Officer, 30 April 2019, states CPT J__ K__, Physician Assistant for 82nd Sustainment Brigade, called CPT M__ on 6 March 2019, stating that the applicant had disclosed behavioral health-related concerns during the pre-deployment health assessment and warranted further assessment. The

applicant willingly went to the Embedded Behavioral Health Clinic for a safety assessment with CPT M___, during which time the applicant denied recent suicide attempts (within the last 8 years) but did endorse suicidal thoughts, self-harming behaviors, and risk-taking behaviors from adolescence to present. The applicant agreed to and was scheduled for a full assessment on 13 March 2019 at which time the applicant was determined to be in intermediate risk for suicide. The applicant was placed on a temporary behavioral health profile and became non-deployable without a waiver due to existing safety concerns and behavioral health treatment status.

(4) Sustainment Brigade, 82nd Airborne Division, memorandum for record, subject: Findings and Recommendations of AR 15-6, 21 May 2019, shows:

(a) Findings:

- By failing to disclose prior suicidal ideation with self-harm, the applicant provided false information during the applicant's entry exam in 2013 that would have led to either ineligibility for service or additional command and medical review for waiver determination.
- There was not sufficient evidence to refute the applicant's claim of being told the applicant's condition was clinically insignificant, and therefore to not need to disclose it, however, if the applicant would have disclosed it, the applicant would have had to obtain a medical waiver.
- The applicant failed to satisfactorily disclose this preexisting condition during the applicant's pre-commissioning exam in 2017.
- The applicant had not reached Medical Retention Determination Point for the applicant's behavioral health conditions, was non-deployable, and a waiver was not recommended.

(b) Recommendations:

- The applicant remained non-deployable until cleared by behavioral health, either by their policy guidelines, or until a deployment waiver is recommended by behavioral health.
- The applicant continued the multidisciplinary treatment course for the applicant's condition.
- Caution in any disciplinary actions against the applicant, as it may be construed as occurring because the applicant sought mental health, instead of because of the applicant's failure to uphold the Army value of integrity.
- The applicant should at least receive a letter of concern for failing to disclose information as part of an official statement that led to possible fraudulent entry of a commissioned officer.

(5) Headquarters, 82nd Airborne Division Artillery, 319th Airborne Field Artillery Regiment, memorandum, subject: Legal Review of AR 15-6 Investigation (Applicant), 6 June 2019, states the AR 15-6 proceedings complied with procedural and regulatory requirements. The legal officer recommended approving the findings with a modification to the recommendations by changing, the applicant to receive a GOMOR instead of a letter of concern for intentional failure to disclose a pre-existing and potentially disqualifying medical condition until the applicant was about to deploy.

(6) On 9 July 2019, the applicant acknowledged receipt of the GOMOR, 9 July 2019. (Analyst notes, the AMHRR is void of the GOMOR, 9 July 2019 and the applicant did not provide a copy).

(7) On 14 July 2019, the applicant submitted a response to the GOMOR requesting the GOMOR to not be filed or locally filed. At no point did the applicant fail to disclose any sort of medical condition, and the attending physicians did not express the need for a waiver or state that the applicant had any sort of disqualifying condition.

(8) Headquarters, 82nd Airborne Division (GOSCA), memorandum, GOMOR (Applicant), 4 September 2019, shows the GOSCA directed the GOMOR be filed in the applicant's AMHRR.

(9) Sustainment Brigade, 82nd Airborne Division, memorandum, subject: Request for Initiation of Officer Elimination for (Applicant), 9 September 2019, shows the brigade commander requested initiation of an officer elimination proceeding against the applicant for substandard performance of duty.

(10) Headquarters, 82nd Airborne Division (GOSCA), memorandum Thru, Commander, 82nd Airborne Division Sustainment Brigade, and Commander, 82nd Special Troops Battalion, 82nd Airborne Division Sustainment Brigade, subject: Initiation of Elimination, 18 September 2019, shows an elimination action was initiated and the applicant was required to show cause for retention on active duty under the provisions of AR 600-8-24, paragraphs 4-2a (13) for substandard performance and 4-2c(5) for derogatory information for:

(a) Having a medical history of suicidal behavior which if known prior to the applicant's appointment would have precluded the applicant's appointment.

(b) Having a reprimand filed in the applicant's official records for lying by failing to disclose a preexisting condition of suicidal behavior.

(11) On 20 September 2019, the applicant requested to be retained on active duty. There are no records or other evidence of suicidal behavior that would have been reportable in the applicant's pre-commissioning and entry-level medical exams.

