

AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD HEARING RECORD

NAME OF SERVICE MEMBER (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL)	GRADE	AFSN/SSAN
--	--------------	------------------

TYPE	X	PERSONAL APPEARANCE		RECORD REVIEW
COUNSEL		NAME OF COUNSEL AND OR ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS AND OR ORGANIZATION OF COUNSEL	
YES	No			
	X			

MEMBER SITTING	VOTE OF THE BOARD				
	HON	GEN	UOHC	OTHER	DENY
					X
					X
					X
					X
					X

ISSUES A94.05	INDEX NUMBER A67.10	EXHIBITS SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD		
		1	ORDER APPOINTING THE BOARD	
		2	APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE	
		3	LETTER OF NOTIFICATION	
		4	BRIEF OF PERSONNEL FILE	
			COUNSEL'S RELEASE TO THE BOARD	
			ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS SUBMITTED AT TIME OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE	
			TAPE RECORDING OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE HEARING	

HEARING DATE 18 Jun 2009	CASE NUMBER FD-2008-00409	
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

APPLICANT'S ISSUE AND THE BOARD'S DECISIONAL RATIONALE ARE DISCUSSED ON THE ATTACHED AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE.

Case heard in 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.

Names and votes will be made available to the applicant at the applicant's request.

SIGNATURE OF RECORDER <i>[Signature]</i>	SIGNATURE OF BOARD PRESIDENT <i>[Signature]</i>
--	---

INDORSEMENT		DATE: 6/30/2009
TO: SAF/MRBR 550 C STREET WEST, SUITE 40 RANDOLPH AFB, TX 78150-4742	FROM: SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PERSONNEL COUNCIL AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD 1535 COMMAND DR, EE WING, 3RD FLOOR ANDREWS AFB, MD 20762-7001	

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 available pertinent data on the applicant and the factors leading to the discharge.

FINDINGS: Upgrade of discharge is denied.

The Board finds that neither the evidence of record nor that provided by the applicant substantiates an inequity or impropriety that would justify a change of discharge.

ISSUE:

Issue 1. Applicant contends discharge was inequitable because it was too harsh and believes his discharge should be based on hardship. The records indicated the applicant received an Article 15, a Vacation, five Letters of Reprimand, nine Letters of Counseling, a Record of Individual Counseling and eight Memorandums for Record for misconduct. The applicant was administratively disciplined for failure to go (three times), sleeping on duty (three times), failure to pay debt to AAFES, failure to maintain quarters, being late for duty (six times), overdue suspense, training assignment being overdue (twice), failure to maintain base housing yard, missed appointment, failure to complete assigned training, failure to pay bills, failed inspection of quarters, and failure to obey an order. The DRB noted applicant's contention that his discharge should have been for hardship. However, the applicant failed to provide documentation to support his contention. Therefore, his request is without merit. The DRB opined that through these administrative actions, the applicant had ample opportunities to change his negative behavior. The Board concluded that the negative aspects of the applicant's service outweighed the positive contributions he made in his Air Force career. The characterization of the discharge received by the applicant was found to be appropriate.

Issue 2. The applicant cited his desire to receive the G.I. Bill benefits as justification for upgrade. The DRB noted that when the applicant applied for these benefits, he understood he must receive an Honorable discharge to receive future educational entitlements. The Board was sympathetic to the impact the loss of these benefits was having on the applicant, but this is not a matter of inequity or impropriety which would warrant an upgrade.

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