

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2012-01928
COUNSEL: NONE
HEARING DESIRED: NO

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

His reentry (RE) code of "2X - *First-term, second-term or career airman considered but not selected for reenlistment under the SRP,*" be changed to allow him to reenter the military.

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

He does not know why he received this RE code. In 2009, he had turned down the opportunity to test for staff sergeant because he knew he was going to fulfill his contract and did not want to take another person's well-earned promotion. He feels he made an honorable choice and thinks the RE code he received is unjust. He fulfilled his full service commitment and was honorably discharged.

In support of his appeal, the applicant provides a copy of his DD Form 214, *Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*.

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

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The applicant is a former member of the Regular Air Force who served on active duty from 17 February 2004 to 16 February 2010. He was honorably discharged in the grade of senior Airman (E-4) after serving six years on active duty. His DD Form 214 indicates his RE code as "2X" and his narrative reason for separation as "*Completion of Required Active Duty.*"

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

AFPC/DPSOA recommends denial. DPSOA states the applicant has not provided any evidence of an error or injustice that would warrant a change of his RE code. A thorough search of the applicant's record did not reveal an Air Force Form 418, *Selective Reenlistment Program Consideration*, non-selecting him; however, a printout from the Personnel Data System, dated 15 November 2011,

identified the applicant was non-selected for reenlistment. Additionally, he had received two Article 15s and two referral evaluations that would support the RE code "2X."

The complete DPSOA 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 25 June 2012, for review and comment within 30 days. 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 timely filed.
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, 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.

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-2012-01928 in Executive Session on 6 December 2012, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

, Panel Chair
, Member
, Member

The following documentary evidence was considered in connection with AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2012-01928:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 26 Apr 12, w/atch.
- Exhibit B. Letter, AFPC/DPSOA, dated 18 Jun 12, w/atch.
- Exhibit C. Letter, SAF/MRBR, dated 25 Jun 12.

Panel Chair