

**AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD HEARING RECORD**

<b>NAME OF SERVICE MEMBER (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL)</b> [REDACTED]	<b>GRADE</b> AB	<b>AFSN/SSAN</b> [REDACTED]
--	--------------------	--------------------------------

<b>TYPE GEN</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>PERSONAL APPEARANCE</b>	<b>RECORD REVIEW</b>
-----------------	----------	----------------------------	----------------------

<b>COUNSEL</b>	<b>NAME OF COUNSEL AND OR ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>ADDRESS AND OR ORGANIZATION OF COUNSEL</b>
<b>YES</b>	<b>No</b>	
	<b>X</b>	

VOTE OF THE BOARD				
HON	GEN	UOTHC	OTHER	DENY
			X*+	
			X*+	
			X*+	
			X*+	
X				

<b>ISSUES</b> A94.06 A93.02	<b>INDEX NUMBER</b> A67.10 A49.00	<b>EXHIBITS SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD</b>
		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

<b>HEARING DATE</b> 30 Mar 2010	<b>CASE NUMBER</b> FD-2008-00444	
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

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 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.

\* CHANGE RE CODE  
 + CHANGE CHARACTERIZATION TO ENTRY LEVEL SEPARATION AND CHANGE REASON AND AUTHORITY TO SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY

<b>TO:</b> SAF/MRBR 550 C STREET WEST, SUITE 40 RANDOLPH AFB, TX 78150-4742	<b>FROM:</b> 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-2008-00444

**GENERAL:** The applicant appeals for upgrade of discharge to honorable and 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, at Andrews AFB on 30 Mar 2010. The following witness also testified on the applicant's behalf: Mr. William H. Hunter (father).

The following additional exhibits were submitted at the hearing:

Exhibit # 5: Applicant's Contentions

Exhibit # 6: A Resume, a Personnel Statement, 15 Character Reference Letters, and a Certification of Completion for a Criminal Justice Standards and Training

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

**FINDING:** The discharge is upgraded to Entry Level.

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 reason and authority for discharge inequitable.

**ISSUE:** The applicant contends discharge was inequitable because it was too harsh given his misconduct was a result of his youth and immaturity. The applicant was discharged for minor disciplinary infractions and for failure to progress in on-the-job training as an Air Traffic Controller. The records indicated the applicant received an Article 15 for wrongful use, with intent to deceive, of an Enlisted Phase Program, Phase II identification card; a Letter of Reprimand for wearing a sloppy uniform; a Letter of Counseling for failing a dorm room inspection (x2); and four AETC Form 173s (sleeping in class, unshaven (x2), reporting to class in a sloppy uniform, and failing to complete a homework assignment). He was discharged with an under honorable conditions (general) service characterization 20 days after completing six months of service. The DRB opined that the type of minor disciplinary infractions the applicant committed, along with the technical school washout, is the type of behavior we are looking for during the initial six months of service to determine whether to separate an individual under an Entry Level Separation. Although the DRB did not condone the misconduct of the applicant, the DRB deemed, given the type of the misconduct and the fact that the misconduct and the applicant's elimination from technical training all occurred within six months of entering the service, an Entry Level Separation discharge was more appropriate and equitable.

**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 described as Secretarial Authority. The applicant's characterization of discharge should be changed to Entry Level Separation and the reason for the discharge changed to Secretarial Authority under provisions of 10 USC §1553.

Attachment:

Examiner's Brief