

AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD HEARING RECORD

NAME OF SERVICE MEMBER (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL)		GRADE	AFSN/SSAN			
		A1C				
TYPE	PERSONAL APPEARANCE		X RECORD REVIEW			
COUNSEL		NAME OF COUNSEL AND OR ORGANIZATION				
YES	NO					
	X					
		ADDRESS AND OR ORGANIZATION OF COUNSEL				
MEMBERS SITTING		VOTE OF THE BOARD				
		HON	GEN	UOTHC	OTHER	DENY
						X
						X
						X
						X
						X
						X
ISSUES		INDEX NUMBER		EXHIBITS SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD		
A95.00		A67.90		1	ORDER APPOINTING THE BOARD	
				2	APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE	
				3	LETTER OF NOTIFICATION	
HEARING DATE		CASE NUMBER		4	BRIEF OF PERSONNEL FILE	
17 Jan 03		FD2002-0263			COUNSEL'S RELEASE TO THE BOARD	
					ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS SUBMITTED AT TIME OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE	
					TAPE RECORDING OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE HEARING	
APPLICANT'S ISSUE AND THE BOARD'S DECISIONAL RATIONAL ARE DISCUSSED ON THE ATTACHED AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE.						
REMARKS						
Case heard at Washington, D.C.						
Advise applicant of the decision of the Board, the right to a personal appearance with/without counsel, and the right to submit an application to the AFBCMR.						
SIGNATURE OF RECORDER			SIGNATURE OF BOARD PRESIDENT			
INDORSEMENT				DATE: 17 Jan 03		
TO:			FROM:			
SAF/MIBR 550 C STREET WEST, SUITE 40 RANDOLPH AFB, TX 78150-4742			SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PERSONNEL COUNCIL AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD 1535 COMMAND DR, EE WING, 3 RD FLOOR ANDREWS AFB, MD 20762-7002			

AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE

CASE NUMBER

FD02-0263

GENERAL: The applicant appeals for upgrade of discharge to Honorable.

The applicant was offered a personal appearance before the Discharge Review Board (DRB) but declined to exercise this right.

The attached brief contains the available pertinent data on the applicant and the factors leading to the discharge.

FINDINGS: Upgrade of discharge is denied.

The board finds that the applicant submitted no issues contesting the equity or propriety of the discharge, and after a thorough review of the record, the Board was able to identify none that would justify a change of discharge.

ISSUE: The applicant submitted no issues and requested that the review be completed based on the available service record. The Board reviewed the entire record and found no evidence of impropriety or inequity in this case on which to base an upgrade of discharge. The records indicated applicant had two Article 15's, one for refusing to return to correctional custody after being medically cleared to do so and dereliction in the performance of her duties. The other one was for failing to maintain her weight/body fat within standards in order to get out of an impending PCS assignment to Kunsan Air Base, Korea. This second Article 15 was dismissed by the applicant's Administrative Discharge Board. She also received two Records of Individual Counseling for substandard job performance, unacceptable attitude and behavior, and for having a poor attitude. The DRB opined that through these administrative actions, the applicant had ample opportunities to change her negative/repetitive behavior. The Board concluded the disciplinary infractions were a significant departure from the conduct expected of all military members. The Board found no evidence of impropriety or inequity in this case on which to base an upgrade of discharge.

CONCLUSIONS: The Discharge Review Board concludes that the discharge was consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the discharge regulation and was within the discretion of the discharge authority and that the applicant was provided full administrative due process.

In view of the foregoing findings the board further concludes that there exists no legal or equitable basis for upgrade of discharge, thus the applicant's discharge should not be changed.

Attachment:
Examiner's Brief

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD
ANDREWS AFB, MD

[REDACTED]
(Former A1C) (HGH SGT)

1. **MATTER UNDER REVIEW:** Appl rec'd a GEN Disch fr USAF 95/07/28 UP AFR 39-10, para 5-47b (Misconduct - Conduct Prejudicial to Good Order and Discipline). Appeals for Honorable Disch.

2. **BACKGROUND:**

a. DOB: 67/03/18. Enlmt Age: 19 1/12. Disch Age: 28 4/12. Educ: HS DIPL. AFQT: N/A. A-82, E-88, G-82, M-57. PAFSC: 1C351 - Command and Control Journeyman. DAS: 92/03/18.

b. Prior Sv: (1) AFRes 86/04/28 - 86/08/04 (3 months 7 days) (Inactive).

