

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2012-01728
COUNSEL: NONE
HEARING DESIRED: NO

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

He be awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross (DFC).

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

He completed 35 combat missions but was not properly awarded the DFC. It was normal to be awarded the DFC after completing 35 combat missions with the 94th Bomb Group (BG). His missions were extremely hazardous and his B-17 was always riddled with 20 millimeter and anti-aircraft artillery damage. He attended numerous group reunions and his friends were always amazed he had not received the DFC.

In support of his request, the applicant provides personal statements from his former squadron and group operations officers, copies of a reassignment of combat crew personnel memorandum, and his Air Medal citations.

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

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The applicant served on active duty from 7 Jan 44 to 28 Feb 74.

The applicant submitted his initial request in Sep 96 through a Congressional Inquiry. On 16 Dec 96, AFPC/DPPRA notified the applicant of the Secretary of the Air Force Personnel Council (SAFPC) Decoration Review Board (SAF/MRBP) disapproval decision. He was advised that unless he could provide additional justification to substantiate his request, SAFPC would not reconsider his case.

The applicant has made several requests for consideration for award of the DFC in lieu of the Air Medal (AM) with one silver oak leaf cluster (AM w/1SOLC). He has exhausted his administrative avenues in accordance with Title 10, U.S.C., section 1130, through the SAFPC Decorations Board.

The DFC is awarded for extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flight. The performance of the act of heroism must be evidenced by voluntary action above and beyond the call of duty. The extraordinary achievement must have resulted in an accomplishment so exceptional and outstanding as to clearly set the individual apart from comrades or from other persons in similar circumstances. Awards will be made only to recognize single acts of heroism or extraordinary achievement and will not be made in recognition of sustained operational activities against an armed enemy.

The remaining relevant facts pertaining to this application are contained in the letter prepared by the appropriate office of the Air Force, which is attached at Exhibit C

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

AFPC/DPSIDR recommends denial. DPSIDR states the Board needs to consider the merits of the applicant's request for award of the DFC in lieu of the AM w/1SOLC. SAFPC Decorations Board disapproved the applicant's request and requested additional justification in order to reconsider his request. However, the applicant has not provided any new evidence to SAFPC for consideration.

DPSIDR states in order for SAF/MRBP to reasonably consider a recommendation for a decoration, it must have the following documentation:

1) A recommendation in writing by someone (preferably within the chain of command) who has first-hand knowledge of the acts or achievements on which the recommendation is based.

2) A proposed citation.

Neither of which were provided. The applicant's request for the DFC is for sustained operational activities and does not meet the eligibility criteria for award of the DFC.

The complete DPSIDR evaluation is at Exhibit C.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

By letter dated 17 Jun 12, the applicant states he was 22 years old when he piloted a B-17 during combat with the 94th Bomb Group, 8th Air Force. The applicant states that World War II

veterans are dying at a rate of 100 daily; therefore, its hard for him to obtain support beyond what he has already provided.

The applicant's response, with attachments are at Exhibit E.

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 complete submission in judging the merits of the case; however, as pointed out by DPSIDR, the applicant's request for the DFC for sustained operational activities does not meet the eligibility criteria for award of the DFC. While we note the applicant's contentions and his honorable service to our Nation; we do not find the evidence provided in support of his request sufficient to recommend granting his request. Therefore, in the absence of persuasive evidence to the contrary, we find no basis to recommend granting the relief sought in this application.

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 Docket Number BC-2012-01728 in Executive Session on 29 Nov 12, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

Panel Chair
Member
Member

The following documentary evidence pertaining to AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2012-01728 was considered:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 18 Apr 12, w/atchs.
- Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.
- Exhibit C. Letter, AFPC/DPSIDR, dated 17 May 12, w/atchs.
- Exhibit D. Letter, SAF/MRBR, dated 8 Jun 12.
- Exhibit E. Letter, Applicant, dated 17 Jun 12, w/atch.

Panel Chair