

1. Applicant's Name: [REDACTED]**a. Application Date:** 4 December 2023**b. Date Received:** 4 December 2023**c. Counsel:** [REDACTED]**2. REQUEST, ISSUES, BOARD TYPE, AND DECISION:**

a. Applicant's Requests and Issues: The current characterization of service for the period under review is General (Under Honorable Conditions). The applicant requests an upgrade to Honorable; a narrative reason change to "Completion of Required Active Service"; the separation code changed to "MBK"; and the reentry code changed to "RE-1".

(1) Counsel states. The applicant seeks relief contending, they had only one incident of misconduct in their over five years of Honorable active duty service. Unfortunately, their commander chose to take almost every conceivable negative action against the applicant for the one act of misconduct, with no opportunity to Soldier back. The command made no effort at rehabilitation – no chance to observe the applicant demonstrate their ability to bounce back from the incident and continue to serve honorably. They were awarded, among other things, the Basic Aviation Badge, the NATO Medal, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the Air Medal, and the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, with two Campaign Stars. They deployed from Germany to Afghanistan on a 10-month combat tour. There, the applicant put their knowledge, training, and bravery to the test repeatedly under very difficult conditions, often taking fire during their deployment. **Exhibit A and E.**

(2) Viewing the entire command response to the applicant's misconduct, the Soldier was punished beyond the extent necessary, was not provided any rehabilitation, and paid for their misdeed without receiving the opportunity of a second chance. While the chosen punitive tool was an Article 15, UCMJ, the punishment almost seems pointless when it is not followed by an opportunity for the applicant to prove they were worthy of continuing to wear the uniform. Their case clearly called for the chance at rehabilitation. Instead, their harsh but fair actual punishment was followed by a slow administrative process and collateral effects that were, in essence, just a continuation of the punishment, where the net effect is this Soldier could no longer contribute in any meaningful way in his chosen career. The **legal brief** provides additional details for further consideration.

b. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 22 November 2024, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the applicant's length and quality of service, to include combat service, the circumstances surrounding the discharge, and post-service accomplishments. Therefore, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade of the characterization of service to Honorable and changed to the separation authority to AR 635-200, paragraph 14-12a, the narrative reason for separation to Misconduct (Minor Infractions), with a corresponding separation code of JKN. The Board determined the reentry code is proper and equitable and voted not to change it.

Please see Section 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: Misconduct (Serious Offense) / AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12C / JKQ / RE-3 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

b. Date of Discharge: 2 February 2015

c. Separation Facts:

(1) Date of Notification of Intent to Separate: Undated

(2) Basis for Separation: wrongfully operated a motor vehicle while intoxicated, with a blood alcohol content (BAC) of .132

(3) Recommended Characterization: General (Under Honorable Conditions)

(4) Legal Consultation Date: 12 December 2014

(5) Administrative Separation Board: NA

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: 14 January 2015 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 25 January 2010 / 6 years

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 18 / High School Diploma / 114

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-4 (SPC) / 15U10 CH-47 Helicopter Repairer / 5 years, 8 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: None

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: SWA / Afghanistan (5 May 2012 – 1 March 2013)

f. Awards and Decorations:

- Afghanistan Campaign Medal w/two campaign stars
- Air Medal
- Army Achievement Medal
- Army Good Conduct Medal
- National Defense Service Medal
- Army Service Ribbon
- Overseas Service Ribbon (2nd Award)
- NATO Medal
- Basic Aviation Badge
- Certificate of Achievement

g. Performance Ratings: NA

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:

(1) On 25 January 2010, the applicant enlisted in the Regular Army (RA) for 6 years as a PVT (E-1). The Enlisted Record Brief provides on 25 January 2012, they promoted up to SPC (E-4). On 9 April, 21 July, and 24 September 2014, they were flagged, Suspend Favorable Personnel Actions (FLAG), for failing an Army Physical Fitness Test (JA), for field-initiated involuntary separation (BA), and for punishment phase-adverse action (HA), which expired on 23 March 2015. **Exhibit B.**

(2) On 20 July 2014, the command notified Fort Carson Operations Center on a serious incident report providing, the applicant was drinking in their barracks room the night prior. Early this morning, they left in their vehicle to get something to eat (McDonalds) and upon returning to post through Gate 3, the gate guard smelled alcohol on their breath and notified the military police at the gate (SGT). SGT conducted a breathalyzer test resulting in a .147 blood alcohol content (BAC), arrested the applicant for driving under the influence of alcohol (DUI), and took them to the station. 1SG was notified and the platoon sergeant (SFC), picked them up from the station and took them to the barracks.