(2) Enlisted as AB 86/08/05 for 4 yrs. Extended 88/07/07 for 13 months. Extended 88/12/07 for 6 months. Svd: 3 yrs 9 months 3 days, all AMS. AMN-(APR Indicates): 86/08/05-87/07/31. A1C-(APR Indicates): 87/08/01-88/07/31. SRA - 89/08/05. APRs: 9,9,9. EPRs: 4.

3. **SERVICE UNDER REVIEW:**

a. Reenlisted as SRA 90/05/07 for 6 yrs. Svd: 05 Yrs 02 MoS 21 Das, all AMS.

b. Grade Status: A1C - 94/06/27 (Article 15, 94/06/27).
SGT - (EPR Indicates): 90/01/18-91/01/17.

c. Time Lost: None.

d. Art 15's: (1) 94/06/27, Holloman AFB, NM - Article 92. You, having knowledge of a lawful order issued by Major ----- to submit to 30 days correctional custody, an order which it was your duty to obey, did, on or about 10 Jun 94, fail to obey same by wrongfully refusing to return to correctional custody after being medically cleared to do so. Further preliminary investigation has disclosed that you, who knew of your duties, on divers occasions between on or about 3 Jun 94 and on or about 8 Jun 94, were derelict in the performance of those duties in that you negligently failed to conduct yourself in a military manner at all times, to be courteous in manner toward correctional custody personnel, and to inform correctional custody managers of possible health risks you have due to illness and/or allergy, and also to refrain from using a telephone to make personal calls without the permission of a correctional custody manager and from

applying starch to any clothing item Except your Battle Dress Uniform pockets so as not to cause an allergic reaction, as it was your duty to do. Reduction to A1C, suspended forfeiture of \$552.00 pay per month for two months, and 30 days extra duty. (Appeal/Denied) (No mitigation)

- (2) 94/06/01, Holloman AFB, NM - Article 91. You, who knew of your duties, on or about 3 May 94, were derelict in the performance of those duties in that you willfully failed to maintain your weight/body fat within AFR 35-11 standards in order to get out of an impending PCS assignment to Kunsan Air Base, Korea, as it was your duty to do. Forfeiture of \$55.00 pay per month for two months and 30 days correctional custody. (No appeal) (No mitigation)

- e. Additional: RIC, 15 FEB 95 - Poor attitude.
RIC, 4 MAR 93 - Substandard job performance, unacceptable attitude and behavior.

f. CM: None.

- g. Record of SV: 90/01/18 - 91/01/17 Det OL (USAFE) 4 (Annual)
91/01/18 - 92/01/17 Aviano AB 5 (Annual)
92/01/18 - 92/11/09 Holloman AFB 4 (CRO)
92/11/10 - 93/11/09 Holloman AFB 3 (Annual)
93/11/10 - 94/11/09 Holloman AFB 2 (Annual)REF

(Discharged from Holloman AFB)

h. Awards & Decs: AFCM, AAM, AFOUA W/BOLC, AFGCM W/BOLC, NDSM, SWASM W/BSS, AFOSLTR, AFLSAR W/BOLC, NCOPMER W/1 BOLC, AFTR.

- i. Stmt of Sv: TMS: (09) Yrs (03) Mos (01) Das
TAMS: (08) Yrs (11) Mos (24) Das

4. **BASIS ADVANCED FOR REVIEW:** Appln (DD Fm 293) dtd 02/06/10.
(Change Discharge to Honorable)

NO ISSUES SUBMITTED.

ATCH
None.

02/09/26/ia



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

HEADQUARTERS 49TH FIGHTER WING (ACC)
HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO

30 June 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR 49 FW/CC

FROM: 49 FW/JA

SUBJECT: Legal Review of AFI 36-3208 Administrative Discharge Board
Proceedings of [REDACTED]

