

1. Applicant's Name: [REDACTED]

- a. **Application Date:** 13 October 2023
- b. **Date Received:** 23 October 2023
- c. **Counsel:** None.

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

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

The applicant states in effect, the military had a chance to do right by them, but they failed. They were sexually assaulted at their first duty station in September of 2018, everyone knew about the assault and treated them differently, they were reassigned to Fort Lewis in November of 2018. When they arrived at their new duty station, they were told the Command Sergeant Major only knew about the assault, however that was not the case, the chaplain and chaplain assistant knew also. They treated the applicant differently, like they felt sorry for them. They were always asked how they were holding up, when the motor pool consisted of other people and the others were never asked the same thing.

They had to return to their previous duty station for court, their commander had to sign paperwork that would excuse their absence for the week, their commander asked them why they needed to leave, and they told their commander "if the paper does not say that information then with all respect it means it is not your business". When they returned from court their Commander and First Sergeant started treating them differently as if they knew why they left. After all that happened, they made an appointment with mental health, their appointment was cancelled, and they were at their breaking point. They were stopped at the gate, while being under the influence and that is why they were discharged from the Army.

Since leaving the military, they stopped drinking, they went to court for their DUI and received a misdemeanor. They realized they should not have been drinking and driving because they could have taken someone's life. They have a child now; their whole focus is on their child and bettering their self as a person and parent. The truly believe the military had a chance to do right by them, but they failed.

- b. **Board Type and Decision:** In a records review conducted on 25 October 2024, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the circumstances surrounding the discharge (PTSD due to MST). Therefore, 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 635-200, Chapter 15, and the narrative reason for separation to Secretarial Authority, with a corresponding separation code to JFF. No change to the reentry eligibility (RE) code.

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

3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:

- a. **Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization:** Misconduct (Serious Offense) / AR 635-200 / JKQ / RE-3 / Under Honorable Conditions (General)

- b. **Date of Discharge:** 8 June 2020

c. Separation Facts:

- (1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** NIF
- (2) Basis for Separation:** On 7 March 2020 the applicant received a DUI.
- (3) Recommended Characterization:** General, under honorable conditions.
- (4) Legal Consultation Date:** 6 May 2020
- (5) Administrative Separation Board:** N/A
- (6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization:** NIF / General, under honorable conditions.

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

- a. Date / Period of Enlistment:** 2 October 2017 / 3 years, 28 weeks
- b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score:** 20 / Alternate Education Diploma / 86
- c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service:** E-4 (Specialist) / 91B10 Wheeled Vehicle Mechanic / 2 years, 8 months, 7 days.
- d. Prior Service / Characterizations:** None.
- e. Overseas Service / Combat Service:** Hawaii / None.
- f. Awards and Decorations:** NDSM, ASR
- g. Performance Ratings:** N/A
- h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:**

- (1)** On 31 August 2018 the applicant was a victim of abusive sexual contact. The accused was adjudged and found guilty on 30 August 2019.
- (2)** Orders C1-275-021 provides the applicant proceeded on a permanent change of station to Joint Base Lewis McChord. The Enlisted Record Brief (ERB) indicates the applicant arrived on 11 November 2018.
- (3)** An Investigative Summary document provides on 7 March 2020 the applicant was arrested for driving under the influence. The applicant declined to consent to a voluntary breath sample, a search warrant was requested and approved for a blood sample.
- (4)** A Developmental Counseling Form provides on 17 March 2020 the applicant was counseled inform them they were flagged for alcohol abuse adverse action. On 7 March 2020, the applicant was stopped at the gate while trying to gain access to the installation, they were found to be impaired after a Field Sobriety Test was conducted. The applicant refused to provide a breath sample and a blood draw; their blood was drawn after obtaining a court order.

(5) The applicant's immediate commander notified them of their intent to separate them for commission of a serious offense. The commander recommended a general, under honorable characterization of service. On 6 May 2020 the applicant acknowledged the commander's notification and basis for separation, they consulted with counsel and completed their election of rights indicating they understood the prejudices that may occur in receiving a characterization of service of less than honorable.

(6) The chain of command endorsed and concurred with the commander's discharge recommendations and on an unknown date the appropriate authority reviewed the applicant's separation packet and directed the applicant be separated with a General under honorable conditions characterization of service.

(7) A DD Form 214 shows on 8 June 2020 the applicant was discharged accordingly, they completed total active service of 2 years, 8 months, and 7 days.

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: None.

j. Behavioral Health Condition(s): PTSD, MST

(1) Applicant provided: Department of Veteran Affairs documents that shows a 70 percent rating for PTSD.

