

1. Applicant's Name: [REDACTED]**a. Application Date:** 17 April 2024**b. Date Received:** 22 April 2024**c. Counsel:** NA**2. REQUEST, ISSUES, BOARD TYPE, AND DECISION:****a. Applicant's Requests and Issues:**

(1) The current characterization of service for the period under review is General (Under Honorable Conditions). The applicant in effect, requests reconsideration of their request for an upgrade to honorable previously denied in Army Discharge Review Board Docket Number AR2010001522, dated 16 February 2011. The applicant now states, related to their request is Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and Other Mental Health, thus warranting another Record Review.

(2) The applicant seeks relief contending their claim for PTSD is probably a little uncongenial but in support of their claim for PTSD they literally have no idea what "money" is anymore. Their question of what "money" has messed them up mentally and led them down a pretty messed up path that has brought them to homelessness and being in a much lower state than they should have.

b. Board Type and Decision: In a records review conducted on 5 February 2026, and by a 3-0 vote, the Board determined the discharge is inequitable based on the applicant's length and quality of service, to include combat service, and the circumstances surrounding the discharge (Unspecified Anxiety Disorder and PTSD). Therefore, the Board voted to grant relief in the form of an upgrade of the characterization of service to Honorable and changed 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 **Board Discussion and Determination** section for more detail regarding the Board's decision. Board member names available upon request.

3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:

a. Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization: Pattern of Misconduct / Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12B / JKA / RE-3 / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

b. Date of Discharge: 15 December 2009

c. Separation Facts:

(1) **Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** 28 September 2009

(2) **Basis for Separation:** The applicant was informed of the following reasons: failed to show respect to noncommissioned officers (NCO) and failed to drive safely on post.

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

(4) **Legal Consultation Date:** 6 October 2009

(5) Administrative Separation Board: NA

(6) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: undated / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Enlistment: 25 January 2006 / 4 years

b. Age at Enlistment / Education / GT Score: 18 / HS Diploma / 127

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: E-4 / 94F1O, Computer/Detection System Repairer / 3 years, 10 months, 21 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: None

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: SWA / Iraq (6 September 2007 – 19 November 2008)

f. Awards and Decorations: ARCOM, MUC, AGCM, NDSM, GWTSM, ICM-CS, ASR, OSR

g. Performance Ratings: NA

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:

(1) A DA Form 4856 (Developmental Counseling Form) dated 22 April 2009 reflects the applicant received event orientated counseling for the suspension of installation driving privileges. The Key Points of Discussion reflects as a result of the applicant's traffic citations of Limitations on Backing/Improper Backing, their driving privileges on any Military Installation have been suspended for a period of 12 months.

(2) A DA Form 2627 (Record of Proceedings under Article 15, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), dated 27 May 2009, reflects the applicant received nonjudicial punishment, in that they, at Fort Riley, KS, on about 4 March 2009, was disrespectful in deportment toward a senior NCO, by rolling their eyes at them, in violation of Article 91 (Insubordinate conduct toward NCO), UCMJ. Their punishment consisted of a reduction in rank/grade from specialist/E-4 to private first class/E-3, suspended to be automatically remitted if not vacated before 27 November 2009, forfeiture of \$473.00 pay for one month, 14 days extra duty and an oral reprimand. The applicant elected not to appeal.

(3) A DD Form 2627-2 (Record of Supplementary Action under Article 15, UCMJ) dated 17 June 2009, reflects the suspension of the punishment of reduction to private first class/E-3 imposed on the applicant on 27 May 2009 is vacated. The vacation is based on, the applicant having received a lawful command from a senior commissioned officer not to drive on post for a year, did at or near Fort Riley, KS, on or about 23 April 2009, willfully disobeyed, in violation of Article 90 (Willfully disobeying superior commissioned officer), UCMJ.

(4) A memorandum, Headquarters, Support Company, 601st Aviation Support Battalion, subject: Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, Paragraph 14-12b, undated, the applicant's company commander notified the applicant of their intent to separate them under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14-12b, a pattern of misconduct, with a recommended characterization of service as General (Under Honorable Conditions) for

misconduct described in previous paragraph 3c(2). On 28 September 2009, the applicant acknowledged receipt of the foregoing correspondence and that they have been advised of their rights to consult with counsel prior to making any election of rights.

