| | | | AIR FOR | CE DISCHARGE | REVIEW BOA | RD | HEARI | NG RECOR | D | | |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|-------------|---|----------------------------|
| NAME OF SE | | GRADE | | | AF | AF\$N/S\$AN | | | | | |
| | | AB | | | | | | | | | |
| TYPE GEN | YPE GEN X PERSONAL APPEARANCE | | | | | | ······································ | RECORD R | | | |
| COUNSEL NAME OF COUNSEL AND OR ORGANIZATION | | | | | | ADDRESS AND OR ORGANIZATION OF COUNSEL | | | | | |
| YES No | | | | | | | | | | | |
| X | | | | | | | Market santa | VOT | E OF THE BO | DARD | Singapor estration, et al. |
| | | Mb. | HON | GEN | UOTHC | OTHER | DENY | | | | |
| | | | | 4 | | | | | | *************************************** | X |
| | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| ISSUES A94.05 | | | INDEX NUMBER | INDEX NUMBER A67.50 | | EXHIBITS SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | PPOINTING TH | | HARGE | |
| | | | | | | _ | | F NOTIFICATI | | II INO | |
| | | | | | | 4 | BRIEF OF | PERSONNEL I | TLE | | |
| | | | | | | | | 'S RELEASE T | | | |
| | | , | | | | | | L APPEARANO | | AT TIME OF | |
| | | | | | | | TAPE REC | ORDING OF P | ERSONAL AP | PEARANCE H | EARING |
| HEARING DATE | | | CASE NUMBER | | | | | | | | |
| 15 Apr 201 | | | FD-2008-00 | | | | | | | | |
| APPLICANT'S IS | | | | ARE DISCUSSED ON THE AT | | | | OARD DECISIONAL | | | |
| Case heard | in W | ashington, | , D.C. via video | -teleconference w | vith Robins AF | BC | Georgia. | | | | |
| Advise app | lican | t of the dec | cision of the Bo | oard and the right | to submit an ap | pli | cation to | the AFBCN | ΔR. | | |
| Names and | l vote | s will be m | nade available t | o the applicant at | the applicant's | req | ļuest. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| _ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A | | | | | | | | | | | o |
| τo: | a se de | | ĪN | DORSEMENT | FROM; | | | | DATE: 4/15/ | zo ro* | |
| SA 550 | | BR REET WEST, : PH AFB, TX 1 | | | | | AIR FORCE I 1535 COMMA | OF THE AIR FORC DISCHARGE REVIE ND DR, EE WING, 1 FB, MD 20762-7001 | W BOARD | OUNCIL | |
| | | -, -J- | _ | | | | | | | | |

AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE

FD-2008-00375

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 15 Apr 2010.

The following additional exhibits were submitted at the hearing:

Exhibit #5: Applicant's Contentions

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

FINDING: The Board denies the upgrade of the discharge.

The Board finds the applicant submitted no issues contesting the equity or propriety of the discharge, and after a thorough review of the record, the Board was unable to identify any that would justify a change of discharge.

ISSUE: Applicant contends discharge was inequitable because it was too harsh. The records indicated the applicant received two Article 15s, two Letters of Reprimand, and two Letters of Counseling for misconduct. The misconduct included failure to go, underage drinking, driving a personal vehicle on base while under restriction, and drinking while on call. 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.

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.

In view of the foregoing findings, the Board further concludes that there exists no legal or equitable basis for upgrade of discharge and determines the discharge should remain unchanged.

Attachment: Examiner's Brief