(2) AMHRR Listed: CID Report

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: A DD Form 293 (Record Review) application, two Department of Veteran Affairs documents that shows they are 70 percent service connected for PTSD.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: They applicant stopped drinking, had a child and they are focused on being a better person and parent.

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), 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.

d. Army Regulation 635-200 provides the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel provides the authorized types of characterization of service or description of separation.

(1) An Honorable discharge is a separation with honor and is appropriate when the quality of the Soldier's service generally has met the standards of acceptable conduct and performance of duty for Army personnel or is otherwise so meritorious that any other characterization would be clearly inappropriate.

(2) A General discharge is a separation from the Army under honorable conditions and is issued to a Soldier whose military record is satisfactory but not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge.

(3) An Under other-than-honorable-conditions discharge is an administrative separation from the Service under conditions other than honorable and it may be issued for misconduct, fraudulent entry, security reasons, or in lieu of trial by court martial based on certain circumstances or patterns of behavior or acts or omissions that constitute a significant departure from the conduct expected of Soldiers in the Army.

(4) Except as otherwise indicated in this regulation, commanders must make maximum use of counseling and rehabilitation before determining that a Soldier has no potential for further useful service and, therefore, should be separated. In this regard, commanders will ensure that adequate counseling and rehabilitative measures are taken before initiating separation proceedings for the following reasons. Rehabilitative requirements are not required for individuals separated under Chapter 14-12c.

- Involuntary separation due to parenthood
- Personality disorder
- Other designated physical or mental conditions
- Entry-level performance and conduct
- Unsatisfactory performance
- Minor disciplinary infractions or a pattern of misconduct
- Failure to meet body fat standards

(5) Chapter 14 establishes policy and prescribes procedures for separating members for misconduct. Specific categories include minor disciplinary infractions, a pattern of misconduct, and commission of a serious offense, to include abuse of illegal drugs, convictions by civil authorities and desertion or being absent without leave. Action will be taken to separate a member for misconduct when it is clearly established that rehabilitation is impractical or unlikely to succeed. A discharge under other than honorable conditions is normally appropriate for a Soldier discharged under this chapter. However, the separation authority may direct a general discharge if such is merited by the Soldier's overall record. A soldier subject to this discharge under this regulation will be considered and processed for discharge even though he/she has filed an appeal or has stated his/her intention to do so. Paragraph 14-12c, states a Soldier is subject to action per this section for commission of a serious military or civilian offense, if the specific circumstances of the offense warrant separation and a punitive discharge is, or would be, authorized for the same or a closely related offense under the Manual for Courts-Martial.

(6) Chapter 15 provides explicitly for separation under the prerogative of the Secretary of the Army. Secretarial plenary separation authority is exercised sparingly and seldom delegated. Ordinarily, it is used when no other provision of this regulation applies, and early separation is clearly in the Army's best interest. Separations under this paragraph are effective only if approved in writing by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary's approved designee as announced in updated memoranda. Secretarial separation authority is normally exercised on a case-by-case basis.

e. Army Regulation 600-85 (Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP)) governs the program and identifies Army policy on alcohol and other drug abuse, and responsibilities. The ASAP is a command program that emphasizes readiness and personal responsibility. It provides the ultimate decision regarding separation or retention of abusers is the responsibility of the Soldier's chain of command. Abuse of alcohol or the use of illicit drugs by military personnel is inconsistent with Army values and the standards of performance, discipline, and readiness necessary to accomplish the Army's missions. Individuals who do not self-refer for treatment and are subsequently identified as positive for controlled substances for which they

do not have a valid prescription may be considered in violation of the UCMJ for drug misuse/abuse.

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 "JKQ" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, paragraph 12c, misconduct (serious offense).

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.

h. Army Regulation 601-210, Regular Army and Reserve Components Enlistment Program, governs eligibility criteria, policies, and procedures for enlistment and processing of persons into the Regular Army, the U.S. Army Reserve, and Army National Guard for enlistment per DODI 1304.26. It also prescribes the appointment, reassignment, management, and mobilization of Reserve Officers' Training Corps cadets under the Simultaneous Membership Program. Chapter 4 provides the criteria and procedures for waivable and nonwaivable separations. Table 3-1, defines reentry eligibility (RE) codes:

- RE-1 Applies to: Person completing his or her term of active service who is considered qualified to reenter the U.S. Army. Eligibility: Qualified for enlistment if all other criteria are met
- RE-3 Applies to: Person who is not considered fully qualified for reentry or continuous service at time of separation, but disqualification is waivable. Eligibility: Ineligible unless a waiver is granted
- RE-4 Applies to: Person separated from last period of service with a nonwaivable disqualification. This includes anyone with a DA imposed bar to reenlistment in effect at time of separation or separated for any reason (except length of service retirement) with 18 or more years active Federal service. Eligibility: Ineligible for enlistment

i. Sexual Assault/Sexual Harassment Prevention.

