

1. Applicant's Name:

a. **Application Date:** 4 December 2023

b. **Date Received:** 4 December 2023

c. **Counsel:** None

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

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

b. The applicant seeks relief contending, at the time of service, they made the mistake of going out with a person who they thought was their friend. They made plans to go out to enjoy the night life and walk the strip in Austin, Texas. Later that night, they were separated from each other, as the friend was publicly intoxicated, being vulgar and disrespectful to people. A call from the local police department telling the applicant the friend was headed to jail if they were not picked up. As a friend, they could not leave their comrade behind and went to retrieve them. It did not matter that the applicant had a minuscule amount of alcohol in their system; the police were waiting for them to show up in a car, which they did. Their 'friend' abandoned the applicant and their vehicle and the applicant felt obligated to take care of them.

(1) Afterwards, they found out that the friend had an extensive criminal record from a youth and this was just another day for them. Before this incident, the applicant had never even received as little as a parking ticket, as they are a law abiding citizen, who takes pride in their country. This hiccup has taken a toll on the applicant, their family, and their pride. Instead of getting help from their unit, the applicant was then publicly shamed in front of the entire battalion. They were forced to explain to the battalion what had happened front and center, prior to morning PT. The hazing started with their 1SG and carried on downward into their platoon. No one was there for them to support the applicant; instead, they were shamed, mocked, and was made a fool of, which was not the way to handle a mistake someone regrets.

(2) The applicant was on edge and would question their life at times, for feelings of unworthiness, as leadership's constant reminders and hazing, was not at all helpful. The worst part was finding out they would be discharged, while their so called friend who was in a different unit, received a slap on the wrist. This destroyed their reality. They did not know how to break the news to their family as the applicant felt disappointment and a grudge towards themselves. There was a better way to resolve this, to help them grow, having learned from their mistake; instead, the applicant was made to feel useless and unworthy of serving their country. They were so dedicated to the Army, even after having known they were being discharged, the applicant was still sent to the training center to train for a deployment they would not be a part of. The applicant still conducted the entire month in the box and did so enjoyably.

(3) The applicant loved what they did in the military and even attempted to reenlist; however, their reentry code did not allow it. They would love to serve their country especially in the times we are in now. To emphasis how big of a toll this takes on people, their real friend (D_M_), a mortarman in their platoon, was discharged after the applicant and took it really hard. They committed suicide, as they did not know how to cope with all the emotions and the lack of support from leadership. Mental health is such a strong issue in this country and when there is no support, it makes it so much harder to get by day by day. The applicant hopes their

discharge status is reconsidered, they want to be proud of their service, although it was not a complete term, they enjoyed it very much.

c. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 30 October 2024, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board denied the request upon finding the separation was both proper and equitable.

Please see Section 10 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, Chapter 14-12C / JKQ / RE-3 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

b. Date of Discharge: 17 May 2018

c. Separation Facts:

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

(2) Basis for Separation: for consuming alcohol under the age of 21 and then driving while intoxicated (DWI)

(3) Recommended Characterization: NIF

(4) Legal Consultation Date: NIF

(5) Administrative Separation Board: NA

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: 2 May 2018 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 21 February 2017 / 3 years, 16 weeks

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 18 / High School Diploma / 102

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-3 (PFC) / 11C10 Indirect Fire Infantryman / 1 year, 2 months, 27 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: None

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: None

f. Awards and Decorations: NDSM, ASR

g. Performance Ratings: NA

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:

(1) On 21 February 2017, the applicant enlisted in the Regular Army (RA) for 3 years and 16 weeks as a PV2 (E-2). The Enlisted Record Brief provides on 1 November 2017, they were promoted to PFC (E-3). On 10 January and 21 March 2018, the applicant was flagged,

Suspend Favorable Personnel Actions (FLAG), for adverse action (AA) and field-initiated involuntary separation (BA).

(2) On 4 November 2017, the applicant was arrested by County Police in violation of Article 111, UCMJ (drunken driving) for DWI, in which a hearing was set for 17 November and reported to the Criminal Investigation Division on 4 December 2017. Although not in the record, on 8 January 2018, the applicant received nonjudicial punishment and was reduced to PV2 (E-2).

(3) On 30 January 2018, the applicant received a General Officer Memorandum of Reprimand (GOMOR), for consuming alcohol under the age of 21 and then driving while intoxicated, with an unknown blood alcohol content (BAC) on 4 November 2017, near Austin, Texas. The company and battalion commander both recommend permanent filing in their AMHRR, with the company commander providing the applicant had a second incident after this DWI, where they were arrested for driving drunk through a closed fence on Fort Hood, TX. The approval authority directed permanent filing in the record.