(3) On 24 September 2014, the applicant accepted nonjudicial punishment (NJP) in violation of Article 111, UCMJ, for DUI (driving under the influence), with a blood alcohol content (BAC) of .132, at or near Fort Carson, CO, on or about 20 July 2014. Their punishment imposed a reduction to PV2 (E-2); forfeiture of \$858.00 pay per month for two months, suspended, to be automatically remitted if not vacated before 23 March 2015; extra duty for 45 days; restriction to the limits of company area, dining/medical facility, and place of worship for 45 days, suspended, to be automatically remitted, if not vacated before 23 December 2014; oral reprimand. They did not appeal. **Exhibit G.**

(4) Although undated, the company commander notified the applicant of their intent to initiate separation proceedings under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12C, Misconduct (Serious Offense), for having wrongfully operated a motor vehicle while intoxicated, with a BAC (blood alcohol content) of .132 on 20 Jul 2014. They recommended a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service. On 3 December 2014, the applicant acknowledged receipt of the separation notice. **Exhibit G.**

(a) The election of rights signature page provides on 12 December 2014, the applicant signed as the respondent; however, the first page indicating their election is missing from the record and was not provided in the exhibits. Defense counsel acknowledged having counseled the applicant on the possible effects of their separation, rights available to them, and the right to waive their rights.

(b) On 17 December 2014 and 6 January 2015, the battalion commander concurred with the company commander's recommendation and the brigade judge advocate found the separation legally sufficient. On 14 January 2015, the separation approval authority approved the discharge, with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service.

(5) On 26 January 2015, their separation orders were issued. A DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) reflects the applicant was discharged accordingly on 2 February 2015, with 5 years, 4 months, and 19 days of total service. The applicant provided their electronic signature and has not completed their first full term of service. **Exhibit A.**

i. **Lost Time / Mode of Return:** 2 days; Confined by Civil Authorities (CCA), 16 – 17 June 2014 / Released to Military Control

j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):

(1) **Applicant provided:** None

(2) **AMHRR Listed:** None

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (Exhibit **A**); Enlisted Record Brief (Exhibit **B**); Four Character Letters (Exhibits **C, D, I, J**); Self-Authored Statement (Exhibit **E**); Recommendation for Award (Exhibit **F**); Separation Package (Exhibit **G**); Wilkie Memorandum (Exhibit **H**); Credit Report History (Exhibit **K**); Resume (Exhibit **L**); Performance Reviews/Evaluations (Exhibits **M-O**)

a. CW3 is a career Army pilot, who began their service in Germany as an enlisted Soldier, having worked closely with the applicant, is contending through counsel, effusive praise for their friend and former coworker. They describe a Chinook helicopter maintenance mission in Germany for which they were chosen over their peers and helped each other excel. CW3 states, “Once the mission was complete [their] leadership recognized [their] commitment to completing the mission and [they] were continuously selected over [their] peers as leaders on missions where failure was not an option...” Most importantly, CW3 laments that the applicant’s actions on one night can wash away “all of that positive impact [they have] had on [their] leaders and peers.” **Exhibit D.**

b. CW2(P) is a maintenance test pilot who was the applicant’s supervisor, primary trainer, and mentor in Germany, and also worked closely with them on their 10-month deployment to Afghanistan. Through counsel, CW2(P) contends, “[They were] always motivated, and could be counted on to fulfill whatever obligation [they] had, without error or fail...quickly progressed...as a CH-47F Chinook helicopter door gunner. [Their] ability for increased responsibility led to [the applicant] being selected to begin training as a Crew Chief...a mid-level job with high responsibility in [their] military occupation specialty (MOS).” The applicant has accepted responsibility for their actions and taken their punishment in stride, going on to a successful career. CW2(P) says of the applicant’s character that they “a brave [person], and in totality, [they have] served honorably.” And does not want to see “a single isolated event” dim that assessment. **Exhibit C.**

c. SFC (retired) is the applicant’s coworker (quality inspector for their current employer), and contends through counsel, they were “immediately impressed with the attention to detail, technical knowledge, and professionalism [the applicant] brought to our team.” SFC were also thoroughly impressed with the applicant’s selfless nature in assisting them with tasks made difficult by SFC’s service-connected disabilities. The applicant as described by SFC, is a fellow veteran who does not hesitate to help those in need, currently helps protect America’s borders, “and is what the Army taught [them] an Honorable person is.” SFC only asks that the applicant’s discharge be upgraded “to match [the applicant’s] character – Honorable.” **Exhibit J.**

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: The applicant remained in the same career field – only not in uniform and was commended on their performance appraisals. They have worked for the past eight years maintaining helicopters and conducting essential training for defense contractors. They have established themselves as a positive contributor to their community. **Exhibits M-O.**

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]. **Exhibit H.**

(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 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations), set policies, standards, and procedures to ensure the readiness and competency of the force while providing for the orderly administrative separation of Soldiers for a variety of reasons. Readiness is promoted by maintaining high standards of conduct and performance.

(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) 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 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.

(5) 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 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 14-12, Misconduct (Serious Offense).

f. 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 waiverable and nonwaiverable separations. Table 3-1, defines reentry eligibility (RE) codes:

(1) 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.

(2) RE-3 Applies to: Person who is not considered fully qualified for reentry or continuous service at time of separation, but disqualification is waiverable. Eligibility: Ineligible unless a waiver is granted.