(a) The applicant did not fail to disclose the conditions because the applicant was never asked to disclose those conditions. The questions on DD Form 2492 (DOD Medical Examination Review Board Report of Medical History) and the DD Form 2807-1 (Report of Medical History) do not specifically ask about the conditions of "suicidal behavior," "Suicidal Ideations," or "Self-Harm," except for the question under item 17(h), DD Form 2807-1, which states, "[H]ave you ever ... attempted suicide." To which the applicant truthfully answered "No."

(b) Questions 22 and 23 of DD Form 2492, states "[H]ave you ever had or do you now have: Depression, anxiety, excessive worry or nervousness?" and "[H]ave you ever had or do you now have: Any mental condition or illness?" The applicant answered truthfully "no" to both questions. The applicant had never been diagnosed for any form of mental condition or illness.

(c) Within a month of beginning treatment for a mental health condition, the applicant felt retaliation and shame for seeking behavioral health treatment. The applicant received a "Commander's Investigation" flag, which goes against DoDI 6490.03 (Deployment Health).

(12) Army Review Board Agency, Memorandum For Commanding General, U.S. Army Human Resources Command, subject: Probationary Officer Elimination Case [Applicant], 13 February 2020, shows the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Review Boards) involuntarily eliminated the applicant from the U.S. Army with a general (under honorable conditions) characterization of service. The elimination was based on substandard performance (AR 600-8-24, paragraph 4-2a) and derogatory information (AR 600-8-24, paragraph 4-2c).

(13) The applicant's DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) shows the applicant had not completed the first full term of service. The applicant was discharged on 20 March 2020 under the authority of AR 635-200, paragraph 4-2a, with a narrative reason of Substandard Performance. The DD Form 214 was authenticated with the applicant's electronic signature.

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

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

(1) **Applicant provided:**

(a) 82nd Airborne Division Sustainment Brigade, Memorandum for Record, subject: Behavioral Health Treatment for (Applicant), 19 September 2019, states the applicant was currently being treated for persistent depressive disorder and borderline personality disorder. The applicant first sought military behavioral health services on 6 March 2019 following a pre-deployment health assessment. The diagnosis as stated were made on 5 April 2019.

(b) VA Disability Rating Decision, 22 June 2020, shows the applicant was rated 100 percent disabled for borderline personality disorder with persistent depressive disorder (claimed as depression and borderline personality disorder and dysthymic disorder).

(2) **AMHRR Listed:** None

The ARBA's medical advisor reviewed DoD and VA medical records and not solely those documents listed in 4j(1).

5. **APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE:** DD Form 293; separation case file; VA Rating Decision.

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

the Duties of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Kurta memo], and 2018 Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Wilkie memo].

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

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

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

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

(1) Paragraph 1-23a, 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.

(2) 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.

(3) 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.

(4) Chapter 4 outlines the rules and steps for eliminating officers for substandard performance of duty, misconduct, moral or professional dereliction, and in the interests of national security.

(5) Paragraph 4-2a, prescribes for the elimination of an officer for substandard performance of duty for: downward trend in over performance of duty; failure to keep pace or to progress with contemporaries; failure exercise necessary leadership or command; and other reasons.

(6) Army Regulation 635-5-1 (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 "JHK" as the appropriate code to assign commissioned officers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 600-8-24, Chapter 4-2a, substandard performance.

8. SUMMARY OF FACT(S): 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 and a narrative reason change. The applicant's AMHRR, the issues, and documents submitted with the application were carefully reviewed.

b. The applicant's DD Form 214 shows the applicant served 1 year, 8 months, and 28 days. The applicant's DD Form 214 shows the applicant was discharged on 20 March 2020 under the provisions of AR 600-8-24, Chapter 4, paragraph 4-2a, by reason of Substandard Performance, with a characterization of service of general (under honorable conditions).

c. The applicant contends, in effect, the narrative reason for the discharge should be changed. The applicant was separated under the provisions of Chapter 4, paragraph 4-2a, AR 600-8-24 with a general (under honorable conditions) discharge. The narrative reason specified by Army Regulations for a discharge under this paragraph is "Substandard Performance," and the separation code is "JHK." Army Regulation 635-8 (Separation Processing and Documents) governs 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.

d. The applicant contends, in effect, to have been separated from service for having a previous medical history of suicidal behavior/mental health prior to appointment, however the applicant has no such civilian records prior to appointment that show the applicant lied during the applicant's examinations, and only obtained a mental health diagnosis during the applicant's

time in service. There is no diagnosis for suicidal ideation or any mental health issues that exist prior to the applicant entering military service. The applicant's personal belief is that the applicant was persecuted for having valid mental health concerns prior to deployment, and the applicant's command team and command climate sought reprisals through initiating a AR 15-6 Investigation and subsequent GOMOR and separation. The applicant provided:

(1) 82nd Airborne Division Sustainment Brigade, Memorandum for Record, subject: Behavioral Health Treatment for (Applicant), 19 September 2019, states the applicant was currently being treated for persistent depressive disorder and borderline personality disorder. The applicant first sought military behavioral health services on 6 March 2019 following a pre deployment health assessment. The diagnosis as stated were made on 5 April 2019.