(1) In February 2004, Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld directed the Under Secretary of Defense, Personnel and Readiness to review the process for treatment and care of victims of sexual assault in the Military Services. One of the recommendations emphasized the need to establish a single point of accountability for sexual assault policy within the Department, which led to the establishment of a Joint Task Force for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response.

(2) The Task Force focused its initial efforts on developing a new DoD-wide sexual assault policy that incorporated recommendations set forth in the Task Force Report on Care for

Victims of Sexual Assault as well as in the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (PL108-375). This act directed the Department to have a sexual assault policy in place by January 1, 2005. In January 2005, DoD presented to Congress a comprehensive policy on prevention and response to sexual assault. The policy provides a foundation for the Department to improve prevention of sexual assault, significantly enhance support to victims and increase reporting and accountability.

(3) The Army first introduced SAPR (Now SHARP) training in 2006, requiring annual unit training and subsequently embedding it in all levels of professional military education and initial entry training to the Army War College.

(4) In 2009 the Army's SHARP program has focused its efforts on five specific priorities or Lines of Effort: (1) Prevention of sexual assault (2) Competent and sensitive investigations of sexual assault (3) Accountability for the perpetrators of sexual assault (4) Assistance to, and advocacy for, the victims of sexual assault (5) Effective assessment of SHARP programs. Additionally, the cornerstone of the Army's accountability efforts is the Special Victims Prosecutor (SVP) and Sexual Assault Investigators (SAI) Program; recognizing the need for improved training and resources for the prosecution of sexual assault and family violence crimes, the Army initiated the SVP in the Judge Advocate General's Corps (JAGC) and the Sexual Assault Investigators SAI within CID. The SVPs are hand selected by senior leaders at the HQDA level for their expertise in the courtroom and their ability to work with victims.

(5) Revised SHARP training was implemented in early 2011 in the basic combat training portion of initial entry training. Soldiers are introduced to "Sex Rules" ("Sex Rules - Follow Them") which defines each rule and linking them to an Army Value. and "Sex-Signals" a 90-minute, live, two-person, audience interactive program containing skits dealing with topics ranging from dating and consent to rape and other topics such as body lingual, alcohol use and intervention. Additionally, Drill Sergeants and Army Recruiters attend specialized training tailored to their unique roles and use a pocket guide "Sex Rules - Teach Them." U.S. Army Cadet Command assessed and revived all basic officer leader course-accessions.

(6) CID issued the Sexual Assault Investigation Handbook in April 2013. This resource provided investigators with a pamphlet that highlights and reminds agents of important issues regarding sexual assault investigations such as crime scene processing, interviews and alcohol facilitated incidents. One of the most innovative aspects of the Army's sexual assault investigation training is the Forensic Experiential Trauma Interview (FETI) technique. Since 2013, CID has used a forensic tool (Cellebrite) that allows agents at all locations to analyze and download emails, texts and phone numbers from suspects' and victims' cell phones, providing valuable evidence in sexual assault investigations.

(7) The Chief of Staff set the tone for leader accountability when, in June 2013, he issued five imperatives and told senior Army leaders that, "combating sexual harassment and sexual assault is our primary mission." These imperatives require leaders to establish positive command climates where incidents of sexual assault are rare, but when they do occur, victims are treated with dignity and respect while offenders are held appropriately accountable.

(8) In December 2013, President Obama directed the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide a comprehensive report that would detail the military's progress in preventing and responding to incidents of sexual assault. In preparation for the omnibus report of the DOD, Secretary Hagel and Chairman Dempsey tasked each Military Service to provide a report outlining all of the Service-level programs implemented since Fiscal Year 2012, a period in which all of the Services have taken aggressive steps in this area.

(9) In 2014 the Army implemented Special Victims Counsel (SVC) Program. This program is unique to the military justice system and is unequalled in the civilian community. At no cost to the victim, the Army provides a specially trained attorney to every Soldier or dependent family member victim of sexual assault. The SVC represents the victim throughout the investigation and accountability process, with the primary duty to zealously represent the express interests of the victim, even if those interests do not align with the government's interests. National Defense Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2014 resulted in key provisions of the UCMJ Article 120.

