

**1. Applicant's Name:** [REDACTED]**a. Application Date:** 5 October 2022**b. Date Received:** 11 October 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. The applicant requests an upgrade to honorable.

**b. Applicant Contention(s)/Issue(s):** Through counsel, the applicant requests relief contending, consistently demonstrated superior performance, earning multiple commendations, including the Bronze Star Medal, Army Commendation Medals, Army Achievement Medals, and the Combat Action Badge. They successfully completed Ranger School, Airborne, and Air Assault training, and received numerous "Best Qualified" ratings on Officer Evaluation Reports (OERs). The applicant deployed to Iraq in 2005, where they served in high-intensity combat operations within the "Triangle of Death." The applicant and their unit sustained frequent enemy contact, including exposure to small-arms fire, improvised explosive devices (IEDs), and indirect fire attacks. The applicant later deployed to Afghanistan, maintaining a record of excellence and leadership in combat environments.

(1) In 2016, the applicant was investigated for inappropriate electronic communications with two adults, met through a dating website. During the inquiry, one individual was later found to be under 18 years of age. The Investigating Officer determined the applicant did not violate AR 600-20 or the UCMJ, but concluded the conduct violated Army Values. As a result, the applicant received a General Officer Memorandum of Reprimand (GOMOR) on 19 October 2016 for conduct unbecoming of an officer. The applicant subsequently submitted an Unqualified Resignation in lieu of elimination. The resignation was approved on 3 March 2017, resulting in an other than honorable discharge.

(2) The applicant contends, the misconduct occurred during a period of undiagnosed Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) following combat exposure in Iraq. During the deployment, the applicant experienced multiple traumatic incidents, including witnessing the deaths of Soldiers under their command and surviving repeated attacks. These experiences led to nightmares, anger, and emotional withdrawal. The applicant's spouse corroborated the following redeployment, specifically the applicant exhibited symptoms of trauma, hypervigilance, and insomnia, often resorting to alcohol to cope. Marital strain and the spouse's infidelity during the applicant's deployment further compounded their psychological distress. The applicant later received a formal PTSD diagnosis and entered continuous treatment through therapy and counseling. The applicant asserts their lapse in judgement was directly linked to untreated combat trauma rather than moral disregard or habitual misconduct.

(3) Since separation, the applicant has demonstrated exemplary post-service conduct. They have remained law-abiding and steadily employed. The applicant has maintained sobriety and engaged in regular individual and group therapy addressing PTSD, anger management, and addiction recovery. They have reconciled with their spouse, who submitted a supporting statement describing significant behavioral improvement, emotional stability, and renewed

dedication to family. The applicant has continued to mentor peers and uphold the Army's core values in civilian life.

**c. Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 18 November 2025, and by a 3-0 vote, the Board determined that the characterization of service was too harsh based on the totality of the applicant's record to include length and quality of service, to include combat service, prior periods of honorable service, and post-service accomplishments and as a result it is inequitable. Accordingly, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade to the characterization of service to General, Under Honorable Conditions. 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:** Unacceptable Conduct / AR 600-8-24, Chapter 4-2b and 4-24a (1) / BNC / NA / Under Other than Honorable Conditions

**b. Date of Discharge:** 9 March 2017

**c. Separation Facts:**

**(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** 4 November 2016

**(2) Basis for Separation:** The applicant was required to Show Cause for retention due to adverse information filed in the Official Military Performance File (OMPF) in accordance with AR 600-37. The action was based on the following specific reasons or elimination: the applicant engaging in inappropriate conduct with two civilians. Between February and May 2016, the applicant initiated and maintained electronic communication with two individuals (One of them was later identified as a minor, though there was no physical evidence of in-person contact or criminal acts) through social media and text messaging platforms.

**(3) Board of Inquiry (BOI) Date:** The applicant tendered a resignation in lieu of further elimination proceedings.

**(4) Legal Consultation Date:** 2 November 2016

**(5) GOSCA Recommendation Date / Characterization:** On 4 January 2017, the General Officer Show Cause Authority recommended the resignation in lieu of elimination be approved and recommended with an under other than honorable conditions characterization of service.