(5) On 6 October 2009, the applicant completed their Election of Rights signing that they have been advised by their consulting counsel of the basis for the contemplated action to separate the for Pattern of Misconduct under Army Regulation 635-200, chapter 14, paragraph 14-12b and its effects; the rights available to them; and the effect of any action taken by them in waiving their rights. They understand they may expect to encounter substantial prejudice in civilian life if their service is characterized as General (Under Honor Conditions). They further understand that, as the result of issuance of a discharge Under Other Than Honorable Conditions, they may be ineligible for many or all benefits as a veteran under both Federal and State laws. They requested consulting counsel and elected to submit two statements on their own behalf.

(a) In their letter to the separation authority, they apologize for their behavior, and they have learned from their mistakes and hope to receive some other punishment for their actions besides a chapter. Apart from the few incidents they have been a good Soldier. They are willing to start over in any unit and ask that if they cannot be retained in this unit, that they are given a rehabilitative transfer.

(b) In the applicant's Senior Defense Counsel's memorandum, counsel states the applicant requests a rehabilitative transfer. There is no evidence in the applicant's packet to indicate that without a fresh start under new leadership they could not become a valued asset to the Army where their misconduct is minor.

(6) A memorandum, Headquarters, Support Company, 601st Aviation Support Battalion, subject: Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, Paragraph 14-12b, undated, the applicant's company commander submitted a request to separate them from the Army prior to their expiration of current term of service. The commander states for a description of rehabilitative attempts, the applicant has been counseled, and through subsequent behavior, has demonstrated a lack of acceptance of rehabilitative measures. The commander states they do not consider it feasible or appropriate to accomplish other disposition as the applicant has demonstrated through repeated conduct, after formal counseling, that other disposition would be inappropriate. After review of this case, and tempered by common sense and sound judgement, a rehabilitative transfer of the applicant would serve no useful purpose. Therefore, they request that the requirement for a rehabilitative transfer in this case be waived. This request for waiver is based upon the determination that further duty of the applicant would create serious disciplinary problems or a hazard to the military mission or to the applicant.

(7) A memorandum, Headquarters, 601st Aviation Support Battalion, Combat Aviation Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, subject: Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14 Paragraph 14-12b, undated, reflects the applicant's battalion commander thoroughly reviewed the applicant's separation packet. They recommended the applicant be separated with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) discharge.

(8) A memorandum, Headquarters, Combat Aviation Brigade, subject: Separation under Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, Paragraph 14-12b, undated, reflects the separation authority directed the applicant be separated from the Army prior to the expiration of their current term of service for Patterns of Misconduct. They directed the requirements for rehabilitative transfer in this case be waived. The applicant will be discharged and their service characterized as General (Under Honorable Conditions)

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE**AR20240006765**

(9) A DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) reflects the applicant was discharged on 15 December 2009, with 3 years, 10 months and 21 days of net active service this period. The DD Form 214 shows in –

- item 18 (Remarks) – MEMBER HAS NOT COMPLETED FIRST FULL TERM OF SERVICE
- item 24 (Character of Service) – General (Under Honorable Conditions)
- item 25 (Separation Authority) – Army Regulation 635-200, Paragraph 14-12B
- item 26 (Separation Code) – JKA
- item 27 (Reentry Code) – 3
- item 28 (Narrative Reason for Separation) – Pattern of Misconduct

(10) On 16 February 2011 the Army Discharge Review Board denied that applicant's request to upgrade their characterization of service to Honorable. The Board found no mitigating factors that would merit an upgrade of the applicant's discharge. The applicant's discharge was appropriate because the quality of their service was not consistent with the Army's standards for acceptable personal conduct and performance of duty by military personnel. By their misconduct, the applicant diminished the quality of their service below that meriting a fully honorable discharge. The applicant provided no independent corroborating evidence demonstrating that either the command's action was erroneous or that the applicant's service mitigated the misconduct or poor duty performance. The evidence of record shows the command attempted to assist the applicant in performing and conducting themselves to Army standards by providing counseling and by the imposition of nonjudicial punishment. The applicant failed to respond appropriately to these efforts. All requirements of law and regulation were met and the rights of the applicant were fully protected throughout the separation process.

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

j. **Behavioral Health Condition(s):** None

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE:

- DD Form 293 (Application for the Review of Discharge from the Armed Forces of the United States), with four page letter
- Internal Revenue Service Wage and Income Transcript

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: None submitted with the application.

