

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD

Docket Number: 2012-083

**Discharge Issued**

**Character:** Under Honorable Conditions (General)

**Narrative Reason:** Misconduct

**SPD/RE Code:** JKK / RE4

**Authority of Discharge:** COMDTINST M1000.4, 1.B.17.B

**Date of Separation:** 2013-01-14

**DRB Decision**

**Character:** No Change

**Narrative Reason:** No Change

**SPD/RE Code:** No Change / No Change

**New Authority:** No Change

**Discharge Review Board Discussion and Decision:**

**DISCUSSION:**

The applicant was discharged for Misconduct due to a drug incident resulting from a positive urinalysis for steroids.

The applicant states that not being directed to the urinalysis testing by way of a random selection process. Under the provisions of an Administrative investigation, "the consent of the member is not required to collect a specimen. the scope of the inspection may include all personnel of the unit or only a part of the unit; e.g., a duty section, a division, the occupants of a building, etc." The provisions regarding to the administrative inspection involve the mechanism for collection. In the case of the applicant, beyond the standard urinalysis the specimen was selected for additional steroid screening based upon statements that the applicant made to another Coast Guard member regarding the propensity of steroid use based on past usage prior to enlistment in the service.

The applicant does not dispute illegal use of the steroids in the statements provided before Discharge, or on the board application. The Board finds that the command properly processed the applicant's discharge and determination of a drug incident. Coast Guard policy prescribes no higher than a General, Under Honorable Conditions character of service for individuals separated as a result of violating the Coast Guard's drug policy.

Propriety: Discharge was proper.

Equity: Discharge was equitable.

Final Adjudication by Assistant Commandant For Human Resources: No relief. Stand as issued.

In reviewing discharges, the Board presumes regularity in the conduct of governmental affairs unless there is substantial credible evidence (to include evidence submitted by the Applicant) to rebut the presumption.