

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD

Docket Number: 2016-067

**Discharge Issued**

**Character:** Honorable

**Narrative Reason:** Completion of Required Active Service

**SPD/RE Code:** KBK / RE4

**Authority of Discharge:** COMDTINST M1000.2A Art 1.B.11

**Date of Separation:** 2016-04-11

**DRB Decision**

**Character:** No Change

**Narrative Reason:** No Change

**SPD/RE Code:** No Change / RE3

**New Authority:** No Change

**Discharge Review Board Discussion and Decision:**

**DISCUSSION:**

The applicant was discharged due to Completion of Required Active Service. The Applicant telephonically appeared before the Board. After a brief introduction, the Board President stated the roles and responsibilities of the Coast Guard Discharge Review Board (DRB). The Applicant was sworn-in and made a statement. During the discussion, The Applicant adamantly stated that they were erroneously discharged from the Coast Guard (in their application to the DRB, they stated that the re-entry code of RE4 was given without approval from CG PSC (EPM)). They continued to confer that their leadership/command at the unit made it clear that they would not be allowed to stay in the Coast Guard by not allowing them to re-enlist. The Members of the Board asked the Applicant if they were afforded reenlistment counseling and the Applicant's answer was no because they were made to believe that they were not going to reenlist. In their written statement to the DRB, The Applicant had requested numerous investigations, including prejudice and abuse of discretions by the Command.

The Applicant had been placed on performance probation. According to Administrative Remarks Entry - CG 3307, the reasons for this probationary status included: dereliction of duties as the Communications Center Supervisor, failure to provide junior members with leadership and direction, failure to qualify as an Operations Unit Controller within a prescribed timeframe, and as recommended by the Chiefs Council. During their verbal testimony to the Board, The Applicant stated that they received an Article 15 (non-judicial punishment) for dereliction of duty.

The Board Members reviewed the totality of The Applicant's service record and their evaluations, which display that they were a high performer.

The Board finds no issues with propriety in this case.

On the equity standard, the Board referred to ALCOAST 125/10 to make a recommendation. The Board notes most or all separations occurring after said ALCOAST to the present only issue a RE1 or RE3 Reentry Code. RE3 is prescribed for cases when the Commanding Officer does not recommend member for reenlistment.

Propriety: Discharge was proper.

Equity: Discharge was not equitable.

Final Adjudication by Assistant Commandant for Human Resources: Concur with the Board to provide the following relief based on policy issued in ALCOAST 125/10: Upgrade to Reentry Code from RE4 to RE3.

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.