(4) Notwithstanding the partially missing separation package, on 2 May 2018, the separation approval authority approved the discharge under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12C, Misconduct (Serious Offense), with a General (Under Honorable Conditions). On 4 May 2018, their separation orders were issued. A DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) reflects the applicant was discharged accordingly on 17 May 2018, with 1 year, 3 months, 9 days of total service. The applicant provided their electronic signature and has not completed first full term of service.

i. Lost Time / Mode of Return: None

j. Behavioral Health Condition(s):

(1) Applicant provided: None

(2) AMHRR Listed: None

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: ACTS Online Application

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: None were identified on the application.

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

a. Section 1553, Title 10, United States Code (Review of Discharge or Dismissal) provides for the creation, composition, and scope of review conducted by a Discharge Review Board(s) within established governing standards. As amended by Sections 521 and 525 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020, 10 USC 1553 provides specific guidance to the Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records and Discharge Review Boards when considering discharge upgrade requests by Veterans claiming Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), sexual trauma, intimate partner violence (IPV), or spousal abuse, as a basis for discharge review. The amended guidance provides that Boards will include, as a voting board member, a physician trained in mental health disorders, a clinical psychologist, or a psychiatrist when the discharge upgrade claim asserts a mental health condition, including PTSD, TBI, sexual trauma, IPV, or spousal abuse, as a basis for the discharge. Further, the guidance provides that Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records and Discharge Review Boards will develop and provide specialized training specific to sexual trauma, IPV, spousal abuse, as well as the various responses of individuals to trauma.

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

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

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

c. Army Regulation 15-180 (Army Discharge Review Board), 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 14-12c, 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 (2016 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 laws is to promote justice, to assist in maintaining good orders and discipline in the Armed Forces. Article 111 (drunken driving) states in subparagraph, the maximum punishment consists of dishonorable 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 and a narrative reason change. A review of the available records provide there were administrative irregularities in the proper retention of the official military records, specifically, the referral to ASAP [a two-part mandatory clinical assessment, required within 5 days of the event] the separation package, and the separation medical/mental examinations.

(1) The available evidence provides the applicant enlisted in the RA, promoted to PFC, and served for nearly 11 months prior to their being flagged for adverse action and involuntary separation. They received nonjudicial punishment, for underage drinking and DWI, with an unknown BAC, which imposed a reduction to PV2. Moreover, they received a GOMOR, ultimately filed in their permanent record, as the company commander's recommendation revealed the applicant's second incident received after DWI, where they were arrested for driving drunk through a closed fence on Fort Hood, TX. As a result, they were processed for separation under the provisions of AR 635-200, Chapter 14-12C, Misconduct (Serious Offense), with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service.

(2) The record is void of a mental status evaluation or a medical examination prior to their separation. They served 1 year, 2 months, and 27 days of their 3 year-16 week contractual obligation.

b. 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.

c. Published DoD 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. DOCUMENTS / TESTIMONY PRESENTED DURING PERSONAL APPEARANCE: In addition to the evidence in the record, the Board carefully considered the additional document(s) and testimony presented by the applicant at the personal appearance hearing.

a. **The applicant submitted the following additional document(s):** None

b. **The applicant presented the following additional contention(s):** None

c. **Counsel / Witness(es) / Observer(s):** None

10. 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 which were void of a behavioral health diagnosis. However, the applicant asserts behavioral health factors which may be sufficient evidence to establish the existence of a condition that could mitigate or excuse the discharge.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** Per applicant's assertion alone, behavioral health factors contributed to the discharge.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **No.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that while the applicant's suggestion of behavioral health factors is acknowledged, there are no known diagnoses for mitigation.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **No.** After applying liberal consideration to the evidence, including the Board Medical Advisor's opine, the Board determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's conditions outweighed the basis for separation.

b. Prior Decisions Cited: None

c. Response to Contentions: The applicant seeks relief contending, at the time of service, they made the mistake of going out with a person who they thought was their friend. They made plans to go out to enjoy the night life and walk the strip in Austin, Texas. Later that night, they were separated from each other, as the friend was publicly intoxicated, being vulgar and disrespectful to people. A call from the local police department telling the applicant the friend was headed to jail if they were not picked up. As a friend, they could not leave their comrade behind and went to retrieve them. It did not matter that the applicant had a minuscule amount of alcohol in their system; the police were waiting for them to show up in a car, which they did. Their 'friend' abandoned the applicant and their vehicle and the applicant felt obligated to take care of them.

