



**DRB DIGEST/EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
DRB DOCKET 2013-015**

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| NAME | E2 |
| CURRENT DD-214 | Honorable, COMDTINST M1000.6A, ART 12.B.18, JKA, Pattern of Misconduct, RE4 |
| RELIEF REQUESTED | Upgrade RE code and Narrative Reason for Separation |
| RELIEF GRANTED BY DRB | None |
| ADMIN CORRECTIONS | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| TIS | 5 yrs, 3 months, 9 days |
| Policy Implications | None |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The applicant was discharged for Pattern Of Misconduct due to making False Official Statements, substandard performance, and an attempt to compromise an End of Course Test.

The applicant received two NJP's over an 8 month period. In late 2009, the applicant knowingly created false invoices for the procurement files, and submitted them to the supervisor with the intent that the invoices be accepted as legitimate company invoices. Thereafter, the member was restricted to the assigned unit for 21 days, reduction to pay-grade: E-3, extra duties for 21 days, reduction in Pay Grade suspended for 06 months. In the summer of 2010, just 6 months later, the applicant did with the intent to cheat on the Storekeeper Second Class End-Of-Course Test write 24 of the 25 test questions and answers on scratch paper and try to remove from the written item from the testing facility. This violated Coast Guard testing policy and procedures. Removal of the scratch paper would have resulted in a test compromise. Applicant was reduced to Pay Grade E-2 as a result of this NJP.

Prior to the two NJP's, the applicant was counseled on poor performance between the Fall of 2008 and Spring of 2010. At that time, the applicant was placed on performance probation due to neglecting budget responsibilities, spending hours on the internet during the work day, and being unprepared/untimely for basic collateral duties. In short, the applicant had been a burden to the command leading up to the discipline actions.

The Board finds no issues with propriety or equity in this case. The applicant was notified of the intent to discharge, and the applicant was advised of the rights to an attorney. The applicant was afforded to make a detailed statement on their behalf. The Board voted unanimously to recommend no relief.

Propriety: Discharge was proper.

Equity: Discharge was equitable.

Final Adjudication by Assistant Commandant For Human Resources: Concurs with Board. No relief.