(10) The Army has continued to transform critical elements of the military justice system through improved policy and practice which include but are not limited to Continued evolution of Article 120 into one of most progressive, expansive and offender-focused sexual assault statutes in the country • Elevation of initial disposition authority for sexual assault offenses; elevated review of decisions not to refer allegations to court-martial • Revision of the scope and procedural rules for Article 32 preliminary hearings • Enhanced protections for victims during preliminary hearings, including application of "rape shield" evidentiary rules and the victim advocate privilege • Revision of the Rules for Court-Martial governing disposition of offenses • Revision of procedures to allow victims and their counsel to be heard throughout the pre and post-trial process • Addition of mandatory minimum sentences for sexual assault • Procedures for identifying and separating Soldiers convicted of sexual offenses • Codifying the criminal nature of retaliatory acts taken against Soldiers who report a sexual assault or intervene to stop one • Adopting a policy to publish all courts-martial results in a public forum to provide maximum transparency to our community.

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. The applicant's DD-214 provides that the applicant received a General (under honorable conditions) characterization of service, rather than an under other than honorable conditions (UOTCH) discharge which is normally considered appropriate for a soldier discharged for serious misconduct.

b. Based on the available evidence the applicant enlisted in the army at the age of 20, four months after arriving to their first duty station they were a victim of abusive sexual contact. The applicant had a permanent change of station less than three months later. In August of 2019 the accused was found guilty of abusive sexual contact. On 7 March 2020 the applicant was stopped at the ACP (Access Control Point) for a 100 percent trunk inspection, when they existed their vehicle, they were stumbling, and using their vehicle for balance. A standardized field sobriety test was conducted, and they were arrested for DUI. They applicant refused to submit a breathalyzer test and their blood was drawn after a court order was obtained. The

AMHRR is void of the results of their blood alcohol content level. They were subsequently processed for administrative separation.

c. The applicant was notified of the intent to separate them for misconduct (serious offense) and they acknowledged they understood the basis for separation under the provisions AR 635-200, CH 14-12c. They elected to consult with counsel; AMHRR is void of the counsel's signature. The appropriate authority approved separation and a DD Form 214 indicates they were discharged with an under honorable conditions (general) characterization of service on 8 June 2020.

d. Chapter 14 establishes policy and prescribes procedures for members being separated for misconduct. Specific categories include minor disciplinary infractions, a pattern of misconduct, commission of a serious offense and convictions by civil authorities. Action will be taken to separate a member for misconduct when it is clearly established that rehabilitation is impracticable or is unlikely to succeed. A discharge under other than honorable conditions is normally appropriate for a soldier discharged under this chapter. However, the separation authority may direct a general discharge if such is merited by the soldier's overall record.

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/experiences: PTSD; MST.

(2) Did the condition exist, or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor found PTSD and MST developed/occurred during active service. VA service connection for PTSD establishes nexus with active service.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that the applicant has a mitigating BH condition, PTSD due to MST. As there is an association between this condition and self-medication with alcohol and/or illicit drugs, there is a nexus between her diagnosis of PTSD due to MST and her DUI.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **Yes.** After applying liberal consideration to the evidence, including the Board Medical Advisor's opine, the Board determined that the applicant's condition or experience outweighed the listed basis for separation for the aforementioned reasons.

b. Prior Decisions Cited: None.

c. Response to Contentions: N/A

d. The Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the circumstances surrounding the discharge (PTSD due to MST diagnoses). Therefore, 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 635-200, Chapter 15, and the narrative reason for separation to Secretarial Authority, with a corresponding separation code to JFF. No change to the reentry eligibility (RE) code.

e. Rationale for Decision:

(1) The Board carefully considered the applicant's request, supporting documents, evidence in the records, a medical review, and published Department of Defense guidance for liberal consideration of discharge upgrade requests. The Board considered the applicant's statement, record of service, the frequency and nature of misconduct, and the reason for separation. The Board found sufficient evidence of in-service mitigating factors (Length, Combat) and concurred with the conclusion of the medical advising official that the applicant's (PTSD due to MST) does mitigate the applicant's DUI. There is an association between this condition and self-medication with alcohol and /or illicit drugs. Based on a preponderance of evidence, the Board determined that the character of service the applicant received upon separation was inequitable.

(2) The Board voted to change the applicant's reason for discharge to Secretarial Authority with a corresponding separation code JFF.

(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: Yes
- b. Change Characterization to: Honorable
- c. Change Reason / SPD Code to: Secretarial Authority / JFF
- d. Change RE Code to: No change
- e. Change Authority to: AR 635-200

Authenticating Official:

6/23/2025

Le
A
R
B
B
C
C
D

Without Leave
Military Human
d
duct Discharge
I Health
Grade Article 15
nvestigation

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

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE
AR20230014347

SPD – Separation Program
Designator
TBI – Traumatic Brain Injury

UNC – Uncharacterized
Discharge

UOTHC – Under Other Than
Honorable Conditions

VA – Department of Veterans
Affairs