1. SUMMARY: In a proceeding conducted on 16-17 and 23-24 March 1995, a board of officers found two of the allegations against [REDACTED] respondent, were substantiated, and determined she should be discharged from the United States Air Force (AF) with a general service characterization. On 21 October 1994, 49 MSS/CC recommended respondent be administratively discharged for misconduct under the provisions of AFR 39-10, Section H, Paragraph 5-47b, specifically, for conduct prejudicial to good order and discipline. He recommended respondent be separated with a general service characterization, without probation and rehabilitation (P & R). Pursuant to AFR 39-10, paragraph 6-19a, I reviewed the record of the board proceedings and found it legally sufficient to support the board's findings and recommendations. Thus, I recommend you approve the findings of the administrative discharge board.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

a. Respondent enlisted in the AF on 5 August 1986. Her current term of enlistment, for 6 years, commenced on 7 May 1990. She has been assigned to the 49 MSS since 26 August 1993. On 26 June 1994, as a result of Article 15, UCMJ, punishment, for failure to obey a lawful order, respondent was reduced in grade from Senior Airman to Airman First Class. (Although 49 MSS/CC's 21 October 1994 recommendation, and other documentation included in this discharge file, incorrectly indicate respondent's demotion was effective 26 July 1994 instead of 27 June 1994, the administrative inaccuracy does not affect the legal sufficiency of this discharge action.)

b. Respondent is entitled to wear the AF Training Ribbon, the National Defense Service Medal, the AF Longevity Service Award, and the NCO Professional Military Education Ribbon.

- c. She received the following overall evaluations on her EPRs and APRs:

<u>Period</u>	<u>thru</u>	<u>Rating</u>
10 Nov 93	9 Nov 94	2
10 Nov 92	9 Nov 93	3
18 Jan 92	9 Nov 92	4
18 Jan 91	17 Jan 92	5
18 Jan 90	17 Jan 91	4
18 Jan 89	17 Jan 90	4
1 Aug 88	17 Jan 89	9
1 Aug 87	31 Jul 88	9
5 Aug 86	31 Jul 87	9

d. On 21 October 1994, 49 MSS/CC recommended respondent be administratively discharged for misconduct under the provisions of AFR 39-10, Section H, Paragraph 5-47b, specifically, for conduct prejudicial to good order and discipline. He recommended respondent be separated with a general service characterization, without probation and rehabilitation (P & R). His 21 October 1994 notification to respondent of such recommendation was amended on 2 November 1994, in order to advise respondent that the worst possible characterization she could receive was an Under Other Than Honorable Conditions (UOTHC) characterization. Respondent acknowledged receipt of the amended notification and made her election to present her case to a board of officers on 2 and 3 November 1994, respectively. Pursuant to paragraph 6-2b, respondent was entitled to a board hearing because she had served over six years of active military service. On 15 March 1995, the government's representative (GR) notified respondent of the time, date, and place of the hearing. Respondent acknowledged receipt of said information on 16 March 1995.

e. Since this discharge action was initiated prior to AFI 36-3208 arriving at Holloman AFB, New Mexico and thus superseding AFR 39-10, the Legal Advisor correctly determined these proceedings were governed by the provisions of AFR 39-10 instead of AFI 36-3208. Moreover, he also determined that the 15 March 1995 Notification of a Board Hearing Letter to respondent was sufficient to notify respondent of the pending hearing although it referenced AFI 36-3208 instead AFR 39-10.

3. ALLEGED BASIS FOR THE DISCHARGE ACTION:

a. On or about 3 May 1994, at or near Holloman AFB, NM, respondent, who knew of her duties, was derelict in the performance of those duties in that she willfully failed to maintain her weight/body fat within AFR 35-11 standards in order to get out of a pending PCS assignment to Kunsan AFB, Korea, as it was her duty to do.

b. On or about 10 June 1994, at or near Holloman AFB, NM, respondent, having been issued a lawful order by [REDACTED] to submit to 30 days correctional custody, an order which was respondent's duty to obey, failed to obey such order by wrongfully refusing to return to correctional custody after being medically cleared to do so.

c. On or about 3 June 1994, at or near Holloman AFB, NM, respondent, who knew of her duties, was derelict in the performance of those duties in that she negligently failed to conduct herself in a military manner at all times; to be courteous in manner toward correctional custody personnel; and to inform correctional custody managers of possible health risks she had due to illness and/or allergy; and also to refrain from using a telephone to make personal calls without the permission of a correctional custody manager and from applying starch to any clothing item except her Battle Dress Uniform pockets so as not to cause an allergic reaction; as it was her duty to do.