**(6) DA Board of Review for Eliminations:** On 4 November 2016, the Army Board of Review for Eliminations considered the GOSCA's request to involuntary separate the applicant for unacceptable conduct in accordance with AR 600-8-24, Chapter 4-2(b).

**(7) DASA Review Board Decision Date / Characterization:** 3 March 2017 / Under Other than Honorable Conditions

### 4. SERVICE DETAILS:

**a. Date / Period of Appointment:** 13 July 2005 / Indefinite

**b. Age at Appointment / Education:** 23 / Bachelor's Degree

**c. Highest Grade Achieved / AOC / Total Service:** O-4 / 13A 2B Field Artillery Officer / 11 years, 5 months, and 15 days

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

**e. Overseas Service / Combat Service:** SWA / Iraq (2006-2007: 10 months); SWA / Iraq (2009-2010: 1 year, 3 months); Afghanistan (2011: 1 month, 1 day)

**f. Awards and Decorations:** ACM-CS, ICS-CS-3, BSM, MSM, ARCOM-3, AAM-4, NDSM, GWOTSM, ASR, OSR-2, NATOMDL, RANGERTAB, CAB; AAB

**g. Performance Ratings:** 2LT, 9 March 2006 – 8 March 2007 / Best Qualified

- 1LTP, 26 October 2007 – 25 October 2008 / Best Qualified
- CPT, 26 October 2008 – 15 June 2013 / Best Qualified
- CPT, 16 June 2013 – 1 March 2014 / Not Evaluated
- CPTP, 3 March 2014 – 4 January 2015 / Highly Qualified
- CPTP, 5 January – 1 July 2015 / Most Qualified

**h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:** On 20 May 2016, the applicant was flagged (Suspend Favorable Personnel Actions (FLAG)) for commander's investigation (LA).

(1) A Findings and Recommendations for Army Regulation (AR) 15-6 Investigation – [The Applicant] memorandum, dated 28 June 2016, reflects an IO was appointed to examine the allegations of the applicant engaging in inappropriate conduct with two civilians. The investigation determined the applicant initiated and maintained electronic communication with two individuals through social media and text messaging platforms between February and May 2016.

(a) Evidence indicated the applicant sent explicit images and made repeated attempts to arrange personal meetings despite being married at the time. One of the individuals was later identified as a minor, though there was no physical evidence of in-person contact or criminal acts. Interviews conducted with multiple witnesses confirmed the applicant misrepresented their marital status as divorced and pursued inappropriate relationships inconsistent with professional and moral standards expected of an Army officer. The applicant declined to provide a sworn statement but appeared for interviews accompanied by counsel. The IO reviewed statements from military personnel, family members, and the involved individuals.

(b) While the inquiry found no violation of AR 600-200 or the UCMJ, it concluded the applicant's behavior constituted a violation of Army Values and was inappropriate for an officer. Based on the evidence, the IO found the applicant engaged in conduct unbecoming by sending explicit electronic communications and attempting to deceive others about their marital status. Although the behavior did not meet the threshold for criminal misconduct, it demonstrated poor judgement and a failure to uphold integrity and professionalism. The IO recommended an administrative and/or disciplinary action be taken as deemed appropriate by the command.

(2) On 19 October 2016, a General Officer Memorandum of Reprimand (GOMOR) provides the applicant was found to have wrongfully engaged in appropriate conduct as

mentioned above. The reprimand was issued under AR 600-37 and the applicant had seven days to submit matters for consideration in extenuation, mitigation, or rebuttal prior to the final determination, in which the applicant provided. Notwithstanding the rebuttal matters, the approval authority directed the reprimand's permanent filing.