The Board acknowledged this contention, however the Board determined the discharge was proper and equitable based on the lack of medical mitigation, in-service factors, and the applicant had multiple DUI.

(1) The applicant contends, afterwards, they found out that the friend had an extensive criminal record from a youth and this was just another day for them. Before this incident, the applicant had never even received as little as a parking ticket, as they are a law abiding citizen, who takes pride in their country. This hiccup has taken a toll on the applicant, their family, and their pride. Instead of getting help from their unit, the applicant was then publicly shamed in front of the entire battalion. They were forced to explain to the battalion what had happened front and center, prior to morning PT. The hazing started with their 1SG and carried on downward into their platoon. No one was there for them to support the applicant; instead, they were shamed, mocked, and was made a fool of, which was not the way to handle a mistake someone regrets. The Board acknowledged this contention. However, the Board determined the discharge was proper and equitable and voted not to change it.

(2) The applicant is contending, they were on edge and would question their life at times, for feelings of unworthiness, as leadership's constant reminders and hazing, was not at all helpful. The worst part was finding out they would be discharged, while their so called friend who was in a different unit, received a slap on the wrist. This destroyed their reality. They did not know how to break the news to their family as the applicant felt disappointment and a grudge towards themselves. There was a better way to resolve this, to help them grow, having learned from their mistake; instead, the applicant was made to feel useless and unworthy of serving their country. They were so dedicated to the Army, even after having known they were being discharged, the applicant was still sent to the training center to train for a deployment they would not be a part of. The applicant still conducted the entire month in the box and did so enjoyably.

The Board acknowledged this contention and considered it in its deliberations.

(3) The applicant contends, they loved their military career and even attempted to reenlist; however, their reenry code did not allow it. They would love to serve their country especially in the times we are in now. To emphasis how big of a toll this takes on people, their real friend (D_ M_), a mortarman in their platoon, was discharged after the applicant and took it really hard. They committed suicide, as they did not know how to cope with all the emotions and the lack of support from leadership. Mental health is such a strong issue in this country and when there is no support, it makes it so much harder to get by day by day. The applicant hopes their discharge status is reconsidered, they want to be proud of their service, although it was not a complete term, they enjoyed it very much.

The Board acknowledged this contention and determined that applicant's leadership enrolled him in Substance Use Disorder Clinical Care (SUDCC) for assistance. Applicant remained in SUDCC until discharge.

d. The Board determined that the discharge is, at this time, proper and equitable, in light of the current evidence of record. However, the applicant may request a personal appearance hearing to address the issues before the Board. The applicant is responsible for satisfying the burden of proof and providing documents or other evidence sufficient to support the applicant's contention(s) that the discharge was improper or inequitable.

e. Rationale for Decision:

(1) The Board voted not to change the applicant's characterization of service based on the lack of medical mitigation, lack of in-service factors (length, quality, or combat service), and the applicant had two DUIs. The DUI that led to the separation was the applicant's second DUI. The applicant's medical history revealed the applicant has a long-standing history of alcohol abuse. The discharge was consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the regulation, was within the discretion of the separation authority, and the applicant was provided full administrative due process.

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

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20240000829

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

11. BOARD ACTION DIRECTED:

- a. Issue a New DD-214 / Separation Order: No
- b. Change Characterization to: No change
- c. Change Reason / SPD code to: No change
- d. Change RE Code to: No change
- e. Change Authority to: No change

Authenticating Official:

11/6/2024

X

Presiding Officer, COL, U.S. ARMY

Army Discharge Review Board

Legend:

AWOL – Absent Without Leave
AMHRR – Army Military Human
Resource Record
BCD – Bad Conduct Discharge
BH – Behavioral Health
CG – Company Grade Article 15
CID – Criminal Investigation
Division
ELS – Entry Level Status
FG – Field Grade Article 15

GD – General Discharge
HS – High School
HD – Honorable Discharge
IADT – Initial Active Duty Training
MP – Military Police
MST – Military Sexual Trauma
N/A – Not applicable
NCO – Noncommissioned Officer
NIF – Not in File
NOS – Not Otherwise Specified

OAD – Ordered to Active Duty
OBH (I) – Other Behavioral
Health (Issues)
OMPF – Official Military
Personnel File
PTSD – Post-Traumatic Stress
Disorder
RE – Re-entry
SCM – Summary Court Martial
SPCM – Special Court Martial

SPD – Separation Program
Designator
TBI – Traumatic Brain Injury
UNC – Uncharacterized
Discharge
UOTHHC – Under Other Than
Honorable Conditions
VA – Department of Veterans
Affairs