4. EVIDENCE FOR THE GOVERNMENT:

a. In addition to the documents discussed in previous paragraphs, including their respective attachments, the government submitted the following documentary evidence:

(1) An affidavit from [REDACTED], in which he states he did not have personal knowledge of much of the present case, but he did observe several instances of "unprofessional" telephone conduct exhibited by respondent. Further, he recalled several commanders' complaints of unprofessional behavior were traced to respondent. Finally, [REDACTED] stated since [REDACTED] was the OIC of the Command Post Operators, it was his job to address these complaints with the respective offender. He opined that perhaps due to various counseling sessions regarding the complaints, respondent believed [REDACTED] had a grudge against her (Gov Ex 10).

(2) The government also entered into evidence many documents relating to the Air Force Weight Management Program and respondent's specific documents regarding her participation in the program (Gov Exs 11-13, 16).

(3) Also entered into evidence were two AF Forms 174, Record of Counseling, regarding her unprofessional behavior during a SAV and over the telephone and her negative attitude (Gov Ex 15, 42, respectively).

(4) Further, the government submitted copies of respondent's Article 15s, UCMJ, AF Forms 3070, and their attachments and related documents, such as the AF Form 1137, UIF Summary (Gov Exs 17, 36, 39, 44, 45).

(5) The government also included all the correctional custody documentation, including the medical examinations, her refusal to return to the facility, her understanding of the rules, her progress therein, and her counseling sessions, (Gov Exs 19-28, 31-35, 37-38).

(6) The government entered into evidence a copy of her orders to Kunsan (Gov Ex 43).

(7) Finally, the government entered a redacted statement by [REDACTED] regarding his observations of respondent's unprofessional conduct and negative attitude. Therein he states she was competent in her work but displayed a negative attitude toward authority (Gov Ex 46).

b. The following witnesses testified for the government:

(1) [REDACTED] who was the NCOIC of the orderly room and in charge of the Fitness and Weight Management Program for respondent's unit. Her testimony included the allegations and scenarios regarding respondent's weigh-in and subsequent conversation involving intentional weight gain.

(2) [REDACTED] respondent's former commander who directed respondent's weigh-in, determined respondent did intentionally gain weight, gave respondent two Article 15s, UCMJ, and entered her into the correctional custody program, testified as to how and why she directed the initial weigh-in, offered the Article 15s, and determined the punishment for each nonjudicial punishment. She also testified respondent did very well when she chose to, but that respondent had a very negative attitude. [REDACTED] further opined respondent does not have rehabilitative potential and should be discharged.

(3) [REDACTED] the Chief of Correctional Custody during the period respondent was in the program, testified regarding the purpose and procedures of the correctional custody program and respondent's participation therein. Further, she stated respondent's attitude, military bearing, and appearance were poor when she arrived to in-process. Her testimony also included information regarding the above allegation in paragraph 3.b. of this review. [REDACTED] also stated she believed respondent had the ability to be rehabilitated because in her opinion, respondent is capable of accomplishing whatever she sets out to do.

(4) [REDACTED] superintendent of the Command Post, testified regarding his indorsement on respondent's referral EPR and her repeated failure to meet Air Force standards. He further testified military members must enforce all Air Force standards, not selective ones.

(5) [REDACTED] current commander of the 49th Mission Support Squadron stated he became respondent's commander on 25 June 1994, reviewed her record,

allowed time to get to know her, and came to the conclusion cross-training for her was inappropriate and that she was unsuitable for her job. Therefore discharge was appropriate and based upon his personal knowledge, it should be an honorable discharge.

(6) [REDACTED] first sergeant of the 49th Mission Support Squadron stated she has known the respondent since she became the first sergeant in October 1993. She felt the respondent had a problem with authority and correctional custody had been a correct decision. Her retention now would affect good order and discipline therefore she should be discharged. A general discharge would be appropriate since she disobeyed a direct order.

(7) [REDACTED] Chief Military Personnel Flight of the 49th Mission Support Squadron knew the respondent after she was removed from the command post and sent to the military personnel flight. The respondent was capable but had a problem with authority and trying to change policy. If she is discharged, she should receive an honorable discharge.

5. EVIDENCE FOR RESPONDENT:

a. In addition to documents previously discussed, respondent, through his counsel, submitted the following documents:

(1) Letter of Appreciation for [REDACTED] for her job performance after her removal from the command post from [REDACTED] Res Exs A & B).

