

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
PHYSICAL DISABILITY BOARD OF REVIEW

NAME: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
BRANCH OF SERVICE: AIR FORCE

CASE: PD-2022-00069  
SEPARATION DATE: 20050523

---

**SUMMARY OF CASE:** Data extracted from the available evidence of record reflects this covered individual (CI) was a Reserve O3, Special Investigations Officer, medically separated for “chronic left knee pain” with a disability rating of 20%.

---

**CI CONTENTION:** The left knee condition has worsened since separation. He also requested review of additional conditions not identified by the Medical Evaluation Board (MEB) and Physical Evaluation Board (PEB).

---

**SCOPE OF REVIEW:** The panel’s scope of review is defined in DoDI 6040.44. It is limited to review of disability ratings assigned to those conditions determined by the PEB to be unfitting for continued military service, and when specifically requested by the CI, those conditions identified by the MEB, but determined by the PEB to be not unfitting or non-compensable. Any conditions outside the panel’s defined scope of review, and any contention not requested in this application, may remain eligible for future consideration by the Board for Correction of Military Records. The panel’s authority is limited to assessing the fairness and accuracy of PEB rating determinations and recommending corrections when appropriate. The panel gives consideration to VA evidence, particularly within 12 months of separation, but only to the extent that it reasonably reflects the severity of disability at the time of separation.

---

**RATING COMPARISON:**

SERVICE PEB - 20050407			VARD - NA			
Condition	Code	Rating	Condition	Code	Rating	Exam
Chronic Left Knee Pain	5258	20%	No VA Examination Proximate to Separation in Evidence			
<b>COMBINED RATING: 20%</b>			<b>COMBINED RATING OF ALL VA CONDITIONS: NA</b>			

---

**ANALYSIS SUMMARY:**

**Left Knee Pain.** According to the service treatment record and MEB narrative summary (NARSUM), the CI underwent multiple left knee arthroscopies for a partial medial meniscectomy and removal of a symptomatic plica. The last operation in April 2004 showed no significant pathology. Rehabilitative efforts (physical therapy, steroid injections and non-steroidal medications) did not allow return to full duty in his specialty. In September 2004, X-rays revealed an unremarkable left knee.

At an orthopedic appointment on 21 December 2004, 5 months prior to separation, the CI complained of pain (rated at 4-8/10) in the anteromedial aspect of the left knee, near the previous surgery. He complained of stabbing pain under the kneecap with certain movements and was unable to get comfortable. Physical examination noted range of motion from 0-135 degrees (normal 0-140). There was some hamstring tightness, but portal sites were well-healed with no effusion. All tests for instability were negative and X-rays and an MRI from 2 November 2004 noted no significant pathology. A bone scan on 29 December 2004 was essentially unremarkable with no definitive abnormality noted.

The 20 January 2005 MEB NARSUM examination, 4 months before separation, noted complaints of continued left knee pain, significant with standing and prolonged walking and minimally helped with Motrin. Physical examination showed “good range of motion” with no obvious instability. There was no VA examination proximate to separation in evidence.

The panel directed attention to its rating recommendation based on the above evidence. The PEB rated the left knee condition 20%, coded 5258 (cartilage, semilunar, dislocated, with frequent episodes of locking, pain, and effusion into the joint). Panel members agreed that there was no evidence of ankylosis to rate under code 5256, or instability under code 5257. There was also no compensable limitation of flexion or extension for a higher rating under code 5260 or 5261. After due deliberation, considering all the evidence and mindful of VASRD §4.3 (reasonable doubt), the panel concluded there was insufficient cause to recommend a change in the PEB adjudication for the left knee condition.

---

**BOARD FINDINGS:** In the matter of the left knee condition and IAW VASRD §4.71a, the panel recommends no change in the PEB adjudication. There are no other conditions within the panel’s scope of review for consideration. Therefore, the panel recommends no modification or re-characterization of the CI’s disability and separation determination.

---

The following documentary evidence was considered:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 294, dated 20220726, w/atchs
- Exhibit B. Service Treatment Record
- Exhibit C. Department of Veterans Affairs Record

SAF/MRB  
3351 CELMERS LANE  
JBA NAF WASHINGTON, MD 20762-6435

Dear XXXXXXXXXXXX

Reference your application submitted under the provisions of DoDI 6040.44 (Section 1554, 10 USC), PDBR Case Number PD-2022-00069.

After careful consideration of your application and treatment records, the Physical Disability Board of Review determined that the rating assigned at the time of final disposition of your disability evaluation system processing was appropriate. Accordingly, the Board recommended no rating modification or re-characterization of your separation.

I have carefully reviewed the evidence of record and the recommendation of the Board. I concur with that finding and their conclusion that modification of your disability rating or characterization of your separation is not warranted. Accordingly, I accept the recommendation that your application be denied.

Sincerely,