(3) On 1 November 2016, the applicant voluntarily tendered their resignation from the Army for the good of the service and requested an honorable discharge. The next day, defense counsel, through the staff judge advocate's office, provided to the commanding general approval would result in a substantial cost savings to the government eliminating the need to maintain the applicant on active duty during pending administrative actions. The memo further emphasized time savings in approving the resignation in lieu of elimination (RILO), rather than an unqualified resignation reviewed through the Army Review Boards Agency. It was additionally noted, the applicant's resignation packet was already complete, allowing for immediate submission and a separation date within 90 days of approval, as permitted by regulation.

(4) A Report of Medical Examination, dated 5 January 2017, reflects the applicant was qualified for separation with the recommendation to follow up with primary care manager and/or the VA for diagnoses as noted.

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:** Through counsel, the applicant provided 24 pages of medical records indicating a diagnosis of PTSD, Chronic, last dated 13 March 2018.

(2) **AMHRR provided:** None

**5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE:** Application for the Review of Discharge; Legal Brief; Service Records (**Enclosures 1,15,30-34**); Twelve Officer Evaluation Reports and Two School Academic Evaluation Reports (**Enc: 3,5,9,10,12,14,16,19,20,22,25,26,28,29**); Awards and Recognitions (**Enc: 2,4,6-8,11,13,17,18, 21,23,24,27**); Three Character Letters (**Enc: 37,38,42**)

**6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS:** The applicant has demonstrated exemplary post-service conduct. They have remained law-abiding and steadily employed. The applicant has maintained sobriety and engaged in regular individual and group therapy addressing PTSD, anger management, and addiction recovery. They have reconciled with their spouse, who submitted a supporting statement describing significant behavioral improvement, emotional stability, and renewed dedication to family. The applicant has continued to mentor peers and uphold the Army's core values in civilian life.

**7. STATUTORY, REGULATORY AND POLICY REFERENCE(S):** 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.

**a.** 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.

**b.** 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.

**c.** 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.

**d.** 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.

**e.** 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.

**(a)** 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.

**(b)** 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.

**(c)** 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 they: Resign 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.

**(2)** Chapter 4 outlines the policy and procedure for the elimination of officers from the active Army for substandard performance of duty, for misconduct, moral or professional dereliction, or in the interest of national security. An officer identified for elimination may, at any time during or prior to the final action in the elimination case elect one of the following options: (1) Submit a resignation in lieu of elimination; (2) request a discharge in lieu of elimination; and (3) Apply for retirement in lieu of elimination if otherwise eligible.

**f.** 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 "BNC" as the appropriate code to assign for members who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 600-8-24, Unacceptable Conduct.

**g.** Title 38, U.S. Code, Sections 1110 and 1131, permits the VA to award compensation for a medical condition which was incurred in or aggravated by active military service. The VA, however, is not required by law to determine medical unfitness for further military service. The VA, in accordance with its own policies and regulations, awards compensation solely on the basis that a medical condition exists and that said medical condition reduces or impairs the social or industrial adaptability of the individual concerned. Consequently, due to the two concepts involved, an individual's medical condition, although not considered, medically unfitting

for military service at the time of processing for separation, discharge, or retirement, may be sufficient to qualify the individual for VA benefits based on an evaluation by the agency.

**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. An authenticated DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) provides the applicant was discharged under the provisions of AR 600-8-24, Chapter 4-2b and Chapter 4-24a (1) with an under than honorable conditions characterization of service for unacceptable conduct. In October 2016, the applicant received a GOMOR for having wrongfully engaged in inappropriate conduct and communications with two individuals (one of which was another officer's 16-year old stepchild), which included explicit photographs shared through Snapchat. The applicant voluntarily tendered their resignation from the Army for the good of the service under the abovementioned provisions. They served 11 years, 5 months, and 15 days of an indefinite appointment.

