RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF: DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2012-01264

COUNSEL: NONE

HEARING DESIRED: YES

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

The narrative reason for separation on her DD Form 214, Certificate of Discharge or Release from Active Duty, be changed from personality disorder to medical disability due to post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), bi-polar disorder, and anxiety.

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

- 1. The recommendation for her discharge rested solely on the diagnosis of personality disorder, not otherwise specified (NOS), per two doctors from the mental health clinic at her assigned base. She disagrees with the diagnosis on the basis that she was in the service for a little over three years and not once, while in the Air Force or even before she enlisted, did she have any issues nor was she told she had a personality issue. In fact, it was her personality that most people adored about her.
- 2. It seems as though her diagnosis of personality disorder was being blamed on incidences of domestic disputes with her husband which occurred at her duty station. Before these incidences she was told she was doing a great job. She received kudos on her character and the great job she was doing from coworkers, family members, and friends. She also received multiple comment cards from patients that she served. It was therefore, quite hard for her to process and understand how she was considered a risk to herself as well as her unit and was told she had to leave all that she had worked so hard for.
- 3. She believes that the unresolved issues with her husband had a significant impact on her mental status and the unit mission only because she was not receiving treatment for her illnesses. She credits her mother for utilizing her skills as a case manager to link her to appropriate needed services and education resources related to family stress.
- 4. Since being discharged she has received medical evidence that is contrary to what is on her DD Form 214, therefore, she wishes the narrative reason for her separation be changed due to

the evidence of PTSD, bipolar disorder, and anxiety. Unlike personality disorder, these disabilities can be treated with medication as well as therapy. She hopes this injustice is overturned as this characterization on her record has cost her multiple jobs and may possibly affect her Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) priority level and/or ratings.

In support of her request, the applicant submits a personal statement and copies of medical assessments from the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Service and All that's Therapeutic agencies.

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

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The applicant enlisted in the Regular Air Force on 15 January 2008, served as a pharmacy journeyman and was progressively promoted to the rank of senior airman (SrA), E-4 with an effective date of rank of 29 June 2010.

- 1. On 28 February 2011 the applicant was notified by her commander that she was recommending her for discharge from the Air Force under the provisions of AFPD 36-32 Military Retirements and Separations and AFI 36-3208, Administrative Separation of Airmen, paragraph 5.11.9., Mental Disorders. The specific reason for this action was that on 5 January 2011; the applicant was given a psychological evaluation by the mental health flight commander and a clinical psychology resident.
- 2. The results of the command-directed mental health evaluation described the applicant's episodes of care for "psychological testing and clinical interviews on six separate occasions between 15 November and 10 December 2010" for the purpose of determining "if there were psychological factors that rendered the applicant unfit or unsuitable for continued military service." The evaluation was also conducted "due to concerns for the safety of the applicant and her child due to a repeated history of violent interactions with her husband which resulted in significant injury to the applicant."
- 3. The evaluators noted that although the applicant was cooperative with the evaluation process, the evidence accumulated across the testing and interview sessions suggested that she had a tendency to deny or minimize her shortcomings and externalize blame and responsibility. The report listed the following sources of information utilized in reaching the diagnostic conclusions:
 - a. multiple clinical interviews with the applicant,

- b. two psychological testing sessions,
- c. review of available medical records,
- d. review of the applicant's personnel records,
- e. collateral phone interviews with four members of her chain of command and two persons chosen by the applicant.

The applicant's psychological testing was considered valid. While testing was not indicative of serious psychiatric conditions such as mood or thought disorder, clinically significant Cluster B personality traits consistent with both narcissistic personality disorder and histrionic personality disorder were noted.

- 4. The evaluating psychology resident, with concurrence by the staff psychologist, determined that the applicant "appears to have interpersonal style and clinically significant personality traits consistent with personality disorder, not otherwise specified, with marked narcissistic and histrionic traits." The psychology resident further opined, "This constellation of personality traits have resulted in clinically significant impairment in multiple important areas of functioning (e.g., occupational, social, and relational)" and that "key aspects of this personality structure have been present since adolescence, are ego-syntonic for the applicant, and are not highly amenable to change."
- 5. The evaluators further concluded that the applicant met all requirements for personality disorder, NOS, with narcissistic and histrionic traits so severe that her ability to function in the military environment was significantly impaired. They deemed the applicant unsuitable for continued military service based on the diagnosis of Axis II: Clinical disorder, according to atch 1 of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition.
- 6. Although not a basis for discharge, the commander also considered the following:
- a. On or about 14 October 2010, the applicant failed to go to a mandatory formation at the main pharmacy at 0730 in preparation for a local mission exercise. She was not accountable until 0745. As a result, she received a Letter of Counseling (LOC) dated 15 October 2010.
- b. On or about 10 November 2010, the applicant did not report to duty as scheduled. Her supervisor was informed that her father-in-law called and stated that she would not be in because she was admitted to a local hospital. When the first sergeant spoke with the applicant concerning this matter, he

noted several discrepancies in her story. The applicant was counseled about integrity, failing to go to her appointed place of duty on time, and the correct actions to take if she was in a situation that would cause her to be late reporting for duty. As a result, she received a Letter of Reprimand (LOR) dated 10 November 2012.

- 7. On 28 February 2011, the applicant acknowledged receipt of the notification of discharge and was advised of her right to consult counsel and submit a statement to the commander for consideration. She opted to consult counsel and submit a statement on her behalf.
- 8. Subsequent to the file being found legally sufficient the discharge authority approved the recommendation and directed that the applicant be separated with an honorable discharge without probation and rehabilitation. The applicant was discharged on 14 March 2011, with a narrative reason for separation of "Personality Disorder" and a separation code of "JFX." She was credited with 3 years, 2 months and 1 day of active duty service.

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.
- Insufficient relevant evidence has been presented 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 find no evidence of an error or injustice that occurred during the discharge process. Based on the available evidence of record, it appears the discharge was consistent with the substantive requirements of the discharge regulation and within the commander's discretionary authority. The applicant has provided no evidence, which would lead us to believe the narrative reason for separation was contrary to the provisions of the governing regulation. We note the applicant's contention that her PTSD, bipolar disorder and anxiety should be reflected as the narrative reason for separation due to postservice medical evidence. However, the applicant has not provided sufficient evidence to support these conditions were the reasons for her discharge.

Therefore, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we find no basis upon which 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 issue(s) 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 this application in Executive Session on 10 January 2013, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

Panel Chair Member Member

The following documentary evidence pertaining to Docket Number BC-2012-01264 was considered:

Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 7 March 2012, w/atchs.

Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.

Panel Chair