

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD

Docket Number: 2020-012

Discharge Issued

Character: Under Honorable Conditions (General)

Narrative Reason: Misconduct

SPD/RE Code: JKQ / RE4

Authority of Discharge: COMDTINST M1000.4 Art 1.B.17

Date of Separation: 2019-06-24

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 after serving a total of 3 Years and 5 Days on Active Duty.

The Board thoroughly reviewed all documentation including the applicant's statement. The applicant's Character of Service is Under Honorable Conditions and the separation authority listed on the DD-214 is COMDTINST M1000.4 Article 1.B.17. The SPD handbook prescribes an RE Code of RE4 for an SPD Code of JKQ.

The former member was discharged for misconduct following an investigation in which the applicant admitted to forging medical documents. The Command was informed by another member that the applicant had altered a doctor's note, changing the two weeks of convalescent leave to four months. The Command called the doctor's office and confirmed the note had indeed been altered. The doctor's office contacted the applicant and shortly after, the applicant confessed to forging the document to their Command. The applicant was found to have altered the document by finding the medical office's logo online, recreating the document and forging the doctor's signature. The applicant then Facetime another shipmate, telling them I did something bad. I need to show you before sending the forged document to the Coast Guard Clinic.

During the investigation, the applicant was read their Miranda Rights and admitted to all the elements of Article 123 (Forgery) of the UCMJ. The applicant agreed to separation in lieu of judicial or non-judicial punishment. The Command found that this was not an isolated incident of poor judgement but was instead a culmination of a lack of integrity and dedication to the Coast Guard. Prior to the incident, the applicant was placed on modified duty for exceeding qualification timelines on three different occasions. The applicant was formally counseled for reckless driving after totaling two borrowed vehicles and blowing up their own car's engine. The applicant was also counseled on their pattern of tardiness after consistently showing up substantially late for work, including showing up an hour late on the day of the investigative interview. The applicant made multiple comments to fellow shipmates about not wanting to be in the Coast Guard. During the discharge process, the applicant did not wish to provide a statement on their behalf, nor did they object to being discharged.

The former member is requesting relief to their discharge characterization, requesting an Honorable discharge. The applicant states that they made a mistake and instantly felt regret. The applicant states that after the incident, they immediately turned themselves in to their Command. The applicant explains that they did what they did for a girl that they believed they would marry. The applicant states that their career in the Coast Guard was their life and they had intended it to be their one and only career. The applicant stated they feel remorse for their decisions and did everything in their power to make it right. The applicant makes no claims of impropriety or inequity and provides no

evidence of such.

The Board discussed the applicant's actions and their sense of remorse for the misconduct. While the applicant seems to be genuinely remorseful for the incident, it does not negate the negative actions prior to the incident nor the severity of the incident in question. The applicant showed no attempts at improvement despite countless attempts at mentoring and instruction. The applicant displayed a previous pattern of poor performance and behavior, ultimately culminating in this incident. The applicant made claims that the Coast Guard was their entire life and they intended to make it their career. Contradictory to that claim, the applicant told multiple shipmates they did not want to be a part of the Coast Guard, nor did they object to being discharged. The pattern of substandard performance and lack of initiative, in conjunction with continued poor behavior, makes an Under Honorable Conditions characterization the correct discharge. The applicant makes no claims of impropriety or inequity, nor do they provide evidence of such.

The Board finds no error of fact, law, or policy in this discharge. There have been no relevant policy changes since the date of discharge that are unique to this case. The discharge of the applicant was justified and consistent with the standards of discipline. The Board finds no issues concerning the propriety or equity of 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 discharge characterization is 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.