(1) Through counsel, the applicant contends an exceptional record of military service marked by valor, achievement, and leadership before the incident, which occurred during a period of untreated combat-related PTSD, reflected impaired judgement rather than a disregard for Army standards. Since discharge, the applicant has shown sustained rehabilitation through therapy, sobriety, family reconciliation, and community involvement. Their consistent post-service conduct, documented professional excellence, and genuine remorse strongly support an upgrade of their discharge characterization to accurately reflect their honorable service and recovery.

c. Chapter 4 outlines the policy and procedure for the elimination of officers from the active Army for substandard performance of duty. The elimination of an officer for misconduct, moral or professional dereliction, or in the interests of national security. An officer identified for elimination may, at any time during or prior to the final action in the elimination case elect one of the following options: (1) Submit a resignation in lieu of elimination; (2) request a discharge in lieu of elimination; and (3) Apply for retirement in lieu of elimination if otherwise eligible.

d. 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/experiences: PTSD.

(2) Did the condition exist, or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor found the applicant is SC for treatment only of PTSD

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **No.** "The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that the applicant has a BH condition that potentially mitigates misconduct as outlined in the BoS. Applicant is SC for treatment only for PTSD related to combat experience, however, the applicant's misconduct characterized by Unacceptable Conduct – engaging in inappropriate relationships with two civilians, is not mitigated, as the misconduct is not natural sequela of PTSD and the applicant did not have a condition that impaired ability to differentiate between right and wrong and adhere to the right, at the time of the misconduct. Therefore, upgrade based on medical mitigation is not supported.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **No.** Despite the Board's application of liberal consideration, the Board considered the opinion of the Board's Medical Advisor, a voting member, that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's PTSD outweighed the basis for applicant's separation – engaging in inappropriate relationships with two civilians – for the aforementioned reason(s).

b. Prior Decisions Cited: N/A

c. Response to Contention(s): Through counsel, the applicant contends an exceptional record of military service marked by valor, achievement, and leadership before the incident, which occurred during a period of untreated combat-related PTSD, reflected impaired judgement rather than a disregard for Army standards. Since discharge, the applicant has shown sustained rehabilitation through therapy, sobriety, family reconciliation, and community involvement. Their consistent post-service conduct documented professional excellence, and genuine remorse strongly support an upgrade of their discharge characterization to accurately reflect their honorable service and recovery. Character letters consistently describe the applicant as a capable, selfless, and respected officer whose lapse in judgement was an isolated event amid an otherwise exemplary career. Senior leaders highlight the applicant's integrity, compassion, and accountability, noting clear rehabilitation and recommending an honorable or general discharge, based on overall service and restored character. The Board considered this contention, but found an upgrade to Honorable not supported by the evidence of record. The Honorable characterization is appropriate when the quality of the Soldier's service generally has met the standards of accept conduct and performance of duty or is otherwise meritorious that any other characterization would be clearly inappropriate. The Board found that the applicant's service, given the nature of the misconduct, including two inappropriate relationships with civilians, was not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge. However, the Board determined that the characterization of service was too harsh based on the totality of the applicant's record to include length and quality of service, to include combat service, prior periods of honorable service, and post-service accomplishments and as a result it is inequitable. Accordingly, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade to the characterization of service to General, Under Honorable Conditions.

d. The Board determined that the characterization of service was too harsh based on the totality of the applicant's record to include length and quality of service, to include combat service, prior periods of honorable service, and post-service accomplishments and as a result it is inequitable. Accordingly, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade to the characterization of service to General, Under Honorable Conditions. 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

**ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE****AR20230000486**

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 based on the totality of the applicant's record to include length and quality of service, to include combat service, prior periods of honorable service, and post-service accomplishments. While the prior characterization is no longer appropriate, the applicant's misconduct fell below that level of meritorious service warranted for an upgrade to Honorable discharge.

(3) The Board voted not to change the applicant's reason for discharge or accompanying SPD code as the applicant's misconduct of two inappropriate relationships with civilians was Unacceptable Conduct, as the reason the applicant was discharged was both proper and equitable.

(4) As there is no RE-code listed on the applicant's discharge paperwork, due to being an Officer, no upgrade actions are required for this item.

**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:**

1/15/2026



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