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

a. Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1553, (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, Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 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. Office, Secretary of Defense memorandum (Supplemental Guidance to Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records Considering Discharge Upgrade Requests by Veterans Claiming Post Traumatic Stress Disorder), 3 September 2014, directed the Service Discharge Review Boards (DRBs) and Service Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records (BCM/NRs) to carefully consider the revised PTSD criteria, detailed medical considerations and mitigating factors when taking action on applications from former service members administratively discharged UOTHC and who have been diagnosed with PTSD by a competent mental health professional representing a civilian healthcare provider in order to determine if it would be appropriate to upgrade the characterization of the applicant's service.

c. Office, Under Secretary of Defense memorandum (Clarifying Guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records Considering Requests by Veterans for Modification of their Discharge Due to Mental Health Conditions, Sexual Assault, or Sexual Harassment), 25 August 2017 issued clarifying guidance for the Secretary of Defense Directive to DRBs and BCM/NRs when considering requests by Veterans for modification of their discharges due in whole or in part to mental health conditions, including PTSD; Traumatic Brain Injury; sexual assault; or sexual harassment. Boards are to give liberal consideration to Veterans petitioning for discharge relief when the application for relief is based in whole or in part to those conditions or experiences. The guidance further describes evidence sources and criteria and requires Boards to consider the conditions or experiences presented in evidence as potential mitigation for misconduct that led to the discharge.

d. Office, Under Secretary of Defense memorandum (Guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records Regarding Equity, Injustice, or Clemency Determinations), 25 July 2018 issued guidance to Military DRBs and BCM/NRs regarding equity, injustice, or clemency determinations. Clemency generally refers to relief specifically granted from a criminal sentence. However, the guidance applies to more than clemency from a sentencing in a court-martial; it also applies to other corrections, including changes in a discharge, which may be warranted based on equity or relief from injustice.

(1) This guidance does not mandate relief but rather provides standards and principles to guide Boards in application of their equitable relief authority. In determining whether to grant relief on the basis of equity, injustice, or clemency grounds, DRBs shall consider the prospect for rehabilitation, external evidence, sworn testimony, policy changes, relative severity of misconduct, mental and behavioral health conditions, official governmental acknowledgement that a relevant error or injustice was committed, and uniformity of punishment.

(2) Changes to the narrative reason for discharge and/or an upgraded character of service granted solely on equity, injustice, or clemency grounds normally should not result in separation pay, retroactive promotions, and payment of past medical expenses or similar benefits that might have been received if the original discharge had been for the revised reason or had the upgraded service characterization.

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

f. Army Regulation 635-200 (Active Duty Enlisted Administrative Separations), dated 6 June 2005, 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. It may be issued for misconduct, fraudulent entry, security reasons, or in lieu of trial by court-martial.

(4) Paragraph 3-9 (Uncharacterized Separation) stated a separation will be described as entry-level with service uncharacterized if processing is initiated while a Soldier is in entry-level status.

(5) Chapter 1 (General Provisions) sets policies, standards, and procedures to ensure readiness and competency of the force while providing for the orderly administrative separation of Soldiers, it provides in pertinent part:

(a) When a separation is ordered, the approved proceedings will be sent to the commander who has the Soldier's records for separation processing. The original copy of the proceedings will be filed in the permanent part of the Soldiers official personnel record.

(b) Army leaders at all levels must be continually aware of their obligation to provide purpose, direction, and motivation to Soldiers. It is essential that Soldiers who falter, but have the potential to serve honorably and well, be given every opportunity to succeed. Except as otherwise indicated, commanders must make maximum use of counseling and rehabilitation before determining that a Soldier has no potential for further useful service and ensure it occurs prior to initiating separation proceedings for reason to include Minor Disciplinary Infractions (14-12a) or a Pattern of Misconduct (14-12b).

(6) Paragraph 1-16 (Counseling and Rehabilitative Requirements) stated Army leaders at all levels must be continually aware of their obligation to provide purpose, direction, and motivation to Soldiers. It is essential that Soldiers who falter, but have the potential to serve honorably and well, be given every opportunity to succeed. 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. Commanders will ensure that adequate counseling and rehabilitative measures are taken before initiating separation proceedings for, to include, a pattern of misconduct. The rehabilitative transfer requirement may be waived by the separation authority in circumstances where common sense and sound judgement indicate that such transfer will serve no useful purpose or produce a quality Soldier.

(7) Chapter 14 (Separation for Misconduct) established policy and prescribed procedures for separating members for misconduct. Action will be taken to separate a member for misconduct when it is clearly established that rehabilitation is impractical or unlikely to succeed. Paragraph 14-12b (Pattern of Misconduct), stated, a pattern of misconduct consisting

of one of the following – discreditable involvement with civil or military authorities, or discreditable conduct and conduct prejudicial to good order and discipline including conduct violating the accepted standards of personal conduct found in the UCMJ, Army regulations, the civil law, and time-honored customs and traditions of the Army.

(8) Paragraph 14-3 (Characterization of Service or Description of Separation) prescribed 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.

