

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD

Docket Number: 2013-038

**Discharge Issued**

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

**Narrative Reason:** Misconduct

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

**Authority of Discharge:** COMDTINST M1000.6A, Art 12-B-18

**Date of Separation:** 2001-03-20

**DRB Decision**

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

**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 Involvement with drugs.

Prior to the separation, the applicant received formal punishment for bouncing checks, failure to pay debts, illegal drug use, and assaulting a law enforcement officer.

The Board finds no issues with propriety or equity in this case. Coast Guard policy prescribes no higher than an Under Honorable Conditions character of service for individuals separated as a result of violating the Coast Guard's drug policy. The Board notes that the applicant's DD-214 Worksheet contained in Direct Access reads as Under Honorable Conditions. Conversely, the DD-214 issued has General listed as the character of service.

In accordance with ALCOAST 562/08, a General discharge is no longer a valid option for the character of service upon separation. Therefore, based on the post-separation policy, the Board recommends that the character of service be amended to Under Honorable Conditions.

Propriety: Discharge was proper.

Equity: Discharge was equitable.

Final Adjudication by Assistant Commandant For Human Resources: No relief based on the items provided by the applicant. Yet, in accordance with ALCOAST 562/08, the Board does recommend that the character of service be amended to Under Honorable Conditions based on the post-separation policy.

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.