RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF: DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2012-01489

COUNSEL: NONE

HEARING DESIRED: NOT INDICATED

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

His narrative reason for separation, unsuitability - personality disorder, be changed.

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

The narrative reason for his discharge is preventing him from obtaining gainful employment with the federal government.

In support of his request, the applicant provides a personal statement, a character reference, his DD Form 214, Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty, his master personnel records and excerpts from his medical records and other supporting documentation.

The applicant's complete submission, with attachments, is at Exhibit A.

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The applicant enlisted in the Regular Air Force on 6 February 1979. Documentation submitted by the applicant shows that on 27 July 1981 he was notified of his commander's intent to discharge him from the Air Force for unsuitability due to a personality disorder. Specifically, the applicant was diagnosed with having a paranoid personality disorder that interfered with his ability to adequately perform his duties. The applicant acknowledged his commanders intent, his right to counsel and to submit matters on his behalf on 27 July 1981: he submitted matters for his commander's consideration.

The discharge was found legally sufficient on 8 September 1981. On 10 September 1981, the commander approved the separation. He received an honorable discharge and his narrative reason for separation was listed as unsuitability - personality disorder. He was credited with serving 2 years, 7 months and 11 days of active duty.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

AFPC/DPSOS recommends denial. The applicant was referred for a psychological evaluation due to his difficulty in smoothly relating to his co-workers, showing up to work late and financial irresponsibility. He stated he believed the people in his office were out to get him and that he was being treated unfairly. The evaluation showed the applicant tested at dull normal intelligence and poor abstract reasoning. It also showed he was oversensitive and displayed ready resentment and interpersonal distrust. The applicant also felt emotionally pressured by his work environment and making adjustment to the military was difficult for him.

On 2 September 1981, an evaluation officer was appointed to the applicant's case. He recommended the applicant be honorably discharged and the he be considered for probation and rehabilitation. The commander reviewed the evaluation officer's report and determined discharge was appropriate.

The applicant did not submit any evidence or identify any errors or injustices in the discharge processing. He provided no facts warranting a change to his narrative reason for separation. The discharge, to include the narrative reason for separation, were consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the discharge manual and was within the discretion of the discharge authority.

The complete DPSOS evaluation is at Exhibit C.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

A copy of the Air Force evaluation was forwarded to the applicant on 8 June 2012, for review and comment within 30 days (Exhibit D). As of this date, this office has received no response.

THE BOARD CONCLUDES THAT:

- 1. The applicant has exhausted all remedies provided by existing law or regulations.
- 2. The application was not timely filed; however, it is in the interest of justice to excuse the failure to timely file.
- 3. Insufficient relevant evidence has been presented to demonstrate the existence of error or injustice. We took notice of the applicant's submission in judging the merits of the case;

however, we agree with the opinion and recommendation of the Air Force office of primary responsibility and adopt its rationale as the basis for our conclusion that the applicant has not been the victim of an error or injustice. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we find no basis to recommend granting the relief sought in this application.

4. The applicant's case is adequately documented and it has not been shown that a personal appearance with or without counsel will materially add to our understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, the request for a hearing is not favorably considered.

THE BOARD DETERMINES THAT:

The applicant be notified that the evidence presented did not demonstrate the existence of material error or injustice; that the application was denied without a personal appearance; and that the application will only be reconsidered upon the submission of newly discovered relevant evidence not considered with this application.

The following members of the Board considered AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2012-01489 in Executive Session on 21 August 2012 under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

- , Panel Chair
- , Member
- , Member

The following documentary evidence was considered:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 30 Mar 12, w/atchs.
- Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.
- Exhibit C. Letter, AFPC/DPSOS, dated 21 May 12.
- Exhibit D. Letter, SAF/MRBR, dated 8 Jun 12.

Panel Chair