(3) RE-4 Applies to: Person separated from last period of service with a nonwaiverable 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.

g. Army Regulation 600-85 (Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP)) provided a comprehensive alcohol and drug abuse prevention and control policies, procedures, and responsibilities for Soldiers for ASAP services. The ASAP is a command program that emphasizes readiness and personal responsibility. 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 mission. All Soldiers who are identified as drug abusers, without exception, will be referred to the ASAP counseling center for screening; be considered for disciplinary action under the UCMJ, as appropriate; and be processed for administrative separation in accordance with Army Regulation 635-200.

(1) Unit commanders must intervene early and refer all Soldiers suspected or identified as alcohol and/or drug abusers to the ASAP. The unit commander should recommend enrollment based on the Soldier's potential for continued military service in terms of professional skills, behavior, and potential for advancement. ASAP participation is mandatory for all Soldiers who are command referred. Failure to attend a mandatory counseling session may constitute a violation of Article 86 (Absence Without Leave) of the UCMJ.

(2) Alcohol and/or other drug abusers, and in some cases dependent alcohol users, may be enrolled in the ASAP when such enrollment is clinically recommended. Soldiers who fail to participate adequately in, or to respond successfully to, rehabilitation will be processed for administrative separation and not be provided another opportunity for rehabilitation except under the most extraordinary circumstances, as determined by the Clinical Director in consultation with the unit commander.

(3) Alcohol and/or other drug abusers, and in some cases dependent alcohol users, may be enrolled in the ASAP when such enrollment is clinically recommended. Soldiers who fail to participate adequately in, or to respond successfully to, rehabilitation will be processed for administrative separation and not be provided another opportunity for rehabilitation except under the most extraordinary circumstances, as determined by the Clinical Director in

consultation with the unit commander.

(4) All Soldiers who are identified as drug abusers, without exception, will be referred to the ASAP counseling center for screening; be considered for disciplinary action under the UCMJ, as appropriate; and be processed for administrative separation in accordance with Army Regulation 635-200.

h. Manual for Courts-Martial (2012 Edition), United States, states military law consists of the statutes governing the military establishment and regulations issued thereunder, the constitutional powers of the President and regulations issued thereunder, and the inherent authority of military commanders. Military law includes jurisdiction exercised by courts-martial and the jurisdiction exercised by commanders with respect to nonjudicial punishment. The purpose of military law is to promote justice, to assist in maintaining good orders and discipline in the Armed Forces. Article 111 (drunken driving) states in the subparagraph, the maximum punishment consists of a bad conduct discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and confinement for six months.

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, a narrative reason change, and changes to both of the separation and reentry codes. A review of the records provides there was an administrative irregularity in the proper retention of official military records, specifically, the referral to ASAP [a two-part mandatory clinical assessment, required within 5 days of the incident], their medical/mental separation examinations, and their election of rights.

b. The evidence provides the applicant enlisted in the RA, promoted to SPC, deployed to Afghanistan for nearly 10 months, and served for 4 years and 6 months prior to their having been flagged for involuntary separation. The applicant was charged in violation of Article 111, UCMJ (drunk driving) for DUI with a BAC of .132%. They received NJP and was consequently reduced to PV2 and sentenced to extra duty. Separation proceedings were initiated under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12C, Misconduct (Serious Offense), with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service.

(1) The election of rights only provides the signature page and not the page indicating their election, as it is missing from the record. Defense counsel acknowledged having counseled the applicant on the possible effects of their separation, rights available to them, including the right to waive their rights.

(2) There is no evidence of a medical examination and/or mental status evaluation in their record, which is required under this chapter of separation. They served 5 years and 8 days of their 6-year contractual obligation.

c. Chapter 14 establishes policy and prescribes procedures for separation members 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.

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

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

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

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

b. Prior Decisions Cited: None

c. Response to Contention(s): Through counsel, the applicant is contending, for all of the foregoing reasons, their discharge should be upgraded to Honorable, their narrative reason for discharge changed to "Completion of Required Active Service", and their separation and reentry codes changed to "MBK" and "RE-1". The Board voted to change the characterization and narrative reason, but did not change the Re-entry code.

d. The Board determined: 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, Quality, post service accomplishments) to mitigate the misconduct DUI. Based on a preponderance of evidence, the Board determined that the character of service the applicant received upon separation was inequitable and warranted an upgrade.

e. Rationale for Decision:

(1) The Board voted to change the applicant's characterization of service to Honorable. The Board found sufficient evidence of in-service mitigating factors (Length, Combat, Quality, post service accomplishments) to mitigate the misconduct DUI. Based on a preponderance of evidence, the Board determined that the character of service the applicant received upon separation was inequitable and warranted an upgrade.

(2) The Board voted to change the reason for discharge to Misconduct (Minor Infractions) under the same pretexts, thus the reason for discharge is no longer appropriate. The SPD code associated with the new reason for discharge is JKN.

(3) The RE code will not change, as the current code is consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the regulation.

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE
AR20230015265

10. BOARD ACTION DIRECTED:

- a. Issue a New DD-214 / Separation Order: Yes
- b. Change Characterization to: Honorable
- c. Change Reason / SPD code to: Misconduct (Minor Infractions)/JKN
- d. Change RE Code to: No Change
- e. Change Authority to: No Change

Authenticating Official:

7/28/2025



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