(2) Respondent's EPR's from 5 August 1986 to 9 November 1995 (Res Ex C).

(3) Respondent's letter of 24 May 1994 in defense of [REDACTED] allegation that respondent intentionally gained weight to avoid Kunsan assignment with nine character references (Res Ex D).

(4) Respondent's letter of appeal to 1 June 1994 Article 15 with 7 attachments (Res Ex E).

(5) Respondent's letter of 15 June 1994 for Article 15 presentation (Res Ex F).

(6) Response to Article 15 written appeal dated 22 July 1994 (Res Ex 6).

(7) Affidavits of support for respondent from [REDACTED] Res Exs H - J).

(8) Aerobics sign-in sheet showing respondent's participation (Res Ex L).

- (9) Affidavits of support for respondent from [REDACTED] (Res Exs L, M, & O).
- (10) Social Actions Climate Assessment dated 21 January 1994 (Res Ex N).
- (11) Extracts from: Weight Management Progress and Weight and Fitness Program (Res Exs P, Q, and V1).
- (12) Respondent's AF Form 379 - Physical Fitness Evaluation Data (Res Ex R).
- (13) Respondent's AF Form 393 - Weight Management Record (Res Ex R1).
- (14) TWIX'S regarding Respondent's assignment to Kunsan AB and Article 15 imposition (Res Exs S and T).
- (15) AF Form 973 confirming respondent's cancellation of Kunsan AB assignment (Res Ex U).
- (16) AF Form 422 Respondent's Physical Profile Report (Res Exs V).
- (17) Citation for Commendation Medal and Achievement Medal for respondent (Res Exs W & X).
- (18) Letters of support for respondent from [REDACTED] (Res Exs Y & Z).

b. The following witnesses testified for respondent:

(1) [REDACTED], mother of the respondent. The respondent looked forward to her assignment to Korea and made preparations accordingly. The respondent did say she had a problem with [REDACTED] also going to Korea, but she still wanted to go. She never advised the respondent as to how she might gain weight.

(2) [REDACTED] (sworn), respondent. She stated she first came into the Air Force in August of 1986. She worked as a command post controller, first at Charleston AFB, then Aviano AB, and finally at Holloman AFB. When she arrived at Holloman, she felt there were problems with the squadron commander, [REDACTED] but her replacement, [REDACTED] was much easier to work with. When [REDACTED] replaced [REDACTED] she had problems with his style of leadership. She began volunteering for TDYs and went to Saudi twice. She volunteered for a world wide remote assignment in order to get out of the Holloman command post.

During her last tour in Saudi, she became overweight and worked to reduce her weight through diet and exercise and lost about 25 pounds. In January 1994 she was notified of her assignment to Kunsan and was excited about going. Her excitement was dampened in April 1994 when she found out [REDACTED] her OIC at Holloman, would also be going to Kunsan. She had difficulties working with [REDACTED] but felt she could adjust if she didn't have to work with him.

She continued her weight loss program, but was notified she was overweight at her 3 May 1994 weigh-in with [REDACTED]. She never told [REDACTED] that she wanted to get out of her Kunsan assignment because of [REDACTED] and she did not intentionally gain weight to get out of the assignment.

When she was given an Article 15 for gaining weight intentionally, she felt wronged but she wanted to complete her punishment, correctional custody, successfully. However, after a few days, she became ill and was hospitalized. During her hospitalization she came to the conclusion she could not mentally or physically complete correctional custody, and refused to continue in the program, despite being ordered to do so.

Respondent testified to her own outstanding job performance and her wish to remain in the Air Force. She felt that many of her problems with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were commonly experienced by other personnel and were due to their own problems.

6. DISCUSSION AND LAW:

a. AFR 39-10, paragraph 5-53, requires the Special Court Martial Convening Authority (SPCM) to personally approve or disapprove the recommendations of an administrative discharge board when the recommendation is a general discharge under Section H.

b. According to the board's finding, they determined respondent:

(1) Was not derelict in her duties in that she did not intentionally gain weight in order to avoid a pending assignment to Kunsan AB, Korea.

(2) Did fail to obey a lawful order to return to correctional custody while correctional custody.

