

7-9

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS**

---

Application for Correction  
of Coast Guard Record of:

BCMR Docket  
No. 159-96

---

**FINAL DECISION**

This is a proceeding under the provisions of section 1552 of title 10, United States Code. It was commenced on September 12, 1996, upon the filing of the applicant's application for correction.

This is the final decision in this case, dated September 12, 1997. It is signed by three duly appointed members, who were designated to serve as the Board in this case.

**Request for Relief**

The applicant, a former [REDACTED]; pay grade E-4), enlisted in the Coast Guard on March 15, 1993. He was honorably discharged on July 11, 1996 with separation code KND (convenience of the Government) and reenlistment code RE-1 (eligible for reenlistment). The applicant requested early separation to assist in the family business and to return to school to complete his B.A. His request for early separation was granted, and he was released after three years, three months, and 27 days on active duty.

The applicant alleged that his "narrative reason for separation [Separation for Miscellaneous/General Reasons] does not allow him to receive (sic) unemployment benefits." He asked to have his narrative reason "changed to separation for attending school."

**Views of the Coast Guard**

On March 19, 1997, the Coast Guard Personnel Command (CGPC) recommended that the Board not grant any relief to the applicant.

The CGPC pointed out that the applicant's RE-1 reenlistment code meant that he could reenter military service at any time, and that a specific state's criteria for

awarding unemployment benefits is not a factor to be considered during the determination of a separation code. The Personnel Command also said that he had in fact been separated for attending school because he was separated for "all other reasons." The Command pointed out that it was under no obligation to release the members at their request.

On August 11, 1997, the Chief Counsel of the Coast Guard agreed with the views of the CGPC. The Chief Counsel followed the view of the CGPC in recommending denial of relief in this case because "additional information" may not be added to a narrative reason for separation and because the applicant did not provide substantial evidence of error or injustice by the Coast Guard.

### **Response of the Applicant to the Coast Guard's Views**

On August 22, 1997, the applicant responded to the views of the Coast Guard. He said, in part:

As I do accept the views of the Coast Guard, and request no further action; I do not fully agree with the decision made.

He also commended the Service for saying that it desires to assist members with career goals where possible.

The applicant also said that the Coast Guard "is inhibiting these goals by lessening a truly Honorably discharged member who provided consistently excellent and untarnished service to the Country."

### **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

The Board makes the following findings and conclusions on the basis of the submissions of the applicant and of the Coast Guard, the military record of the applicant, and applicable law:

1. The Board has jurisdiction to determine the issues in this proceeding under section 1552 of title 10, United States Code. The application was timely.
2. The applicant was honorably discharged in 1996 before his enlistment had expired, by reason of the convenience of the Government with an RE-1 reenlistment code.
3. He alleged that he could not obtain unemployment benefits with the "current narrative reason" for his discharge." The applicant has not submitted evidence that he was denied employment benefits, if he submits such evidence, within 180 days, the Board will re-open this case for further consideration.

4. It is not error or injustice for the Coast Guard to have failed to develop a narrative reason for separation that would cover the specifics of each discharge. The narrative reason used in this case was a "catch-all" ground that would cover a variety of bases for separation: "separation for miscellaneous/general reasons."

5. Accordingly, the applicant has not established any error or injustice on the part of the Coast Guard. The application should therefore be denied.

**[ORDER AND SIGNATURES ON FOLLOWING PAGE]**

**ORDER**

The application to correct the military record of  
USCG, is denied.