(2) VA Disability Rating Decision, 22 June 2020, shows the applicant was rated 100 percent disabled for borderline personality disorder with persistent depressive disorder (claimed as depression and borderline personality disorder and dysthymic disorder).

e. Published Department of Defense guidance indicates that the guidance is not intended to interfere or impede on the Board's statutory independence. The Board will determine the relative weight of the action that led to the discharge and whether it supports relief or not. In reaching its determination, the Board shall consider the applicant's petition, available records and/or submitted documents in support of the petition.

9. BOARD DISCUSSION AND DETERMINATION:

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

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor, a voting member, reviewed the applicant's DOD and VA health records, applicant's statement, and/or civilian provider documentation and found that the applicant has the following potentially mitigating diagnoses: Borderline Personality Disorder and Persistent Depressive Disorder.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** Borderline Personality Disorder and Persistent Depressive Disorder existing in-service as pre-existing.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **No.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that documentation thoroughly supports the discharge, the applicant did not divulge the applicant's behavioral health history. Irrespective of providing a specific pre-enlistment diagnosis, the conditions listed in-service were the pre-enlistment conditions resulting in the reported history. While those unreported conditions and symptoms were present at the time of untruthfulness, they do not render an individual unable to make a conscious choice of whether to be forthcoming or not and related consequences. Regarding the post-service connected Bipolar Disorder, even if accurate, also did not impact the applicant's choice to be dishonest. There is no indication related symptoms were present at the time/s of deceit. Moreover, the ability to be dishonest over time requires consistent reports on paperwork and verbal interactions not suggestive of an impairing cognitive or psychiatric condition.

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

b. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant contends, in effect, the narrative reason for the discharge should be changed.

The Board considered this contention and found documentation thoroughly supports the discharge.

(2) The applicant contends, in effect, to have been separated from service for having a previous medical history of suicidal behavior/mental health prior to appointment, however the applicant has no such civilian records prior to appointment that show the applicant lied during the applicant's examinations, and only obtained a mental health diagnosis during the applicant's time in service. There is no diagnosis for suicidal ideation or any mental health issues that exist prior to the applicant entering military service. The applicant's personal belief is that the applicant was persecuted for having valid mental health concerns prior to deployment, and the applicant's command team and command climate sought reprisals through initiating an AR 15-6 Investigation and subsequent GOMOR and separation.

The Board considered this contention but found insufficient evidence in the applicant's AMHRR or applicant-provided evidence to show that the command acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner, other than the applicant's contention. Therefore, a discharge upgrade is not warranted.

c. The Board determined that the discharge is, at this time, proper and equitable, in light of the current evidence of record. However, the applicant may request a personal appearance hearing to address the 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.

d. Rationale for Decision:

(1) The Board voted not to change the applicant's characterization of service because, despite applying liberal consideration of all the evidence before the Board, the applicant's Borderline Personality Disorder and Persistent Depressive Disorder existing in-service as pre-existing did not excuse or mitigate the applicant's failure to divulge her behavioral health history resulting in Substandard Performance. The applicant provided false information during the entry exam in 2013 that would have led to ineligibility for service or required a medical review or waiver. The applicant's BH diagnoses do not impact the choice to be dishonest. The Board also considered the applicant's contention regarding the applicant was persecuted for having valid mental health concerns prior to deployment, however there is no evidence in the file to support this contention. The Board found that the totality of the applicant's record does not warrant a discharge upgrade. The discharge was consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the regulation, was within the discretion of the separation authority, and the applicant was provided full administrative due process. Therefore, the applicant's General discharge was proper and equitable as the applicant's misconduct fell below that level of meritorious service warranted for an upgrade to Honorable discharge.

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

(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:** No
- b. Change Characterization to:** No Change
- c. Change Reason / SPD Code to:** No Change
- d. Change RE Code to:** No Change
- e. Change Authority to:** No Change

Authenticating Official:

9/16/2024

X

Presiding Officer, COL, U.S. ARMY
Army Discharge Review Board

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