(9) Chapter 15 (Secretarial Plenary Authority), currently in effect, 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. If Secretarial Authority is granted normally correct the record to show the following:

- Separation Authority: Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 15
- Separation Code: JFF
- Reenlistment Code: RE1
- Narrative Reason for Separation: Secretarial Plenary Authority
- Character of Service: Honorable

g. 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 "JKA" as the appropriate code to assign enlisted Soldiers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, paragraph 12b, (Pattern of Misconduct).

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 DoD Instructions 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.

i. Manual for Courts-Martial, United States (2008 Edition) stated, 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 order and discipline in the Armed Forces. Appendix 12 (Maximum Punishment Chart) Manual for Courts-Martial shows the maximum punishments include punitive discharge for violating the following Article 90 (Willfully disobeying superior commissioned officer) and Article 91 (Insubordinate conduct toward NCO).

8. SUMMARY OF FACT(S):

a. The Army Discharge Review Board considers applications for upgrade as instructed by DoD Instruction 1332.28.

b. A review of the available evidence provides the applicant received Developmental Counseling for violation of Article 90 (Willfully disobeying superior commissioned officer) received nonjudicial punishment for violation of Article 91 (Insubordinate conduct toward NCO) and was involuntarily discharged from the U.S. Army. The applicant's DD Form 214 indicates their discharge under the provisions of Army Regulation 635-200, Chapter 14, paragraph 14-12b (Pattern of Misconduct) with a character of service of General (Under Honorable Conditions). They completed 3 years, 10 months and 21 days of net active service this period and did not complete their first full term of service of their 4-year enlistment 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 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. 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: Unspecified Anxiety Disorder, PTSD.

(2) Did the condition exist, or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The applicant is service connected by the VA for Unspecified Anxiety Disorder, and the VA has diagnosed the applicant with combat-related PTSD which establishes that the conditions existed during military service.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board applied liberal consideration and opined that there is evidence of BH conditions that partially mitigate the basis of separation. The applicant is service connected by the VA for Unspecified Anxiety Disorder, and the VA has diagnosed the applicant with combat-related PTSD. Given the nexus between PTSD and difficulty with authority, the failure to show respect to NCOs and disobeying an order to drive safely on post are mitigated.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **Yes.** Based on liberally considering all the evidence before the Board, the ADRB determined that PTSD outweighed hazardous driving and disrespecting NCOs.

b. Prior Decisions Cited:

c. Response to Contention(s): The applicant contends their claim for PTSD is probably a little uncongenial but in support of their claim for PTSD they literally have no idea what “money” is anymore. Their question of what “money” actually is has messed them up mentally and led them down a pretty messed up path that has brought them to homelessness and being in a much lower state than they should have. The Board recognizes and appreciates the applicant’s service, considered this contention during board proceedings along with the totality of the applicant’s service record, and determined that the applicant’s length and quality of service, to include combat service, outweighed the applicant’s basis of separation for disrespect was overly harsh and relief is warranted.

d. The Board determined: The medical advisor opined there is evidence of BH conditions that partially mitigate the basis of separation. The applicant is service connected by the VA for Unspecified Anxiety Disorder, and the VA has diagnosed the applicant with combat-related PTSD. Given the nexus between PTSD and difficulty with authority, the failure to show respect to NCOs and disobeying an order to drive safely on post are mitigated; however, there was other minor misconduct (traffic violations etc) in the file. The Board had a lengthy discussion on the applicant’s length of service, (3y, 10m and 21d of a four-year enlistment). The consensus was that the discharge seemed overly harsh considering the applicant was days away from completing their initial enlistment. After considering all documents in the file, the medical mitigation, the applicant’s self-assertion of homelessness, along with a record of length, quality and combat to Iraq, the Board voted unanimously to upgrade the discharge.

e. Rationale for Decision:

(1) Published Department of Defense guidance indicates the guidance is not intended to interfere or impede on the Board’s statutory independence. The Board determines the relative weight of the action that was the basis for the discharge and whether it supports relief or not. In reaching its determination, the Board considers the application, available records and any supporting documents included with the application.

(2) The Board voted to change the applicant’s characterization of service to Honorable because, the applicant’s Behavioral Diagnoses of Anxiety Disorder, and PTSD mitigated the offenses of disrespect to NCOS, and disobeying an order to drive safely off post. Thus, the prior characterization is no longer appropriate.

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE**AR20240006765**

(3) 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.

(4) 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: Misconduct (Minor Infractions)/JKN
- d. Change RE Code to: No Change
- e. Change Authority to: No Change

Authenticating Official:

3/10/2026

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