

# AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD HEARING RECORD

NAME OF SERVICE MEMBER (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL) <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div>			GRADE <b>AB</b>		AFSN/SSAN <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div>	
TYPE	<b>X</b>	PERSONAL APPEARANCE		RECORD REVIEW		
COUNSEL YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		NAME OF COUNSEL AND OR ORGANIZATION <b>AMERICAN LEGION</b>		ADDRESS AND OR ORGANIZATION OF COUNSEL <b>ATTN: QUEEN BAKER 1608 K STREET NW WASHINGTON DC 20006</b>		
MEMBER SITTING				VOTE OF THE BOARD		
<div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 100px;"></div>				HON	GEN	UOTHC
						OTHER
						DENY
						X*+
						X*+
						X*+
						X*+
						X*+
ISSUES <b>A93.11 A94.05</b>		INDEX NUMBER <b>A67.30</b>		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 <b>27 May 2010</b>		CASE NUMBER <b>FD-2008-00426</b>				
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.						
*Reason and Authority +Reenlistment Code						
<div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 50px;"></div>				<div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 50px;"></div>		
INDORSEMENT				DATE: 6/3/2010		
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		

**AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE**

CASE NUMBER

**FD-2008-00426**

**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 was offered a personal appearance before the Discharge Review Board (DRB) but declined and requests that the review be completed based on the available service record.

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, change of reason and authority for discharge, and change of reenlistment code.

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:**

Applicant contends discharge was inequitable because it was too harsh. She admits that she made mistakes and was experiencing financial problems with her husband. The applicant also expressed a desire to have her discharge upgraded so that she may be eligible to reenlist into the armed forces. The records indicated the applicant received a Special Court Martial for stealing money from another airman on four different occasions. She was punished with a reduction in grade to Airman Basic and was placed in confinement for four months. The Board concluded that the negative aspects of the applicant's service outweighed the positive contributions she made in her 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