		AIR FORCE DISCHARGE	REVIEW BOARD HE	EARIN	G RECORD	)			
NAME OF SERVICE MEMBER (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL)				GRADE			AFSN/SSAN		
			SI	SRA					
TYPE GEN	X PER	SONAL APPEARANCE	, , ,	R	ECORD RE	EVIEW			
COUNSELY	<b></b>	ND OR ORGANIZATION	ADDR	ESS AND O	R ORGANIZATION	OF COUNSEL			
YES No									
X			75.14 · S		VOTE	OF THE BO	von i Sastiliai		
MEMRER SITTING				ION	GEN	UOTHC	OTHER	DENY	
			X	[*+					
			Х	[*+					
			х	<b>*</b> +					
				[*-+-					
		<u> </u>		[*+					
A92.	36	INDEX NUMBER A67.30	31 32 A		XHIBITS SUB		THE BOARD		
				1 ORDER APPOINTING THE BOARD 2 APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE					
			<u> </u>	1.1555					
			<del> </del>	w <sup>2</sup>					
				COUNSEL'S RELEASE TO THE BOARD  ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS SUBMITTED AT TIME OF					
				PERSONAL APPEARANCE					
			TA	PE RECO	ORDING OF PE	RSONAL APP	EARANCE HE	ARING	
HEARING DATE		CASE NUMBER							
13 Apr 2010		FD-2008-00354							
H APPLICANT'S ISSUE	S AND THE BOARD'S DEC	ISPONAL RATIONALE ARE DISCUSSED ON THE AT	TACHED AIR FORCE DISCHARGE R	EVIEW BO	ARD DECISIONAL.	ATIONALE.	Activity of the Charles of	gapath at	
Case heard vi	ia videotelecont	ference between Andrews AFB	, Maryland and Robin	ns AFE	3, Georgia o	n 13 April	2010.		
Advise applic	cant of the decis	sion of the Board.							
Names and ve	otes will be mad	de available to the applicant at	the applicant's reques	st.					
* CHANGE R	E CODE								
		UTHORITY TO SECRETARIAL	AUTHORITY						
01111101111							1 21 g		
		CNT			· ·	N I I CONTRACTOR			
TO:			FROM:		E TUE 410 PAGE	DEDCOMMON CO.	INCU		
SAF/MRBR 550 C STREET WEST, SUITE 40			AIR	FORCE DIS	F THE AIR FORCE SCHARGE REVIEW D DR, EE WING, 3R	BOARD	INCIL		
	DOLPH AFB, TX 781				, MD 20762-7001				
AFHO FOI	RM 0-2077, JAN	[ 00	(EF-V2)				Pro	evious	
		•	(=- · ~)				21.		

## AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE

FD-2008-00354

**GENERAL:** The applicant appeals for upgrade of discharge to honorable, to change the reason and authority for the discharge, and to change the reenlistment code.

The applicant appeared and testified before the Discharge Review Board (DRB), without counsel, via video teleconference between Andrews AFB, Maryland and Robins AFB, Georgia on 13 April 2010.

The following additional exhibits were submitted at the hearing:

Exhibit #5: Applicant's Contentions
Exhibits #6-8: Character reference letters

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

**FINDING**: The board grants the requested relief.

The Board finds that neither the evidence of record nor that provided by applicant substantiates an impropriety that would justify a change of discharge. However, based upon the record and evidence provided by applicant, the Board finds the applicant's discharge characterization, RE code, and reason and authority for discharge inequitable.

ISSUE: Applicant contends his discharge was inequitable because it was based on an isolated incident during his otherwise good service. The applicant was discharged for commission of a serious offense based on an incident that occurred on 1 December 2005. The applicant was pulled over by a Florida state trooper and initially refused to pull over or exit his vehicle. The applicant finally left his vehicle and was apprehended by the police officer. During the time he was in the car, the applicant recognized the police officer from a previous occasion two months prior where he was stopped for speeding and the police officer was very rude and intimidating. Based on this previous negative experience, the applicant called 911 while in his car so that another police officer would come to the scene. The applicant ultimately pled no contest to charges of resisting arrest, battery upon a police officer (based on the applicant's window hitting the police officer's arm when he rolled up the window), and making a false 911 call. He was issued a letter of reprimand by his unit for this incident. There were also several other minor disciplinary issues during the applicant's enlistment that were not used as the basis for the discharge but were used for characterization. The Board felt that, on their face, the charges against the applicant certainly warranted a discharge for commission of a serious offense. However, when the Board viewed the DVD recording of the incident, it appeared much less serious than what was written on paper. The police officer had written a statement that the applicant had tried to hit and kick him. The recording of the event showed this not to be the case. Additionally, the Board felt the police officer used excessive force on the applicant. Though not excusing the applicant's conduct, the applicant appeared to be in genuine distress and seemed to genuinely fear the police officer. The applicant also provided evidence of other disciplinary issues involving the police officer which showed the police officer had previously engaged in unprofessional conduct on a number of occasions. All of this evidence, combined with the applicant's otherwise good service (as evidenced by his previous "firewall" 5 EPR) convinced the Board that the applicant's discharge was inequitable.

**CONCLUSION:** 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 the applicant was provided full administrative due process.

However, in view of the foregoing findings, the Board concludes that the overall quality of applicant's service is more accurately reflected by an Honorable discharge and the reason for the discharge is more accurately described as Secretarial Authority and the reenlistment code changed to 3K under the provisions of Title 10, USC 1553.
Attachment: Examiner's Brief
Divinition of Divinition of the Control of the Cont
7.14 <u>0.0</u>