(3) Was derelict in the performance of her duties by failing to maintain a military manner to be courteous to correctional custody personnel, to refrain from using the telephone, to refrain from applying starch to her clothing when she knew of the allergies to starch.

c. The board recommended that respondent be separated with a general discharge and that she not be offered probation and rehabilitation.

d. Options:

1. Direct Retention of the respondent.
2. Authorize suspension of the discharge for Probation and Rehabilitation.
3. Direct execution of the discharge without Probation and Rehabilitation.

7. RECOMMENDATION: Approve respondent's discharge pursuant to the administrative discharge board's findings.

A large, irregular black redaction mark covering several lines of text in the signature area.

1st Ind, 49 FW/JA

TO: 49 FW/CC

I Concur.

A large, irregular black redaction mark covering several lines of text in the signature area.



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

HEADQUARTERS 49TH FIGHTER WING (ACC)
HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO

21 October 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR [REDACTED]

FROM: 49 MSS/CC

SUBJ: Letter of Notification

1. I am recommending your discharge from the United States Air Force for a pattern of misconduct, specifically for conduct prejudicial to good order and discipline. The authority for this action is AFR 39-10, Section H, paragraph 5-47b. If my recommendation is approved, your service will be characterized as honorable or general. I am recommending that your service be characterized as general.

2. My reasons for this action are:

a. You did, at Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, on or about 10 June 1994, having been issued a lawful order by [REDACTED] to submit to 30 days correctional custody, an order which it was your duty to obey, failed to obey such order by wrongfully refusing to return to correctional custody after being medically cleared to do so. Further investigation revealed that you did, at Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, on or about 3 June 1994, knowing of your duties at Holloman Air Force Base, were derelict in the performance of those duties in that you negligently failed to conduct yourself in a military manner at all times, to be courteous in manner toward correctional custody personnel, and to inform correctional custody managers of possible health risks you have due to illness and/or allergy, and also to refrain from using a telephone to make personal calls without the permission of a correctional custody manager and from applying starch to any clothing item except your Battle Dress Uniform pockets so as not to cause an allergic reaction, as it was your duty to do. Your actions were in violation of Article 92 of the UCMJ, for which you received nonjudicial punishment under Article 15, UCMJ, on 26 July 1994.

b. You, who knew of your duties, at or near Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, on or about 3 May 1994, were derelict in the performance of those duties in that you willfully failed to maintain your weight/body fat within AFR 35-11 standards in order to get out of an impending PCS assignment to Kunsan Air Base, Korea, as it was your duty to do. Your actions were in violation Article 92, UCMJ for which you received nonjudicial punishment under Article 15, UCMJ, on 23 June 1994.

Copies of the documents to be forwarded to the separation authority in support of this recommendation are attached. The commander exercising Special Court-Martial jurisdiction or a higher authority will decide whether you will be discharged or retained in the Air Force. If you are discharged, you will be ineligible for reenlistment in the Air Force.

3. You have the right to consult counsel. Military legal counsel has been obtained to assist you. I have made an appointment for you to consult [REDACTED] Area Defense Counsel, Building 302, Holloman AFB, phone 3474, at 1030 hours on 27 October 1994. You may request that a different military defense counsel represent you, if that counsel is reasonably available as defined by AFR 111-1. You may consult civilian counsel at your own expense.

4. You have the right to submit statements in your own behalf. I will forward your statements to the separation authority. Any statements you want me to forward must reach the Separations Processing Center, Room 1940, Building 29, Holloman AFB, by 28 October 1994 unless you request and receive an extension for good cause shown. You must submit your request for extension to the Separation Processing Center in a timely manner.

5. If you fail to consult counsel or to submit statements in your own behalf, your failure will constitute a waiver of your right to do so.

6. You were previously scheduled for a medical examination at Bldg 15, 49th Medical Group, Physical Exams, at 0700 on 17 December 1992.

7. Any personal information you furnish in rebuttal is covered by the Privacy Act Statement as explained in AFR 39-10, attachment 2. A copy of AFR 39-10 is available for your use in the office of the Area Defense Counsel.

8. You must execute the attached acknowledgment and return to me immediately. The acknowledgment does not admit or deny any of the allegations against you, nor does it mean that you agree with the discharge action. It is simply an acknowledgment that you have received this Letter of Notification.



Attachments:

1. Supporting Documents
2. Other Derogatory
3. Airman's Acknowledgment