

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD

Docket Number: 2017-051

**Discharge Issued**

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

**Narrative Reason:** Misconduct

**SPD/RE Code:** JKQ / RE4

**Authority of Discharge:** COMDTINST M1000.6 Art 2.B.18

**Date of Separation:** 2016-08-08

**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 separated due to Misconduct.

While attending training, the applicant failed to report for watch. The watch-stander went to applicant's room to wake them up. The watch-stander knocked on the door and upon entering the room, the watch-stander discovered the applicant was in the same rack with another trainee. The next morning the watch-stander reported their findings to the Officer of the Day and an investigation was initiated. During the investigation, the applicant initially denied being involved in anything more than a close relationship but eventually admitted to having a romantic relationship with another trainee. The other trainee also admitted to having an inappropriate relationship with the applicant.

The Board Members discussed how the admitted inappropriate relationship is strictly prohibited in accordance with the Discipline and Conduct, COMDTINST M1600.2 and other relevant training regulations. The service records display that upon arriving to the training facility, the applicant was specifically counseled on the Coast Guard's interpersonal relationship policies and the consequences if the policies were not strictly adhered to. The investigation concluded the applicant violated Article 92 (failure to obey order or regulation) and Article 107 (false statements) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Based on the preponderance of the evidence, the applicant did commit a serious offense.

The Board finds no issues with propriety or equity in this case. The applicant was notified of the intent to discharge, and advised of their rights to an attorney, and made a statement on their behalf. The applicant did object to the discharge.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Board members thoroughly reviewed the applicant's record of service and all available documentation. The Board deemed that the applicant's character of service, reason for separation and reenlistment code are appropriate and should not be changed. The applicant has not substantiated any error or inequity.

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.