

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2012-01483

COUNSEL: None

XXXXXXXXXX

HEARING DESIRED: NO

---

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

He be commissioned as an officer.

---

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

1. He accepted an appointment as a flight officer because he was not given the opportunity to accept a commission.
2. He was never promoted.
3. He was a licensed pilot when he enlisted in the Army Air Corp. He completed flight school and served with the 446 Bomb Group, 8<sup>th</sup> Air Force in England. As an aircraft commander, he flew 28 combat missions and never lost a plane or a man. His co-pilot and bombardier/navigator were commissioned officers.

In support of his appeal the applicant provides a copy of his discharge from the Flight Officer Air Corps, a copy of WD AGO 53-97, *Military Record and Separation Report*, Honorable Discharge Certificate, Enlisted Record of Service, and a copy of special orders.

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

---

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The applicant enlisted in the Army of the United States (AUS) enlisted reserve on 27 Oct 42 and was subsequently appointed an aviation cadet. On 11 Mar 44, he was honorably discharged from aviation cadet status to accept an appointment as a flight officer. He was appointed as a flight officer and entered active duty on 12 Mar 44. He was discharged from active duty as a flight officer on 22 Apr 46 by reason of physical disability.

---

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

AFPC/DPSIPR recommends the applicant's request be denied. DPSIPR states the applicant's record contains no documentation to support appointment to second lieutenant upon completion of training, nor is there documentation to support he was recommended for appointment as a second lieutenant subsequent to being appointed a flight officer. Additionally, the applicant provided no documentation to support an error or injustice in his appointment upon completion of training.

According to Army Regulation 615-160, *Enlisted Men-Aviation Cadets*, dated 5 Nov 42, selected aviation cadets who successfully completed a prescribed course of air crew training were commissioned second lieutenants in the AUS. All other aviation cadet graduates of aircrew training were appointed flight officers in the AUS. Upon completion of air crew training, a board of officers considered the qualifications of each aviation cadet and prepared a report, submitted through channels, to the Commanding General, Army Air Forces. The report contained the number of hours devoted to and grades attained in each subject, including flying time and flying grades. The report also contained a statement as to whether the cadet was physically, morally, educationally, and professionally qualified for commission as a second lieutenant or appointment as a flight officer.

According to Army Regulation 610-50, *Flight Officers*, dated 5 Nov 42, flight officers could be selected for appointment to the grade of second lieutenant. The system for selection was designed to assure fairness and uniformity and to provide for due consideration of individual merit.

The complete AFPC/DPSIPR evaluation, with attachments, is at Exhibit C.

---

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATIONS:

In his response dated 19 December 2012, the applicant indicates his disagreement with AFPC/DPSIPR's recommendation to deny his request. He reiterates his previous contentions and states that he geared everything towards flying in support of his country during the war and in the end he was not treated fairly or recognized for his exemplary service. It is his wish to have this injustice corrected before he expires. Additionally, he requested he be given a phone interview before his case is decided.

The applicant's complete response is 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, 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. Additionally, while we note the applicant's assertion he was treated unfairly, the evidence available to us is insufficient to conclude that he should have been commissioned as a second lieutenant. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we find no compelling 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 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 Docket Number BC-2012-01483 in Executive Session on 10 January 2013, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

, Panel Chair  
, Member  
, Member

The following documentary evidence was considered:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 22 March 2012, w/atchs.
- Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.
- Exhibit C. Letter, DPSIPR, dated 28 November 2012, w/atchs.

Exhibit D. Letter, SAF/MRBR, dated 3 December 2012.  
Exhibit E. Letter, Applicant, dated 19 December 2012

XXXXXXXXXX  
Panel Chair